

Speaking Notes
The Honourable Noël A. Kinsella
Speaker of the Senate of Canada

Address to the Atlantic Lieutenancy of the Equestrian Order of the Holy
Sepulchre of Jerusalem
Saturday, October 1, 2011

H.E. Most Rev. Anthony Mancini,
H.E. Mr. Stewart LeForte,
Knights and Ladies,
Special guests,

I. INTRODUCTION

I am honoured to have been asked to address the Atlantic Lieutenancy of the Equestrian Order of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem on the occasion of your annual investiture of new members; and most particularly in light of the historic and tumultuous events that are taking place even now across the Middle East and North Africa. I had the opportunity to visit the region, including the Gulf area, in January of this year in my capacity as Speaker of the Senate. This was a truly fascinating and informative trip that merely reinforced my perception of the vast range of economic, cultural and educational opportunities that exist between our respective nations. Yet, it is the ‘Arab Spring’ that has understandably captured the imaginations of people across the world and for a variety of different reasons.

We have all watched in awe the bravery of those in Egypt and Tunisia; and with trepidation for those in Syria and Libya. Although the ruling élites initially attempted to attribute these large scale social movements to religious extremist's intent on undermining the state, such assertions began to ring increasingly hollow with time. In reality, people have become tired and frustrated with broken promises, or in some cases, no promises at all. Scores have taken to the streets and demanded their rights. The violence and oppression that many have endured in this effort can only be described as appalling, yet they have persevered against all odds. They deserve our absolute respect for the risks that they have taken in seeking to bring about economic, social and political change in their respective countries.

Yet, despite all of these recent historic moments, the one issue; perhaps *the* core issue that has perpetually occupied many a mind for decades is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This past week alone has presented us with yet another turning point in this seemingly intractable situation with the Palestinian leader, Mahmoud Abbas going before the United Nations General Assembly pressing for recognition of a Palestinian state on the pre-1967 borders. Whatever the outcome of this effort, the reality is that until such time as a truly sustainable peace deal has been negotiated between both sides, we will continue to speak of instability, anger, frustration and unnecessary bloodshed in the Middle East.

II. Religious Tolerance

Of course, one cannot speak of the Middle East, and more particularly, the Holy Land, without referencing religion. The birthplace of the world's three main monotheisms: Christianity, Islam and Judaism; it is sacred land to all three. On a personal level, having had the privilege of visiting Jerusalem, one cannot escape

the sense of tragedy when looking across this encapsulating city at the countless numbers of innocent people who have been killed, maimed or tortured in the name of religion. Indeed, speaking more broadly, while the Arab Spring should be positively embraced for the potential long term benefits that it could bring to the citizens of these countries, others have issued a word of caution for the possible religious and sectarian divisions that could ensue. Evidence for this, and most particularly of a sectarian nature, emerged forcefully in post-invasion Iraq, while high profile incidents have occurred between the Coptic Christian and Muslim communities in Egypt, even prior to the fall of Hosni Mubarak. The respective recent histories of Lebanon and, as mentioned, Israel and the Occupied Palestinian Territories, are replete with examples of violence in the name of religion, while others are concerned about events currently gripping Syria and the potential religious/sectarian fall-out in that country.

And while many seek to attribute such divisions to religious extremism, this does not truly reveal the entirety of the underlying factors. Often times, while religious intolerance and violence is the vehicle by which a certain group or groups vent their frustration, it typically masks more deep-seated historical grievances of an economic, social and political nature. Nevertheless, irrespective of such grievances, none can excuse the methods employed by the aggrieved. Indeed, such methods merely serve to threaten and destabilise entire populations irrespective of their faith or political affiliations. Moreover, the unintended civilian victims of violence are, unfortunately, merely collateral damage in the eyes of the perpetrator.

Religious tolerance or the lack thereof is an issue that affects practically every country in the world and is certainly not confined to the countries of the Middle East and North Africa. We have all, including Canada, grappled with this issue. Its

sensitivities can be witnessed in, for example, the recent measures adopted by France and Belgium relating to Muslim head-dress. However, events unfolding in the Middle East and North Africa are particularly intriguing. History is full of examples whereby territories, countries and empires were ruled with an iron fist; where dissent was not an option and where free and open expression of one's thoughts, opinions, culture and faith were suppressed in the interests of order. This has been the case in many countries in the Middle East and North Africa, where autocratic 'democratically elected' leaders have contained or exploited religious diversity and/or grievances for political gain.

Democracy is, in truth, an unnerving leveller for many. It represents a challenge because it is primarily designed to give everyone a voice. All are to be considered equal and entitled to the same rights and duties of every other citizen of a state. However, in this process of respecting rights and duties, a balance is required, and this balance can, at times, be very challenging to negotiate. Essentially, as attractive a form of governance as it is; it is neither a free-for-all nor perfect. Certain limitations have to be exercised so that the healthy respect for different opinions and approaches to life are equally recognised; where none takes precedent over another. Democratic societies have to contend with this balance on a daily basis, with often times competing interests forced to compromise on their positions. As a relatively new country with a diverse population, Canada has developed its own approach to negotiating a place for a diverse Aboriginal population; for accommodating two official language communities; and for constantly adapting to increased ethnic, racial, linguistic and religious diversity. This has not been easy. Nonetheless, in this effort, we have developed a powerful legal and constitutional basis for what is commonly known as multiculturalism.

III. THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE

Indeed Canada became the first country in the world to adopt a multiculturalism policy in 1971. Multiculturalism was subsequently written into our constitution; a constitution that not only outlines Canada's system of government, laws, and civil rights, but also a constitution that guarantees the fundamental rights and freedoms of all Canadians through the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*. This Charter recognises Aboriginal peoples, official language minorities, as well as religious freedom, while acknowledging the multicultural heritage of Canadians. The 1988 *Canadian Multiculturalism Act* reaffirms multiculturalism as a fundamental value of Canadians, committing the Government of Canada to support the full participation of all Canadians regardless of race, national or ethnic origin, colour or religion in all aspects of Canadian society.

With the guarantees of freedom of conscience and religion in Section 2, the Charter provides not only that Canada will be a multicultural society, but also a multi-*faith* society. We have chosen to bring all religious communities into the 'town square' in an inclusive manner, allowing all the opportunity to learn of one another's faith, to celebrate in our shared beliefs, and to freely discuss our differences.

The measure of Canada's success is premised on our respect for human rights and the rule of law, which represent the cornerstones of our country. Unfortunately, at this point in time, violence and intolerance appear to be the dominant forces in the Middle East and North Africa. Those peacefully protesting to demand their human rights are seeing their efforts undermined by more sinister forces intent on contravening those very rights. Indeed, it appears that these same sinister forces

will stop at nothing to maintain their unwarranted authority. However, the hope and expectation is that the forces for good; for equality, justice, tolerance and respect ultimately succeed. Equally, there are powerful non-state actors seeking to profit from the uncertainty created; seeking to create disunity and division where perhaps none previously existed to any great degree. We must therefore ensure that the forces for good; for the common good, triumph over these darker forces.

IV. THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE RULE OF LAW

It is in times like these, and when reflecting also on the longer-term hostilities in the Middle East, that we have reason to inquire after the purpose and intent of human rights and the rule of law. We are witnessing and have witnessed supposedly democratic states attempting to, on occasion, almost bludgeon peacefully dissenting citizens into submission. In fact, even in times of comparative peace, such dissenting voices were dealt with in a heavy handed manner. Moreover, any perceived subversive elements were dismissed as Al Qaeda influenced and thereby incorporated into the war on terror paradigm and all that that entailed. The basic human rights to freedom of thought, conscience and expression were blatantly suppressed through methods of imprisonment and torture. However, this deliberate failure to separate legitimate dissent with that of a more insidious nature has led to that which we are witnessing today. In fact, through their actions, such states have completely undermined their legitimacy to govern. Furthermore, they are vividly contributing to questions of state sovereignty and the perennial debate as to when another state or group of states can legitimately interfere in the affairs of a sovereign state. Tied into this process, we have witnessed the absolute devastation caused by religious and sectarian violence;

violence that has in part been caused by, and unleashed anew by the decreasing legitimacy attached to the actions of certain governments and their state institutions.

The Middle East is not just of historical significance. It is also relevant to today's global relations and reflects the epicenter of the perceived 'clash of civilizations'. The Arab Spring, as dramatic and all as it is, cannot mask the centuries old confrontations between the Muslim, Christian and Jewish worlds. All sides have contributed to any mistrust that exists; therefore, we all have a responsibility to usher in an era of greater mutual tolerance and respect. Indeed, while the end result for many of those nations currently embroiled in the Arab Spring remains unclear, if conditions allow for the transition to greater democratic and truly representative government that serves all of the people, this transition will also require greater observance of people's rights, or more specifically, human rights. Such observance will reflect a truly comprehensive shift to open and transparent democratic governance.

In consideration of all of this, and the apparent proliferation of both violent and non-violent conflict, one might well ask whether it is still possible to engage others on the basis of generally accepted precepts; that is, on the basis of mutually accepted moral principles and human rights. Can we still speak of a bedrock that informs our human consciousness? Can we meaningfully speak of reaching across cultural landscapes and boundaries in the hope of sharing a common vision – not a vision of sameness, but one of shared decency and kindness? Can we speak meaningfully of a “reality” that informs our common humanity, irrespective of race or creed? What is certain is that those divisions, suspicions and confrontations currently dominating are not sustainable. We all have a vested interest in

facilitating greater tolerance, respect and understanding for others; for embracing diversity in all its forms. I submit that in this effort, we must engage each other on the principles of justice, equality and respect. We must therefore approach this in an almost hybrid fashion: reverting back to the original concepts of law and right, while recognising that our traditional application of the human rights model must conform to new realities.

V. HUMAN RIGHTS, LAW AND REASON

In the Westphalia model of international relations, there was an orderly basis for the development of international humanitarian law and international human rights law. Indeed, there was, within this paradigm, an acceptance of the principle of the *rule of law* with respect to state sovereignty. However, over time, the abuse of state authority and the increasing influence of violent non-state actors have challenged the current order of things. Therefore, in such ubiquitous circumstances, one might ask whether or not an appeal to moral law would be strategically more effective? Indeed, one might also reflect on the effectiveness of a renewed appeal to *ius naturalis* or to *ius gentium*.

St. Thomas Aquinas, that great philosopher and theologian, defines law as “a rule and measure of acts, whereby man is induced to act or is restrained from acting: for “lex” [law] is derived from “ligare” [to bind], because it binds one to act.” Laws, therefore, are rules meant to bind individuals to certain actions. St. Thomas continues that law is naturally derived from the human faculty of reason, which grounds the human understanding of law:

...the rule and measure of human acts is the reason, which is the first principle of human acts.

St. Thomas derives the notion that reason is the rule of human action from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. In the first sentence of Book I, Aristotle argues:

Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit, is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason the good has rightly been declared to be that at which all things aim.

St. Thomas uses this observation of the fundamental nature of human beings to elaborate upon the nature of law and human beings natural inclination toward law as a constitutive aspect of their nature. St. Thomas then analyzes the respective natures of both human and natural law and asserts Divine Law to be the predominant and guiding principle of both. This affirmation is to be found in his justification of the necessity of Divine law, which states:

Besides the natural and the human law it was necessary for the directing of human conduct to have a Divine law... on account of the uncertainty of human judgment, especially on contingent and particular matters, different people form different judgments on human acts; whence also different and contrary laws result. In order, therefore, that man may know without any doubt what he ought to do and what he ought to avoid, it was necessary for man to be directed in his proper acts by a law given by God, for it is certain that such a law cannot err.

Law, therefore, is in accordance with reason, and is based on the notion that individuals only engage in action that is thought to bring forth some good. The judgment used to determine the goodness of an action is decided by the individual's reason. An individual's rational capacity for judgment, then, will determine the goodness of the end towards which his or her action aims. Does it follow then that those who engage in illegal violent acts, whether they be state or non-state actors, do so because they believe that the pain and suffering they will cause will truly result in a greater good? If so, what is the relationship between their thought process and divine law?

Pope Benedict XVI, in his lecture at the University of Regensburg on September 12th 2006, was particularly instructive on the right use of reason and "sharing responsibility for the right use of reason". The Church is equally clear in its teachings that the dignity of the individual is the standard by which all actions that can be taken, either toward another or oneself:

By reason, man recognizes the voice of God which urges him "to do what is good and avoid what is evil." Everyone is obliged to follow this law, which makes itself heard in conscience and is fulfilled in the love of God and of neighbour. Living a moral life bears witness to the dignity of the human person.

VI. THE RIGHT TO HUMAN SECURITY

The foundation of the right to human security, as with all human rights pursuant to international human rights law, is most poignantly articulated in the first paragraph of the preamble to the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, which provides:

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

Blessed John XXIII, in *Pacem in Terris*, observed just this when recognizing the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* as a:

...solemn recognition of the personal dignity of every human being; an assertion of everyone's right to be free to seek out the truth, to follow moral principles, discharge the duties imposed by justice, and lead a fully human life.

Indeed, the Second Vatican Council re-affirmed that the foundation of human rights "is to be found in the dignity that belongs to each human being."

Ultimately, the final cause of human rights is the common good of all people. One recalls that law is "the ordination of reason directing all things to the common good, and promulgated by proper authority". Given that the efficient cause of *right* is law, it must have the same final purpose of law, namely the common good. That is, the common good of all people is the extrinsic principle positively attracting and demanding the existence of *right*. Furthermore, the common good can be seen as the final cause of human rights when one considers that *right* is the internal constitutive element of society, and must therefore have the same ultimate goal as society itself; namely, the common good. If one considers the nature of society and the Thomistic notion of *right*, it is evident that *right* establishes the proper relations among persons in society. It is *right* that serves as the equalizing medium established by law and apprehended by rational human beings according to which

their actions are regulated and rendered just in themselves and in relation to each other. Therefore, by developing the just and orderly relation among human beings, *right* acts as the objective, yet intrinsic, element of society itself.

It is noted that order does not exist for its own sake but rather for the common good of all persons involved. *Right* therefore exists for the common good. An analysis of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* from the perspective of Thomistic thought must involve the understanding of his approach to natural law, which he defined as the “participation of Eternal Law in a rational creature...according to which man inclines toward his proper acts and ends.”

VII. STATE RESPONSIBILITY

International human rights law is clear on the responsibility of states for the protection and promotion of human rights. One finds an articulation of the obligation of states in the Charter of the United Nations to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and freedoms. *The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* reiterates this duty of states:

Each State Party to the present Covenant undertakes to respect and to ensure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in the present Covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

An analysis of human rights in terms of the different categories of recognized human rights illustrates the duties of states in the protection and promotion of human rights. The methodology followed by states in meeting their duty will vary depending on what category or type of human right is in question.

The spirit of international cooperation requires that, beyond the strict market mentality, there should be an awareness of the duty to solidarity, justice and universal charity. In fact, there exists something that is due to man because he is man, by reason of his lofty dignity. Cooperation is the path to which the entire international community should be committed, “according to an adequate notion of the common good in relation to the whole human family”.

Some consider solidarity rights as the new generation of rights that speak to the right to share in the hopes and aspirations of the universal community. Active solidarity engages individuals, civil society, as well as states. The relationship based on solidarity is where the interaction is in accordance with principles of truth and justice. As Blessed John XXIII said:

Since relationships between States must be regulated in accordance with principles of truth and justice, states must further their relationships by taking positive steps to pool their material and spiritual resources.

The duty of the state to protect and promote human rights is a capital responsibility for domestic and international governing bodies. The Church has consistently taught that:

...to safeguard the inviolable rights of the human person and to facilitate the performance of his duties is the principal duty of every public authority.

Pacem in Terris underscores the duty of states to sustain and advance human rights and indicates that this must be done in such a way:

1. That the exercise of their rights by certain citizens does not obstruct other citizens in the exercise of theirs;
2. That the individual, standing upon his own rights, does not impede others in the performance of their duties;
3. That the rights of all be effectively safeguarded, and completely restored if they have been violated.

Aristotle teaches that man is a political animal. The state is the natural home of people. Leo XIII in *Immortale Dei* summarizes this notion by saying:

Man's natural instinct moves him to live in civil society, for he cannot, if dwelling apart, provide himself with the necessary requirements of life, nor procure the means of developing his mental and moral faculties.

St. Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa Theologiae* I-II, q. 90.a.2 taught that:

Because of its ability to provide all things necessary for the temporal happiness and well-being of man, the state is designed as a perfect community.

But the State exists for the temporal well-being of man. As such, it is the duty of the state to respond to the temporal needs of man in society. Yet the individual person also has certain duties towards the state. The overarching objective of the state in exercising its duty toward the individual and collective human rights of its citizens is the common good. The ultimate or end objective that draws the duty of the state is the imperative of the “common good”. It is here where Blessed John XXIII is instructive:

But one of the principle imperatives of the common good is the recognition of the moral order and the unfailing observance of its precepts.

As states meet their duty to protect and promote human rights and the *rule of law* in the contemporary world; a world now composed of both state and non-state actors, they will be challenged to do so on the basis of four pillars: truth, justice, freedom, and charity. Such requirements are born from respect for human dignity and human rights; from observance of the respective duties; and from an awareness of belonging to the world community formed from one human family. This is why it is desirable to have a global authority not imposed by force, but instituted by common agreement among national authorities that maintain relations with it according to the principle of subsidiarity.

It is argued that a careful analysis of the very notion of *right* demonstrates that *duty* is a constituent element of the concept of *right*. A further inherent element of the formal notion of right is *otherness*. To speak of right, therefore, is to speak of duty and responsibility. Right is a social concept that flows from the social nature of the human person.

VIII. STATE SOVEREIGNTY

Our belief in the universality of human rights has gone a long way towards influencing the manner in which we approach conflict resolution today. As a consequence, we have adopted a vocabulary informed by a broader and more subtle set of concepts than was previously possible. We now speak of human security, capacity building, the sanctity of the individual, multilateralism, and the need to hold the authority of the state to account. We no longer accept the notion that the pursuit of genuine security for human beings, as individuals, is necessarily subversive of the foundations of international society. External intervention to protect civilians suffering at the hands of their state's forces is an increasingly acceptable, though undoubtedly controversial, principle of international relations. In fact, events in Rwanda have taught us that it can, at times, be an obligation. Such concepts reflect attempts to come to terms with a reality we still do not fully comprehend nor feel entirely comfortable with. What we are certain of is that "security" today means coming to terms with various forms of domination and insecurity that had long been ignored or lost in the discourse of *realpolitik*.

In reality, the Westphalian order is over. Its legacy, which essentially copperfastened the primacy of the state in strategic thinking, permitted a gap to develop between the meaning of the term security as it applied to individuals, and its meaning for the state. We have slowly come to understand that for security to make sense at the international level, it must make sense at the basic level of the individual human being. Therefore, when attempting to understand the complexities of modern security threats, we are obliged not only to examine the perceptions and histories of statesmen and diplomats, but also the experiences of those rendered insecure by the present order.

We now accept the fact that the principle of state sovereignty can be breached to save those victimized by the state and its agents. Human security, first and foremost, entails physical security and the basic security of the individual. All too often, governments have claimed immunity from their abrogation of human rights by appealing to the international law principle that forbids intervention in the internal affairs of a recognized state. And while not suggesting the abandonment of this principle, it is now possible to argue that international law protects the sovereign people, rather than the government that rules them. Security that sacrifices individual human rights is not real security. Long-term stability cannot be achieved by strategies that alienate and de-humanize segments of a nation's citizenry. The language of realpolitik is slowly giving way to the more nuanced and humanitarian principles of soft power and human security.

IX. STATE RESPONSE TO TERRORISM

In their attempt to confront terrorism, democratic states are confronted with an unfortunate paradox. The very qualities that make democracies so vulnerable to terrorists are those that make them superior to other systems of government. When dealing with matters of an appropriate response, we find that the overriding questions are neither legal nor technological; they are philosophical and political. Decisions as to how accommodating or uncompromising states should be in their response to terrorism involves questions that fall primarily within the domain of political philosophy.

Terrorism is the indirect strategy that wins or loses in terms of the response it receives. It can only succeed if governments respond to it as the perpetrators desire. Therefore, in combating terrorism it is imperative that democratic regimes

retain their legitimacy while denying that of the perpetrator, and it is important to have a consistent understanding of what constitutes the legitimate use of force. The argument that combating terrorism requires using terrorist methods is not only morally questionable, but can prove to be politically disastrous.

Terrorism is a threat to stability, freedom and democracy, and all states have a duty to combat it to protect their citizens. However, while it is evident that this struggle requires certain measures, it is also crucial that the legitimate right of states to combat terrorism be exercised in full accordance with international human rights law and moral principles.

The purpose of anti-terrorism measures is, of course, to guarantee security for all citizens. In the longer term, however, the struggle against terrorism is also an effort to protect the fundamental values and freedoms that have been developed over the years, as well as to defend an international environment based on a mutually agreed set of rules that can be called the “international rule of law.” Our efforts against terrorism cannot be to protect an international order based exclusively on the “law of the strongest” and the projection of power. The protection of democratic values and human rights, therefore, should be seen as an integral part of the struggle against terrorism, not as an obstacle to it.

Circumventing established international human rights standards and humanitarian law when adopting legislative and administrative counter-terrorism measures can only prove problematic. To do so would mean relinquishing the moral high ground and the ability to address human rights problems in other countries. Ignoring commonly agreed norms can only lead to an unpredictable and chaotic international legal order. It is therefore the duty of all states, and indeed in their

best interests, to preserve existing achievements when developing new approaches to the fight against terrorism.

In ensuring that states strike the right balance in their response, it is crucial that the democratic process based on the rule of law and a functioning system of checks and balances be maintained. Strict adherence to international obligations also remains important. That is particularly valid in cases where governments decide they must derogate from certain rights guaranteed under international law. International standards require that any measures pursued must be of a genuinely exceptional character and carefully weighted. They must be strictly limited in time and substance, and subject to regular review.

The process of adopting derogations must also be consistent with established national and international procedures and mechanisms. Some rights, including the right to life and the prohibition of torture, cannot be derogated from. Certain minimum fair trial standards must always be respected under any circumstance. As far as law enforcement is concerned, there is obviously a need for efficient and quick responses to terrorist threats, but extra powers given to law enforcement agencies should always be subject to close judicial oversight. Clamping down on legitimate and non-violent dissent, indiscriminate harassment of certain ethnic or religious groups, and other similar excessive measures taken in the name of the fight against terrorism are not only contrary to international law, but they also play into the hands of extremists exploiting frustration and discontent among those who feel they are victims of intolerance and persecution.

Insofar as it is imperative for democratic regimes to retain their legitimacy while denying that legitimacy to terrorists, it is important to have a consistent

understanding of what constitutes the acceptable use of force. Actions in response to terrorism must be legally and morally founded. Governments undertaking any special measures have a duty to maintain effective control over them. Thus, to delegate authority to autonomous security bureaucracies or private organizations can do more to undermine a state's legitimacy than to combat terrorism. The power of terrorism is in winning acceptance in the eyes of a significant population and discrediting the government's legitimacy.

X. CONCLUSION

The challenge of faith communities is to continue to promote respect for human dignity and human rights. To paraphrase Jacques Leclercq, the challenge to the Church is to present and promote its sublime and eternal moral teachings in a manner adapted to the reality of the times. It is critically important that all those who seek to influence the affairs of society must accept the responsibility imposed by reason, and discover the basis for the sacred obligation to respect the human right to security and the human right to life.

Countries like Canada can be described as mature democracies. We have worked extremely hard to create and sustain the systems that we enjoy. Admittedly, like very few things, they are not perfect. However, the pros, I think we can all agree, most certainly far outweigh any perceived negatives. Nevertheless, it is a system that is in an almost continual process of fine-tuning and re-interpretation. Typically, this does not relate to the major cornerstones of the system, but more the finer elements that were either never previously considered, or were simply not a consideration to this point. When you consider that we have been fine-tuning this system since the earliest days of confederation some 144 years ago, we need to

remain aware of this fact when we consider events now unfolding in the Middle East and North Africa. These nations, their governments and their citizens cannot be expected to be everything to everyone immediately. There appears to be broad-based support for greater tolerance and respect, yet such things do not happen overnight. They are, for better or for worse, invariably slow, and sometimes painful processes. There will be many ups and downs on what we hope to be a road of, ultimately, great success. Yet, we must be patient. Creating too many unrealistic expectations and targets will only lead to frustration for all concerned. However, what we most certainly must be prepared to do is to impart all of our experience, as well as the lessons that we have learned along that path to those who seek it.