



# Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Applying His Ethic to Contemporary U.S.—Responding to '911'

David Michael Hensler

Advisor: Josina M. Makau  
Capstone Instructor: Paul Mason Fotsch

Concentrations:  
Narrative, History, and Memory  
Practical and Professional Ethics

Spring 2002

cover constructed by  
Glen "G factor" Smallman

# Table of Contents

.....Dedication/Acknowledgments

.....I. Introduction

.....II. Historical Context of Bonhoeffer's Ethic

.....III. The Structure of Responsible Life

.....IV. The Place of Responsibility

.....V. Post-911 Responsibility in the U.S.

.....VI. Destructive Tendencies to Responsible Life

.....VII. Objections to Bonhoeffer's Ethic

.....VIII. Conclusion

.....IX. Appendices

.....X. Bibliography

*To those in it for the Cause.*

*For JAH, my Friend and Savior.*

I owe special thanks to the following:

Jennifer Hensler

Josina Makau

Renee Curry

&

a special acknowledgment to all those who have lived and died resistance throughout world history.

*In Germany they first came for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came for the Jews and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me—and by that time no one was left to speak up.*

Martin Niemoller

.....I. Introduction

September 11 (911) will never leave our minds. Forever etched on our memory will be the burning towers of the World Trade Center, the collapse, and the sublime sense of empty sky in New York City, where fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters once went to work.

Within hours of the devastation, the United States was sincerely united with providing relief to the victims and their relatives. Boxes overflowing with donated goods crowded the sidewalks in New York City. Restaurants were giving away free food in return for donations to Red Cross. A national day of silence commemorated the lives of the victims. For a week, our country was united. Indeed, even Major League Baseball teams still stop at 9:11 to dedicate a minute of silence before resuming the game.

Once the rubble settled, though, America wanted solutions. The solution came in the form of the USA PATRIOT Act, which targets immigrants and abridges our civil liberties. Hundreds of immigrants are incarcerated without due process, all in the name of national security. Soon following the Act, the President sent troops to Afghanistan to begin the war on terror, starting with Osama bin Ladin.

Now, the unity that once flourished with tears of compassion and enduring strength has become the bloodshot eyes of vengeance and the mission of proving imperial strength to the world with the "war on terror" against the "axis of evil."

My research is in response to the targeting of non-white American immigrants by the government. The purpose of this paper is to give a malleable ethic to U.S. citizens in response to post-911 legislation, especially any involving xenophobia, finding a scapegoat, and anti-Arab and anti-Muslim racism and hatred. The ethic is not for citizens only. It is also applicable to the President and the U.S. Government as a whole. Indeed, all in leadership around the globe should consider this ethic before executing their decisions to fight evil. For the ethics portion, I refer to Dietrich Bonhoeffer, a Lutheran pastor who resisted Hitler and Nazism. During his time of resistance, he formed an ethic of responsible life in his book, Ethics. In the face of despotism, anti-Semitism, and human extermination, Bonhoeffer witnessed the apex of evil and oppression.

Within the last 30 years, interest surrounding Bonhoeffer's life and thought has increased immensely. Some would go so far as to label Bonhoeffer the most important thinker of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. I would have to agree. Not only is he the most important thinker of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, I would argue he is the answer to the question of human rights. For the marginalized, oppressed, and silenced, Bonhoeffer is the diplomat they send to the political powers and authorities that reign.

It is impossible for Bonhoeffer to advocate from the grave, however. Thus my purpose of presenting his ethic in the hopes of others adopting it with the intention of applying, revising, expanding, and sharing it: Ethics is reality.

What follows is an outline of the historical context that shaped Bonhoeffer's ethic. I then discuss his ethic of responsible life, and the place of responsibility. I transition into a discussion of post-911 legislation and responsibility. Then offer several objections to Bonhoeffer's ethic. I conclude with outlining how Bonhoeffer's ethic promotes multicultural education, which can promote diverse understanding and the raising of consciousness toward injustice and inequality. Not since the banning of segregation has education been so important in implementing understanding, appreciation, and respect for diverse races, cultures, worldviews, and religions.

This paper is not meant to be an authority. Rather, it is designed to: 1) inform the reader of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's ethic, and 2) be used as a tool to do further research on a topic too large for the scope of this capstone project.

.....II. Historical Context of Bonhoeffer's Ethic

1933-1945 saw the bottle of swinging, roaring twenties run empty and dry into the Depression in America; the ugliness of Jim Crow still loomed its ugly head; and the world was just starting to fully recover from the First World War.

Hitler took the leadership of Germany in January 1933. Reactions across Germany varied. For Dietrich Bonhoeffer and his family, they were of an excessively pessimistic opinion.

January 1933 changed the direction of Bonhoeffer's life. Now, academic dialogue must lead to action. And the only shelter to find cover from Hitler was academia and ministry. As a part of academia and the ministry, Bonhoeffer was faced with polar opposite demands: Hitler's politics and God's commandments.

Up to this point in his life, Bonhoeffer was a staunch pacifist. Living by the standards set by Jesus of Nazareth in the Sermon on the Mount (see Appendix B)—"turn the other cheek"—, the ethics of pacifism consumed Bonhoeffer. During the late 20s, he was introduced to the ethic of pacifism by a fellow student while studying at Union Theological Seminary in New York. Fervor for pacifism became so ardent that he wished to study under Mahatma Gandhi.

A month after Hitler's ascension, Bonhoeffer delivered a radio broadcast on "The Younger Generation's Altered View of the Concept of *Fuhrer*."<sup>1</sup> Although the radio broadcast was planned before Hitler came to power, he analyzed the development of the concept of *Fuhrer*, and its changes, among the Youth movement. The correct structure of authority was Bonhoeffer's main concern. His broadcast was cut off as he ventured to discuss the topic of the leader: "[should the leader] surrender to the wishes of his followers, who would always make him their idol—then the image of the Leader will gradually become the image of the 'misleader.'...Leaders or offices which set themselves up as gods mock God."<sup>2</sup> The radio broadcast serves as an apt example of Bonhoeffer's resistance. Though he

---

<sup>1</sup>Eberhard Bethge, Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 259.

<sup>2</sup>Bethge 260

wrote the script before January 1933, he chose to resist the frenzied excitement of Hitler by going on the air.

February 1933 in Germany was a time of political intensity. With the elections a month away in March, the political parties continued to struggle. Political parties rioted in the streets; politicians were openly attacked in public; party demonstrators overflowed off the streets into churches; among the parishioners it was not uncommon to find a group of uniformed S.A. men.

The chaos was not out of Hitler's control, however. The enthusiasm of most German people for the new national era caused many to submit to one legislative decree after another. In the hopes of freedom through Hitler, the people did not question the laws. In essence, Hitler deprived the people of their rights. One such decree was the "Reich President's Edict for the Protection of People and State"<sup>3</sup>—what became known as the "Reichstag Fire Edict"—, which was a response to the Reichstag burning to the ground. This edict gave Hitler supreme powers: "Therefore restriction of personal freedom, the right of free speech, including the freedom of the press, of the right of association and of public assembly, intervention in the privacy of post, telegraph and telephone, authorization of house searches and the confiscation and restriction of property, beyond the hitherto legal limits, will henceforward be admissible."<sup>4</sup> Because of the radio broadcast, and his ecumenical church contacts throughout the world, Bonhoeffer experienced much censorship after this decree. The majority of censorship involved letters and phone conversations. At his parent's home, Bonhoeffer and his family discontinued any discussions involving politics because they feared an outside listener.

In addition to the Reichstag Fire Edict, the Malicious Practice Act soon followed. Its function applied to any person who, "with malice aforethought puts forward or spreads an untrue or grossly distorted assertion of a factual nature that is likely to seriously impair the welfare of the Reich or of a province or the reputation of the Reich Government or of a regional government or of the parties or associations behind those governments."<sup>5</sup> For anyone who refused to affirm Hitler's government—like Bonhoeffer—, this decree meant danger.

---

<sup>3</sup>Bethge 263

<sup>4</sup>Bethge 263

<sup>5</sup>Bethge 266

In the ecumenical world, many church leaders wrote their partner churches in England and America, asking them to resist any propaganda that opposed Germany's new order. These church leaders assured their counterparts that all was peaceful in Berlin, and those who were arrested were being well treated. Of course, the Malicious Practice Act enforced an optimistic view of Hitler and his government. The truth of these church leaders may be lost in the Act. Only time will tell the truths of the motivation behind these church leaders.

The German people lost their right to privacy through the Reichstag Fire Edict, and lost their freedom of speech through the Malicious Practice act. Two fundamentals of freedom were gone; yet Hitler enacted another law: "The Law to Relieve the Emergency of the People and the State"—otherwise known as The Enabling Act. This Act, "conferred legislative power upon the government, legalized all past and future decrees, and released Hitler from the requirement to conform to constitutional regulations when these got in his way."<sup>6</sup>

Another law, The Law for the Reconstruction of the Civil Service, affected non-Aryan academic teachers. The extent of this law also covered any professors with sympathies for non-Aryans. On 1 April,<sup>7</sup> the National Socialist restricted participation in academic disciplines by Jewish professors or sympathizers.

The National Socialist German Christian Faith movement was organized in 1932. In April 1933, a Reich conference for German Christians was held. The topic for discussion was people of "alien blood"; those of non-Aryan backgrounds, the German Christians maintained, had no place in ministry. This issue soon led to the Aryan Clause—discrimination against Jews holding an office in the church. The Jewish question, whether a Christian of Jewish descent may be a member of a Protestant church, was, for Bonhoeffer, the primary problem facing the church. Some ministers and theologians placed the Jewish Question on lower priority. By June, nearly every university had a "German Christian Students' Fighting League" set up by German Christians. This group organized meetings to pass resolutions in favor of Ludwig Muller, Hitler's confidential advisor in questions regarding the Protestant church. Muller

---

<sup>6</sup>Bethge 268

<sup>7</sup>Bethge 276

was made president of the High Church Council as bishop, which invested in him the power to exercise the authority of the High Church Council independently. Muller wished to use the church as an instrument of Nazi ideology.

Within the chaos of state interference in church affairs, Martin Niemoller founded the Pastor's Emergency League, which soon became the Confessing Church. The mission of the Confessing Church was combating the discrimination against Christians of Jewish descent. Opposition to Hitler's efforts to bring German churches under Nazi control is largely due to Niemoller's instrumental efforts. By 1934, the Confessing Church openly declared opposition to Hitler, the German Christians, and anti-Semitic ideology. However, without Karl Barth, the 1934 declaration may not have taken place. Along with Niemoller, Barth was one of the founders of the Confessing Church. A draft prepared by Barth for the 1934 Synod of Barmen proposes proper resistance to German Christians and Nazi Germany—stand firm on true Christian doctrine. The draft came in six articles, called the Theological Barmen Declaration. Between 1933-35, Bonhoeffer was appointed as the leading spokesman for the Confessing Church.

Bonhoeffer was appointed to organize and direct a seminary for the Confessing Church. The seminary was declared illegal in 1937, but continued in disguised form until 1940 at Finkenwalde. It was here, during his experience at the seminary, that Bonhoeffer wrote The Cost of Discipleship and Life Together. As a study on the Sermon on the Mount, The Cost of Discipleship attacks the notion of "cheap grace" being marketed by the German Protestant churches of that time—the churches offered unlimited forgiveness, which is said to be a cover for ethical laxity.<sup>8</sup>

Church leaders had willingly accepted Nazi policy into their church confession. To Bonhoeffer, they were guilty of crossing church boundaries, boundaries of revelation. In a lecture to his students at Finkenwalde in 1936, Bonhoeffer professed the seriousness of resistance. He states that, "Whoever knowingly cuts himself off from the Confessing Church in Germany cuts himself off from salvation."<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>"Bonhoeffer, Dietrich" *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*.

<<http://search.eb.com/bol/topic?eu=82755&sctn=1>> [Accessed February 6, 2002].

<sup>9</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, "The Question of the Boundaries of the Church and Church Union," in A Testament to Freedom: The Essential Writings of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, eds. Geoffrey B. Kelley and F. Burton Nelson (New York: HarperCollins, 1990), 173.

From 1933-37 he saw the rise of collectivism and nationalism in the unquestioning acceptance of Nazism.

Bonhoeffer was approached by his brother-in-law Hans von Dohnanyi in 1938. Dohnanyi proposed a plan to overthrow Hitler. A group had already formed in support of the plan. Bonhoeffer had up to this point spent much time in ecumenical affairs, especially in England where he met George K.A. Bell, bishop of Chichester. Bell was sympathetic to the realities Bonhoeffer presented about the German Church struggle. In 1939, Bonhoeffer fled to America to escape the war. Two weeks later, he returned, knowing that to take part in the reconstruction of life in Germany after the war, he must take part in the struggle of that time with his people. Under cover as an employee for the Military Intelligence Agency (*Abwher*), Bonhoeffer was in fact a part of the resistance movement to overthrow Hitler. By 1940, he was out of the realm of ecclesiastical resistance and treading the territory of political conspiracy.

Eberhard Bethge places the conspiracy in three categories<sup>10</sup>: information; readiness; participation. The information stage is 1938-39, before fleeing to America, during his time teaching the students of the Confessing Church, and the time he was approached by Dohnanyi about the conspiracy. Being informed of a conspiracy, Bonhoeffer was, according to the Reich, liable for the death penalty.

In the second stage of readiness, 1939-40, Bonhoeffer was ready to act. The course of action for Bonhoeffer and the conspirators was at this point: get rid of Hitler, then to negotiate peace. Interestingly, this was after his return from America—Bonhoeffer loosened his pacifism and conscientious objection to military service. It was also no longer an issue whether or not he saluted Hitler. He also met the figure of the German military counter-espionage, Hans Oster. It was during the second stage that Bonhoeffer began his work on Ethics.

The third stage is 1940-43. Bonhoeffer had dual identities: a civilian, theological expert; a civilian employed by the *Abwher*. However, in reality, he was working for the opposition. He exploited his ecumenical contacts to strengthen and build support for the conspiracy. On one hand, Bonhoeffer

---

<sup>10</sup>Eberhard Bethge, Bonhoeffer: Exile and Martyr (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1971), 120.

played a very minimal role in the conspiracy; on the other hand, the leap from pacifism to conspiracy is gargantuan.

On 5 April 1943, he was arrested on account of the Gestapo headquarters proving certain rules between them and the *Abwehr* had been broken. He was linked to the conspiracy on 20 July 1944, even though both attempts by the conspirators to assassinate Hitler failed. Until this time, he was in prison awaiting trial. The new discovery brought new sentencing. Bonhoeffer was executed in Flossenburg concentration camp on 9 April 1945, a week before the war ended.

.....III. The Structure of Responsible Life

Bonhoeffer did not complete Ethics. What is available to read is a compilation of notes and writings from his prison cell and his parent's attic. Though it is incomplete, it is not insufficient to gain insight and understanding of the ethical issues facing him. The ethic Bonhoeffer attempts to construct is responsible life. In a time of evil terrorizing a nation, he formulates the ethical basis for when extreme ethical actions are required of morally reasonable people. Of course, the extreme ethical action for Bonhoeffer was political assassination and attempting to overthrow the Third Reich. Ultimately, his ethic is designed for both action and thought.

In Ethics, Bonhoeffer asserts the need for concrete ethics. He claims that rarely has a generation "shown so little interest...in any kind of theoretical or systematic ethics"<sup>11</sup> as did his. In the midst of Hitler's Nazi policies, concentration camps, and public persecution, Bonhoeffer saw what he calls a "superabounding reality of concrete ethical problems."<sup>12</sup> Living in such calamity, no room exists for theoretical ethics. Ethics that challenge a person with ideas are superfluous in this situation. Criminals were not removed from society; rather, criminals were running society. The law-breakers were not placed under arrest or punished; rather, they stood erect in the gaze of society. What is needed is ethics with action, ethics with concreteness.

---

<sup>11</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics (New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1995), 66.

<sup>12</sup>Bonhoeffer 66

What Bonhoeffer constructed during this time was responsible life. The responsible person lives in reality, which requires an individual response. "Responsibility means...that the totality of life is pledged and that our action becomes a matter of life and death."<sup>13</sup> The person of responsibility has responsibility to humans and for humans, to reality and for reality. In being thus responsible, they have responsibility for themselves. The catalyst for Bonhoeffer's ethic probably came about in his resistance work. In working with Christians and non-Christians, his "person of responsibility" came into being. Thus, he gives a structure to responsible life; the life lived with responsibility to humans and reality. The structure consists of deputyship, correspondence with reality, deed of free responsibility, acceptance of guilt, conscience, and freedom.

The first tier of responsible life is deputyship. Deputyship arises in situations where one person is in direct obligation to another. Bonhoeffer uses a father as an example of one with direct obligations. The father acts for his children by working, caring, and interceding for them. The father is no longer an isolated individual. Now, he combines to himself the lives of others, his family. If he were to live as if he were a single individual, he would be denying his responsibility. Bonhoeffer claims that the responsible person is not the isolated individual of ethical conflict; instead they are the agent of ethical reflection. His principle of deputyship is not affected by the limits of responsibility assumed, whether it is an individual or a community. Even the solitary individual lives as a deputy, for, as Bonhoeffer says, their life is lived in deputyship for humans as humans, for humanity as a whole. No one can escape responsibility, so no one can flee from deputyship. Individual responsibility is being responsible with respect to humanity. "Deputyship...and responsibility, lies only in the complete surrender of one's life to the other man. Only the selfless man lives responsibly, and this means that only the selfless man lives."<sup>14</sup> Deputyship is responsibility from person-to-person, in all of humanity.

Besides responsibility for all humanity in deputyship, to live responsible life one must act in accordance with reality. To act in accordance with reality means to have a concrete situation for a concrete individual. The responsible person acting in accord to reality does not seek an absolute good.

---

<sup>13</sup>Bonhoeffer 219

<sup>14</sup>Bonhoeffer 222

Rather, says Bonhoeffer, they prefer what is relatively better than that which is relatively worse, and they understand the "absolute good" may in fact be the very worst. Bonhoeffer wrote this in the midst of the conspiracy, so his frame of mind was consumed with dual identity, mass human extermination, and Nazi oppression. "In action which is genuinely in accordance with reality there is an indissoluble link between the acknowledgement and the contradiction of the factual."<sup>15</sup> Bonhoeffer claims this is because reality is not lifeless. Reality is real humanity, the real human, and the incarnation of God. The Incarnate God, Jesus Christ is factual reality. As such, he is the justification and contradiction, the affirmation and negation. Action apart from the understanding of real humanity and reality is an abstraction, according to Bonhoeffer. On the other hand, "Action which is in accordance with Christ is in accordance with reality because it allows the world to be the world; it reckons with the world as the world; and yet it never forgets that in Jesus Christ the world is loved, condemned and reconciled by God."<sup>16</sup> Still, no unity exists between a Christian and a secular principle. However, an advanced knowledge of what is "Christian" and what is "secular" does not exist. So, according to Bonhoeffer's ethic, it is in the action of the individual done in concrete responsibility, motivated by the effected reconciliation in Christ, that a unity is found. Unity between Christians and non-Christians is in responsible action done in accordance with the reality of the reconciliation through Christ. The world and God are now one reality. Concrete action for others in this reality is responsibility. Whether Christian or non-Christian, responsible action in the knowledge of reality ensures human rights and effects human equality.

For non-Christians, conforming to the real is reality. In other words, the Christian asks: How is Christ taking form in the world?; and, How can I conform to Christ's form in the world? The non-Christian asks: What is real?; and, How can I conform to reality? This methodology is universal for Bonhoeffer. In this manner, he was probably able to work in the resistance movement against Hitler with Christians and non-Christians.<sup>17</sup> For Bonhoeffer, God entering the world created an ontological

---

<sup>15</sup>Bonhoeffer 225

<sup>16</sup>Bonhoeffer 227

<sup>17</sup>Kobina Oforu-Donkoh. "Dietrich Bonhoeffer, 'The Man for Others'—Freedom and Responsibility in the Ethical Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer" (M.A. thesis, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1991), 16.

coherence between the reality of God with the reality of the world. This polemical unity<sup>18</sup> displays the Christocentric worldview of Bonhoeffer's understanding of all reality. The assumption on his part is that the reality of both God and the world in Christ makes the form of Christ accessible and apprehendable by everyone.

In addition to deputyship and responsible action is the deed of free responsibility. Free responsibility confronts situations of immense conflict. Bonhoeffer coins the time of requiring free responsibility as times of necessity, situations that no law can control. These are times when the laws of a state, the traditions of family, even science, come in conflict with the lives of others. The extraordinary necessity of action appeals to those who are responsible. The situation must be so severe that no law can bring resolution. The person of responsibility acts in concert with their freedom, knowing full well that they will abridge the law. In cases of free responsibility the responsible individual leaps out of the confines of conventional law and into the realm of history. In fact, Bonhoeffer asserts that "in this breaking of the law the validity of the law is acknowledged."<sup>19</sup> No judgment can be passed between the one bound by the law and the one who acts in free responsibility, according to Bonhoeffer. The judgment is left to God alone.

Responsible action is rooted in deputyship, correspondence with reality, and free responsibility. Bonhoeffer adds a fourth tier—the acceptance of guilt: "If it is responsible action, if it is action which is concerned solely and entirely with the other man, if it arises from selfless love for the real man who is our brother, then precisely because this is so, it cannot wish to shun the fellowship of human guilt."<sup>20</sup> As Jesus took upon Himself the guilt of humanity, so too does the person of responsibility. If one deters from accepting guilt they detach themselves from ultimate reality, the reality of human existence. Real innocence, says Bonhoeffer, is precisely in accepting the guilt of others through responsible action. This fellowship of guilt between humans represents the unity of Christ to the world in that Christ took upon Himself the guilt and suffering of all humanity. In so doing, He sets precedence of accepting guilt through responsible action.

---

<sup>18</sup>Oforu-Donkoh 12

<sup>19</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics (New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1995), 236.

<sup>20</sup>Bonhoeffer 237

The fifth tier of the responsible life is conscience. In the case of those who have a problem with some of the preceding elements of the responsible life, Bonhoeffer understands their conscience as the barrier unwilling to sacrifice its integrity. No one should be expected to act against conscience. In fact, Bonhoeffer says that "action against one's own conscience runs parallel with suicidal actions against one's own life, and it is not by chance that the two often go together."<sup>21</sup> Any responsible action, then, which enacted such violence to one's conscience in this manner would be ridiculed. However, Bonhoeffer questions the unity of conscience within each person. The first part of this unity, according to Bonhoeffer, is ego in humanity's claim to be like God in the knowledge of good and evil. Conscience, in this regard, is an attempt of the ego seeking justification before humanity, God, and itself, to secure a self-justification. Conscience, however, according to Bonhoeffer, will find no support on this type of individuality. Instead, it must be made whole in the autonomy of a person's ego. The law of conscience each individual must obey is beyond them. This law takes different concrete forms, binding the individual, and threatens the loss of self if transgressed. Finding conscience beyond themselves, for Bonhoeffer it is in Christ, each person is bound to the miracle of faith. For some in Bonhoeffer's period, the National Socialists (Nazis) said, "My conscience is Adolf Hitler" in an attempt "to find a foundation for the unity of [their] own ego somewhere beyond [themselves]."<sup>22</sup> The Nazis, in consequence, surrendered their autonomy for heteronomy, and this is fulfilled only if the unity of their life, Hitler, fulfills his function as redeemer for them. If one looks to Christ as the unity of their conscience, they are free to serve God and humanity. Because Jesus broke certain laws—eating with sinners, healing on the Sabbath, being forsaken by God on the cross—He took part in human guilt. This was responsible action. From this, Bonhoeffer maintains that a relative freedom from sin, especially in the responsible acceptance of other's guilt. Further, he claims that responsibility is held by conscience, but conscience is set free by responsibility. People with liberty of free responsibility are justified by free conscience; before themselves they are innocent by their conscience; before God they only hope for mercy.

---

<sup>21</sup>Bonhoeffer 238-39

<sup>22</sup>Bonhoeffer 239

The final tier of responsible life is freedom. For Bonhoeffer, factually, responsibility presupposes freedom and freedom consists solely in responsibility. Responsibility is the individual's freedom to act on themselves. Proof of responsibility is found in that no one can answer for the individual except for their act and their self. It is up to them to decide and act. This existential leap requires the individual to create the standard of their motives and the purpose of their action. This freedom would not exist if an outside law appealed as an authority on action advocated for the individual. As Bonhoeffer states:

The action of the responsible man is performed in the obligation which alone gives freedom and which gives entire freedom, the obligation to God and to our neighbor as they confront us in Jesus Christ. At the same time it is performed wholly within the domain of relativity, wholly in the twilight which the historical situation spreads over good and evil; it is performed in the midst of the innumerable perspectives in which every given phenomenon appears. It has not to decide simply between right and wrong and between good and evil, but between right and right and between wrong and wrong... Precisely in this respect responsible action is a free venture; it is not justified by any law; it is performed without any claim to a valid self-justification, and therefore also without any claim to an ultimate valid knowledge of good and evil.<sup>23</sup>

The free abandonment of their knowledge of good and evil enables one to perform the good of God. Responsible good is done in ignorance of good; it is surrendered to God so He can weigh the deed as He directs history. Thus for the sake of God and humanity, for the sake of Christ, a freedom from divine law, parental law, state law, exists; a freedom that permits one to break these laws, but only to give effect to them anew.

.....IV. The Place of Responsibility

After Bonhoeffer defines the structure of responsible life, he notes the demand for a more concrete formula. This, in turn, brings into question if it is possible to define the place of responsibility.

The place "at which responsible life is realized."<sup>24</sup> Such questions arise as:

Does responsibility set me in an unlimited field of activity? Or does it confine me strictly within the limits which are implied in my daily concrete tasks? What must I know myself to be responsible

---

<sup>23</sup>Bonhoeffer 245

<sup>24</sup>Bonhoeffer 249

for? And what does not lie within the scope of my responsibility? Is there any purpose in regarding myself as responsible for everything that takes place in the world? Or can I stand by and watch these great events as an unconcerned spectator so long as my own tiny domain is in order? Am I to wear myself out in impotent zeal against all the wrong and all the misery that is in the world? Or am I entitled, in self-satisfied security, to let the wicked world run its course, so long as I cannot myself do anything to change it and so long as I have done my own work? What is the place and what are the limits of my responsibility?<sup>25</sup>

From this, Bonhoeffer moves into placing responsible life in the realm of vocation. In reference to vocation, he draws a parallel to what he defines as the calling. For Bonhoeffer, the concept of the calling is seen two ways: the Monastic view and the Lutheran view. Monasticism restricts the calling, which is a protest of New Testament ideas of vocation, to a meditative life inside the four walls of a sanctuary. Thus Monasticism ignores the world and isolates itself into a place that is not the world. On the other hand, Martin Luther left the monastery to return to the world. In his return, Luther was concerned about his responsibility for humanity. The total responsibility for humanity Luther felt is polar-opposite to his experience in the monastery.

The place of responsibility led Bonhoeffer to inquire about the concept of the calling. Two views of calling are here represented: Monasticism and Luther's return to the world. He adds more dimensions to the concept of the calling. One is the place where the call finds a person. Another is how the calling embraces work with objects and relations with others. And last is the demand by the call to a "limited field of accomplishments."<sup>26</sup> Through service to humanity the "limited field of accomplishments" is freed from isolation. An example, according to Bonhoeffer, would be a physician. In a concrete instance the physician not only serves the patients but also medical science, which includes the knowledge of truth. In practice the physician performs this service at a concrete position—the bedside of the patient. Yet they are continuously aware of their responsibility for the whole (patient and knowledge of truth). In this, says Bonhoeffer, the physician's calling is fulfilled: "Vocation is responsibility and responsibility is a total response of the whole man to the whole of reality; for this very reason there can be no petty and

---

<sup>25</sup>Bonhoeffer 249-50

<sup>26</sup>Bonhoeffer 253

pedantic restricting of one's interests to one's professional duties in the narrowest sense.<sup>27</sup> Under the essence of free responsibility it is impossible to establish laws defining the extent of when and where departure from the "limited field of accomplishments" forms a person's calling and their responsibility to humanity. Further, Bonhoeffer explains, there is a "wrong and a right restriction and there is a wrong and a right extension of responsibility: there is an enthusiastic breaking-down of all limits, and there is a legalistic setting-up of limits."<sup>28</sup> In a concrete instance, it is often difficult to judge from the outside whether an action is responsible or enthusiastic or legalistic. Although assessing actions from the outside is difficult, Bonhoeffer outlines criteria for self-examination: Neither the limitation nor the extension of responsibility must be based on a principle; if one knows themselves to be inclined towards zeal for reformation and fanaticism, then they will be in danger of extending their responsibility in an arbitrary fashion; if one knows themselves to be prudent, cautious, and law-abiding, then they will have to be cognizant of possibly representing the restriction of their responsibility to a narrow field; and last, it is never in thinking of themselves that a person shall be set free for genuine responsibility.

In free responsibility, we are permitted to help humanity. In some cases, however, the New Testament concept of "love your neighbor" is attacked. The reason, according to Bonhoeffer, is "the legalistic and philistine misinterpretations"<sup>29</sup> of the commandment. One opposed to the misinterpretations—albeit unknowingly—was Nietzsche. Bonhoeffer claims Nietzsche was speaking much like the essence of the New Testament when he wrote:

You are assiduous in your attentions to your neighbor and you find beautiful words to describe your assiduity. But I tell you that your love for your neighbor is worthless love for yourselves. You go to your neighbor to seek refuge from yourselves and then you try to make a virtue of it; but I see through your 'unselfishness'!... Do I advise you to love your neighbor? I advise you rather to shun your neighbor and to love whoever is furthest from you!<sup>30</sup>

In commenting on Nietzsche, Bonhoeffer asserts the open space of responsibility to humanity.

Responsibility for the other is not confined to geographical landmass or geopolitical borders. This,

---

<sup>27</sup>Bonhoeffer 254

<sup>28</sup>Bonhoeffer 254

<sup>29</sup>Bonhoeffer 255

<sup>30</sup>Quoted in Bonhoeffer 255

according to Bonhoeffer, means our neighbor may well be the one who is extremely remote from us, and one who is extremely remote from us may well be our neighbor.<sup>31</sup>

Bonhoeffer uses a situation from the United States in 1831 involving nine black men who were sentenced to death for the rape of a white woman. The guilt of the men could not be proved, and the reputation of the woman was doubtful. Indignation was spread in Europe, and prominent public figures expressed their abhorrence in writing to the United States. One person in particular, a Christian cleric in Germany, asked whether he ought not to raise his voice in this situation. On the grounds of the "Lutheran" idea of vocation—the grounds of limited responsibility—the clergymen refused, and thus remained silent. Later, however, the immense amount of protest from around the world led to a revision of the sentence. In light of this situation, the saying of Nietzsche is appropriate. Not to pass judgment on the silent clergymen, but to "keep open the boundary"<sup>32</sup> of responsibility to humanity.

Similar to the silent clergymen in 1831, the churches of Bonhoeffer's time stayed silent. Often a minister would not intervene publicly and responsibly in cases of persecution because their congregations were not yet inflicted. Their hesitance was not out of cowardice, however. Most of the ministers felt that speaking out meant overstepping their calling, namely their vocation to assist their congregation in matters of faith. If matters of persecution turned upon their congregation, then actions of free responsibility ensued. Much like the example of the silent clergymen in 1831, the silent ministers who witnessed the Holocaust serve as an example of keeping open the boundaries of responsibility to humanity in the face of any false limitation.

.....V. Post-911 Responsibility in the U.S.

History is complex, and no simple answers exist for "ordinary" or "extraordinary" times. However, Bonhoeffer's ethic of responsible life is apt for responding to 911. Taking into account the context his ethic was formed, the situation facing the United States is not much different. The war on

---

<sup>31</sup>Bonhoeffer 255

<sup>32</sup>Bonhoeffer 256

“evil”, “terrorism”, and “terrorist organizations” is abridging the rights of citizens and targeting legislation at ideology. In the name of national security, innocent people are incarcerated without due process. The blind patriotism of 1933 Germany screaming against non-Aryans echoes the cry of U.S. citizens wanting expedient justice, even if it is at the expense of innocent life.

Throughout U.S. history, times of crisis have posed a threat on civil liberties. During World War I, for instance, the Supreme Court upheld the conviction of Eugene Debs<sup>33</sup>, a socialist who expressed his opposition to World War I. The decision ignored the protection of the First Amendment, which granted Debs the right to free speech—especially in expressing his unpopular opinion of non-violence and anti-war advocacy. A more commonly known instance is when in World War II the Supreme Court upheld the Executive Order, which mandated the internment of over 100,000 Japanese Americans and Japanese immigrants. The Order was strictly based on the ancestry of the Japanese. This mandated detention violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

In these two cases, the judiciary bowed to the demands of the political branches of the government. Now, in the name of gaining security after 9/11, Congress is willing to sacrifice civil liberties despite past mistakes. For instance, the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act (USA PATRIOT Act)<sup>34</sup>, abridges fundamental constitutional rights of U.S. citizens.

Not all citizens are targeted, however. With broad terminology, the Act covertly strips off the rights of immigrants. For instance, the Act grants the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) the authority to detain immigrants suspected of terrorism for lengthy, indefinite periods of time.<sup>35</sup> The Department of Justice (DOJ) has admitted to detaining more than 1,100 immigrants in response to an interim regulation announced by Attorney General John Ashcroft on September 17.<sup>36</sup> All were held

---

<sup>33</sup>*Debs V. United States*, 249 U.S. 211 (1919).

<sup>34</sup>Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001, Pub. L. No. 107-56.

<sup>35</sup>Nancy Chang, “The USA PATRIOT Act: What’s So Patriotic About Trampling on the Bill of Rights?” Silencing Political Dissent: How Post-September 11 Antiterrorism Measures Threaten Our Civil Liberties (New York: Seven Stories, 2002). <[http://www.ccr-ny.org/whatsnew/usa\\_patriot\\_act.asp](http://www.ccr-ny.org/whatsnew/usa_patriot_act.asp)>

<sup>36</sup>Chang

without due process. Stigmatizing immigration with terrorism, the Attorney General declared: “Let the terrorists among us be warned, if you overstay your visas even by one day, we will arrest you.”<sup>37</sup>

Currently, Amnesty International is confronting the INS with violating due process rights of those detained after the September 17 regulation. All together, Amnesty was able to form evidence against the government avoiding the constitutional rights of the detainees. One Saudi Arabian man was held for 119 days before being charged.<sup>38</sup> Most of the detainees the government admits to incarcerating are Pakistani (207), Egyptians (74), Turks (46), and Yemenis (38).<sup>39</sup> The profiling and discrimination is apparent.

To avoid misrepresentation, the USA PATRIOT Act does not only target immigrants. The civil liberties of all U.S. citizens are threatened. Among the most important rights, our right to free speech and privacy protected by the Constitution are abridged in the name of national security. Any political dissent that “[appears] to be intended...to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion” that “[occurs] primarily within the territorial jurisdiction of the United States”<sup>40</sup> is deemed “domestic terrorism.”

Loss of privacy comes in the adopted surveillance tactics. The surveillance tactics include sneak and peek searches (covert searches of a person’s home or office), access to records in international investigations, and tracking Internet usage.

What the Act means primarily for immigrants is of concern. The terminology of the Act is designed to target immigrants. Even though the terminology can apply to all citizens, the subject-to-removal policy is clearly an anti-immigrant expansion. For instance, “terrorist activity” is stretched to encompass any crime that involves the use of a weapon or dangerous device. As Nancy Chang points out, this definition includes any in-the-heat-of-the-moment altercation involving a person grabbing a knife or makeshift weapon out of passion as subject to removal as a “terrorist.” Also, according to the

---

<sup>37</sup>Dan Eggen, “Tough Anti-Terror Campaign Pledged,” *Washington Post*, Oct. 26, 2001, A1.

<sup>38</sup>Abby Scher, “Amnesty International Comes Down on the INS,” <Alternet.org>, April 8, 2002.

<sup>39</sup>Scher

<sup>40</sup>Nancy Chang, “The USA PATRIOT Act: What’s So Patriotic About Trampling on the Bill of Rights?” <[http://www.ccr-ny.org/whatsnew/usa\\_patriot\\_act.asp](http://www.ccr-ny.org/whatsnew/usa_patriot_act.asp)>

Act, a “terrorist organization” is two or more individuals, organized or not, which engage in terrorist activity. This, in turn, links groups to terrorism even though they have never been affiliated with terrorism.

Ultimately, the Act means anathema for immigrants. Even if an immigrant avoids association with a designated terrorist group, they cannot ignore the Act’s expansive definition of “terrorist organizations.” As such, any immigrant who congregates with an undesignated group or organization, having nothing to do with terrorism, may violate the Act’s restriction of terrorist activity, which subjects the person to the threat of removal. Refraining from associating with groups that could potentially be deemed “terrorist organizations” means that immigrants should ignore groups involved in furthering humanitarian and peace-oriented activities, such as training affiliates with presenting international human rights claims to the United Nations, representing such a group in peace talks, and donating humanitarian aid to such a group.<sup>41</sup>

In most cases, says Claudia Card, when human rights are disregarded, the perpetrator is not held accountable.<sup>42</sup> Accountability is now with humanity. According to Bonhoeffer, we are accountable to our fellow humans as to whether or not we are living responsibly. Though we may not have a "relationship" with another, our humanity binds us to action. However, Bonhoeffer is not advocating parochialism where we jump into situations where we do not belong. Rather, he calls us to raise our consciousness to the world around us by starting in our society. When an occurrence of unquestionable injustice occurs across the street or across the world, and a need is expressed for our immediate assistance, we are called to responsibility.

The main issue is in the U.S. today. Ethical relativism is leaving some citizens in our country stagnant. Bonhoeffer calls us out of idleness and into action. With apparent injustice and evil blanketing our society, the U.S. is without excuse as to why it does not act responsibly for its citizens. Besides the constitutional protection of U.S. citizens, our common humanity and pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness, bind us in the book of commonality. Ethically we ask: 1) who are we responsible to, and 2)

---

<sup>41</sup>Chang

<sup>42</sup>Claudia Card, "Responsibility Ethics, Shared Understandings, and Moral Communities," *Hypatia* 17, no. 1 (2000): 150.

what is our goal? Being responsible for others in this case means responsibility for the “other.” Bonhoeffer’s push for liberating the marginalized meant, for him, those of Jewish descent. In the case of post-911 U.S., the marginalized are all those targeted through ant-Arab, anti-Muslim, and anti-immigrant, legislation. Our common humanity holds us together. Responsibility for others in the U.S. does not confine us to those only in our community. Because of our common humanity, we are obligated to responsibility with everyone. The injustice of post-911 legislation is apparent. It is up to the citizens of the U.S. to respond with responsibility to other humans. Although feelings of justice take precedence over most our thoughts, it is not fair to leave the rights of others behind us in the dust of our fervor.

If another shares our common humanity, no matter their diverse cultural manifestation, we are responsible for them. Bonhoeffer’s structure of responsible life is not strictly a Western concept. He saw deputyship, for instance, as best carried out in the East by Mahatma Gandhi and his Satyagraha movement, than it was in the West.<sup>43</sup> Thus, responsible life is seen in the behavior of Bonhoeffer and Gandhi, Christian and non-Christian, German and Indian. Any legislation that deems a person anathema for the sake of patriotism and national security must be met with radical resistance. Responsible life constructs our place in society.

The war against evil is ironic considering our country is stripping its citizens of freedom. In the name of Free America, the Star Wars-like battle against the Evil Empire has chosen terrorists as its enemies. Osama bin Ladin has been the personification of evil.

Terrorism is no topic to downplay. It is truly an evil act. Combating unarmed civilians to spread a political message or religiously fervent ideology is horrific. If America truly wants to combat terrorism—especially terrorism that happens to us—we cannot support the President's war to uproot evil.<sup>44</sup> To value freedom, justice, security, and human rights, is a contradiction to supporting the war our government is waging. The USA PATRIOT Act and the war on terror testify to the President's belief that inalienable rights only apply to some. Protecting home costs humanity. American citizens are incarcerated, and a rampant display of U.S. military might is desecrating an already war-torn country.

---

<sup>43</sup>Kobina Ofofu-Donkoh. "Dietrich Bonhoeffer, 'The Man for Others'—Freedom and Responsibility in the Ethical Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer" (MA, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1991), 25.

<sup>44</sup>Terra Lawson-Remer, "Striking Back at the Empire." <Alternet.org> April 17, 2002.

Much like the newspeak of George Orwell's 1984, reality is changing by our terminology. For instance, "'justice' means revenge, 'freedom' requires the sacrifice of fundamental liberties, and 'terror' refers only to attacks against Americans."<sup>45</sup> All those opposed to U.S. interests face the chance of being called an enemy and a potential terrorist.

The true enemy of terrorism, war, and violence is fanaticism—especially an "ultraconservative religiously inspired domestic fascism."<sup>46</sup> As one alternative news journalist points out, the challenge is not to defeat a personified evil, a faceless "them." And once that is done, celebrate our virtue. It is, rather, to extend human rights and liberties to all people, no matter their color, creed, nation, or religion.<sup>47</sup> If America is to be worth fighting for—not in the strict military sense—the fundamental values it is founded on must remain. Right now in defending America, much like in other times of crisis, American values are degraded. As of right now, the President's "war on terror" contradicts the values of freedom, justice, and human rights that it is claiming to defend.<sup>48</sup>

In continuing the Star Wars analogy I cannot claim as my own, it is illustrated thus:

In the end, Darth Vader is not the enemy. He is, in fact, Luke's father, seduced by the power of the dark side. Our battle, then, is not with a straw-man Darth Vader, but with the socio-political conditions that make the dark side seductive. [The President] should heed the patriotic protestors—call off this senseless war, and take a stand for freedom and justice, grounded firmly in reality, both home and abroad.<sup>49</sup>

For the U.S—leaders and citizens—and even the whole world, responsible life calls us to fight off evil. Combating evil does not excuse imperialism or despotism, however. The current war on terror and the battle against evil should not be across the Atlantic. Even if a few terrorists are executed by the U.S., we still face the social, economic, political, and religious oppressions that create violence. The war should be right on our home front. From private life to politics, it will be messy. Ridding the world of these injustices should take up most of our lifetime. A way of looking at the situation is this: Wherever you are at, be all there.

---

<sup>45</sup>Lawson-Remer

<sup>46</sup>Khoren Arisian, "Another day of Infamy: Waking up to A Changed America." <[www.aeu.org](http://www.aeu.org)> September 16, 2001.

<sup>47</sup>Terra Lawson-Remer, "Striking Back at the Empire." <[Alternet.org](http://Alternet.org)> April 17, 2002.

<sup>48</sup>Lawson-Remer

<sup>49</sup>Lawson-Remer

Bonhoeffer christens us to ward off evil. That is why he gave his ethic of responsible life. In the process of ethically fighting evil to restore freedom and justice, he calls us to be cognizant of several destructive tendencies to responsible life that humans do when fighting evil people.

.....VI. Destructive Tendencies to Responsible Life

Reality pulled the curtain and revealed itself. Bonhoeffer and all of Germany faced the ugliness of villainous tyranny and groupthink. In a time where evil is appearing in the form of light, beneficence, and loyalty, conforming to the necessities of social justice, this is a time of wickedness, according to Bonhoeffer. In the midst of this evil, he labeled several strategies people take on when dealing with evil people: reasonableness, fanaticism, conscience, duty, free responsibility, and silent virtue. These strategies make responsible life impossible, according to Bonhoeffer.

Reasonable people persist in their best intentions to use reason to solve the problem of evil. If enough people come together and reason, it will suffice to hold a crumbling structure together. Bonhoeffer defines these reasonable people as those who try and bring about solutions with pure intellect. He says reasonable people are blind. Their blindness comes in their desire to see justice done on both sides. In effect, they are crushed between the contrasting forces. In the end they achieve nothing. Disappointed at all the unreasonableness of society and the world, they depart from the scene or yield to the party with more power. Reasonable people fail by missing the depths of evil.

Reasonable people, in other words, are much like a court of law, in that they try to be just on both sides of the argument. In this they ignore questions of character, because all people are equal under the law. Therefore, if an evil person tells the truth when it is in their interest to do so, the person of reason should reward them. The person of reason is bound to do so, and in the end is rejected, by good and evil. They achieve nothing.

The second group of people is the fanatics. By using the purity of their will and of their principle, fanatics believe they can conquer the power of evil. However, like a bull charging at the red cloth instead of the man who holds it, the fanatic loses sight of the totality of evil. In losing sight and

continuously charging at the red cloth, the bull-like fanatic tires and inevitably admits to defeat. They aim at a broad target, wide of the mark. In their earnest journey for truth and justice, they will eventually be entangled in non-essentials and fall into the trap of their more skillful opponent. In other words, they continuously charge like a bull at the red blanket, but not at the matador who holds it. The enthusiasm of the fanatic is enthralled with action.

People of conscience is the third group. In situations with an overwhelming force of inescapability that demands a decision, people of conscience fight a lonely battle. With no advocate or aid, these people are torn in two by the conflict. The only resource they have is what their innermost, deepest conscience can produce. To the people of conscience evil comes in a myriad of disguises. Because of the immense amount of lost trust in their judgment, their conscience becomes weaker and unsure of itself; and in the end, the person of conscience will be more satisfied if instead of having a clear conscience, they have salvaged one. To avoid despair, they will lie to their conscience. Bonhoeffer claims these people of conscience can never understand that a bad conscience may be healthier and stronger than a conscience that is deceived.<sup>50</sup>

Added to this confusing multiplicity of possible decisions is the path of duty. The path of duty seizes upon that which is commanded. One can be the most sure when acting upon the command. Whoever gives the command is vested with responsibility, not they who act upon it. However, this confines the limit of individual duty; the only act that strikes at the core of evil, according to Bonhoeffer, is the act of free responsibility. In the end, the person of duty would be obligated to execute a command from the devil.

Beyond people of reasonableness, fanaticism, conscience, and duty, the person of freedom sets themselves apart from the crowd. This existential leap of the individual introduces the person of freedom to sacrifice. They must be prepared. The person of freedom must care more for the necessary deed than their reputation, be prepared to sacrifice a dead principle to a live compromise, or sacrifice dead wisdom for live radicalism; their supposed freedom may end in their undoing. They will consent to the bad, consciously aware of it being bad, to force off the worse. In so doing, they will be incapable of

---

<sup>50</sup>Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Ethics (New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1995), 68.

realizing the worse they are trying to avoid may be the better. They ignore reputation, conscience, and facts. They ignore everything possible to achieve the best strategy possible under the circumstances. They use their freedom to do wrong to avoid the worse. Bonhoeffer acknowledges this as the "underlying theme of tragedy."<sup>61</sup>

Those with a private virtuousness find a refuge from taking a public stand. They do not murder, steal, or commit adultery; within their limits of power, they do good. In voluntarily cutting themselves off from all public life, they are aware of how to exist in the boundary preserving them from conflict. With all the wrongs around them, they must be blind and deaf. In order to maintain their private blamelessness from remaining uncontaminated from responsible action in the world, they must live in self-deception. No matter what they do, it is in what they do not accomplish that haunts them. People with private virtue will be destroyed either by their inaction or in becoming a hypocritical moral legalist.

These types of people—with reason, fanaticism, conscience, duty, free responsibility, and private virtue—are what Bonhoeffer calls the "achievements and attitudes of a noble humanity."<sup>62</sup> Much like Don Quixote rushing into imagined battles for the love of a woman who does not exist, the old world rushes against a new one and the world of the past attacks the superior with forces of commonplace. Bonhoeffer draws on this analogy to show that it is too easy for his contemporary world to scorn at the past weapons that worked for the moral battles of their forefathers. The weapons of the past were now obsolete. New weapons were needed for the new battle. Bonhoeffer claims the necessity to replace the rusty weapons with newer sharp ones. In other words, combine simplicity with wisdom. This combination, according to Bonhoeffer, is the only way for a person to stand their ground.

Also counter to Bonhoeffer's ethic of responsible life is any type of scorn or idolization of humanity, especially among those in leadership. Bonhoeffer lived in the midst of an ideology that either scorned humanity or idolized humanity. Hitler scorned Jews, homosexuals, prostitutes, and any person with a physical impairment. On the other hand, Hitler idolized the perfect person, the perfect Aryan blood of the Nordic race. In the period of Nazi policy, the highest attainable wisdom was scorn or

---

<sup>51</sup>Bonhoeffer 69

<sup>52</sup>Bonhoeffer 69

idolization of humanity. Hitler was the ultimate despiser of humanity. In this stormy time of legislated inhumane brutality, Bonhoeffer saw human nature being exposed. Similar to ethics as theory in times of calm, is the idea of human goodness in periods of peace. In the thick of the storm clouds, Bonhoeffer saw the tyranny of the despiser of humanity take advantage and exploit the baseness of others:

Fear he calls responsibility. Desire he calls keenness. Irresolution becomes solidarity. Brutality becomes masterfulness. Human weaknesses are played upon with unchaste seductiveness, so that meanness and baseness are reproduced and multiplied ever anew. The vilest contempt for mankind goes about its sinister business with the holiest of protestations of devotion to the human cause. And, as the base man grows baser, he becomes an ever more willing and adaptable tool in the hand of the tyrant.<sup>53</sup>

The unquestioning majority acts upon these actions of the tyrant, the despiser of humanity. In the sweep of patriotic fervor, the tyrant builds a following of people compacting themselves against unexpected threats. The drive of the majority, according to Bonhoeffer, is fear, desire, irresolution and brutality. The plague of groupthink amongst the majority decays the autonomy of each person. Unable to think unattached from the veins connected to the heart of uniformity, the majority is sucked into the overwhelming current of the crowd. Any opposition to the crowd, any band of existential individuals are chastised:

Their bravery is called insubordination; their self-control is called pharisaism; their independence arbitrariness and their masterfulness arrogance. For the tyrannical despiser of men popularity is the token of the highest love of mankind...In the presence of the crowd he professes to be one of their number, and at the same time he sings his own praises with the most revolting vanity and scorns the rights of every individual.<sup>54</sup>

The tyrannical despiser of humanity deifies his own person by the mob through his contempt for humanity and seeking favor from those whom he despises. The despiser of humanity, the tyrannical despot, hates what God has loved.

In contrast to what Hitler was doing towards the Jews, and what the U.S. is doing to immigrants, Arabs, and Muslims, Bonhoeffer calls for human rights based on equality found in the incarnation of God. Hitler fought for an ideal, the Nordic race, perfect Aryan blood. This ideal lead to

---

<sup>53</sup>Bonhoeffer 74

<sup>54</sup>Bonhoeffer 75

the deaths of millions. Nazism is the antithesis of human rights found in Bonhoeffer's ethic. According to Bonhoeffer, God does not pass judgment on humans. Nor does God permit humans to create a standard to measure each other with, or either to classify other humans. God loves and chooses the real human and the real world, not a manmade ideal. Hitler faces the accusation by God of placing himself as judge over the world and humans. As a forewarning, anyone who places themselves above humanity and the world to declare a standard or classification has placed themselves above God. In doing so, they are accused by God and the world as despisers of humanity, real humanity. They have missed reality.

.....VII. Objections to Bonhoeffer's Ethic

Human finitude limits Bonhoeffer, of course. Even though I have attempted to apply his ethic to contemporary U.S., it is still inadequate. In order for his ethic to fully apply to a contemporary context it would need to be reformulated. Reformulation is just half the matter. The complete picture lacks the final version of Ethics. What I have to work with is the incomplete document recovered from several locations and compiled in a guessed sequence. In progress work, however, does not discount the major contributions Bonhoeffer made in living his ethic. In forming an ethic promoting human rights, Bonhoeffer can definitely be drawn upon as a resource. But, indeed, he should be seen as a limited resource, not an ultimate authority.

The context Bonhoeffer wrote in directly affected his ethic. One aspect of this context is the combination of church and state. Since 1648, when the Peace of Westphalia occurred, Germany has state supported churches. Thus creating a German "Christendom." In regard to this fact, the German churches were captive to the state after the war as in the years of Nazi policy under Hitler.<sup>55</sup> Even though Bonhoeffer strongly advocated religious liberty, a shadow was cast by his continued acceptance of state support for the church. With this in mind, a major issue regarding freedom of conscience and

---

<sup>55</sup>Michael L. Westmoreland-White, "Contributions to Human Rights in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Ethic," Journal of Church & State 39, no. 1 (1997): 67.

religious liberty arises. Although Bonhoeffer clearly demonstrated the need for religious liberty and freedom of conscience, the issue of conformity leaves them vulnerable. Pressure to conform, of course, was a tactic used by Hitler. As one theologian points out, "genuine Christian faith must be truly free and un-coerced if it is to be truly Christian and truly faith."<sup>56</sup>

Another inadequacy in Bonhoeffer's ethic is the aura of German hierarchical culture. His notion that God has ordained superior/inferior relationships in society weakens the foundation for universal, equal human rights. Universal, equal human rights, of course, is the center of Bonhoeffer's ethic. Reforming this part of his ethic would entail correcting service to the status quo, and possibly referring to contemporary insights from feminists, liberation theologians, and critical power-analysts.<sup>57</sup>

The high Christology of Bonhoeffer's ethic is another limitation. Although I attempted to apply his ethic to Christians and non-Christians, his Christology maintains an exclusive worldview of Christians. An effect of this is a dividing wall separating common ground between Christians and non-Christians to form an ethic of human rights. Connecting Christians and non-Christians in an ethic of human rights would mean re-evaluating the themes of creation. Bonhoeffer's ethic carries the reticence of "orders of creation" supporting Germany's status quo, which should be corrected.<sup>58</sup> Amidst Nazi propaganda, this similarity is understandable. However, his ethic did correct the forms of natural law ethics separating creation from Christ, which should remain uncorrected.

Finally, Bonhoeffer's ethic did not develop a public language. It was not until the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations (see Appendix A) emerged that a public language of human rights existed. This, indeed, was out of his control. Public language in a pluralistic society, some argue, may be the lowest common denominator. The lowest common denominator would have no respect for the integrity of specific traditions. However, it has been pointed out that one can grasp a, "non-foundational, Fap postmodern tradition-embedded understanding of morality without lapsing into complete relativism."<sup>59</sup> The concept for this is "bricolage." Bricolage refers to, "the many ways in which

---

<sup>56</sup>Westmoreland-White

<sup>57</sup>Westmoreland-White

<sup>58</sup>Westmoreland-White

<sup>59</sup>Westmoreland-White

different moral traditions can communicate with one another with varying degrees of comprehension and without claiming that all moral beliefs are equally valid.<sup>60</sup> Here, according to this, Bonhoeffer begins the process of bricolage. He communicated with the public realm, although it was not fully developed. This may be due in part of his taking for granted the knowledge of Christianity in Europe.<sup>61</sup> For our situation, developing an ethic of human rights should entail the process of bricolage. However, our process will need to be more exhaustive, in that our society is immensely more pluralistic than that of Bonhoeffer's time.

.....VIII. Conclusion

We, no doubt, live in a pluralistic society. Contributions to the history of the United States are from both Christians and non-Christians. The Puritans provided Christian contributions. However, if one stops at the generalization that the founding colonizers were all Puritan, the fallacy then becomes the "Christian America" myth.<sup>62</sup> Non-Christians, too, contributed to the roots of the United States. For example, the United States has roots in John Locke from the Scottish Enlightenment, and Jean Jacques Rousseau from the French Enlightenment. According to Michael L. Westmoreland-White, the "Christian America" myth is often used to oppress those who have no faith, and fight separation of church and state. In contrast, the ethic of Dietrich Bonhoeffer requires American society to, "recognize not only the contributions of ethnic and religious minorities, but the contribution of the secular forces both to the harm and health of society."<sup>63</sup>

In addition to recognizing the contributions of *all* to American Society, Westmoreland-White also adds the need to recognize contributions to the Church. The Enlightenment contributed immensely to the Church. "Inheritance and Decay" in Ethics clearly states how Bonhoeffer saw the elements of classical culture in early Christianity. In fact, from the beginning of Christianity, Bonhoeffer says, classical

---

<sup>60</sup>Westmoreland-White

<sup>61</sup>Westmoreland-White

<sup>62</sup>Westmoreland-White

<sup>63</sup>Westmoreland-White

culture has always played a part in the development of Christianity. This assertion refutes the notion that Christianity can be "purified" of secular, non-Christian elements. Surprisingly, some theologians reject human rights. They argue it is a secular Enlightenment concept.<sup>64</sup> However, it is possible to ground human rights apart from Christianity. The United Nations Declaration on Human Rights provides an objective standard. For Christians, though, human rights are seen in the philosophical roots of Christianity, which can be appealed to for advocating human rights for a pluralistic society.

For Bonhoeffer, the idea of national purity meant Nazism. The Nazi myth of national and racial purity led to the Holocaust. Hitler believed that miscegenation between Jews and Germans created the problems of German life, and thus Jews were responsible. In the face of Nazi propaganda, Bonhoeffer asserted: it is because of a Jew—Jesus—that time and history have meaning. According to Bonhoeffer, without Jesus, the Germans would still be living cyclical myths. It is because of the Jewish contribution to Western culture that history and the linear concept of time exist. In desiring to expel Jews from western culture, Hitler, says Bonhoeffer, was trying to expel Jesus Christ. Further, he states, Jesus Christ is the unifying factor of Western culture and civilization.

In contrast to national and cultural purity, human rights declares an ethic of careful appreciation for multicultural contributions to a pluralistic society. In U.S. society, for instance, the "Christian America" myth and racist myths only claim significance to white European cultural contributions. American society is faced with these myths. Similar to Hitler excommunicating Jews from history, much of American history is written from a white ruling class perspective—Eurocentrism. Bonhoeffer's ethic of human rights promotes—even demands—a multicultural education.

Multicultural education, especially one from the standpoint of feminist ethics, aptly promotes Bonhoeffer's vision of human equality and human rights. One element is the importance of communication and dialogue. As noted by Marilyn Friedman: "One pervasive feature of oppression is the silencing of a viewpoint. Overcoming oppression must involve overcoming the silencing of the oppressed."<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup>Westmoreland-White

<sup>65</sup>Marilyn Friedman, "Multicultural Education and Feminist Ethics," *Hypatia* 10, no. 2 (1995): 59.

Communication and dialogue would also involve acquainting students with values and ideals underlying our government and culture that hold dominance in society. This familiarity could enable a student to gain knowledge of social criticism and also an effective political activism. A proposed curriculum would include the study of Western classics with contemporary “nonclassical” material. In implementing this curriculum, it is imperative to avoid using the word “multicultural” to mean anything non-Western. This stigmatizes anything non-Western as inferior by allowing the West to define the standard for literary canonization.

The purpose of the curriculum, in addition, would be promoting effective political struggles. As it is, says Friedman, anyone who publicly challenges the conventional treatment of race in U.S. society, sets themselves up for being attacked and intellectually discredited.<sup>66</sup> In such debate, the student will have, hopefully, grasped who the enemy is. In knowing the enemy, they can achieve reciprocal dialogue with compassion and understanding. Yet also stand their ground.

A possible downfall of multicultural education is what Friedman calls the “shopping-mall consumerism”<sup>67</sup> attitude. Adopting this attitude means endorsing multicultural education merely for the edification, enrichment, and diversification of privileged U.S. students. In actuality, multicultural education calls for serious commitment and being engaged to achieve human betterment around the globe. Of course, taking on an imperialistic attitude and an absolutists’ approach to morality is not what this means. What combating global oppression means is starting in your own society, and if you move beyond your boundaries—say, to another country—first seek permission before releasing people from oppression. What a Westerner deems oppressive may well be the freedom of another individual.

.....IX. Appendices

.....Appendix A.

---

<sup>66</sup>Friedman 60

<sup>67</sup>Friedman 64

## **Universal Declaration of Human Rights**

*Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948*

### ***PREAMBLE***

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people,

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law,

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations,

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

**Now, Therefore THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY proclaims THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS** as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

### ***Article 1.***

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

### ***Article 2.***

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

***Article 3.***

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.

***Article 4.***

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms.

***Article 5.***

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

***Article 6.***

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

***Article 7.***

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

***Article 8.***

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law.

***Article 9.***

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

***Article 10.***

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

***Article 11.***

(1) Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guarantees necessary for his defence.

(2) No one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed.

***Article 12.***

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

***Article 13.***

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

(2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

***Article 14.***

(1) Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

(2) This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

***Article 15.***

(1) Everyone has the right to a nationality.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

***Article 16.***

(1) Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

(2) Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

(3) The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the State.

***Article 17.***

(1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

***Article 18.***

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

***Article 19.***

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

***Article 20.***

(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

(2) No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

***Article 21.***

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

***Article 22.***

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

***Article 23.***

(1) Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment.

(2) Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

(3) Everyone who works has the right to just and favourable remuneration ensuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

(4) Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

***Article 24.***

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

***Article 25.***

(1) Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

(2) Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

***Article 26.***

(1) Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

(2) Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

(3) Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

***Article 27.***

(1) Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

(2) Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author.

**Article 28.**

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized.

**Article 29.**

(1) Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

(2) In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society.

(3) These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

**Article 30.**

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

.....Appendix B.

**Sermon on the Mount**

And seeing the multitudes, He [Jesus] went up on a mountain, and when He was seated His disciples came to Him. Then He opened His mouth and taught them, saying:

"Blessed are the poor in spirit,  
For theirs is the kingdom of heaven.  
Blessed are those who mourn,  
For they shall be comforted.  
Blessed are the meek,  
For they shall inherit the earth.  
Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness,  
For they shall be filled.  
Blessed are the merciful,  
For they shall obtain mercy.  
Blessed are the pure in heart,

For they shall see God.  
Blessed are the peacemakers,  
For they shall be called sons of God.  
Blessed are those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake,  
For theirs is the kingdom of heaven.

"Blessed are you when they revile and persecute you, and say all kinds of evil against you falsely for My sake. Rejoice and be exceedingly glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so they persecuted the prophets who were before you.

"You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt loses its flavor, how shall it be seasoned? It is then good for nothing but to be thrown out and trampled underfoot by men.

"You are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hidden. Nor do they light a lamp and put it under a basket, but on a lampstand, and it gives light to all who are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father in heaven.

"Do not think that I came to destroy the Law or the Prophets. I did not come to destroy but to fulfill. For assuredly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle will by no means pass from the law till all is fulfilled. Whoever therefore breaks one of the least of these commandments, and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever does and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say to you, that unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven.

"You have heard that it was said to those of old, 'You shall not murder, and whoever murders will be in danger of the judgment.' But I say to you that whoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment. And whoever says to his brother, 'Raca!' shall be in danger of the council. But whoever says, 'You fool!' shall be in danger of hell fire. Therefore if you bring your gift to the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your gift there before the altar, and go your way. First be reconciled to your brother, and then come and offer your gift. Agree with your adversary quickly, while you are on the way with him, lest your adversary deliver you to the judge, the judge hand you over to the officer, and you be thrown into prison. Assuredly, I say to you, you will by no means get out of there till you have paid the last penny.

"You have heard that it was said to those of old, 'You shall not commit adultery.' But I say to you that whoever looks at a woman to lust for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart. If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and cast it from you; for it is more profitable for you that one of your members perish, than for your whole body to be cast into hell. And if your right hand causes you to sin, cut it off and cast it from you; for it is more profitable for you that one of your members perish, than for your whole body to be cast into hell.

"Furthermore it has been said, 'Whoever divorces his wife, let him give her a certificate of divorce.' But I say to you that whoever divorces his wife for any reason except sexual immorality causes her to commit adultery; and whoever marries a woman who is divorced commits adultery.

"Again you have heard that it was said to those of old, 'You shall not swear falsely, but shall perform your oaths to the Lord.' But I say to you, do not swear at all: neither by heaven, for it is God's throne; nor by the earth, for it is His footstool; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. Nor shall you swear by your head, because you cannot make one hair white or black. But let your 'Yes' be 'Yes,' and your 'No,' 'No.' For whatever is more than these is from the evil one.

"You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' But I tell you not to resist an evil person. But whoever slaps you on your right cheek, turn the other to him also. If anyone wants to sue you and take away your tunic, let him have your cloak also. And whoever compels you to go one mile, go with him two. Give to him who asks you, and from him who wants to borrow from you do not turn away.

"You have heard that it was said, 'You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy.' But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who spitefully use you and persecute you, that you may be sons of your Father in heaven; for He makes His sun rise on the evil and on the good, and sends rain on the just and on the unjust. For if you love those who love you, what reward have you? Do not even the tax collectors do the same? And if you greet your brethren only, what do you do more than others? Do not even the tax collectors do so? Therefore you shall be perfect, just as your Father in heaven is perfect.

"Take heed that you do not do your charitable deeds before men, to be seen by them. Otherwise you have no reward from your Father in heaven. Therefore, when you do a charitable deed, do not sound a trumpet before you as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory from men. Assuredly, I say to you, they have their reward. But when you do a charitable deed, do not let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, that your charitable deed may be in secret; and your Father who sees in secret will Himself reward you openly.

"And when you pray, you shall not be like the hypocrites. For they love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the corners of the streets, that they may be seen by men. Assuredly, I say to you, they have their reward. But you, when you pray, go into your room, and when you have shut your door, pray to your Father who is in the secret place; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you openly. And when you pray, do not use vain repetitions as the heathen do. For they think that they will be heard for their many words.

"Therefore do not be like them. For your Father knows the things you have need of before you ask Him. In this manner, therefore, pray:

Our Father in heaven,  
Hallowed be Your name.  
Your kingdom come.  
Your will be done  
On earth as it is in heaven.  
Give us this day our daily bread.  
And forgive us our debts,  
As we forgive our debtors.

And do not lead us into temptation,  
But deliver us from the evil one.  
For Yours is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

"For if you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you. But if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.

"Moreover, when you fast, do not be like the hypocrites, with a sad countenance. For they disfigure their faces that they may appear to men to be fasting. Assuredly, I say to you, they have their reward. But you, when you fast, anoint your head and wash your face, so that you do not appear to men to be fasting, but to your Father who is in the secret place; and your Father who sees in secret will reward you openly.

"Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust destroy and where thieves break in and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys and where thieves do not break in and steal. For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.

"The lamp of the body is the eye. If therefore your eye is good, your whole body will be full of light. But if your eye is bad, your whole body will be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in you is darkness, how great is that darkness!

"No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and mammon.

"Therefore I say to you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or what you will drink; nor about your body, what you will put on. Is not life more than food and the body more than clothing? Look at the birds of the air, for they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not of more value than they? Which of you by worrying can add one cubit to his stature?

"So why do you worry about clothing? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow: they neither toil nor spin; and yet I say to you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Now if God so clothes the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, will He not much more clothe you, O you of little faith?

"Therefore do not worry, saying, 'What shall we eat?' or 'What shall we drink?' or 'What shall we wear?' For after all these things the Gentiles seek. For your heavenly Father knows that you need all these things. But seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you. Therefore do not worry about tomorrow, for tomorrow will worry about its own things. Sufficient for the day is its own trouble.

"Judge not, that you be not judged. For with what judgment you judge, you will be judged; and with the measure you use, it will be measured back to you. And why do you look at the speck in your brother's eye, but do not consider the plank in your own eye? Or how can you say to your brother, 'Let me

remove the speck from your eye'; and look, a plank is in your own eye? Hypocrite! First remove the plank from your own eye, and then you will see clearly to remove the speck from your brother's eye.

"Do not give what is holy to the dogs; nor cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you in pieces.

"Ask, and it will be given to you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and he who seeks finds, and to him who knocks it will be opened. Or what man is there among you who, if his son asks for bread, will give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish, will he give him a serpent? If you then, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father who is in heaven give good things to those who ask Him! Therefore, whatever you want men to do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets.

"Enter by the narrow gate; for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leads to destruction, and there are many who go in by it. Because narrow is the gate and difficult is the way which leads to life, and there are few who find it.

"Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves. You will know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes from thorn bushes or figs from thistles? Even so, every good tree bears good fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, nor can a bad tree bear good fruit. Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire. Therefore by their fruits you will know them.

"Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' shall enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father in heaven. Many will say to Me in that day, 'Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in Your name, cast out demons in Your name, and done many wonders in Your name?' And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness!'

"Therefore whoever hears these sayings of Mine, and does them, I will liken him to a wise man who built his house on the rock: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it did not fall, for it was founded on the rock.

"But everyone who hears these sayings of Mine, and does not do them, will be like a foolish man who built his house on the sand: and the rain descended, the floods came, and the winds blew and beat on that house; and it fell. And great was its fall."

And so it was, when Jesus had ended these sayings, that the people were astonished at His teaching, for He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.

.....X. Bibliography

Theodore de Bary, "Multiculturalism, Civility and Human Rights," Freedom Review 26, no. 2 (1995).

Eberhard Bethge, Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Biography (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

-----, Bonhoeffer: Exile and Martyr (New York: The Seabury Press, 1975).

Dietrich Bonhoeffer, "What is a Christian Ethic?," in A Testament to Freedom: The Essential Writings of Dietrich Bonhoeffer, eds. Geoffrey B. Kelley and F. Burton Nelson (New York: HarperCollins, 1990).

-----, Ethics (New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1995).

-----, The Cost of Discipleship (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1963).

-----, Letters and Papers from Prison (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1979).

Claudia Card, "Responsibility Ethics, Shared Understandings, and Moral Communities," Hypatia 17, no. 1 (2002).

David Chidester. Christianity: A Global History (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2000).

André Dumas, Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Theologian of Reality (New York: The Macmillan Press, 1971).

Wayne Whitson Floyd Jr. and Charles Marsh eds., Theology and the Practice of Responsibility: Essays on Dietrich Bonhoeffer (Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1994).

Marilyn Friedman, "Multicultural Education and Feminist Ethics," Hypatia 10, no.2 (1995).

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. The Christian Religion: Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion (Missoula: Scholars press, 1979).

Martin Luther, "Secular Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed," in Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings ed. John Dillenberger (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1961).

Charles Marsh. Reclaiming Dietrich Bonhoeffer: The Promise of His Theology (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

Reinhold Niebuhr, Moral Man and Immoral Society

Gerald O'Collins, SJ. Christology: A Biblical, Historical, and Systematic Study of Jesus Christ (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Kobina Oforu-Donkoh. "Dietrich Bonhoeffer, 'The Man for Others'—Freedom and Responsibility in the Ethical Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer" (MA, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1991).

William Paton, The Church and the New Order (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942).

Tiemo Rainer Peters. "Orders and Interventions: Political Ethics in the Theology of Dietrich Bonhoeffer," in A Bonhoeffer Legacy: Essays in Understanding, ed. A.J. Klassen (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1981).

Larry L. Rasmussen, Dietrich Bonhoeffer: Reality and Resistance (New York: Abingdon Press, 1972).

Edwin Robertson, The Shame and the Sacrifice: The Life and Martyrdom of Dietrich Bonhoeffer (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1988).

Michael L. Westmoreland-White, "Contributions to Human Rights in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's Ethic," Journal of Church & State 39, no. 1 (1997).

Renate Wind, Dietrich Bonhoeffer: A Spoke in the Wheel (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992).

Wolf-Dieter Zimmerman and Ronald Gregor Smith eds., I Knew Dietrich Bonhoeffer (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966).

.....Web resources

Amnesty International  
<<http://www.amnesty-usa.org/education/>>

Augsburg Fortress Publishers  
<[www.augsburgfortress.org](http://www.augsburgfortress.org)>

"Barth, Karl" *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*. <<http://search.eb.com/bol/topic?eu=13682&sctn=3>>  
[Accessed February 6 2002].

Bonhoeffer's Cell  
<[www.thesumners.com/bonhoeffer/](http://www.thesumners.com/bonhoeffer/)>

"Bonhoeffer, Dietrich" *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*.  
<<http://search.eb.com/bol/topic?eu=82755&sctn=1>>  
[Accessed February 6 2002]

Christian History Magazine  
<[www.christianityonline.com](http://www.christianityonline.com)>

Christian History Institute  
<[www.gospelcom.net/chi](http://www.gospelcom.net/chi)>

"Confessing Church" *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*.  
<<http://search.eb.com/bol/topic?eu=26234&sctn=1>>  
[Accessed February 6 2002]

Dietrich Bonhoeffer Home Page  
<[www.cyberword.com.bonhoef/](http://www.cyberword.com.bonhoef/)>

"German Christian" *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*.  
<<http://search.eb.com/bol/topic?idxref=21247>>  
[Accessed February 6 2002]

"Niemoller, (Friedrich Gustav Emil) Martin" *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*.  
<<http://search.eb.com/bol/topic?eu=57186&sctn=1>>  
[Accessed February 6 2002]

"Protestantism, history of" *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*.  
<<http://search.eb.com/bol/topic?eu=117338&ctn=1>>  
[Accessed February 6 2002]

University of Minnesota Human Rights Library  
<<http://www.umn.edu/humanrts/>>

US Holocaust Memorial Museum  
<[www.ushmm.org/bonhoeffer.index.html](http://www.ushmm.org/bonhoeffer.index.html)>

Vision Video/Gateway Films  
<[www.gatewayfilms.com](http://www.gatewayfilms.com)>  
<[www.visionvideo.com/vv/home/asp?I=item&i=306&k=pbsaal](http://www.visionvideo.com/vv/home/asp?I=item&i=306&k=pbsaal)>

.....Tours and Presentations

Dietrich Bonhoeffer Ministry and Travel  
Services, Inc.  
12732 Villa Beach Road  
Villard, MN 56385-2354  
(320) 554-2422  
<[www.dbmintrav.com/](http://www.dbmintrav.com/)>

Dietrich Bonhoeffer-- A Life in Photographs  
Prof. Kristin Anderson  
Augsburg College, Art Department  
2211 Riverside Avenue  
Minneapolis, MN 55445  
(612) 330-1000