



Compassionate Peacemaking, Volume Two
Healing the World's Wounds One at a Time
Bearing Witness

Ruth Elizabeth Krall, MSN, PhD

Compassionate Peacemaking, Volume Two
Healing the World's Wounds One at a Time
Bearing Witness

Ruth Elizabeth Krall, MSN, PhD
Emerita Professor of Religion, Psychology and Nursing
Program Director Emerita, Peace, Justice and Conflict Studies
Goshen College, Goshen, IN 46526
© 2001, 2019

Cover Photograph: Vincent Van Gogh, The Good Samaritan
Retrieved November 1, 2019 from Wikipedia Commons (the public domain)
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Vincent_Willem_van_Gogh_022.jpg
. The original painting is on display at the Kroller-Muller Museum in
Otterlo, The Netherlands.

In Memory

Anna Mae Charles Fretz

Clara Gilchrist

Sally Haney

Nurses, Professors, Healers, Friends

Appreciation

The five essays in this volume were published as they were written by Roman Catholic Theologian and culture critic Dr. William (Bill) Lindsey on his blog Bilgrimage (<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/>). My heart is full of gratitude to Bill for his friendship and his collegial presence in my life.

Ruthkrall.com is maintained for me by my nephew Carl and I am grateful for his presence in my life and for the technology work he does on my behalf.

Foreword

This set of five essays is the second volume in the *Compassionate Peacemaking* trilogy. Volume one was entitled *Compassionate Peacemaking: Visions and Dreams* and in that volume I explored the complex vocabulary of violence from a public health perspective. Volume one can be found on the Enduring Space webpage at ruthkrall.com under the heading *downloadable books*.

In this current volume, I explore the concept of bearing witness as one of the foundational tasks or skills of peacemakers and would-be peacemakers. I begin with Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan by asking, in essence, *what did Jesus teach his disciples (and us) about the behavioral skills of making peace between alienated peoples and strangers?*

This volume concludes with a short case study that raises very troubling questions about communal demands for automatic forgiveness on the part of victimized individuals. It raises even more troubling questions about communal forgiveness of perpetrators without holding them accountable for their abusive behaviors towards others.

The third volume in this trilogy of essays deal with the issues involved as individuals and communities confront abusive behavior.

Table of Contents as of March 14, 2020

In Memory	3
Appreciation	4
Foreword	5
Table of Contents	6
First Essay	7
The Good Samaritan: Pious Parable or Subversive Instruction Luke 10: 25-37	
Second Essay	
Bearing Witness: The First Step in Reconciliation	13
Third Essay	
Bearing Witness: Paying Attention	27
Fourth Essay	
Bearing Witness: Speaking Truthfully	47
Fifth Essay	
A Short Case Study: Today's Reflections: A Sin or a Crime	61
Endnotes	65

First Essay

The Good Samaritan: Pious Parable or Subversive Instruction¹

Holy Scripture as our Beginning Place

On one occasion an expert in the law stood up to test Jesus. *“Teacher,”* he asked, *what must I do to inherit eternal life? What is written in the law?*

Jesus replied. *How do you read it?*

He answered, *Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind and love your neighbor as yourself.*

You have answered correctly, Jesus replied. *Do this and you will live.*

But he wanted to justify himself, so he asked, *and who is my neighbor?*

In reply, Jesus said: *A man was going from Jerusalem to Jericho, when he was attacked by robbers. They stripped him of his clothes, beat him and went away, leaving him half dead. A priest happened to be going down the same road, and when he saw the man, he passed by on the other side. So, too a Levite, when he came to this place and saw him, passed by on the other side. But a Samaritan, as he traveled, came where the man was and when he saw him, took pity on him. He went to him, bandaged his wounds, poured on oil, and wine. Then he put the man on his donkey, brought him to an Inn and took care of him. The next day he took out two denarii and gave them to the innkeeper. “Look after him,” he said, “and when I return, I will reimburse you for any extra expense you may have.”*

Which of these three do you think was a neighbor to the man who fell into the hands of thieves?

The expert in the law replied, *the one who had mercy on him.*

Jesus told him, *Go and do thou likewise.*

Jews and Samaritans: Historical Memory

It is important to note that I am not a Biblical textual scholar; nor am I a Biblical anthropologist nor am I an ordained minister. As a pastoral theologian I am dependent, therefore, on others' writings when I seek to contextualize, to understand, and finally to exegete Christian scripture. I read and interpret the Bible as a member of the laity.

From the account of Jesus and his encounters with a Samaritan woman (John 4:4-42) we learn that during Jesus' lifetime, Jews and Samaritans did not ordinarily engage in social encounters with each other. At a great distance in time, it appears to us as if Jesus was breaking a long-standing cultural taboo when he chatted with a Samaritan woman at a local village well – asking her for a drink. Not only that, as a direct consequence of their conversation, Jesus was invited to stay overnight in her village as its guest - which he did.

In the world in which Jesus lived, some contemporary scholars suggest that the relationships between Jews and Samaritans had been estranged for a long time – centuries of animosity. Samaritans, at times, harassed Jewish travelers on the road between Galilee and Judea. Samaritans were viewed with covert suspicion and overt hostility. There are historical instances when Jewish individuals and groups vandalized Samaritan villages and destroyed that community's religious temples. Samaritans, in their turn, vandalized sacred Jewish sites and buildings. Zangenberg comments that *Samaritans were viewed with suspicion and hostility by Jews in and around Jerusalem.*ⁱⁱ In reading about this history, it is important to note that the animosity, enmity, hostility, harassment and acts of physical violence were reciprocal. Not only did the Jews disdain and distrust the Samaritans, the Samaritans also distrusted and disdained the Jewish people.

McCloskey, following in the footsteps of Roman Catholic scholar Father John (Jack) McKenzie, writes that:

The fact that there was such dislike and hostility between Jews and Samaritans is what gave the use of the Samaritan in the Parable of the Good Samaritan such force. The Samaritan is the one who is able

to rise above the bigotry and prejudices of centuries and show mercy and compassion for the injured Jew after the Jew's own countrymen had passed him by.ⁱⁱⁱ

As we begin, it is also important to note that priests and Levites were both hereditary members of the Hebrew temple caste system. Both groups of individuals served the temple in some manner or other. In other words: they were culturally and ethnically seen as set apart for the work of God.^{iv} They, and their work, provided a kind of purity guarantee that the people believed (indeed, were taught to believe) protected the welfare of the political state, its rulers, and its citizens. To guarantee God's continuing favor, avoiding cultic impurity was essential for the priests and for other servants of the temple. Priests, in particular, were forbidden to touch the dead and the dying (see Numbers 19). Purity codes for Levites were somewhat less strenuous and more ambiguous. They were expected to clean the temple, care for and prepare the sacrificial animals, and provide sacred music for worship during public religious ceremonies.

In this story's narration by Jesus he does not deal with motivations – but with actions. Nor does he describe cultic expectations and behavior. It was the actors and their actions that Jesus details – not their acculturated and embodied motivations. We can assume that Jesus, his interrogator, and his listeners all knew the socio-cultural taboos and were well aware of the historical animosities between Jews and Samaritans that are deeply embedded within Jesus' parable.

As twenty-first century residents of the Judeo-Christian legacy, we inherit the story. But we live in a different century and inside very different worldviews. Of necessity, we each bring our own inherited worldview and its cultural blinders to our understanding of the parable's meaning. To understand Jesus' story we must, therefore, first interrogate it and, secondly, interpret it.

Exegesis

Jesus used this parable as a teaching methodology. Perhaps he was also using it as a public reprimand. What we know is a quite simple story. The Gospel writer, John, recorded the story (90-110 CE) and thus helped a young and growing Christian community to remember it.

We know from the four Gospels that Jesus – as a wandering mystic and spiritual teacher – was often at odds with the temple authorities and the religious-political leaders of his nation (cf., John 2:11-12).^v He disobeyed cultic teachings (cf. Mark 3: 1-6; Mark 2: 26-27; Mark 2: 23) and taught his followers by parables, example, direct action as well as by his specific instructions about how they were to live their everyday lives. .

His teaching attracted many (Jews and non-Jews) to him. Yet, Jesus lived inside his Jewish community and his consciousness was saturated with its teachings and cultic practices. In the parable of the Good Samaritan, therefore, we hear themes lifted from Jewish scripture (the Torah) written down centuries earlier:

- Deuteronomy 6: 5: *You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your strength and your neighbor as yourself.*
- Deuteronomy 10: 18b-19: *The Lord your God....loves the stranger providing him with food and clothing. You too must love the stranger*
- Leviticus 19:16: *Do not do anything that endangers your neighbor's life*
- Leviticus 19: 18b *Love your neighbor as yourself*

We can see (and often do see) the narrative of the Good Samaritan as a simple teaching – *take care of the wounded ones you encounter*. It is essential, I think, to see it also as a rebuke to the spiritual legalism and rigid liturgical orthodoxy of his historical era (a non-compassionate legalism that, for example, disallowed members of the temple staff (priests and Levites) to touch or to care for the body of a wounded and dying man.

Jesus seems to be saying to his legalistic interrogator: *When it is dangerous to you; dangerous to your personal status; dangerous to your personal safety; dangerous to your religious ideology; dangerous to your religious reputation as a faithful Jew, dangerous to your self-understanding: the demand for compassionate care of the neighbor is the trump card of God's teaching about proper living in community. This command to care for the neighbor takes precedence over the purity laws of your profession; it takes precedence over the political realities of your nation-state and its surrounding culture; it takes precedence over legalistic and orthodox religious teachings and cultic practices in your temple.*

The Parable of the Good Samaritan – placed inside its own historical context - becomes a dangerous and subversive narrative because it demands that (1) we pay attention (we are obligated by our faith to stop and actually see); (2) we challenge our cultural conditioning (to hate and to ignore the wounds of those we hate); (3) we actively embody compassionate love for the hated stranger (we go to the wounded ones and address them as fully human); (4) we carefully assess and address their life-endangering wounds (we touch and cleanse their wounds as gently as we know how); and finally (5) we provide them (these hated strangers) with safety and care inside our communities while their wounds heal.

The naked man abandoned and left to die: this man has been isolated from his full humanity by the bandits who beat him, stole his clothing and other items and then left him – alone - to die. In Jesus' story he has also been ignored – thus abandoned by - the priest and Levite who both noticed and then ignored his plight – leaving him unattended and uncared for.

In Jesus narrative, it is the hated other, the Samaritan traveler with his donkey, who sees the victimized man, recognizes him as fully human, cares for his wounds, rescues him, restores him to life, and surrounds him with continuing care.

Given the prejudices and animosities inside Jewish and Samaritan communities and inasmuch as the Good Samaritan stopped at a wayside inn known to him, it is likely that the inn-keeper and the inn's staff members were also members of the Samaritan community. If this is so, then the Good Samaritan engages members of his own community in providing continuous care to this gravely wounded man who did not belong to their kinship network and ethnic community. The wounded man (this stranger, this enemy of the people), having no kin rights, was, nevertheless, cared for with compassion.

If, as the text seems to imply, it was a Jewish man who was assaulted by thieves, then Jesus is telling us a subversive story by applying Jewish cultic law to all human relationships. He does this in an era of pre-existing and enduring cultural and historical enmity between Jews and Samaritans. It is not only a teaching tale of human compassion; it is also a subversive instruction to care for the enemy with the same care we show to our family, friends and neighbors. By his story, Jesus expands the sense of the human

community now to include the hated and disdained other as well as to our immediate family and culturally similar neighbors. Perhaps the story even implies that we are to make the hated stranger part of our kinship and friendship networks.

The implicit command is to provide care to each suffering individual – left by our respective cultures to suffer and perhaps to die unattended.

Jesus' interrogator seems to have recognized this subversive element in Jesus' teaching by insisting that Jesus clarify Jewish law – who, in fact, is the neighbor?

Rather than getting into a debate about the minutiae of Jewish cultic law, Jesus chooses to tell a simple story of violence, rescue and healing. Then, as a good teacher, he asks his interrogator to interpret the story. Boxed into a corner of his own making, the legal scholar answered that the neighbor to the abused and abandoned one was, indeed, the hated other – the Samaritan. The Samaritan, who saw, stopped, paid attention, and provided knowledgeable help to this dying man – the victim of others' violence and abandonment – becomes the spiritual standard for ethical and moral behavior in times of violence and intercultural disdain.

In Jesus' tale, the Samaritan becomes the neighbor because he cared for the culturally hated and religiously ignored stranger.

Posted December 16, 2019 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage
<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2019/12/ruth-krall-good-samaritan-pious-parable.htm> |

Second Essay

Bearing Witness: The First Step in Reconciliation^{vi}

Introductory Remarks

In May (2001) when President Showalter called to ask me about this presentation, the working title for this year's faculty retreat was in the form of questions: *Is the work of reconciliation the mission of Goshen College? Should it be?*^{vii}

As I moved through the summer - combining selected days of work embedded within weeks of vacation and play, I ruminated on the question of reconciliation as institutional mission. All summer long I asked colleagues and personal friends to tell me what they know of violation, trust destroyed, and reconciliation (the restoration of trust). I pondered the issues faced inside those who are violated and the issues faced inside those who seek to be helpers of the violated.

For those of you who do not know me well, I am a clinician turned theologian and my particular theological interests lie in the intersections of healing work and theological work. Much of my own study and personal scholarship arises in my personal and professional struggles to understand the question and pursuit of healing in broken lives - lives in which memory, the body, consciousness, the psyche and the spirit freeze, shatter, or distort during traumatic encounters with violence.

Restorative Work

I am particularly interested in the restorative work of therapists and medical healers in the area of trauma disorders - that arena of shattered or fragmented consciousness that follows individual or communal exposure to violence and violation.

One aspect of this work always includes the very troubling question of forgiveness in the lives of those who have survived and who must now make sense out of their life in the aftermath of violence and violation. The specific relationship of forgiveness to healing and the consequent or parallel relationship of healing to reconciliation remain quite unclear to me.

However, in the realm of the physical body, it appears as if the psychological or cognitive clutching of anger, rage, revenge fantasies or unrelenting demands for repentance on the part of the violator are correlated in some as yet unknown mechanism with immune system failures.^{viii} One of my teachers, Dr. Emmett Miller, talks about the dangers to the physical body of holding on to emotional or cognitive negativity at deep levels of consciousness. While as a secular physician, Emmett does not ordinarily address the issues of spirituality, alienation, and healing, I am convinced a parallel universe exists. What affects the human body, affects the human soul; what affects the human spirit, affects the human body.

In anecdotal medicine there is a large and growing body of literature and practice wisdom that when healing flows into the individual, a certain kind of inner transformation had already taken place so that healing occurs. Dr. Miller notes that the work of clinicians is to help their patients brush away the negative narrative debris of their lives in order to open the pathway to spontaneous healing.

In a recent John Templeton Foundation newsletter, Charlotte van Oyen Witvliet, professor of psychology at Hope College, writes about the health status of those who hold onto thoughts of and desires for revenge and those who forgive. In this article, she claims that the latter have fewer health problems and less stress. About forgiveness, she writes:

Forgiveness does not mean forgetting, minimizing, tolerating, excusing, legally pardoning, liking or reconciling. Rather, forgiveness involves relinquishing vengeance, and adopting merciful thoughts, feelings or behaviors towards the offender....Granting forgiveness, she claims, is often difficult to do...[but] it may paradoxically free [individuals] from the shackles of resentment and rage.^{ix}

It is important to note that in some of the literature of therapists who work with consciousness disorders clients often report a kind of spontaneous grace of forgiveness towards themselves and towards others. A clinical psychologist, Laurel Parnell, describes the experience of "Jan," a client with life-threatening pre-school encounters with violence focused around her mother's rage that she could not yet read and pronounce all of the words in Dr. Seuss.

Somewhere in the process of doing healing work, the following insight occurred. *My mother's whipping me had nothing to do with me. It was something that happened. It is not who I am.*" Parnell goes on to report that the client then experienced a spontaneous and un-coached awareness, *"If I forgive, I'll be vulnerable."* A series of insights associated with forgiveness unrolled. *"When I was a child I believed that if I forgave her and let go of my anger I would be vulnerable and could be hurt. I believed I had to stay strong to survive. I believed my anger made me strong. But I am an adult now and can take care of myself. If I don't forgive and let go of the past, I'm hurting myself. I'm the one who is carrying this pain inside. Forgiving is not forgetting. I will never forget what happened, but I can let go of the pain and anger. I can forgive now without compromising myself."* Parnell concludes that her client had gained a global perspective of the events that had transpired in her life and felt compassion for all who had been involved.^x

"Lois"- a client of physician Marty Rossman wrote to him about one of these spontaneous showerings of grace:

What was done to me, the traumas, the pain, and the fear are not who I am. I walk around in serenity. I would not trade my life for anyone else's. I see it all as an incredible journey to deep understanding, compassion, and to radiant self-awareness. Lois.^{xi}

Yet, clinicians and therapists know how rare this kind of spontaneous transformation is. And no one seems to know how to replicate it in the lives of those for whom healing, reconciliation and transformation are elusive.

In situations of violation and violence, how can the shattered consciousness be healed and reconciled? With experienced violence and violation, is it even remotely honorable to ask questions of forgiveness and healing? For their full healing, is it essential for victimized individuals to seek reconciliation with the perpetrator of violence? Or, as some authors and activists suggest, is this insistence upon reconciliation yet another form of violation?

It is important to note, therefore, that for many victims and their counselors, it is obscene to ask the question of forgiveness and reconciliation at all.

Many clinicians note the oppressive effect of asking the victim to forgive the victimizer, to become reconciled. Harvard psychiatrist and faculty member Judith Herman takes up the question of forgiveness (certainly one of the key issues in reconciliation work).

Claiming that revenge fantasies are mirror images of the traumatic memory in which the victim reverses the roles of victim and victimizer, Herman believes that revenge fantasies actually increase the victim's suffering. Similarly, Herman notes that the choice to bypass outrage, by a decision of the will to forgive, is yet another form of increasing the suffering.

Recognizing the impossibility of exorcising the trauma by either revenge or by unilateral declarations of forgiveness and love, Herman claims that what is necessary is deep mourning - all the way down to the bone - in which the victim finds that she can let go of her negative psychic attachment to the perpetrator. Never forgetting what has happened to her, she weaves her memories together in a new life narrative. Never forgetting what has happened to him, he comes to realize that he is now responsible for his own recovery - for how he re-constitutes his own consciousness and thinking processes.

Healing work has been successful when the survivor relinquishes a tenacious hold on her repetitive memories of victimization at the hands of the other as the (a) central defining aspect of her identity. For Herman, and for many others, reconciliation is never the outcome towards which they work. They consider this goal to be dangerous to the ongoing healing process in their clients. Rather, they work for safety, empowerment, healing and the reconstitution of consciousness itself. Apathy towards the victimizer, non-attachment to the event of victimization is the outcome which best promotes ongoing healing in the life-long management of trauma. It is not, in this view, healing work to ask the question of forgiveness and reconciliation. The question, when asked of the client, is a continuing or repetitious violation towards the victim.

In ongoing work with trauma survivors - whether these be war survivors, sufferers of combat fatigue, first responders, sexual violence victims, hostages and kidnapping victims, child abuse victims, or domestic violence survivors: an engaging question surfaces:

What is the influence of violence awareness itself in the lives and consciousness of those who seek to work with - and perchance be a facilitator of healing or reconciliation?

From work being done at Harvard (Herman, van der Kolk), Berkeley (Levine), and Stanford (Sapolsky, Zimbardo) we have a growing awareness that the helping relationship - whether that be of United Nations workers in refugee camps on the edges of war zones or rape crisis counselors in therapeutic relationships-this growing awareness teaches us that in the helping or reconciling attempt, a situation is created in which the violence itself is always a third party to the work - creating cycles of re-victimization and re-traumatization for victims inside the healing relationship and creating new victims among those who seek to help. Herman describes this well:

*Some of the most clinically astute observations of the treatment of borderline personality disorder [were] written when the traumatic origin of the disorder was not yet known. In these accounts, a destructive force appears to intrude repeatedly into the relationship between therapist and patient. This force, which was traditionally attributed to the patient's inner aggression, can now be recognized as the violence of the perpetrator. The psychiatrist Eric Lister remarks that transference in traumatized patients does not reflect a simple dyadic relationship, but rather a triad: **"The terror is as though the patient and therapist convene in the presence of yet another person. The third image is the victimizer, who demanded silence and whose command is now being broken."**^{xii xiii}*

In his case presentation of "Lois", an audience participant asked physician Marty Rossman about his personal inner life response to working with survivors of childhood sexual violence. Rossman paused for a moment and then he commented:

Doing this kind of work] has forced me to grow a tremendous amount. It touched me in places in me that I can't describe-the horror, the fear, the disbelief. [At each step] I was left wondering if I was really ready [for this work.] On the other hand, knowing the necessity [as a physician] to be there, that these things do happen, it forced me to feel deeper feelings...and it was good for me.^{xiv}

In this teaching presentation, he (Rossman) repeatedly emphasized the need for peer consultation and peer supervision. This is a theme (the need for peer supervision) repeated in the work of the Harvard clinical research project, *Victims of Violence*.^{xv} As members of the Harvard faculty have been working in a wide variety of locales, a repeated theme is the need for helpers and caregivers to avoid over-extension, isolation and unending sacrificial giving of the self to others.

A Basic Shifting

Not knowing that the retreat's title had been changed to a declarative one, I finally decided as I drove alone on the back roads of California that there could be no other answer than a simple **yes** to the question which President Showalter had raised on the phone with me: *Is reconciliation the mission of Goshen College?*

Each time I returned to the question, a litany drummed itself into my consciousness:

- *Yes, of course, of course yes: the work of reconciliation is the work of all of us who are attracted to Jesus;*
- *Yes, of course, yes: the work of reconciliation is the vocation of all of us who seek to be educators;*
- *Yes, of course, yes: the work of reconciliation is the central work of all of us who seek to be healers in a world of woundedness—a world filled with people who know much more about violence, coercive domination, mis-use of power-over them, and oppression than they know about the path of a sustainable, justice-filled, non-chaotic peace, that peace which our Hebrew foreparents in faith called Shalom.*^{xvi}
- *Yes, of course, yes: the great religious traditions of the world all teach that a genuine inner life of the spirit manifests itself in the loving or compassionate ways that we treat others.*

But, as I listened to my own inner litany of "yes, of course, yes," serious questions about this perception also forced their own competing litany into my awareness.

As I drove thousands of West Coast miles, my thoughts kept coming back to the Pauline comment from Romans which I first learned from my mother.

Interestingly, Volf also lifts out this passage. *I do not do what I want to do but what I hate...What happens is that I do not the good I will to do, but the evil I do not instead* (Romans 7:14-20). I will paraphrase these Biblical words here for my own purposes this morning: *the good that I would do, I do not do and the evil that I should avoid, I do not avoid*. From my vantage point as a summer wanderer, this is one of the central problems of too-casually or too-easily claiming reconciliation as an institutional vocation, mission or central religious calling.

What Then Are the Issues?

Tom Clancy's most recent novel, *The Bear and the Dragon*,^{xvii} has a recurring theme. *Nations do not have friends. They have interests*. In Clancy's novel the way to peace is for the dominant good guys - in this case the United States - to wage a quick, technological war in which human beings are expendable collateral damage. The overwhelming quick strike with superior fire power is the way to obtain and maintain peace in the institutionalized and mythologized world of nation states. The goal of such strikes is to lay waste to the hated or mistrusted other while sustaining few losses of either equipment or manpower. The ultimate goal is unconditional surrender.

As I read about an imagined world war in the future, I pondered the question - *can any institution have friends...or are institutions only capable of having interests?* Can an institution, qua institution, have a reconciling mission if it is mostly driven by interests rather than by a vulnerable relationality? Can institutions thrive – indeed, can they live within an active withholding of first strike mentality and/or action?

Clancy's book provides a strong, partisan apology for the need for violence at the hands of the strong in order to maintain the peace of the world. In this worldview, coercion, force, and violence **are** the peace-keepers.

I returned to my internal mutterings:

- *Can any institution, which must by its very nature deal with repeated exercises of power (for example, power held, power lost, power sought, power bartered, power denied) can such an institution rely upon or embody the gospel of surrender, yielding, suffering, loss or crucifixion?*

- *Is it remotely possible for institutions, qua institutions, to remain faithful to a self-declared mission of reconciliation?*

Even inside the litany of the overwhelming, *yes, of course, yes*, I kept being driven back in my thoughts to the sense that the work of authentic reconciliation is a personal and relational activity - done one by one within the communal ethos. And it seemed to me, in these dense ruminations, as if a basic and underlying skill or spiritual practice was the calling or vocation to first of all *bear witness*.

On Bearing Witness

*I am the twelve-year-old girl, refugee on a small boat,
Who throws herself into the ocean after being raped by a sea pirate
And I am the pirate, my heart not yet capable of seeing and loving.*

Thich Nhat Hanh^{xviii}

Jean Shinoda Bolen, a Japanese-American psychiatrist and Jungian analyst has written a very persuasive set of paragraphs that it is the calling or vocation of therapists and healers to bear witness to the sufferings of others. She writes:

I am convinced of the importance of having a significant person bear witness to our lives. I often think this is what I do as a psychiatrist. I witness my patient's lives and thus know what it is like in their particular circumstances and what it means to be them. They share with me those moments and relationships that truly matter. I know of the courage and sacrifices, of the guilt and shame that couldn't be forgiven or faced until whatever it was could be told...

It is no small matter to be a witness to another person's life story. By listening with compassion, we validate each other's lives, make suffering meaningful, and help the process of forgiving and healing to take place. And our acceptance may make it possible for a person who feels outside the human community to gain a sense of surviving once more...Survivors of childhood abuse...feel ashamed, defective, or different...because of what they have experienced. They, too, need

to tell what happened to them, to have someone bear witness to their lives in order to feel that they belong.

...I am convinced that any human being who can serve as witness for another at a soul level heals the separateness and isolation that we might otherwise feel. Witnessing is not a one-way experience; the witness is also affected by the encounter. To comprehend the truth of another's experience, we must truly take it in and be affected.^{xix}

Many years ago, I heard Shoah survivor Elie Wiesel speak at Earlham College in Richmond, Indiana. He was the first person to draw my attention to the elegant powers of bearing witness as a necessary political act of working for justice within a situation of powerlessness in order to confront the ongoing violation of human dignity and human rights. He talked with his Earlham audience about psychological factors experienced by the Jewish inhabitants of Dachau, Auschwitz, etc. They felt abandoned by the human community for it appeared as if these concentration camps were not visible in the world - that no one other than their sadistic perpetrators and fellow victims witnessed their suffering.

He spoke of a later time – years after the ending of World War Two - when he stood on the boundary of another prison camp - from the vantage point of a second nation - and with microphones, spoke across the political nation-state boundary, the cement and wire walls - *We know you are there. We witness your suffering. We know you are there. We stand here and bear witness to your incarceration and suffering. We are powerless to end your suffering but we are here and we watch. We will not abandon our watch over you.^{xx}*

This is very similar to the witness of the women at the foot of the cross.^{xxi} They would not abandon him whom they loved, even as it meant they came to witness and to understand the meaning of Rome's power (alongside of the power of their religious community) to ostracize, exclude and murder. Powerless to affect the outcome of the crucifixion, nevertheless they waited and watched, i.e., they bore witness to the suffering of their beloved son and teacher as he died in front of their eyes.

In his book, *Exclusion and Embrace*, Miroslav Volf writes of the absence of innocence.^{xxii} I think that he is correct: a loss of innocence is involved for both the perpetrator and the recipient of violence and violation. However,

Volf does not address the loss of innocence which seizes the Inner life of the healer, of the victim advocate; of the would-be peacemaker; of the one who hopes to initiate and to facilitate transformation, reconciliation, and healing.

Once one has been a witness to the victim's suffering and shattered consciousness, to her fragmented memory, to his loss of identity, to their sense that not even in one's body is one safe, the sense that there is no safety in the communal body, the nearly total absence of trust: in short, when one is a committed and faithful witness to another's suffering, there is then no more innocence to be found anywhere. Witnessing the devastation of a life broken by betrayal and violence, the healer becomes as broken in the face of overwhelming violence as its intended victim but that brokenness is at a different level of consciousness.

The work of facilitating healing - or, perhaps, reconciliation – is difficult work and it challenges the spirituality of the healer and peacemaker in ways which are very difficult to encode in language. Healers, at times, become overwhelmed by their client's life history. They become highly sensitized to violence. They may become intensely paranoid about their own safety. At times healers may become physically, spiritually, or emotionally ill. They may become addicted to any one of a multitude of addictions. They may lose sight of their own identity. They may become cynical about the humanity of victimizers. They may even become overtly or covertly harmful to their clients, family members, friends, others in the commons, or themselves.

I can only conclude from what I know personally about this as well as what I know from the past five years of conversations with peace workers, healers and religious alike, that **if** the central act of reconciliation work as a vocation is bearing witness, **then** we must pay very close attention to the issues raised in the literature of *the wounded healer*.^{xxiii} We must learn how to be compassionate witnesses even in the midst of great wounds.

Eventually, it seems to me, we must recognize (1) the wounds of the bandits who rob and seek to kill; (2) the wounds of the bandits' victims; (3) the wounds of the Good Samaritan (which Jesus did not address); (4) the wounds of the surrounding cultures. In time we also learn that we must learn how to bear witness to these wounds even as we seek to be healers and reconcilers. Of necessity, therefore, we will be driven to examine and

address our own wounds. Roman Catholic author and priest Henri Nouwen cautions us that even as we address the woundedness of others, we must also address our own.^{xxiv}

Volf's concerns about everyone's loss of innocence becomes, as my generation speaks it, *right on*. In the words of Jewish philosopher Phillip Hallie, *we not only imitate our loves; we imitate our hates*. If we are not paying attention, it is quite likely that we will become part of the cycle of violence rather than part of the healing, restoring, transforming, and perhaps reconciling process.

It is not that we should retreat into purity - the purity of non-engagement. To me, this is a morally reprehensible stance.

It is rather that we must begin a spiritual journey that will take us to the place where we recognize our own selves in the face of the victim *and* in the face of the victimizer. I know of no one who speaks this truth more eloquently than does the Buddhist monk Thich Nhat Hanh in his poem, *Please Call Me by My Own True Names*.^{xxv}

The background to the poem is Nhat Hanh's attempt to rescue boat people in the Gulf of Siam. The particular motivation for the poem was a letter to Nhat Hanh in which he was told about the rape of a twelve year old girl by a Thai sea pirate. The girl immediately jumped into the sea and drowned. He writes about the origins of the poem in a deeply centered process of spiritual meditation

When you first learn of something like that, you get angry at the pirate. You naturally take the part of the girl. As you look more deeply you will see it differently. If you take the side of the little girl, that is easy. You only have to get a gun and shoot the pirate.

But we cannot do that. In my meditation, I saw that if I had been born in the village of the pirate and raised in the same conditions as he was, there is a great likelihood that I would become a pirate. I saw that many babies are born along the Gulf of Siam, hundreds every day, and if we do not do something about the situation in twenty-five years a number of them will be sea pirates. That is certain. If you or I were born today in those fishing villages, we may become sea pirates in twenty-five years. If you take a gun and shoot the pirate, you shoot all of us, because all of us are to some

extent responsible for the state of affairs. After a long meditation, I wrote this poem. In it, there are three people: the twelve-year old girl, the pirate, and me. Can we look at each other and recognize ourselves in each other? The title of the poem: Please Call Me by My True Names. When I hear one of these names, I have to say "Yes."^{ixxvi}

In Conclusion

Our primary mission is pedagogy. We are teachers of the young. We are guides to a future we will not live to see. We are shapers of that which will remain when we are no longer here. We must consider what Native Americans call the seventh generation effect of all that we do for we are shapers of that future time in the present moment. This alone is a daunting awareness.

In the process of muttering all summer long, and in the process of trying to write a paper that had no thesis and now has no conclusions, I find myself still left with the question - can a mission statement create us as an institutional people who facilitate reconciliation? And I remain unclear.

For those of us who seek to follow Christ into hell and who attempt with him to harrow it, it is clear that we will share in the brokenness of the world in ways we do not imagine, indeed, cannot imagine, ahead of time. For here, in the underworld of fragmentation, shattering and suffering, even as a deliberate witness, there often is no moment of transforming grace, no mercy, none of the gentler virtues, no obvious escape.

Traveling into hell, we embed ourselves within the web of violation and violence - when we could have avoided it like the priest and the Levite in Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan. We could have averted our gaze and left the scene of violation. But when we choose to enter one of earth's hells, we enter in the outrageous belief that we, with God's help and with each other as co-traveling companions, that we can perhaps swing the balance beam towards healing. Perhaps we can help to shorten the long moral arc of history towards justice.

I have come to believe that to do this work, we must begin a sustaining spiritual practice-one that is as much about joy, wonder, gratitude and awe as it is about anger, disgust, desires to punish, despair, and distrust.

Entering the dark night of the soul on behalf of the victimized and abandoned other is a journey to be undertaken only with adequate spiritual resources.

If we begin such a spiritual practice, we will find our self strongly anchored to earth in the place of knowing, as Volf's book points out, that we have no innocence. We will come, with Nhat Hanh, to the point of recognizing that reconciliation is not only the goal; it is the life journey itself. The place of healing or reconciliation becomes, turtle-like, our spiritual home, and it is not only a teleological journey with a desired end; it is not only our self-proclaimed mission: it is our spiritual home in the here and now.

We must carry it with us everywhere on our backs. And we must attentively and mindfully practice it in each step of our life, in every decision that we make.

To accept the mission of reconciliation as our vocation means stepping into the politicized position of the margins rather than the more imposing and secure position inside the centers of power. It means learning to be trustworthy as we bear witness to the sufferings of the other. It means authentic repentance when we are the source of the other's suffering. It means humility – the humility of knowing or recognizing our limitations. It means learning compassion. It means a deep recognition of all of our own names- including those we would rather avoid. It means going to the other not in the role of "doing" or "transforming" or "reconciling" or "healing" or "being expert" but rather that of taking the position of "being-along-side-of" and then following the lead and the needs of the violated one, the victimized one, the damaged one, the shattered one, the fragmented one, the marginalized one, the harmed one, the enraged one, the confused one, the estranged one. We begin then the journey of reconciliation with the act of paying attention; of bearing witness.

The first goal is re-establishment of safety for without safety, there is no genuine possibility of reconciliation, no way to open the path to peace, joy, balance, harmony, abundant life, genuine shalom in our midst. We must become the guarantor of safety for the other. This is an almost mystical task. It means being honorable. It means growing in trustworthiness. It means seeking the path of a centered personal and communal integrity.

Activism is the second act in reconciliation work. The spiritual journey of *coming to know all of our own true names* is the first. In truth, they are, in human reality, often concurrent activities. Seeing the need for healing, or for reconciliation, we go inward towards the divine one and in search of the core truths about all of our identities, our many selves. Then and only then can we go outward into the world to help suffering people.

We come to know firsthand, that *often the good which I should do, I do not do and the evil which I ought not to do, I do*. Slowly we learn to let go of our pretense of purity, of innocence. Even more slowly we begin to learn how to be present and to bear witness. As we make this journey from denial and its passive enablement of evil and as we begin – deliberately - to pay attention, we learn that the life-journey demands for reconciliation begin with compassion for others and the inner decision to faithfully bear witness to their suffering.

Parker Palmer quotes Václav Havel, *Consciousness precedes Being and not the other way around*.^{xxvii} It has always been so. In the transformation and redemption of our consciousness, we become reconciled and, in becoming reconciled, we may (perhaps) become facilitators of reconciliation and restoration.^{xxviii}

August, 2001, Revised November, 2019

Part one posted December 18, 2019 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage
<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2019/12/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-first-step.html>

Part two posted December 21, 2019 on Bill Lindsey's blog,
Bilgrimage
<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2019/12/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-first-step.html>

Third Essay

Bearing Witness: Paying Attention

When I was a child, I spoke and thought and reasoned as a child; but when I grew up, I put away childish things.^{xxix}

For many years now, I've been thinking about these two words – *bearing witness*. In one sense bearing a truthful or faithful witness is based upon (1) being fully present inside our life situation and (2) careful observation of our surroundings. It involves paying attention and seeing what is actually present in our personal and social environments.

In our grade school years, teachers and parents often admonished us to *pay attention*. In our high school and college years, other teachers showed us varied ways to pay attention. We gradually learned how to focus our attention and to study the world around us for ourselves. Over time we learned how to question what we thought we knew for sure – often learning that our information and knowledge were incomplete, perhaps overtly and deeply flawed, or even factually untrue. In time we learned to separate trustworthy sources of information from less trustworthy ones. We learned about propaganda and false facts. We learned about setting appropriate interpersonal boundaries in place. We learned how to recognize lying in ourselves and in others. In short, we learned to separate factual truth from lies, propaganda, wishful fantasies, idle gossip, politically-motivated ideologies, magical thinking, and half-truths. As we paid attention, we began to have an educated intuition about untrustworthy individuals and their so-called facts. We learned to distinguish between fiction and non-fiction. The semiotic truths represented by literary fiction and poetry were, we learned, quite different from the scientific truths of the natural and biological sciences and the narrative truths of history and biography.

In our experimentation with life we gradually learned that lying to ourselves or to others was not a good idea. Lies quite often returned to us – biting us on the ass. With each experienced bite we learned something about the need to develop personal integrity. Along the way we learned there was no Santa Claus and there was no Easter Bunny and that on Halloween no witches flew about on broom-power alone. We learned, in other words, to

separate fiction and fairy tales from truth; lies from facts; idle gossip from truth-telling; and trustworthy individuals from untrustworthy ones. Knowing that rumors could be simultaneously malicious and contain necessary facts, we learned to double-check and, in some situations, triple-check the information we received inside our familial, social and professional networks of relationships. Because even chronic liars sometimes tell the truth, we created an inner grid or process of fact-checking dubious information. We learned over time to create a network of individuals where we could safely check information and our internal perceptions about truth or lies with people we trusted.

By our individual and personal processes of experimentation with life, we gradually learned that our deepest intuitions – while fallible – often contained more accurate truthfulness about ourselves and others than we could explain. Learning to trust these inner red and green flags took time and maturity but *if something seemed too good to be true*, it most likely was not true at all. If someone came across as hostile or as having an evil intentionality towards us, we noticed this. Gradually and painfully we learned that sometimes truth-telling was as malicious and as harmful as lying. As we matured, we learned to test our intuitions about maliciousness by consulting with those whom we trusted. We learned, slowly, to trust our gut feelings about others intentionality as well as their claims about veracity. Along the way we made many mistakes. By paying attention, we learned from our own mistakes and from the mistakes of others.

As we continuously interacted with our culture and learned its stash of collected wisdoms and folk tales, our internal gyroscope grew more accurate. We learned that if something smelled really bad – in the physical world or in our moral-ethical-social environment, it was important to pay attention. If one was truly wise, one self-protectively investigated the source of the foul odor or toxic environment; finding it polluted or corrupted, we often chose to move away. We passively or actively sought how to escape this foul-smelling or toxic-looking reality or, conversely being civic-minded, we perhaps stayed long enough to assess, analyze, diagnose it and to clean up the mess.

Some toxic environments meant wearing protective gear during the clean-up process. Chest waders are helpful in cleaning up polluted swamps. Protective gloves are essential in cleaning up roadside trash.

In cleaning up spiritually toxic environments (to avoid spreading the toxicity and to avoid traumatizing the self and others), trustworthy and attentive individuals needed to activate their most-trusted personal, interpersonal and spiritual resources. In my experience with life to date, especially in complex situations of institutional wrong-doing, I often needed wise elders as well as equally concerned and committed peers.

Bearing witness, in this sense of the phrase's meaning, involves paying attention. It means seeing what is factually in front of us before we trip over it. It means testing our individual and collective perceptions to see what is truthful, what is overt or covert propaganda, what is partial truth, what is an outright lie, and what is a shaded, highly nuanced message meant to deceive us.

In our developmental journey to adulthood, we stopped being gullible (not all advertising could be trusted; not all adults were harmless; not all preachers faithfully sought to live the Gospel they so earnestly preached on Sunday mornings; not all spiritual teachers or theologians recognized and taught wisdom and truth). Over time, as we matured, we learned to ask questions about that which presented itself to us as truth in its absolute and its hypothetical or metaphysical forms as well as in its factual forms.

In our humanities classes we learned to separate factual truths from philosophical and spiritual (or metaphysical) claims about truth. In our clinical courses we learned to recognize that what we "knew" to be factual truth was sometimes not truth at all (masturbation will not cause hair to grow on your palms nor does it cause acne).

As we matured and learned about a wide variety of human cultures (and their unique metaphysical claims), we began to see factual truth as a category of reliable information we needed to memorize: 12 inches always equaled a foot; 8 fluid ounces always equaled a cup; sixteen ounces always equaled a pound. Factual truth is not measured in terms of its metaphysical relevancy; it is measured in terms of its accuracy and its usefulness. However, as we learned about cups and rulers, we also needed to learn that there were many different ways of measuring length and volume. Distances could be measured in centimeters and kilometers as well as in inches or miles. Flour, for example, could be weighed for a cake recipe and/or it could be measured in a cup. Some forms of factual data, we learned, were less technologically precise than others. A 1-X tee

shirt could be cut generously or stingily. Thus, not all 1-X tee shirts fit the same body in precisely the same way. A pound of flour gave us a more accurate measure for gourmet cooking than flour measured in cups. Sifting flour, we learned, affected the measured volume but it did not affect its measured weight.

In our natural science classes, as another example, we learned to question the inherited wisdom from our parents and our culture (for example: a cookie dropped on the floor was probably not safe to pick up and eat no matter what the parents' five seconds rule stated); wearing tampons did not cause cervical or vaginal cancer; eating walnuts did not make us beautiful; grabbing and holding a bunch of poison ivy did, however, cause our palms to redden and blister.

No matter how cautiously we approached life there were no guarantees that we would be spared its trauma. Putting metaphorical blinders on our eyes; putting metaphorical ear plugs in our ears; wearing metaphorical elbow length industrial gloves and covering our nose and mouth with heavy masks: we became unable to see, hear, touch, and smell the complexities of factual truth.

In our microbiology laboratory classes, seeing something on a slide under microscopic lens, we were asked to reproduce this seeing on paper. My drawings were never photographically precise images. They were more often clumsy approximations. We were asked to use petri dishes and a growing medium to grow these cells and then see what they looked like in the aggregate – the tiny naked to the human eye individual organism now made visible in a collective form. We were asked to wash our hands – thoroughly cleaning them – and then to grow a culture of the organisms that remained. We were asked to eat brie or Roquefort cheeses and then to culture them. Our awareness – and attentiveness – to the details of these “invisible” worlds of bacteria (living individual cells) was growing. We not only looked through “our” microscope; we looked through the microscopes of our classmates – always making a rough sketch or drawing of what we saw – making visible to others that which had once been invisible to us.

Paying attention, we saw that these living organisms could be collected and seen as individuals and as collectives. We could, therefore, learn about their life cycles and reproductive processes. That which had once been

invisible to us was now predictably visible. Not only had our eyes been taught to see; our mind had been similarly shaped towards questions of meaning and understanding. The five second rule of our childhood changed its meaning as we learned the potential dangers about eating food that had fallen to the floor.

In our social science classes, we learned about invisible but potent realities such as economic structures; socially permeable boundaries such as race, ethnicity, class structures, and gender; socio-political governance, or the invisible but highly operational personality structure (i.e., the empathic barrier) which allowed intuitive information to pass between and among individuals. Some of us (but certainly not all of us) were taught that churches as socio-cultural institutions were, therefore, governed by the social rules of all institutions in our particular cultures. In a similar way, the socio-personal structures of authoritarianism could be identified and studied.

Churches could, therefore, be studied in the same way other social institutions such as schools or multinational corporations could be studied. Churches were subject to the same kinds of economic pressures and socio-cultural forces that other institutions experienced. Each of our culture's institutions could, for example, have corrupted leaders. The similarities, as well as differences, between a sexually corrupt pastor and a sexually corrupt public school teacher could be identified. The institutional responses to employee sexual abuse could, therefore, also be identified and studied.

Churches and other religious organizations not only carried the religious and spiritual wisdom of their long histories; they were also deeply embedded inside the cultural matrix of their time in history. Churches therefore, often reflected or mirrored their surrounding socio-cultural environments. There were, we slowly learned, no 100% pure and culturally non-contaminated institutional churches. Mortal and fallible human beings created fallible human churches and these same mortal and fallible human beings worshipped inside them. Sometimes (more often than not) our cultural understanding blurred that which was divinely inspired and that which was humanly created. Over time we learned that churches routinely get into moral and ethical trouble when they claim divine origins for their human-created structures, ideologies, and liturgies.

There are moral, ethical and spiritual equivalents to physical blinders, ear plugs, gloves and face masks. They allow us to avoid knowing uncomfortable factual truths. In addition, they allow us to escape the moral and ethical needs for our religious and secular cultures to bear a truthful witness. They allow us to remain naïve and innocent of the moral and ethical dilemmas which arise inside human relationships and human institutions.

In our youth the hard-earned folk wisdom of our elders was examined for its relevance in our generational lives. As elders we are now the carriers of such inherited, collected, and collated wisdom. Inevitably, we will experience the questions of the young as they seek to determine if our hard-earned personal share of our culture's wisdom has any relevance for their generation, for their future.

When I think about the so-called wisdom my culture has taught me, I am reminded of the wisdom of ancient Hebrew Scriptures: *vanity of vanity; all is vanity.*^{xxx}

This past week I had a routine medical appointment. A new blood test has been developed which is not dependent upon fasting. A simple finger prick – immediately able to be analyzed in the doctor's office - can give an accurate picture that reflects a three months history and analysis of your blood sugars. The reading is nearly immediate – within fifteen minutes of the blood draw the result can be given to the client and posted on his or her chart for comparison at the next visit. That which lodges invisible in the human body is now made visible in the physician's office laboratory.

The precursor to this new visibility is the human capacity to ask questions of the human body and to develop technological means by which to retrieve accurate answers from the body itself. The physician serves as the intermediary by which the body's answers arrive. In essence, she or he serves as the body's witness and whistle-blower. She or he intuits that the body's wisdom about itself must be made visible in order to assess the well-being of the whole – and proceeds to investigate the intuitive question – seeking an answer that is not always visible to the naked eye.

The scientific method, itself, is a way of paying attention; historical research is another; meditation practices are yet another; even altered states of

consciousness such as hypnosis allow for a focused way of paying attention.

Our parents and our teachers gradually handed the external world over to us in order that we could manage our own life trajectories. Unexpected realities needed to be managed. Unexplained quandaries needed to be investigated. But, given a little luck, crises were few and our personalities gained needed time and wisdom for managing them if and when they happened.

Entering Adulthood

Once we entered adulthood, we became responsible for monitoring our world; for interdependently interacting with it in multiple ways. We also became responsible for protecting the young while they – the next generations - learned how to pay attention. Witnessing their innocence, their naiveté and their curiosity about life, we re-visit, if we are wise, what we know - for sure - is absolute and unchanging and unalterable. We do not ask them to believe that which we know is untrue. We make certain they know the difference between fantasy and factual reality. We make certain that they know the difference between unsafe and safe realities in their daily lives.

While Spiderman can jump between skyscrapers to pursue justice and while Superman can fly across raging rivers to rescue the damsel in distress, we do not want our children jumping off rooftops to see if they too have magical powers just like Spiderman and Superman do.

As a child I listened to my *Let's Pretend* vinyl record of Jack and the Bean Stalk and never once believed that bean stalks grew into the clouds and could be climbed by giants. Likewise, as an eight or nine year old child, I listened to a weekly radio version of Buck Rogers and never once believed that space travel actually happened or dreamed it could, in real life, happen. As an adult, I have often wondered how many of the world's early astronauts and space scientists listened to Buck Rogers as children. That which had once been only an imaginary journey into outer space had, in my lifetime, become reality.

Fantasy nourishes a child's imagination; this nourishment is essential to their growth and development. But, we should not lie to children about

factual truths. We should not threaten them with metaphysical bromides about heaven and hell. Most especially we should not lie to them about facts they need to learn in order to lead a healthy life.

In addition, we need to learn to listen to them as they tell us the truths about their own lives – truths about daily life and everyday relationships. We should pay attention, as well, to that which they cannot yet encode into language. Their bodies and their hours of play carry the lived-truth of their daily lives just as our adult bodies and daily routines carry the truth of our own daily lives.

I am not a critic of fairy tales and fantasy movies for children. But I do know it is a narrow field of play. The child who hears the *Little Engine that Could* speak English needs to know that in real life mechanical train engines do not talk English to each other. The child who reads the luminous series of Harry Potter books needs to know that these miraculous and mythical stories about magic are make-believe.

I personally learned in very early childhood that Santa was my father. I still pretended to believe when I visited the department store Santa on the fifth floor. I was willing to trade my childhood integrity for a holiday spiced lollypop. According to my mother many years later: before I went to grade school, I began asking: *why are there so many Santa Claus men on the streets? Which is the real one?*

But by Christmas of first grade, I was an unbeliever. The guy in the red suit was a fictional character just like the English-speaking train engine of my earlier childhood book was a fantasy. In my family, the pretense of a Santa Claus lasted well into adolescence and beyond because of the annual filled Christmas stocking with its note of (1) commendation and (2) suggestions of needs for improvement was hung during the night of Christmas Eve while we kids slept. I wish I had saved those notes – they were my dad's loving reminders about growth areas in our lives – complete with lumps of coal. But they also contained loving affirmations of the year past and his hopes for us in the year ahead. In my early childhood – under war and post-war rationing – oranges were a holiday delight and so oranges were a part of the holiday stocking stuffers. Later that morning they would become part of our family's mid-day holiday meal. But there were other small gifts as well – Santa was not cheap nor was he petty when it came to his children. Santa's helper – my mom – assisted in this stocking ritual. As an

adult looking back, I am quite certain she did 99 % of the shopping and wrapping that was needed. I am equally certain that Santa's letters were my dad's original form of celebrating his children's maturation processes.

In re-thinking these paragraphs, I, with new insight, realized how many Santa Claus figures the department store needed to hire in order to make one complete fantasy for children. The red-suited guy in the airplane who flew over our hometown dropping department store flyers about Santa's arrival was likely not the same red-suited man who climbed the fire truck ladder to the top floor of the department store – to climb in its window and then wave to all of us on the ground below. And the Santa we told our wishes to was probably a different man – also in a red suit - than these previous two ones. At my current age, I am sure there is a moral to this story of these trinitarian Santa figures but I am not sure what it is.

I just know this: fantasy nurtures a child's imagination. My parents both enabled their children's imaginative life. In addition, they helped us to know the difference between what was real and what was fantasy. It is essential, therefore, that imagination mature as part of the child's journey through childhood and adolescence into adult life. Getting stuck in childhood beliefs, fantasies and wishes is a sure sign of a flawed or failed developmental process.

However, when it comes to violence and harm inside the human commons or inside families, let's pretend has no place. What is called for is paying attention, purposeful listening, truth-speaking, and compassionate kindness.

With life experience, we become able to focus our attention on one thing or allow it to scan the multiple horizons of our lives in a spontaneous and non-focused way. Opening and closing our attention enables us to understand the always present and always shifting social boundaries of our lives. It allows us to pay attention in multiple ways and in multiple situations.

For example, opening and closing our empathic barrier allows us to stay focused. In turn, this allows us to avoid being overwhelmed by external stimuli. Like shutting an office door in order to concentrate on a task that needs to be done, we can open and close our psychic apparatus to preserve our abilities to interact with others *and* to get work done.

Catastrophic Experiences

Some catastrophes come from nature itself: tornadoes, hurricanes, lightning strikes, earthquakes, tsunamis hurling themselves against coastal shores, volcanoes blowing their top, mountain avalanches, dry lightning wildfires that destroy thousands of acres of vegetation and human homes, devastating heat waves and drought, rivers flooding or drying up completely, and tropical cyclones. We now know, thanks to the work of scientists and activists, that global warming is a reality and that it threatens all life forms on earth.

Some catastrophes, however, such as murder, robbery, war, mass gun violence, and rape, are maliciously delivered to our doorsteps by human others. Some, such as poverty caused by economic injustice; trauma caused by war; homelessness caused by other's greed and carelessness, body injuries caused by accidents are each vague in our awareness until they affect us directly

In addition, some personal catastrophes come from our not paying attention to the surroundings in which we live. They come from disregarding warning signals or from taking foolish risks. Falling off a ladder, falling off scaffolding, falling off a cliff; falling off a bicycle - each probably has multiple causes as well as multiple consequences. If we live; if we are not seriously injured, we probably will try to avoid replications of these kinds of accidents. We pay attention in new ways and with new intensities.

For example, I am convinced in old age that my experiences with falling during childhood: falling off bicycles, falling while climbing "cliffs", falling while ice-skating and roller- skating, falling while running, etc., help me in old age falls. My body learned how to fall and how to shield itself from major injuries. From childhood on, scarred knees testified to a child who took on life at full blast and did not stop for bloody knees or a turned ankle. Learning to manage these small traumas in childhood taught me when I could manage alone and when I needed others to help me. Each trauma managed taught me something about managing trauma. Each trauma managed taught me something about being more careful. Each fall taught me how to fall **and** how to be more careful.

If, on the other hand, we are traumatized by the actions of others, for example while doing some recreational boating, we are maliciously shoved overboard and almost drown we learn something about being cautious around others who may not have our best interests at heart. In proximity to this shoving person, we will pay attention in more focused and more intense ways. We may, in future occasions, refuse to go boating with them. If we have had our purse stolen because of our own carelessness, we become more careful about watchfulness and knowing the whereabouts of future purses. For example: I have been in environments where pick-pockets and purse snatchers were common. In those environments, I always took precautions ahead of entering the situation or scene so that I was a less likely target.

In situations where others do deliberate and knowing harm to us, our physical and emotional trauma is now complicated by the trauma of human betrayal. Experiences of human betrayal are accompanied by a consequent loss of trust. Questions of justice, accountability, reprisal, retribution, and revenge now enter our consciousness. We meet head-on the spiritual questions of revenge, retaliation, mercy, or forgiveness. In adult life, we confront issues about other's betrayal in ways that demand we answer questions about our own selves as well.

As we mature through the lifespan we learn the price of not paying attention. With each cost paid, we grow in wisdom; we grow in our ability to be discerning. Our intuition matures. We learn to test it in a wide variety of life situations: we learn to ask trustworthy others: *do you see this situation, this third party, or this issue the way I see it?* When and where it seems important to us, we may research the issue by reading up on it or by talking to experts who know more than we know.

Dulling the sensory apparatus with drugs such as alcohol, heroin, grass, opioids, nicotine, or carbohydrates and sugar creates an illusionary inner world – and thus an illusionary outer one as well. The substances of illusion – and they are found in every world culture - dull the inner capacity of human beings to pay attention, and thus, to apprehend factual reality. They interfere with the human ability to intuit imminent danger. They mess up the mind's ability to pay attention (i.e., bear witness) to its surroundings and in this way diminish the human ability to protect itself from harm. These substances of illusion may be rumored to expand human consciousness but, in my opinion, what they do best is color, distort,

distract, and be-cloud our ability to pay attention. Because they decrease our abilities to pay attention they interfere with and suspend our deepest intuitions about personal and collective safety.

Por Ejemplo/For Example

For example, many years ago on a camping trip in coastal Mexico where I did not fluently speak the language I helplessly watched a friend drink so much alcohol that she eventually needed to kneel down before the toilet as if it were God's sacred altar. As she puked, with me standing watch over her, I became aware that a somewhat drunken man was very much interested in us. I did not know what to do to protect my friend **and** to protect myself. Abandoning her was not an option. I was stone sober. I knew she often became belligerent when she drank – reasoning with her was likely to be futile. She was as likely to leave with the drunken stranger that night as she was to return to our campsite with me. Remembering my father's voice at age sixteen (*If you think or sense that you are in danger, Betsy, ask a trustworthy adult – someone you know - for help.*) I decided to sprint as fast as I could to my friend's family's campsite and to wake her father. While this meant leaving my intoxicated friend alone and vulnerably unguarded in the bar's female rest room, it seemed to be my only option.

My friend's dad and I got my very drunken friend home safely to her own bed. Her father's anger at her drunken behavior was, strangely enough, very comforting to me. I knew he would protect her. Finally, after nearly thirty minutes of incessant chiming, my internal warning bells (about her drunkenness creating a dangerous life situation for both of us) ceased their loud, persistent chiming and I could allow myself to fall asleep. My friend was safe; I was safe; both of her parents were wide awake, and each of them was very angry with both of us. Everything could wait until morning to be sorted out in more detail. It was time to let go of my anxiety and to fall sleep.

There is a sense in which contemporary media and our obsession with its endless entertainment and information possibilities (as well as the daily news) is also a saturation drug. Information overload causes mental (and spiritual) fatigue. Our experience of cognitive and emotional fatigue limits our ability to pay genuine compassionate attention to our world. Our selves become fragmented; our relationships superficial; our attention span both agitated and exhausted. Depending on our personalities and our social

position in life, we become less able to pay attention to things which matter – and to compassionately and thoughtfully pace our interactions with others. Overwhelmed by stimuli, we stop seeking to find specific places where we can make positive life and culture-enhancing contributions to our families, friends, communities and the global world.

The twentieth-century's great spiritual teachers;^{xxxix} great preachers;^{xxxii} great spiritual poets;^{xxxiii} great healers;^{xxxiv} and great shamans^{xxxv} have all taught us (individually and collectively) the principles of paying attention – to the inner world of the body-soul-mind *and* to the outer world of self-other human relationships *and* to the spiritual teachings of the natural world.

Healing the wounds (of ourselves, our clients, and our world) means paying attention with compassion, with engaged curiosity, and with a steadfast intention to collect and organize accurate and truthful information. It means taking the time to differentiate factually accurate information from propaganda, rumor, outright lies, *and* to ascertain truthfulness from flawed opinionated ideologies. It means paying attention to our deepest intuitions – seeking to understand how accurate they are or how contaminated they have become by our culture's continuous noise. This bi-furcated attention is especially needed in solving conflicts in situations of human violence. We need to pay attention to our deepest intuitions at the same time we pay close attention to the outer world.

As we closely observe our outer world (especially in times of conflict, violence and rage), intuitive information is also developing inside the observing mind. As we open and shut our empathic barriers, the inner observing self is collecting information and organizing its intuitions. The inner self's warnings may be overt or they may be subtle and covert. In our attempts simultaneously to assist others and to protect our own selves, paying attention is essential.

Bearing witness – as in paying attention – means educating ourselves about truth; it also means learning about the merits of competing truth claims. Paying attention also means learning to focus our attention; it means learning to investigate issues and situations which catch our attention; it means learning to see accurately whether by our naked eyes, by intuition, or by technology – such as telemetrics, electronic microscopes and outer space satellites. It means developing technologies and methodologies for advanced study (such as count and measure research)

and personal or professional intuitions that help us to make visible – thus understandable - that which has previously been hidden and invisible.

Most importantly, I think, bearing witness in this sense means learning to see that which we have been culturally taught and conditioned not to see. It means countering our natural human tendency to deny that information which (1) makes us uncomfortable; (2) counters our learned ideologies; (3) or threatens our personal and collective security. It means developing a capacity to see with the heart as well as with the eyes. It means learning to hear with the intuition as well as with the ears. It means developing compassion for the other – whom we often do not really see. Finally, it means developing compassion for our own selves – especially when we do not yet see or hear clearly those truths which we need to live our individual and collective lives in balance with the universe.

In addition, perhaps most importantly, paying attention enables us to make ethical and moral decisions in our personal lives, in our professional lives, and in our social lives with others.

We Learn by Paying Attention

As citizens we cannot foresee how things will turn out when we start.

Rachel Madow^{xxxvi}

As I woke up the other morning I was thinking about moral and ethical corruption. One context for this waking reverie is the 2019 presidential impeachment process currently underway in Washington, D.C. But even more importantly for my own awareness about these issues of institutional violence and corruption is a simple reality: I have worked inside two very separate and very different professional organizations where embezzlement by the institutions' chief financial officer was uncovered. I was not directly or even indirectly involved in either of these two situations. I learned about them by public media and internal announcements.

In each of these two widely separated-in-time examples, it was a subordinate – much lower on the institutional power pecking order – in the accounting and budgeting departments – who saw something unusual in the books and decided to examine these transactions with much more

care. By following the money trail, both of these subordinates eventually uncovered the details of their supervisor's embezzlement.

In neither situation did I know the bookkeeper who followed the money trail. I do not have, therefore, his or her first-hand perspective on what happened. In one situation I only know what the institutional press release reported. In the second, however, I know what I was told after-the-fact by my department chair, professional and institutional gossip, and by the local news media.

In the latter situation, I did know the guilty administrator. In none of my encounters with this institutional chief financial officer did I suspect graft. In his relationships with junior members of the organization, he was a consummate, business-like professional. Not knowing him well, I still trusted him. I did not hear internal warning bells that something was amiss. I was trusting. I was, I suppose, naïve about the potential for institutional corruption. The embezzling individual had treated me with professional courtesy and I trusted this person to do his/her job just as s/he trusted me to do mine.

Reading organizational management theory, however, it is quite clear to me that each whistle-blowing subordinate needed to

- be in a position to recognize that something was amiss
- make a conscious decision to pay attention, i.e., to look more closely at the books
- hold an internal conversation with the self about how to proceed
- hold external conversations with others about what s/he had uncovered
- lodge a formal accusation about his/her department head's financial misconduct with the department head's administrative superior – in this case an institutional vice president.

Because individuals in pyramidal organizations intuit that whistle-blowing is often unwelcome and organizationally punished, this kind of self-authority is rare. In my experience of institutional life, no one eagerly goes looking for a reason to blow the whistle on a supervisor or boss. Institution questioning is actually quite rare in situations of structurally-hidden malfeasance. Individuals tripping across the evidence of an institutional crime must make decisions about lodging complaints or staying silent. If what one

inadvertently or even deliberately uncovers is an institution-wide sanctioned or enabled criminal activity with many players, the stakes are even higher.^{xxxvii}

Individuals, in a whistle-blowing situation, usually engage in a period of self-questioning before they go public with what they have observed, with what know. They may double-check and triple-check the information they have uncovered. Crossing the Rubicon (i.e., going public with damaging information about one's superiors and/or peers in pyramidal organizations) is a daunting and an intimidating reality. Individuals generally ask these kinds of questions of themselves before proceeding:

- Do I have accurate information about institutional and financial misconduct by my superior or others inside the institution
- If I am silent about what I have uncovered, what are the institutional consequences for me, for others, and for the institution
- If I speak up about what I know, what will likely happen to me and to others
- If I am mistaken, what are the consequences to me and to others
- What powers of retaliation do individuals and/or the corporation have that might be used against me
- If I choose to speak out as a whistle-blower what are the potential consequences to my employment and to my personal or professional reputation
- What if, despite all my efforts to uncover the facts, I am proven or judged to be wrong (or worse yet, malicious) by individuals higher in the organizational chain of power
- What if everyone in management knows about this greed and graft and accepts it as normal institutional behavior
- What if individuals in other management positions are also directly involved in it, benefitting from it or covering it up
- Who, if anyone, will protect my rights for due process if I proceed
- What if others – most especially my work supervisors and their supervisors – are also involved in this situation as co-offenders
- What if I am fired outright for reporting the evidence I've uncovered of institutionalized wrong-doing
- What are the potential consequences for my boss when I report him or her for fraud, misconduct, and corrupt business practices; what are the consequences for his family

- What is my ethical obligation to the organization, to my boss, to my peers, and to my subordinates inside the chain of power
- What is my ethical or moral obligation to the institution qua institution
- What are my ethical obligations to the customers of my institution
- What is my ethical or moral obligation to the surrounding community
- Who am I? What are my principles? What is my moral and ethical grounding?^{xxxviii}

The Powers of the Isms

You can safely assume that you've created God in your own image when it turns out that God hates the same people you do.

Annie Lamott^{xxxix}

Many of us – perhaps all of us – wear cultural blinders in our encounters with life, our multiple environments, and with a wide diversity of other people. These blinders affect our ability to pay attention. They have an effect on our ability to know factual truth. The better we know ourselves, the better we can manage these blinders. In my personal experiences with life to date, other people are the best mirrors because they spontaneously reflect back to us what they see (and intuit) when they encounter us.

Xenophobia, prejudice against religious minorities, skin color racism, gender identity prejudice, sexism, classism, heterosexism, religious phobias and prejudices towards world religions we do not understand, ideological hostilities towards sexual minorities, a prejudice against victimized peoples and cultures, a rabid nativistic nationalism, as well as various forms of economic class and gender entitlement and skin color preferment are all embedded inside the social structures in which we live – invisible to the naked and non-compassionate eye. In my experience of life to date, these kinds of prejudices and phobias are as true of the institutional church and the nation-state as they are true of individuals.

The intersectionality of the various forms of cultural prejudice and hatreds in our psyche makes it very difficult for culturally disadvantaged individuals

or communities to catch our attention and to change our personal and collective prejudices.^{xI}

Our often insistent denial of the ism's and cultural hatred's noxious presence in our personal and institutional lives makes them invisible. We do not see their presence in our daily encounters with others because we do not want to see; we do not hear what we do not want to hear: willfully blind and deaf to the evils which surround us, we cannot bear witness to systemic injustice in this sense because not only our eyes and ears are numbed and closed: our minds, and our hearts are similarly clouded.^{xii}

Nevertheless, to the victims of these forms of socially malfunctioning institutions and cultures, individual and systemic injustices are very visible. Hearing their victims' critique and their factual reporting, we are wise to pay non-defensive attention. Teaching ourselves to see and to pay attention means acknowledging that these malignant realities and social viruses are, indeed, present among us. It means owning our particular and very personal share of the culture's denial. It means that we must learn to ask ourselves and others – *what do I not see here and what do I not understand?* It also means asking, *what do I need to learn and do in order to be a useful change agent in this situation?*

In addition, it usually means growing up emotionally and spiritually. It means learning to own our very unique, personal and cultural history of bias, denial, entitlement, and enablement.

In the undergraduate classroom, I would often remind students that one essential act of a would-be peace activist was to ask the self and others two simple questions:

- Who is missing at this table, in this conversation, in this consultation?
- What do I/we need to do to remedy this absence?

The issue in this kind of questioning is to avoid tokenism – including someone only because they represent a minority point of view. Rather, we need to see their presence as vital to our understanding of the complexity of the issues at hand. We need them present to help us individually and collectively confront our cultural and personal blinders.

If, for example, I am part of a committee seeking to address homelessness:

- Do I know any homeless individuals
- Have I talked with any homeless individuals
- Are there any homeless individuals sitting at the table with the committee
- How many homeless individuals do I know: do they represent a spectrum of gender, color, ethnicity, age, disabilities, and other socio-cultural and biological differences
- Most importantly, I think, is the question of genuine and hospitable inclusivity – being welcomed at the table of discussion because they are the experts in homelessness

Buddhism, Judaism and Christianity all have scriptures and teachings which seek to educate the human heart; which seek to free the human mind from its blinders; which teach genuine hospitality; which seek to eradicate human suffering; which seek to bear witness to the fundamental truths of human existence; which seek to teach us compassion; which proclaim the potential of rescuing us from our unique pathologies of the spirit.

As a human species, we disregard the warnings and teachings of our many cultures' true prophets and seers at our own peril. Teaching us to pay attention, they help us to begin the needed work of compassionate speaking up and working for cultural and personal accountability. They ask us to ponder the relationship of social justice activism to the spiritual wisdom of our respective cultures. Most importantly, it seems to me, they ask us to bear witness in actions, i.e. asking us to become activists for justice and compassion.

Coming to understand the nature of embodied evil inside our various cultures and institutions, the wisest among us model and teach compassionate witnessing to that which is harmful and that which is evil. The perils of judging another human being at *totally other* – as having no shared humanity with us – are well known. This kind of us versus them attitude leads to human atrocities, genocide, and mass killing.

We all know this: there is a multitudinous array of trauma-causing human behaviors. Human communities – and individuals - throughout the globe struggle every day with the aftermaths of violence, violation, and betrayal. And in nearly every world culture, a prophet rises up to provide a warning

cairn for our collective future if we do not change our attitudes and behavior.^{xlii}

Bearing witness as a form of paying attention is a beginning place for anyone who seeks to become a healer of trauma. It is the foundational skill for making a difference in situations of injustice and violation. It is an essential skill for individuals, who seek to birth and nurture personal and institutional justice and accountability; who seek to create personal and institutional transparency and honesty; who seek to develop compassion in the commons.

November, 2019

Bearing Witness: Paying Attention

Part one posted January 4, 2020 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage
http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-one.html#disqus_thread

Part two posted January 8, 2020 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage
http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-one_8.html

Fourth Essay

Bearing Witness, Speaking Truthfully

Let us realize that the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends towards justice.

Baptist Minister Martin Luther King, Jr.
1929-1968^{xliii}

I do not pretend to understand the moral universe. The arc is a long one. My eye reaches but a little way. I cannot calculate the curve and complete the figure by experience or sight. I can divine it by conscience. And from what I see, it bends toward justice

Unitarian Abolitionist Minister Theodore Parker
1810-1860^{xliiv}

A Prohibition

Do not bear false witness against your neighbor.^{xlv}

I want to continue this discussion of bearing witness with a prohibition. Bearing witness as a form of speaking out is not the same as gossiping. It is not the same as spreading rumors. It is not the same as idle chatter. It is not the same as character assassination. It is not even the same as angry bitching to our friends and family members. There is no accountability in gossiping. There is no accountability in a free-roaming bitch session. And there is little trustworthiness as well. In addition, when we gossip carelessly and/or maliciously about the actual or hypothetical moral and ethical failures of others, we reveal our personal lack of compassion. As much as I personally enjoy political cartoons that skewer hypocrisy and malfeasant behavior done by elected officials or other politically powerful individuals inside my nation-state, I live under no illusions that my enjoyment of well-aimed and barbed sarcasm makes me a change agent in a world of injustice. Nor, does it even make me a grown-up.

The Powerlessness of Gossip

When I was a young child – about age nine or ten – my father warned me about one of our town’s gossips. This may be the first time I heard the word gossip applied to a person. *He is a gossip, Betsy. Do not tell him*

anything you don't want the whole town to know. In addition, he sometimes spreads gossip about people that is not true. Do not believe everything that he tells us. Do not spread his rumors with your friends. His kind of gossiping behavior can hurt people. It is not kind, it is not fair and it is not honest.

Long after our neighbor's death, this is what I remember about my dad's earliest warning instruction about the harmfulness of rumor-mongering and gossip. Unlike outright lying, gossip is lodged in the borderlands between truth-telling and lying. Gossip purveyors may or may not care about these fragile boundaries between truth and lying. They may not even know the difference. Hearing their tales, we need to be skeptical and we need to be paying attention. In the gossip's stories factual truth may be interwoven with misleading innuendo, malicious rumors, and outright falsehoods.

In my adult life I have found my father's instructive warning to be very useful. It helped me in my earliest professional years when I was taught the meaning of and the necessity for professional confidentiality. Knowing what should not be shared with others without being given explicit permission has helped me to create and maintain life-long friendships. It enabled me to be an effective program administrator.

There is harmless gossip – social information-sharing which actually builds community. *Did you hear the news? Mary and Sam's son got accepted into Harvard.* Another variation is this: *I am calling you on Sam's behalf: Mary has just been diagnosed with breast cancer. They want their closest friends to know but just now can't bear talking about this news with others. They need time to absorb the news and to make medical decisions.* Still another version goes something like this. *November 1'st is Mary's fifth anniversary of her cancer surgery. I am planning a small celebratory woman-friendly lunch party for her at Wolfgang Puck's Spago restaurant. Sam agrees we can keep this a secret from her and he will help us with our planning. Save the date. More details will follow.*

Knowing one's friends, acquaintances and professional colleagues allows us to make personal judgments about what is appropriate information to share and about what is intrusive, malicious and harmful. It gives us a window into the difference between compassionate and loving truthfulness and malicious and harmful gossiping.

Some information is sensitive – such as a friend being fired from her job; the break-up of a marriage by a separation; or a son being diagnosed with the HIV virus. Here it is important to make an informed judgment about (1) what details can be shared with whom and (2) when it is appropriate to share such information as well as when it is not.

My own sense of this through the years has been that it is better to err on the side of caution when we share other's personal information with our friends, business colleagues, and casual acquaintances. If we intuit or know outright that we are being given information that might be confidential and/or sensitive, the wisest course of action is to keep the trust of our friends and colleagues by asking ourselves *who knows this information and/or who needs to know*. The wisest course of action is to clarify this with the individual him or herself.

When I was a teenager, my dad talked with me one day about confidentiality and gossiping. This time the context was the dinnertime conversations of my parents. I no longer remember the specific context but his instruction went something like this. *Because of my job, Betsy, I know confidential information about many people. I sometimes hear gossip I know to be unkind, untrue or inaccurate. I can't ethically correct this misperception or faulty information. I cannot share what I know because what I know to be true is confidential. My policy is simple: I never pass this gossip along to others. I may or may not let the subject of gossip know what is being said about them. This is an ethical judgment call that I must make for myself. People do have a right to defend themselves against lies being told about them. But because of my job and/or the originator of the gossip it may not be possible for me to correct this injustice.*

As a late adolescent on the brink of adult life, the instruction about gossip and confidentiality became even more precise: *As you know, I use your mother as a confidential sounding board. We talk about details of my work and she is my sounding board for decisions I must make. You are now often allowed to overhear these conversations and I may even ask you for your opinion. You must never talk about these conversations with others. That is the meaning of confidentiality: you know things other people do not know and you do not talk about them with others.*

As I matured throughout late adolescence and into young adult life, my dad not only sought out my mom's opinions; he increasingly engaged me in conversations about what I thought about the daily news or about the issues he was facing at work. Occasionally, he assumed I was wiser and more mature than I was. I remember him asking me about a potential hire – and what I thought about a candidate we both knew. I was in way over my head; I was very uncomfortable with the question. I didn't want to betray my classmate or harm her opportunities for employment even as I wanted to please my dad by appearing smarter than I was. I was old enough to hear my inner caution about this conversation. I simply said, "I don't know, daddy, what you should do here. She is a very nice person but I don't really know her all that well." I was not yet mature enough to say, *that question is inappropriate and it makes me very uncomfortable. It puts me in a space I don't want to be in.* So, I told my dad the truth but I told it slant. In short, I verbally punted.

First Nation Wisdom

Many years ago I read an essay by Anne Cameron – the Canadian poet, essayist and fiction writer.^{xlvi} She has a first nation identity. For many years, I have remembered Cameron's essay: it deeply affected me when I first read it. In the decades since then, it has often affected my decision-making choices about so-called "wanting-to-be-helpful" gossip. In her chapter length essay Cameron described a women's story telling circle. Here is Cameron's cautionary wisdom as she begins her essay:

It is the custom of the People that when a story has been told, it belongs to the one who told it, not the one or ones who heard it. Nobody would tell a story not given to her, the sin of it is too great. And so it is, a storyteller tells a story and if she does not say, "and now you can tell the story," you must never repeat it, but hold it in your heart, and cherish it, consider it, think about it, learn from it. For a story is like a flower, a precious fragility in itself, and you may take apart that flower and examine it, and you might perhaps press it between the pages of a book, if you have one, or you may store it dried, in a potpourri jar, but what you have is no longer the flower, it has become something else altogether, and so it is with a story. Told without permission the story loses its magic benefit and becomes only a lie and a stolen lie at that. And so I ask you, with these stories, hold them in your heart as you would the memory of a flower, but do

not take them for your own, nor repeat them, nor presume to teach them or demonstrate by your appropriation how great the gap is between us, for if you take what is not given, you demonstrate only how much you have not learned, you demonstrate how far you have to travel to be worthy of having the stories given to you,^{xlvii}

In Cameron's story circle no woman told another woman's story without being given explicit permission. Telling someone else's story without permission brought shame to the woman whose theft of her colleague's or friend's story became known in this particular group of women. The story that did not belong to her was a story she was ethically or spiritually or culturally prohibited from telling. The story belonged to the woman who first told the story. This was not a matter of copyright protection. It was, however, a matter of personal integrity and a matter of personal honor between and among these women.

Women's Story Telling: Violation and Violence

As a community mental health practitioner and therapist, I heard many women's stories. I was told them in a confidential relationship of trust. As a friend, I heard many more stories. And finally, as a college teacher, I both heard and read a gazillion more stories.

Cameron's words reinforced my professional education and clinical training. They accompanied me as I made decisions about talking with other people about what I knew and/or about what I heard others say. It was not a hard leap for me to learn that personal friendships as well as professional confidential relationships also included issues of trust and trust betrayed. Learning about a student's abortion, her story was not mine to tell. Learning about a friend's experience of date rape, her story was not mine to tell. Learning about a colleague's unfaithful and battering spouse, the story did not belong to me. Learning of a fatal diagnosis, the story was not mine to spread. Learning about a friend's delayed and much longed-for pregnancy the story was not mine to tell. Learning about a colleague's newly funded and very prestigious sabbatical grant, the story was not mine to spread. Over the years I became more and more cautious about telling other people's stories without their explicit permission to do so. As Cameron suggests, I took the stories others told me inside my heart and held them there as I pondered their meaning.

When I first began to hear the stories of affinity sexual abuse by clergymen and church leaders – directly or indirectly – I became unwilling to gossip about these stories. I did pay attention, however, and sought to clarify, for myself, where truth lay and where there was only idle speculation or malicious gossip. I eventually created a small community of colleagues and friends – all clinically trained who understood confidentiality. Here I could abstract the stories and ask if anyone else was hearing these kinds of stories. Here I slowly built a professional community of activism in which these stories could be abstracted into a generic story and told in order to warn and protect other women.

There are three aspects to this issue in my opinion. The first is the need to respect the needs and wishes of the story teller. The second is the need to avoid demonizing and defaming the character of those individuals the narrative story casts as victimizers. The third aspect is to inform and to warn vulnerable individuals.

There is no easy path that considers all three of these aspects as essential ones to consider. There is no easy truce among them when they conflict with each other.

I am not a detective; I am not a journalist: I have no valid way of judging the credibility and truthfulness of any particular story. It is clear that I have opinions about the stories I hear – in part based on the nature of my relationship with the story-teller. But I am not God; my information is often incomplete.

This means, for example, that I am not a judge. It also means that I do not make the story my own. However, if I hear ten stories that the hypothetical Very Rev. Emmanuel Smith is abusing kids, I have a moral and professional obligation to act. In some situations, involving other professionals, I have confronted abusing persons head-on – being careful not to betray the sources of my information. In some situations I have asked the accused individual if the story I've been told is true. Depending on the nature of abuse, I may be required by law to report Emmanuel Smith to criminal justice officials. In other circumstances I may be morally obliged to report him to his professional credentialing organization.

If I learn about institutional cover-ups of abusive behavior, I may choose to work with the story-teller to think about how to confront the institution in

appropriate ways. I may also choose to work with other professionals to uncover additional information so that together we can urge institutional change.

I do not have a personality that goes looking for fights. I do not enjoy institutional conflict. However, I believe that each member of an institution is responsible for its collective morality and ethical institutional behavior. Uncovering or tripping over the abuse of power and others' acts of institutional malfeasance, one simply has an obligation to act.

Eventually, as friends and colleagues learned I would not take, without their permission, their private pain and their personal stories of being abused into the public realm. I began to hear many more stories of religious leader and religious institution abusiveness. This continuously raised the question of what was needed to stop such abuse. Without understanding the direction my life trajectory was taking, I became a sexual violence expert inside my religious community and eventually inside my small hometown. I was asked to sit on committees to create solutions. I was asked to speak, preach, and teach about affinity abuse inside my denomination. I told the truth as I understood it, but I often spoke it slant. I protected the identities of my informants and abstracted their stories. I was not a believer in public denunciation of abusive individuals by advocates and helpers. I was, however, an advocate of survivors being enabled to tell their truths as they understood them. In short, I was unwilling to tell a victim's stories for him or her. I was, however, willing to support individuals as they told their own stories. I was willing to point them to other professionals such as attorneys and institutional resource persons such as Title IX coordinators and professional counselors on a college campus.

In speaking publically about sexual abuse in a generic fashion, I used a clinical model in which therapists write about diagnostic issues that they encountered in their clinical practice – but they do this in such a way that no one could identify a specific client or a specific group of clients or even a specific institution.

What happened in the wake of those church-wide committees, sermons, lectures and weekend conferences for survivors blew me away. Not only did my professional awareness-raising and activism work elicit more storytelling by survivors of violation, but I began to hear violence narratives

from other clinicians and ministers as well. Other professionals were as perplexed about how best to proceed as I was.

The story of sexual violence inside the boundaries of my particular religious denomination was everywhere on the landscape. It now seemed to me that it lay there in plain sight of anyone who looked for it. And it was mostly an administratively known secret. Eventually it became clear that church administrators knew the story of perpetrators and victims and were deliberately keeping the information hidden. In addition, they were refusing to act to protect victimized individuals and vulnerable individuals who were potential victims. Perpetrators were being protected. Ministry credentials of abusive individuals were being protected. It became quite clear to me: victims were not being protected by confidential professional rules or by institutional management practices of secrecy and cover-up.

This work exposed me to personal, professional, familial, and institutional secrets I never dreamed of. This time in my life was a volcanic eruption of a hidden narrative that not even the most malicious church gossips could have invented.

There were ethical issues about speaking and not-speaking that littered every corner of my professional life. Speaking up, I betrayed my personal beliefs about confidentiality and my understanding of Cameron's wisdom about not telling other people's stories: not speaking up, I felt as if I abandoned and betrayed victims and became complicit with those who were knowingly silent in my church. I felt both contaminated and corrupted by the stories I knew. I felt morally dirty. All that I knew for certain about my own inner spiritual life was that I did not want to be passively complicit with these violent stories I knew.

I had to re-think Cameron's essay. I had to re-think my internal rules about speaking out and staying silent. Eventually, I realized I could abstract the information and still speak the up-until-now unspoken truth about what was happening. I did not need to tell Mary's story or Sam's story or Aunt Mamie's story. I did not need to name the names of victimized individuals.

I could tell my story – as a listener, as a consultant, as a lay preacher. And my story involved the story of listening to sexual violence narratives and physical abusiveness narratives inside a faith community that openly preached compassionate love, active nonviolence and conflict resolution

while in the same breath it denied the amount of affinity violence that was happening. I felt strongly that (without betraying survivors of sexual violation inside the boundaries of our shared faith community) that I needed to confront the denial and the long-existing patterns of institutional enablement. I needed, however I could do so, to tell the story of a religious community in which the stories and the experiences of sexual and physical violence were all too present.

Confronting the perpetrator was not my job. This job belonged to his or her victims. In some situations, it was the job of organizational executives and personnel administrators. Or, depending on the circumstances, it belonged to law enforcement agencies. Professional counselors, family members, and friends could provide survivors with the needed support. But it was highly unrealistic to expect sexual violence victims and survivors to take down a church establishment that was enabling their abusers.

Subsequently, when perpetrators and their enablers came after me – seeking to destroy my reputation and end my employment, I pushed the pause button. I stopped all United States and Canada-based conference and workshop appearances.

Before I began the work of advocacy on behalf of the survivors of affinity violence, I had believed in the teachings of my church about non-violence. I had believed in the wisdom and integrity of my church and its leaders. Finding that integrity absent, I needed time to mature into the work I'd begun naively and trustingly. When the institutional church's purity patrols came after me and my employment, I decided that "enough was enough." If someone sought me out, I tried to be helpful. But I did not put myself in the position of expert witness. My support for victims who consulted with me remained in place. What paused was my informed witness about the type and amount of affinity violation and interpersonal abusiveness inside the Anabaptist-Mennonite community of faith.

In retirement that has changed. Once again, I am professionally free to speak out and can more freely seek to make a difference in institutional responses to abusive personnel. Now, however, instead of being inside positions of power and influence, I live on the margins of my faith community. Now, I speak and write, therefore, from the margins rather than from the center.

I am suspicious, therefore, of gossip wearing the guise of concern. I am even more suspicious of gossip wearing the mantle of self-righteousness. I have come to see gossip as one form of bearing a malicious false witness.

As clinicians, as survivor advocates and as institutional change agents, we need to tell and debrief our personal and professional stories to each other. Clinical supervisors need to hear what actually happened in a clinical appointment so that they can be helpful. Clinical notes need to be specific enough that treatment plans can be monitored and evaluated. Clinical grand rounds need to be steeped in truthful narratives so that they can benefit the patient. It is important to note that the content of these professional activities occur within a commonly accepted framework of professional confidentiality.

For example: in my first major administrative clinical position, I learned why doctors and nurses have separate dining areas in hospital cafeterias. People such as guests or family members want to overhear professional conversations and may, unknown to the professionals involved, be deliberately listening in and overhearing confidential information. The private dining room option allows professionals to have space and time for informal private consultations – a space where they can debrief a difficult situation or a time when they can ask a colleague for an informal opinion. This may appear to be gossip if overheard by non-professionals. However, it is part of the professional culture to hold these private conversations in confidence.

I once worked with a very busy physician. I quickly learned that when he invited me to have lunch with him, it would be in the doctor's private dining room and that he would pay for the lunch. This was, I assumed but never asked, a tax deductible lunch. I was not expected to reciprocate. I also learned that he usually had a specific topic in mind for these conversations. I learned, over time, to trust these private space working lunches as a way for him to provide me with clinical information or supervision. These lunches allowed him to ask me to clarify issues about his patients – questions that on his part were largely intuitive and sometimes urgent ones.

Truthfulness as Creed

The more we cling to interpersonally respectful truth-telling as our creed, the less likely we are to maliciously gossip about others. The more that we

think about the sources of our information, we realize that we need to ask several questions before sharing this information more widely:

- Is the information factually true?
- Is the information confidential?
- If confidential, is the confidentiality legitimate or corrupt?
- Does the information we hear or uncover contain hints and intimations or actual details and factual information about wrong-doing?
- Does the information we hear or learn contain errors that need to be corrected? If so, we need to go back to the source of our information and correct it.
- If we learn about wrong-doing – behavior that harms other people (or even our own selves) what is our obligation to private and public truth-telling?
- What kind of personal or professional behavior enables malicious gossip and overt or covert wrong-doing in institutions? What is our obligation to truth?
- When is it appropriate or necessary to become a whistle-blower?
- What does it really mean when we say that *personal and institutional integrity and accountability matter*?
- In a historical era where clever – albeit misleading - advertising, outright propaganda and fake news is deliberately panned off as truth and is utilized maliciously as a way of manipulating others for personal or political gain, what is our personal and professional responsibility to search out truthful information? Do we have an obligation to protest such manipulations of truth?

Those of us who seek to be justice-workers and healers in situations of affinity violence; those of us who seek to correct other kinds of organized social injustice: we will inevitably confront questions of factual truth. We will also inevitably confront our own need to debrief the violence we learn about in our day-to-day lives.

I am not sure of the wisdom of my life. But for more than thirty years I paid attention to Cameron's wisdom and instruction. Some first-hand stories were given to me in confidence. It was a sacred duty to recognize that I did not own these stories and that I should never pass them on without permission. Other stories were passed along inside personal or professional gossip channels. Here, over time, I learned to assess the

motivations of the narrator. Whenever possible, I investigated the content of the story for myself.

There is one caveat to “Cameron’s rule”. It is a clinical professional caveat. Learning about someone’s intention to harm him or herself or learning about someone’s intention to deliberately harm someone else, we must break silence and we must intervene by alerting appropriate authorities. We must assess the danger quotient and we must act. In addition, if we know or believe violence is imminent against a third party, there is a professional obligation to warn that individual so she or he can take steps to protect him or herself.^{xlviii}

I can apply this to a non-professional relationship. If I learn that my hypothetical best friend Susie has just made a specific plan to kill herself tomorrow morning, I can and should notify someone who both can and will intervene. In psychiatric hospital wards – where suicidally lethal patients are an ordinary reality, such patients are put on a suicide watch – which involves constant monitoring and active interfering with the desire to die..

If I learn that Susie is planning to kill someone else tomorrow, I must notify police. If I have witnessed evidence that Susie is planning to engage in massive acts of murderous politically-motivated violence (such as the Boston Marathon bombing incident), once again I must immediately notify police.

If I learn that Susie in the past (or currently) has sexually molested a child or an adolescent, I not only can notify the police or child protection agencies; I should notify them. A child’s safety is more important than my friendship or clinical relationship with Susie. Taking care of the child’s welfare is essential. This is the reason for mandated reporting of child abuse. With mandated reporting, professionals are protected when they do report.

There is a general principle: negligent enablement of violence and malicious harm done by family members, friends, professional colleagues, bystanders and other associates creates a moral and ethical issue for all bystanders. The person who enables violence, in my opinion, is as morally and ethically culpable as the person who actually enacts the violence. In addition, morally and ethically deficient enablement includes passive

negligence as well as more active and deliberate institutional cover-up activities.

Knowing, for example, about the cover-up of sexual violence inside religious institutions or learning about the sexual trafficking of children by clergy members means that one must speak up. One must become a whistle-blower.

One can, in these kinds of situations, become an enabler of injustice or one can act. There is a minimum amount of wiggle room between these two options.

The moral action is to become involved on the side of justice and on the side of accountability. The immoral action is to remain silent.

I am drawn to Thich Nhat Hanh's wisdom. In the sexual violation narrative, I need to recognize that given the right circumstances, I could be any one of the narrative's characters. I could be a victim; I could be a victimizer; I could be a passive bystander; I could be a hostile witness. I am drawn, therefore, to his teaching: a compassionate heart is essential to the work of the peace-maker and to the adjudicator of justice for the survivors of violation.

Peacemaking is not making nice-nice. Active peacemaking involves paying attention, learning to see with the heart, and developing a willingness to get one's hands very dirty. It involves learning to speak truthfully about very difficult human issues. It means taking risks to intervene in order to protect the most vulnerable among us. It means learning to live comfortably with power – so comfortably that one can compassionately speak truth to power. Most of all, I suppose, it means learning to recognize and to manage our rage at institutionalized corruption and interpersonal injustice so that we and others are not destroyed by it.

Because of our cultural tendency towards moral outrage and disdain for perpetrators *and* their victims, it is essential work to consider the pathway to healing for victims *and* their perpetrators – a path to personal healing which does not demand forgiveness from victims but which insists upon truthfulness and accountability from perpetrators..

Yet, whenever we enter the work of healing with survivors of violence and victimization, we, at the very least, must allow for the potential of conversion in perpetrators. It is clear to me: this restoration and reconciliation work with perpetrators is not the work of survivors. This is the work of committed spiritual healers and knowledgeable peace workers.

Holding perpetrators and their institutional enablers accountable for their abusive actions is very different from participating in acts of revenge. It is the ongoing work of the peace and justice advocate to know and embody the difference.

November, 2019

Bearing Witness: Speaking Truth in Uncomfortable Times Part one posted January 13, 2020 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage
<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-two.html>

Part two posted January 15, 2020 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage
http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-two_15.html

Fifth Essay – A Short Case Study

Today's Reflections: A Sin or a Crime?



David Stoltzfus Smucker (age 75) Wheeled into Court in Lancaster, PA
January 31, 2020: Pittsburgh Post-Gazette^{xlix}

Sentence: 38-76 years of imprisonment: This means that Smucker will likely die in jail. The crime: 20 felony counts for sexually molesting children, i.e., rape, of his grandchildren.

I have been following this case by means of media coverage. Mennonites often idealize the Amish – while not wanting to be Amish. I have never done this kind of idealizing.

I don't know what my Lutheran father knew but he was quite clear with me that many Amish men and many Mennonite men were not *nice men* and that, as I began to date, I needed to protect myself. It was an explicit message about not dating and not marrying a Mennonite man.

Even as a very young girl I absorbed the warning and protected myself. As I became a teenager on the cusp of adult life he was much more explicit with me about the need to protect myself when he could no longer do this as my father – because he was not going to be present as I matured into young adult life.

My answer, therefore, to the *sin or crime* dilemma is that sexual abuse of children and adolescents, i.e., rape, by their grandfather, is a crime **and** a sin phenomenon. It is a sin problem for the perpetrator's religious community to manage and it is a crime problem for the perpetrator's secular community to manage. It is, therefore, simultaneously both a sin **and** a crime problem. For the victims of child or adolescent sexual abuse, the act of sexual violation is a sin against them and it is also a crime act against them.

In addition, because Mennonites have an important theology of the people of God as a communal people, the sin against children is also a sin against the community. Whether it is the unforgivable sin is open to debate. As an unforgiveable sin, the only needed communal response is deep mourning because there is no way to repair the damages done. Not only, therefore, will the abuse individual be faced with almost intractable dilemmas about how to live life after abuse, the community will also face its own dilemmas about how to continue to be a community in the face of such fractured trust. .

Both aspects of the perpetrator's violation must be acknowledged. A sin has occurred inside the community and a crime has also occurred. The respective communities of perpetrators and victims must manage these sins and these crimes in appropriate ways.

In addition, it is a sin and a crime problem for the children's immediate and extended family. The damage done is pervasive; the harm done is incalculable. In many – probably most –

situations, the harm is intergenerational and will be passed forward in history.ⁱ If left unmanaged, it is very likely that replications of the abuse will occur in future generations. It is very likely that family and community secrets will manifest themselves in repetitious behavioral re-enactments. Future generations of children will be, therefore, at risk.

While the church may hand out forgiveness to child molesters and abusers of adolescents like M and M candies on Halloween, the secular state must guarantee the safety of its citizens and this means it must dole out justice.

According to many Jewish authors, (1) only G-d can forgive sins against G-d; (2) only the victim of harm/sin can forgive the perpetrator of harm, i.e., sin and evil done against them (in other words., there is no substitute); and (3) only the community gathered collectively at Yom Kippur can liturgically deal with confessions of guilt inside the community.ⁱⁱ Vis-à-vis sins against the Jewish individual and/or the Jewish community, there is no ritual scapegoat to be led away into the desert and abandoned to the wolves as an act of liturgical propitiation.

In my mind the question remains: can evil acts against small children be forgiven at all?ⁱⁱⁱ These are transgressions that happen to them when they are powerless to repel the violator; report the crime; when they are not yet mature enough to protect themselves. The damage done to them is life-long. And often there are generational consequences as well – the intergenerational transmission of violence and victimization.^{liii}

What is needed, I think, but likely won't happen, is for Mennonite sociologists such as Steve Nolt and Don Kraybill (Elizabethtown College) and David Weaver-Zercher (Messiah College) to stop romanticizing the Amish Community and its theological praxis of forgiveness.^{liiv} It is also past-time for Mennonite academics such

as Mark Thiessen-Nation (Eastern Mennonite Seminary), Ted Grimsrud (Eastern Mennonite University), Harry and Chris Huebner (Canadian Mennonite Bible College) to stop romanticizing John Howard Yoder's theology of individual and communal forgiveness.^{iv}

We Mennonite academics and retired academics need to re-think our own sociology in light of the vast amounts of child and adolescent abuse (physical, sexual, emotional, theological, and religious) inside of our families and communities. It is time – perhaps way past time – for the Mennonite community to revisit the Schleithem Confession and its theology of forgiveness inside the community of faith.^{lvi} It is time, in my opinion, to jettison this ancient confession of faith as the foundation of Christian formation for Mennonite culture and theology.

Urgently needed is a re-visitation of the theology of John Howard Yoder – most particularly his theology of forgiveness. Young Mennonite scholars need to review Yoderian theology in light of his sexual misconduct. Until this work is done, it is impossible to prevent future sexual transgressions of a recidivist mode. The critical books are Yoder's two theological books (*The Politics of Jesus* (1972) and *Body Politics: Five Practices of the Christian Community* (1992)). These volumes were written during the same time frame that Yoder was abusing adult women.

Posted February 5, 2020 on

<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/02/ruth-krall-sin-or-crime.html>

Endnotes

**First Essay: The Good Samaritan
Pious Parable or Dangerous Instruction
Luke 10: 25-37
Pp. 7 – 12**

ⁱ Luke 10: 25-37 NIV

ⁱⁱ Zangenberg, J.K. (Undated). The Samaritans. Retrieved October 30, 2019 from Bible Odyssey: <https://www.bibleodyssey.org/en/people/related-articles/samaritans> ; See also, McKloskey, P. (Undated). The Rift Between Jews and Samaritans. Retrieved October 30, 2019 from Franciscan Media <https://www.franciscanmedia.org/the-rift-between-jews-and-samaritans/>.

ⁱⁱⁱ McCloskey, *ibid.*

^{iv} Stokl, J. (Undated). Priests and Levites in the First Century C.E. *Passages Online*. Retrieved October 30, 2019 from <https://www.bibleodyssey.org/en/passages/related-articles/priests-and-levites-in-the-first-century-ce>

^v Chaffey, T. (August 10, 2011). When Did Jesus Cleanse the Temple? Retrieved October 30, 2018 from Answers in Genesis online, <https://www.bibleodyssey.org/en/passages/related-articles/priests-and-levites-in-the-first-century-ce>

NOTE: First published December 16, 2019

Lindsey, W. Bilgrimage Blog

<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2019/12/ruth-krall-good-samaritan-pious-parable.html>

Second Essay: Bearing Witness The First Step in Reconciliation?

pp. 13 - 25

^{vi} Note: This chapter (*Bearing Witness: The First Step in Reconciliation?*) was first given as an Invited Faculty Presentation at the Goshen College Annual Faculty Retreat (August 19-20, 2001) at Camp Amigo in Sturgis, Michigan. That year's retreat theme *Called to One Hope: Our Vocation in Reconciliation*.

^{vii} August, 2001: re-edited, November, 2019

^{viii} Witvliet, Charlotte van Oyen, "How Does Forgiveness Affect Our Health?" *John Templeton Foundation Progress in Theology* 7(5), November, 1999,

^{ix} *Ibid.*, p. 1

^x Parnell, Laurel, *Transforming Trauma: EMDR* (New York, NY: W.W Norton, 1997), p. 230.

^{xi} Rossman in Rossman, Martin L., David E. Bressler, and Roxanne WhiteLight, *ATS/3B: Interactive Guided Imagery with Adult Survivors of*

Childhood Abuse (1997: Mill Valley, CA: Academy for Guided Imagery, Inc.).

^{xii} Emphasis mine.

^{xiii} Herman, Judith, *Trauma and Recovery*, (New York: Basic Books, 1997), pp. 136-137.

^{xiv} Rossman, op. cit.

^{xv} For information about the Victims of Violence project, see Powell, A. (September 3, 2014). Three Decades of Treating Trauma, *The Harvard Gazette online*. Retrieved November 3, 2019 from

<https://www.gonzaga.edu/college-of-arts-sciences/departments/religious-studies/events/flannery-lecture-series/past-flannery-lectures>

^{xvi} Yoder, Perry, *Shalom* (Newton, KS: Faith and Life Press), 1987).

^{xvii} Clancy, T. (2001). *The Bear and the Dragon*. New York, NY: Putnam.

^{xviii} Thich Nhat Hanh, (1991). *Please Call Me by My True Names*. For Nhat Hanh's reflections and for the full text of his poem, see http://wtf.tw/ref/nhat_hanh.html. Retrieved November 2, 2019.

^{xix} Bolen, Jean Shinoda, *Crossing to Avalon* (San Francisco, CA: Harper, 1994, pp. 110-112).

^{xx} Wiesel, E. Paraphrased by Ruth Krall nearly twenty years later from a lecture given at Earlham College in Richmond, IN.

^{xxi} See Mark 15: 40-41

^{xxii} Volf, Miroslav, *Exclusion and Embrace: Identity: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*, (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1996. Note: this book was the president's assigned required reading for all members of the teaching faculty.

^{xxiii} Nouwen, H. (1979). *The Wounded Healer: Ministry in Contemporary Society*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

^{xxiv} Ibid.

^{xxv} Retrieve Thich Nhat Hanh's poem, *Please Call Me by My True Names* from <https://bolstablog.wordpress.com/2011/12/09/true-names/>. Retrieved November 10, 2019.

^{xxvi} Ibid.

^{xxvii} Palmer, Parker, *Let Your Life Speak: Listening for the Voice of Vocation* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 2000), p. 75.

^{xxviii} Faculty Presentation: Goshen College Faculty Retreat (2001)

Resources Consulted

- Bateson, Gregory, "Minimal Requirement for a Theory of Schizophrenia." *Archives of General Psychiatry* 2(5), 1966, pp. 477-491.

-
- Bateson, Gregory, "A Note on the Double Bind-1962," in D.D. Jackson, ed., *Communication, Family and Marriage* (Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior, 1968), pp. 55-62.
 - Bateson, Gregory, *Steps to an Ecology of Mind: Collected Essays in Anthropology, Psychiatry, Evolution, and Epistemology* (San Francisco, CA: Chandler, 1972).
 - Bateson, Gregory, "Double bind" and "Foreword," in C. E. Sluzki and D. C. Ransom, eds., *Double Bind: The Foundation of the Communicational Approach to the Family* (New York, NY: Grune and Stratton, 1976).
 - Bateson, Gregory, "The Birth of a Matrix or Double Bind and Epistemology" in M. M. Berger, ed., *Beyond the Double Bind* (New York, NY: Brunner and Mazel, 1978).
 - Bateson, Gregory, "Paradigmatic Conservatism" in C. Wilder-Mott and J.H. Weakland, eds., *Rigor and Imagination: Essays from the Legacy of Gregory Bateson* (New York, Praeger, 1981).
 - Bolen, Jean Shinoda, *Crossing to Avalon* (San Francisco, CA: Harper, 1994, 110-112).
 - Bresler, David E., and Martin L. Rossman, *ATS/2B: Parts, Polarities, and Conflict Resolution*, (Mill Valley, CA: Academy for Guided Imagery, Inc., 1995).
 - Clancy, T. (2001). *The Bear and the Dragon*. New York, NY: Putnam's.
 - Flanagan, Annete and Thomas B. Cole, eds., "Violence and Human Rights: A JAMA Theme Issue" *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association* 286 (5), August, 2001.
 - Hall, Elizabeth, "Symposium Looks at Research on How Faith Affects Human Health" *John Templeton Foundation Progress in Theology* 7(5), November, 1999, 2-3.
 - Hallie, Phillip, Films for the Humanities Bill Moyers Documentary, *Evil*
 - Hanh, Thich Nhat, *Being Peace*, (Berkeley, CA: Parallax Press, 1987).
 - Hanh, Thich Nhat, *Peace is Every Step* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1992).
 - Hanh, Thich Nhat, "Transforming Our Suffering" in *The Parabola Book of Healing* (New York, NY: Continuum, 1994, 87-90).
 - Herman, Judith, *Trauma and Recovery*, (New York: Basic Books, 1997).
 - Krall, Ruth E., Manuscript: *Healing the Wounds of Family Violence: A*

North American Perspective (Guatemala City and Alta Vera Paz, , Guatemala, Central America). *Hacia La Sanidad: Inter-Mennonite Consultation on Domestic Violence in Latin American Mennonite Communities*, May 31, 1997.

- Krall, Ruth E., Manuscript: Post-traumatic Stress Disorder, Complex Post-traumatic Stress Disorder, Personality Change from Catastrophic Experience and Secondary Stress Disorder (CASAS, Guatemala City, Guatemala, Central America: SEMILLA-sponsored, multiagency NGO *Consultation on Secondary Stress Disorder*, June 18-22, 2001).
- Krall, Ruth E., *Rape's Power to Dismember Women's Lives: Personal Realities and Cultural Forms* (Claremont, CA: Southern California School of Theology at Claremont, 1990.).
- Nouwen, H. (1979). *The Wounded Healer: Ministry in Contemporary Society*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Miller, Emmett E., *Personal Conversation*, Spring, 1996.
- Palmer, Parker, *Let Your Life Speak: Listening for the Voice of Vocation* (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 2000).
- Parnell, Laurel, *Transforming Trauma: EMDR* (New York, NY: W.W Norton, 1997).
- Remen, Rachel Naomi, *Final Wisdom: What the Dying Can Teach Us About Living* (Boulder, CO: Sounds True, 1998).
- Rossman, Martin L., David E. Bressler, and Roxanne WhiteLight, *ATS/3B: Interactive Guided Imagery with Adult Survivors of Childhood Abuse* (1997: Mill Valley, CA: Academy for Guided Imagery, Inc.).
- Rossman, Martin L., Lois' Story in Rossman, Martin L., David E. Bressler, and Roxanne Whitelight, *ATS/3B: Interactive Guided Imagery with Adult Survivors of Childhood Abuse* (Mill Valley, CA: Academy for Guided Imagery, 1997).
- Ulanov, Ann Bedford, "Including Even Our Mad Parts," in *The Parabola Book of Healing* (New York, NY: Continuum, 1994, 122-124).
- Volf, Miroslav, *Exclusion and Embrace: A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation*, (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1996. Note: this book was required faculty reading prior to the school-opening retreat.
- Volf, Miroslav, "The Social Meaning of Reconciliation," Interpretation April, 2000.

-
- Witvliet, Charlotte van Oyen, "How Does Forgiveness Affect Our Health?" John Templeton Foundation Progress in Theology 7(5), November, 1999, 1-2.
 - Yoder, Perry, *Shalom* (Newton, KS: Faith and Life Press, 1987).

NOTE:

Part One first published December 18, 2019

<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2019/12/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-first-step.html>

Part Two first published Posted December 21, 2019

http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2019/12/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-first-step_21.html#more

Third Essay
Bearing Witness: Part One - Paying Attention
Pp. 27 - 46

^{xxix} 1 Corinthians 13:11 NLT

^{xxx} Ecclesiastes 1:1 KJV

^{xxxi} Such as Pema Chodron, Mary Daly, Lauren Artress, bell hooks, Nelle Morton, The Dalai Lama, Rabbi Abraham Heschel, Parker Palmer, Thich Nhat Hanh, Matthew Fox, and Rabbi Rami Shapiro

^{xxxii} Such as William Sloan Coffin, Jr., Martin Luther King, Jr., Harry Emerson Fosdick, Robin Meyers, and Bishop Desmond Tutu

^{xxxiii} Such as Wendell Berry, Mary Oliver, Alice Walker, Maya Angelou, Adrienne Rich, Robert Frost, Audre Lorde, and Mark Nepo

^{xxxiv} Such as Rachel Naomi Remen, Carl Hammerschlag, Jon Kabat-Zinn, Peter Levine, Robert Resnick, Emmett E. Miller, Jeanne Achterburg, Andy Weil, Herbert Benson, Martin Rossman, Judith Herman and Bessel van der Kolk

^{xxxv} Such as Sandra Ingerman, Fools Crow, Brooke Medicine Eagle, Michael Harner, Hank Wesselman, Starhawk, Sun Bear, and Rolling Thunder)

^{xxxvi} Rachel Madow on MSNBC, October 31, 2019. Retrieved November 1, 2019 from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=owOd_vDaDjo.. Marker Number 5:29:12:25

^{xxxvii} Two books have helped me to understand crimes of obedience and the enablement of these crimes by bystanders and institutional witnesses: (1)

Cohen, S. (2001). *States of Denial: Knowing about Atrocities and Suffering*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press; (2) Hamilton, V. L. and Kelman, H. (1987). *Crimes of Obedience: Toward a Social Psychology of Authority and Responsibility*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

^{xxxviii} Ibid

^{xxxix} Lamott, Annie. Retrieved November 1, 2019 from <https://www.goodreads.com/quotes/9846-you-can-safely-assume-you-ve-created-god-in-your-own>

^{xi} Crenshaw, K. (2016). The Urgency of Intersectionality: A TED Women Talk. Retrieved November 9, 2019 from https://www.ted.com/talks/kimberle_crenshaw_the_urgency_of_intersectionality?language=en

^{xii} Cohen, S. Op. cit., Lifton, R. J. (1986). *The Nazi Doctors: Medical Killing and the Psychology of Genocide*. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc., Publishing; Martel, F. (2019). *In the Closet of the Vatican: Power, Homosexuality, Hypocrisy*. London, UK: Bloomsbury/Continuum.

^{xiii} For example: Gandhi (India); Martin Luther King, Jr. (United States); Bishop Tutu (South Africa); Jane Addams (United States); Mother Terese (Yugoslavia), Dorothy Day (United States), Aung San Suu Kyl (Burma), the Dalai Lama (Tibet), Rigoberto Menchu (Guatemala), Nadia Murag (Iraq), Thomas Bancaya (the Hopi Nation), Greta Thurberg (Australia), Doug Hostetter (United States)

NOTE

Part one posted January 4, 2020 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-one.html#disqus_thread

Part two posted January 8, 2020 on Bill Lindsey's blog, Bilgrimage http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-one_8.html

Fourth Essay Bearing Witness: Speaking Truthfully

^{xliii} Martin Luther King, Jr., Quotation retrieved November 4, 2019 from <https://ignatiansolidarity.net/blog/2017/02/15/martin-luther-king-jr-3/>

^{xliiv} Smith, M. D. (January 18, 2018). The Truth About “The Arc of the Moral Universe.” *HuffPost Online*. Retrieved November 4, 2019 from https://www.huffpost.com/entry/opinion-smith-obama-king_n_5a5903e0e4b04f3c55a252a4

^{xliv} Paraphrase of Exodus 20:16

^{xlvi} Cameron, A. (1986). Magic in a World of Magic (pp. 1-33) in Zahavia, I. (Ed.), *Hear the Silence: Stories by Women of Myth, Magic, and Renewal*. Trumansburg, NY: The Crossing Press.

^{xlvii} Cameron, Ibid, p. 2.

^{xlviii} For a technical discussion of this issue see <http://www.ncsl.org/research/health/mental-health-professionals-duty-to-warn.aspx> . Retrieved November 8, 2019.

NOTE

Part one posted January 13, 2020 on Bill Lindsey’s blog, Bilgrimage <http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-two.html>

Part two posted January 15, 2020 on Bill Lindsey’s blog, Bilgrimage http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/01/ruth-krall-bearing-witness-part-two_15.html

Fifth Essay: Case Study: A Sin or a Crime? Pp. 61 – 64

^{xlix} Retroieved from <https://www.post-gazette.com/news/crime-courts/2020/01/24/Lancaster-County-Amish-David-Stoltzfus-Smucker-sentencing-sex-abuse/stories/202001240122>

^{li} Eckhardt, A. L. The Dilemma of Forgiveness. Yad Vashem. Retrieved January 31, 2020 from <https://www.yadvashem.org/articles/academic/dilemma-of-forgiveness.html>

ⁱⁱⁱ Wiesenthal, S. (1998). *The Sunflower: On the Possibilities and the Limits of Forgiveness*. New York, NY: Schocken.

ⁱⁱⁱ Imber-Black, E. (1999) *The Secret Life of Families: Making Decisions about Secrets; When Keeping Secrets Can Harm You; When Keeping Secrets Can Heal You ... And How to Know the Difference*. New York, NY: Bantam.

^{iv} Kraybill, D. B., Nolt, S. M. , and Weaver-Zercher, D. L. (2010). *Amish Grace: How Forgiveness Transcended Tragedy*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass.

^{iv} Yoder, J.H. (2003). *Body Politics: Five Practices of the Christian Community before the Watching World*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

^{vi} Sattler, M. (1527); translator John Howard Yoder (1973). *The Schleitheim Confession*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press.

Note: Posted February 5, 2020 on
<http://bilgrimage.blogspot.com/2020/02/ruth-krall-sin-or-crime.html>

© Ruth E. Krall
March 15, 2020