

Round Table 3 - What works? What types of social change efforts show promise in reducing violent conflict and humiliation while upholding the dignity of all people?

Comments from Participants:

Carlos Sluzki: As a point of departure, I want to point out that my presentation has a pragmatic, rather than humanistic, slant. It uses as a point of departure a rather simplified 2-by-2 matrix that will indicate the presence of hostile witnesses or empathetic witnesses and of an internalizing style or an externalizing style [See PowerPoint]. For example, a hostile witness (or perpetrator) combined with an internalizing style will lead to shame and hiding.

In the second diagram, when treating clinically a patient who is stuck in an experience of shame, the recommended road is to facilitate externalization and ideas of revenge – that is, start by transforming shame into humiliation. The third diagram shows the opposite situation: when a person is stuck in a ruminating and haunting feeling of humiliation as a consequence of a given event, the recommended road is to elicit and explore the experiences of shame potentially embedded in the experience.

Now, it is much easier to move from shame to entertaining ideas of revenge and then a redeeming reconciliation than moving away from humiliation to shame and from there to empowerment. How come? The answer is that there are some political advantages about the position of being humiliated. Humiliation puts the humiliated party in the position of victim, which is socially stronger than that of the perpetrator. In what way is the experience of victimization stronger? It activates community in the group being victimized, “us versus them.” (Occasionally it also helps to generate community among perpetrators – such as the KKK, gangs, Nazis, etc.) In confrontation between collective groups, a frequent rhetorical battle centers in who has been humiliated FIRST, and therefore justifying their own actions as justifiable reaction. That is, the position of victim is a socially acceptable argument for engaging in aggressive actions, especially in environments where honor is used to justify violence. It also externalizes responsibility by giving the illusion of fairness and impunity, as revenge takes away the responsibility for one’s own actions.

Why would humiliated people want to relocate themselves into a more reflective position of reciprocal responsibility, conjoint responsibility? Only if an alternative, reflective story doesn’t take away the righteousness of the victims’ position but create a reciprocal story where BOTH are victims (or, occasionally, that there is no victim). The other alternative is a story of active redressing when balance is not reachable. For example, there is no possible balanced narrative for the long lasting plight of African Americans in the US, in which case the only reparative story is one in which victimization is acknowledged and heard, and redressing and reparation becomes enacted by perpetrators with active management by victims, so as to aim at establishing in the long run a level of parity.

Sara Cobb: Dignity. It’s not that humiliation isn’t important, but where are we going? Towards relational knowledge that will generate the conversations Carlos is talking about.

We see dignity as “worthiness,” etymologically. Being “decent” would be appropriate to the role we play. You can get inserted in a role that doesn’t promote your own dignity, the role of slave in a relationship in which you are subservient to others, which is not so great. It’s not just any role we want to examine – it’s those who imprison others (or ourselves) in roles they do not want. The question is: who’s writing the script? We’re positioned in these character roles, and

we didn't make these stories and we cannot control them, as these narratives do not have "sole" authors. We're inserted into a role where our voice may not be able to contest or alter how we are inserted. In positioning theory, positioning is all about power. Once you're positioned, what can you do about it? Being decent isn't always in our control; it depends on social constructions, and positions may become political. Constructed over time through these interactions, people are characters in a story. Moral frameworks are under construction – not just local, also culturally anchored – to legitimize and de-legitimize people. There are hegemonic forces. The consequence of negative positioning is unworthiness, or loss of dignity.

Unworthiness and worthiness come from the telling of a narrative. The key is in the turning points when legitimacy is at stake – the relational devolution, when the roles are already set up to require reciprocal disqualification. Worthiness is developed through relational evolution, transforming narratives and building complex plots, offering legitimacy to all the characters. Irony – these better-formed stories should have an ironic quality, a story that says we actually created the thing we didn't want to have happen through what we did to avert what we didn't want to happen. It's circular logic. To give a Bush example: we generated civil war when trying to avert global terrorism. Rebecca Cliff speaks to ironic moments as "shifts in footing."

Turning Points: Development toward Narrative Pareto Frontier [PowerPoint slide].

- There's path dependency in the conversations that generate relational evolution – helping a party understand the limits and complications that surround their strength.
- Stage 1: Parties first talk about why they're wonderful, perfect (they're struggling for legitimacy). Unless they can talk about complexities of strength, how it's complicated their life, they can't move to the next stage.
- Stage 2: Oops, I'm not perfect, and the other is not terrible.
- Stage 3: Oh, I've contributed to creating the circumstances I didn't want.
- Stage 4: Now that we've had this history of irony, how can we together figure out where to go in the future?
- Stage 5: The reflection on the values of both stories, from which emerges a moral framework. This is highly structured.

I don't think people can talk about their ironic story unless they take ownership in the first moment.

Thinking about humiliation is important and is probably a cause of conflict. But then we have to have an idea of what dignity looks like. I don't think dignity means the erasure of asymmetry. We can have difference and hierarchy. Thinking through dignity and worthiness, I'm offering this up as a possibility.

Floyd Webster Rudmin: Robert gave the presentation I was planning to give, and he did it very well. I'll give a brief rehash of it.

I'm focused on Irving Goffman's book, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (1959). Every book is new the first time you read it.

We all are in social roles, even in the privacy of our own bedroom; we use props and other people. These roles are maintained. We may like or dislike our role, and we may have some flexibility or not. Individualistic cultures are more demanding and abusive than collectivist cultures because the performer and audience are in one head, so there is a double stress in being your self-audience all the time.

One consequence of this is suicide. One of the most stable findings in psychology and sociology is that suicide rates are positively correlated to individualistic cultures and are negatively correlated in collectivist cultures. Hierarchical, stratified societies have a benefit in having fewer suicides. It could be that the equivalent of honor killing in Pakistan is suicide in Finland; both are homicides demanded by social roles, involving a failure that can only be remedied by death.

My wife is Japanese, and most things go quite well in our marriage. We're both from materialistic societies, with high education, merit-based, but occasionally cultural confusions come out. For example, we had one New Year's dinner hosted by a Japanese family: four Japanese adults in the house, two kids, and myself. The husband, by himself, sits down and starts eating alone, ordering the three women who are cheerfully serving him while the rest of us wait. Later, I commented to my wife, "Wasn't that strange?" "No, it's his house." He had done obviously normal behavior. Another example was during an international flight from Tokyo to Toronto with cases of food poisoning, after which the chief stewardess commits suicide. "It's not her fault," I commented. My wife answered, "But what else could she do?"

I say these personal stories to point out that cross-cultural appreciation of social phenomena is not easy, and it will not be easy to understand humiliation cross-culturally. We've been rather ethnocentric and haven't grasped humiliation from a collectivist standpoint. A study in Norway found that Norwegians raise their children gender-blind, non-punitive. The Sami in northern Norway have sexist childrearing (boys and girls raised differently), and with boys sometimes subject to ridicule and physical punishment. The parents are trying to make boys "hardy." In the polar region, boys are expected to survive on their own. For Norwegians, the more the children were ridiculed or punished, the worse was their mental health. For the Sami, the more the boys were ridiculed or punished, the better was their health. This is enacting individualism within a social norm and an internalized audience. For these hunting-gathering individuals in the Arctic, the goal is autonomous survival. Ridicule is breaking the children from dependence since they will need to act on their own to survive. There are different kinds of individualism, so there are probably different kinds of collectivism as well.

James Jones: This is a good place to learn, reflect, share and repair. I like to think of myself as a reflective practitioner; I do social action, reflect, then do social action again. There's a theory I developed on a project trying to bring American Zionist Jews and Muslims together to do something on the Middle East.

Ramallah: I've been there. Two members of the Israeli force were killed with bare hands.

Cairo: Running an institute, I was there when Israel invaded Lebanon. The spontaneous despair, anger and humiliation stunned me.

Bosnia: I have an 80-year-old uncle who lived under the Communists and witnessed the slaughter. He talked about being old enough during the slaughter, and he was spared because he dug the graves of younger men. Some of the same people who brought this about are still in power. It boggles my mind to live in that situation. Bosnians have something to teach us about what works.

Malik: My only blood son was murdered by a police officer. This event called up all my experiences of racism. My faith as a Muslim and a cognitive map inside me wouldn't let good white people off the hook by making it only a racial event. Don't succumb to humiliation.

Erwin: At the Center for Middle East Understanding, we teach a course on religious advocacy and peace. It is a learning experience for us, those of us backing out of our humiliation as Jews or Muslims.

Jimmy Carter: A better ex-president than president. His book shows us we have a lot to learn, and his point is trying to encourage a debate that isn't happening around the Arab-Israeli conflict. He's using the self to try to change the situation.

Malcolm X: "I'm for the truth, no matter who speaks it..." "I'm a human being first and foremost, and as such I'm for whoever benefits in humanity as a whole..."

The idea that my people have been or are being oppressed does not provide me with the right to do anything.

Barry Hart: Andrea's story today is very real for Mennonites – a concept I pay attention to when things are good. It's also true because time collapses for those painful moments in history, for the individual and the collective. Mennonites are in denial for lots of things as well.

Three things – the story, conceptual framework and model – are helpful for knowing how to go about building peace.

My work has been traditionally in war and post-war reconstruction, particularly with people in Nigeria. When a village code is violated and a crime happens by a member of the community, the individual is placed in the center of the village, from sun up to sun down, to stand and listen to every member of village, kids and adults. They say, "Thank you for helping us build our house last year..." "Thank you. You taught me how to fish, and I had fun..." "You carried our goods to the market many times, and you're a person we can count on..." On and on until every member of the community says something, then it's finished. Is this a shaming, a positive shaming? Is it restorative justice? It's possibly all of these things.

It relates to the concept of Mary E. Clark – BAM: Bonding Autonomy Meaning. Nigerians are a collectivist group; they need to be bonded, need that individual even though he violated a code, and they needed to make him accountable. True autonomy in collectivist societies comes from the group. In this village, that one person gets his/her autonomy met by the group. Meaning – we all have need of it. If life is meaningless, it doesn't have meaning in terms of having power. We feel hopeless and helpless; we don't have a god or faith in something greater. In this story, meaning comes through the community: if I'm not for myself, who would be for me? You find this unity in all the traditions in which we find our humanity through the other. When something breaks that human bond, we must find something to restore that human bond. In this village, it was a healing ritual, a ritual of justice.

If war comes to that village and human bonds are broken, life becomes helpless, hopeless, loses meaning. Where's God? Where's our group, the collective?

I like to deal with these situations, the collective pain and trauma when so many people have experienced that human bond being broken. One of the ways I go about doing this is with the peace-building wheel. We need to move through each section of this model if we want a stable society that connects human bonds. Pay attention to each section of the wheel; it is limited. The tangible is protection from the peace force and things we can measure. The intangible is identity, trauma, space, feelings, emotional space... Values of this wheel are inflated by the things we've talked about – human needs, rights, dignity, as well as beliefs. The air needs to fill this tire so that it can roll more smoothly. I see this as a template to place over a traumatic situation to see where our entrée points are to start this peace-building process. It helps to see

who our partners are because we need coalitions, to build and maintain relationships in social systems, for this wheel to roll forward.

I invite you to place this model over the work you do, and I do hope it helps.

Maggie O'Neill: I'm working on forced migration. I have been using participatory action research (PAR) methods with refugees and asylum seekers in the UK since 1998-99, when I started doing work with Bosnian and Afghan communities. Stephen Castles named this concept the asylum-migration nexus, the boundaries between asylum and migration are blurred. An individual may arrive in a migration context, then seek asylum. There are complex narratives involved. PAR takes place within this nexus. There is an absence in the social science literature in relation to the asylum-migration nexus – humiliation was absent. It isn't that people weren't thinking about it, but they were making a choice and instead focusing upon the other major discourses.

In terms of this focus on renewing methods through PAR, I am looking at asylum and migration and the impact of humiliation.

For Castles, migration and forced migration are among the most important social expressions of global inequalities [See PowerPoint slide].

In terms of global flows, the key frameworks, key nodes are global cities with dualistic economies. Diaspora, humiliation and belonging are explored through PAR and the way that the relationship between theory, experience and praxis impacts upon policy.

Recreating the experiences of refugees, asylum seekers and new arrivals in visual form can have quite a powerful impact in terms of the people themselves as well as their audiences. This work is linked to the appreciative framework through concepts of trust, appreciation and empathy. We're creating safe spaces for work and dialogue; it's about "potential space," which is incredibly critical for dialogue to happen through PAR. This visual and dialogic process also examines processes of social justice.

Showing some artwork produced in one of the projects, we see a family's life saved by the people in her block of flats. Three Muslim families were protected by Serbian families. The concept of a "good neighbor" has a huge symbolic resonance in this image. In the second project, three young men tell of their life in a camp in Croatia, and also send a message to their classmates who initially received them as peasants. The young men show here that in Bosnia they had technology and knowledge of popular culture as their classmates do. Their image is rich, with bombs, tanks, a map of the camp and symbols about their lived experience. There are also short pieces of text that help to anchor the meaning of images.

In the UK, the dominant message to asylum seekers is "Welcome to Britain, and go home." Six pieces of legislation have restricted access to those seeking asylum. In current research I am finding women refugees experiencing destitution and forced removals. The goal of PAR linked to policy reform is to engage with complexity and to promote social justice and cultural citizenship, not partial justice and partial inclusion.

There is a theme that has resonated throughout the talks. It involves transformation, then recognition and identity, then distributive resources – this is reflected on Barry's wheel.

Anie Kalayjian: I have used forgiveness as a path that helped me through humiliation in Turkey. In 1998 at a conference, I gave a talk on the impact of the genocide on Armenians. The MIT (the CIA) of Turkey threatened me for using the "g" word, which is taboo in Turkey. Two others said they would not kill me; torture would be a better method. They named my family. I

was terrified, but I tried to find a way to forgive. Viktor Frankl told me that forgiveness was the way. For the past 16 years, I have been trying to research it, practice it and talk about it, and I found that it's moving.

I was teaching about forgiveness to UN ambassadors to Uganda, South Africa... They were in awe, asking me why I didn't do a whole day workshop. I've been pleasantly surprised to see some UN ambassadors come forth. A Rwandan came to Fordham to talk about forgiveness, which helped him and his family after the genocide.

Forgiveness is a choice. Having a model that is trans-cultural, trans-religious – every religion has a deep thought, approach or recommendation on the therapeutic nature of forgiveness, and not just for perpetrator but also for the survivor or witness. In my experience with survivors, we'll come close through dialogues and will express feelings about other things. As soon as we talk about genocide, there is withdrawal from the Turkish side; they feel humiliated. It's important to continue. We're trying to find creative ways to engage them and work through it. It's necessary to heal Armenians as well as Turks so they work through that. But they keep saying, "That's not our priority. We're survivors." It's deep in the psyche of the diaspora.

With forgiveness, I think we can extend this to every culture and conflict and situation. Once that happens, I've seen how anger and humiliation mount and build. There's a connection, and symmetry can arise. It's holding our dialogues back. Turkish Americans are overwhelmed and see it as less important. I feel it's very important. Generations are passing on these feelings of humiliation. There's a new law in Turkey that by saying something about genocide, you can be imprisoned eight years. The Turkish government is feeling extremely humiliated by the Nobel prize winner because of his work on genocide. He is one of the first people courageous enough to write about those stories. The reaction is that the Turkish bar association is going to sue the Nobel committee. France, on the other hand, embraces it. If you deny the genocide, you'll go to jail.

What's next? How are we going to end these cycles of reaction? Forgiveness is a tool, a practice, a choice to overcome victimhood, sadness and humiliation, even on the perpetrators' side.

Additional Comments from Supporters:

Arie Nadler: There are links between humiliation and forgiveness. Truth is a key concept in the issue of humiliation, and the way I view it, the object of humiliation is the denial of your experience. For my personal experience, as the son of two Holocaust survivors, humiliation is when they hear someone denying the Holocaust.

Humiliation can cause physical pain. A movie by Roman Polanski, "Death and the Maiden," is about a torture victim who was raped by her torturer. He denies the humiliation, but she plans to kill him. At the end, he admits to it and she doesn't want to kill him. The value of truth allowed her to step down. The invalidation of the experience was powerful.

Arye Rattner: I would like to compliment Jim Jones for telling his own experience from a practical angle. I'd like to refer to the last few words on how the accumulation of feelings of injustice and humiliation can easily be turned to violent behavior. The stronger those feelings

become, on the edge of eruption, the normative commitment goes down (collective behavior), and the readiness to participate in violent behavior can become very dangerous.

We're trying to develop this theoretical model based on empirical findings on the relationships between Jews and Arabs. If there's something practical, it's how we can intervene at that point when those feelings of humiliation grow to a dangerous point, how we can intervene to avoid the possibility of violent conflict. There's a link between something that comes from an academic, theoretical perspective and that being seen by practitioners.

"The Daughter of Iraq" is about a well-off family at the time Saddam Hussein came to power. They own a shop and are suspected of putting together material in opposition to the regime. They're put in jail. It describes humiliation at an individual level. They're brutally humiliated in jail. It's one of the best examples of humiliation at an individual level.

James Jones: The intellectual's responsibility is to reframe the story, not to let the clash of civilizations go. That's what our project is about. Not to accept the violence. Don't accept the story we use to fight one another; let's recreate the story. There's a difference between forgiveness and letting go of the anger. Committing genocide and then denying it are two separate things. We can't be willing to fight anger, but not willing to forgive...

Anie Kalayjian: After the threats, there came a challenge two months later when after the devastating earthquake, we were called to help. All my colleagues here felt I shouldn't go, and I went. When we were working for three weeks under tents, I met a manager who said I almost sounded like an Armenian. He said, "That's okay," as if I had committed a crime.

Manal Radwan: I want to say that through two days, I've been on an emotional rollercoaster, feeling humiliated, celebrated, dignified... I come with heavy baggage. I hear some people and can reach out; I hear others and it's difficult to hear them. I want to share that and be accepted with all these mixed emotions. I take Sara's positioning theory very seriously. I position myself differently when I interact intellectually and emotionally with what is being said. It's important what use we make of the truth. Reconsider your own position, your own narrative on how you came here, how you process yourself, how you process the other, and perhaps celebrate a counter-narrative. It's hard to ask others to do that if we don't do that ourselves.

I'm puzzled that there might be a hierarchical system or differences in status. It doesn't mean that humiliation has to be a result of it. It's different from Evelin's argument. Sara is the chair of my mental life, and in one of our discussions – here you are, somebody I respect, you're in a higher status, but this is not a toxic relationship. This isn't demeaning to me; I accept and celebrate that. I can't view myself as an equal to you, Evelin, because I see you as an idol.

Evelin Lindner: I hardly know what to say, this session was so touching, moving. These are weak words. I'm basically speechless. I came to say that I hope that Sara can unshock me. I'm always shocked when I'm misunderstood. I don't believe that all hierarchies need be broken down. It's not about becoming all the same, being Communists. The pilot in the plane is always the boss. There is a hierarchy, and we need hierarchies in certain situations. The point I talk about is what you talk about: the pilot shouldn't look down at passengers as lesser beings. This is what I see happens in honor societies. People are not born as lower beings, others as higher beings.

Anie Kalayjian: You're presenting the ideal, but we also see how hierarchies are used and abused.

Sara Cobb: We have to be careful. Part of what makes me anxious is the denigration of the last 10,000 years. People have been doing the best they can for years to figure out how to get along and live together through different periods of social experimentation. I value traditions, and we've mostly gotten it right. The romanticization of previous times worries me; the idea that there's some primordial state of innocence that we can recover, that bothers me. Let's honor, create what's worthy in last 10,000 years. Human rights is not necessarily a solution. Isn't human rights an exclusionary discourse? There is value in asymmetry, in having a lower status.

For example, I have a hierarchical relation to my boss, the president of the university. He expects me to carry out my duties with regard to fundraising, and complaints or excuses on my part would do little to change his mind regarding his sense of my responsibilities, but rather these complaints would enact a relation in which I assume symmetry, which would be a mistake, not only because the president would not like it but because it would not respect the hierarchy that is part of the relational space where I work and live.

Evelin Lindner: I'm 1000% in agreement with you. The central message of my work is what you said now.

Michael Britton: What were the driving questions behind yesterday? What touched me comes from a clinician's soul. In terms of honor cultures: How do I have respect for you who value ranking while I respect that I don't feel that way about the ranking of worth, and how do I communicate my view without humiliating and respecting your view? Normative systems take on meaning and value based on the context. What makes sense to us becomes very believable. I can talk to you with respect for wanting to appreciate ranking in your world, while I can also hold my own view of it. If the context is changing, perhaps you can see my view, too.

Floyd Webster Rudmin: Most of us have to believe that our role is essential, as part of our drama. It's an inherent social-psychological dynamic: we are worthy. Bill Gates must believe that he got money by his own virtues. We have to believe our role is essential for the drama we are playing.

Nora Femenia: A movie talks about class relations in Spain in the 18th century. The lord of the property comes in with a car. His servants are waiting for him. The head of servants tells his boss, "Please, give us orders. We are here to serve you." Those people were proud of their situation, their station in life.

Olga Botcharova: The story that Barry told us about Nigerian village community blends seemingly contradictory things – forgiveness and shame, which, in a way, creates some kind of a new harmony in human relationships. It, in fact, illustrates the idea that I attempted to articulate earlier when I talked about destructive nature of humiliation and possible healing nature of shame, I mean, when shame is used as a constructive punishment. In the context of the story the criminal is placed literally in the spot and confined there for as long as it needs for all affected parties to be able to find and express the words of kindness to the wrongdoer, so the experience of shame heals the wrongdoer and the victimized community. I particularly like about the story

the fact that the person *is sentenced to be exposed to numerous expressions of unconditional forgiveness* from the people he harmed. It is forgiveness that helps the people of the community not to allow anger to stage the process of justice, and it is forgiveness that restores inclusion and evokes healing in the wrongdoer and the community.

I would like to share with you another story, this time, from an American Indian tribe. The event was told by Brown Bear, an Indian elder, and was recorded by Gary Zukav, the author of the book "Soul Stories." To me the story is about forgiveness that provides a new paradigm for justice and transforms it from justice-revenge into justice-reconciliation. In other words, it is about the power of forgiveness that can break the cycle of humiliation and restore human dignity in the relationship. Here is the story the way it appears in the book:

"Kill him!" said the brother. His face was set like stone. "Kill him!" said the mother, through her tears. "Kill him!" said the sister, her voice quivering.

Around the council fire each member of the family spoke. In the balance lay the life of the young man sitting restlessly outside. Murder is a terrible thing. Murder of a friend is more terrible yet. Yet there he sat, the blood of his friend still on his hands, awaiting his fate.

"Let us think this through," spoke the grandfather softly. Sorrow Deepened the lines on his wrinkled face. Generations spoke through him. "Will killing him return our boy to us?"

"No." "No." "No." The word moved slowly around the tortured circle, sometimes whispered, sometimes murmured, sometimes spoken spitefully.

"Will killing him help feed our people?" asked the old man, his eyes steady.

Again, "No," then "No," then "No," moved around the circle.

"My brother speaks the truth," said the great-uncle. All faces turned toward him. A tear ran slowly down his cheek. "Let us look at this matter carefully.

"They did look at it carefully. They deliberated through the night. Then they called the young man to his fate.

"See that tepee?" they said, pointing to the tepee of the young man he had killed. He nodded. "It is yours now."

"See those horses?" they said, pointing to the dead man's horses. He nodded again.

"They are yours now. You are now our son. You will take the place of the one you have killed."

He looked up slowly to the faces surrounding him. His new life had begun, and so had theirs.

Brown Bear looked across the table at me.

"That happened in the late eighteen hundreds," he said. "They could have killed him. Tribal law gave them the right."

I sat amazed as Brown Bear's words sank into me. Could the family of a murdered boy adopt the murderer as their son.

"The young man became a devoted son," Brown Bear continued. "By the time he died, he was known in all the tribes as the model of a loving son."

This is forgiveness. Authentically empowered people forgive naturally. They forgive because they do not want to carry the burden of not forgiving like heavy suitcases through a crowded airport. The family of the murdered boy could have killed his killer. Instead they took him as their son. That changed their lives and his. They did not know how their decision would affect the young man, but they felt the effects of it on themselves.

They did not have to hate him. They did not have to live with his death in their hearts, as well as the death of their son. That is what they gave up. Until you forgive, you cannot use all of your creativity. Part of you is thinking about what you have not forgiven. Do you want to live your life that way? Is it worth it? Is anything worth that?"

Don Klein: In a state of appreciative being, forgiveness is automatic. Spending time and energy on revenge, investing on being unforgiving, takes enormous amounts of energy that could be spent on other purposes. Being unforgiving and needing revenge is a waste of time and energy and doesn't accomplish much, except to make one feel right. In our own minds, we are always right. The way the human mind works, the owner of the mind is always right. I'm now right in acknowledging I'm wrong. We should take our sense of rightness as a given, then explore the source of my rightness, your rightness, etc. Don't feel that I have to be right for you to be wrong.

Rosita Albert: The Dalai Lama asked a monk who had been in prison for 18 years, "What is the hardest thing you had to deal with?" The monk said, "I was losing compassion for the Chinese."

Barry Hart: I see this issue as relating to what Olga was saying. There are so many stories of forgiveness that are powerful. A French woman lived through World War I and was invited to Switzerland in World War II to reconcile. She spoke with one German woman whose husband was in the Underground attempting to kill Hitler. The woman reflected on her hatred for Germans. She asked forgiveness to a roomful of Germans for her hatred of Germans. She recognized that the burdens she held were so problematic. After speaking her words of forgiveness, there was silence. Then the German woman asked the French woman to forgive them. This began 10 years of reconciliation between French and Germans, which did more than any diplomat could do. She had spent 50 years building bridges.