FAMILIES, UNDERSTANDING, RESPECT AND TOLERANCE

EIGHTH DICID CONFERENCE, DOHA, QATAR
DR. RICHARD G. WILKINS
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DOHA INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR FAMILY STUDIES AND DEVELOPMENT

Synopsis

We live in a world of clashing values and views. This conflict can create a range of dangers, from minor interpersonal conflicts to terrorist attacks. Reduction of tension requires that individuals develop the related values of understanding, respect and tolerance. These values not only bring peace to individuals struggling to live in a tense world, they help promote peaceful resolution of great controversies.

Understanding and tolerance are developed – and are perhaps best fostered – within the family. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights declares that the family is the "natural and fundamental group unit of society."[i] The family, as the drafters of the Universal Declaration understood, stands as a safeguard against organized discrimination and tyranny. The value of the family in promoting tolerance and understanding, furthermore, is recognized by the world's great religions. Strengthening the family, therefore, is fundamental to inculcating a culture of tolerance.

I. Conflict and Tolerance

We are surrounded by noise and conflict. "Media outlets and 24-hour news cycles mean that everyone with access to a computer has access to a megaphone to broadcast their views. Never before in human history has an opinion had the opportunity to reach so many so quickly regardless of its accuracy or appropriateness."[ii] As a result, incivility and intolerance have become increasingly serious problems for people of all ages – but particularly the young. As the Southern Poverty Law Center notes, today's youth live "in an era when athletes routinely hurl invective at umpires . . . when 'entertainment' is laced with verbal and physical abuse; and when political protests too often lead to physical attacks."[iii]

And these examples, unfortunately, are among the "lesser evils" of modern intolerance.

The 21st Century brought with it a new era of intolerance and hatred. A growing spiral of religiously driven aggression and intolerance has dominated the past decade. It is well beyond the scope of my remarks to analyze the genesis of this controversy, or to comment on the merits of any particular point of view. Suffice it to say that there is blood, hatred, intolerance and aggression on all sides – and to spare.

Faced with a modern world brimming with interpersonal incivility capped by mounting religious intolerance that threatens world peace, what are we to do? The answer, I believe, is simple: begin anew to teach tolerance to our children within the loving and supporting ambience of the family.

II. Teaching Tolerance Within the "Fundamental Group Unit"

The concept of tolerance can be viewed from a range of perspectives: the arts and sciences of philosophy, history, politics and religion all have something to say. Ancient Greek philosophers, along with the Roman commentator Cicero, viewed tolerance as a necessary condition to the promotion of a just society.[iv] Tolerance has been a major theme of theologians and political commentators throughout history.[v] More recently, international documents have reiterated the importance of tolerance and attempted to set out the basic parameters of the concept.

As eloquently explained in the Preamble to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, "freedom, justice and peace in the world" are founded upon "the inherent dignity" of mankind and the "equal and inalienable rights of *all* members of the human family."[vi] These rights, according to the Universal Declaration, include "freedom of thought, conscience and religion,"[vii] as well as the freedom "of opinion and expression."[viii] Cognizant of the reality that these freedoms will necessarily entail some measure of

disagreement and discord as opinions, thoughts and religions diverge, the Universal Declaration also notes that education "should promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial, [and] religious groups."[ix]

The importance of tolerance in preserving and promoting the fundamental rights of thought, opinion, expression, conscience and religion is noted in the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance, adopted by the Member States of UNESCO on 16 November 1995.[x] The definition of tolerance set out in Article 1 of that Declaration provides:

> Tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human. It is fostered by knowledge, openness, communication, and freedom of thought, conscience and belief. Tolerance is harmony in difference.[xi]

Importantly, by noting that tolerance involves the seemingly inconsistent notion of "harmony in difference," the Declaration instructs that tolerance "is not concession, condescension or indulgence."[xii] There *are* differences between good and bad, right and wrong, good and better, and better and best. Tolerance, in sum, does not entail tacit acceptance of or agreement with every idea, concept or notion propounded.

As the Declaration explains, tolerance "does not mean toleration of social injustice or the abandonment or weakening of one's convictions."[xiii] Thus, a person does not have to abandon his or her own moral, religious, political or ideological compass to be tolerant. One must simply understand that, within relatively broad boundaries, the moral, religious, political and ideological compasses held by others are also entitled to respect. This understanding, in the words of the Declaration:

> means that one is free to adhere to one's own convictions and accepts that others adhere to theirs. It means accepting the fact that human beings, naturally diverse in their appearance, situation, speech, behaviour and values, have the right to live in peace and to be as they are.[xiv]

Tolerance thus requires acknowledgement of the diversity of opinions, beliefs, ideas and cultures of the world, coupled with the understanding that these diversities are entitled to respect.[xv] How are these values to be developed? The Declaration proclaims that "tolerance promotion and the shaping of attitudes of openness, mutual listening and solidarity" should take place in "schools and universities . . . at home and in the workplace."[xvi] The Declaration, here, makes at least two important points. First, it reinforces the understanding of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that education should promote "understanding, tolerance and friendship."[xvii] Second, it echoes another theme set out in the Universal Declaration: the importance of the family in promoting social justice.

Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights establishes the family as "the natural and fundamental group unit of society, . . . entitled to protection by society and the state."[xviii] This language was carefully crafted.[xix] "Early drafts of the Declaration had noted the need for special protection of marriage, family, and children, but in obtuse ways."[xx] Language proposed by the Soviet Union, for example, provided that "marriage and family . . . shall be regulated by law," thus seemingly making the family completely subordinate to the state and (as a result) granting the state rights superior to any "natural and fundamental" rights held by fathers, mothers and other members of a family.[xxi]

At the Commission's first drafting session, however, René Cassin took the family protection clause favored by the Soviets and proposed the addition of the phrase "and society." As amended, Article 16 provided that: "Marriage and the family shall be protected by the State *and society*."[xxii] This seemingly modest change actually reversed the thrust of the sentence. Cassin's conception of "society" meant "all kinds of societies,

. . . including churches."[xxiii] Accordingly, "this little change-of-phrase transformed the state's role from one of implied superiority over parents and children to one of being joint protector of the now implicitly pre-existing family."[xxiv]

At the next drafting session of the Human Rights Commission, "Charles Malik further advanced the verbal revolution."[xxv] He did so by inserting into Article 16 two new sentences:

> "The family deriving from marriage is the natural and fundamental group unit of society. It is endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights antecedent to all positive law and as such shall be protected by the State and Society."[xxvi]

The first proposed sentence won Commission approval. The second sentence was ultimately rejected because of Soviet Union complaints that the Article (as conceived by Malik) used overt religious terminology. Nevertheless, the word "natural" – contained in Malik's second sentence – carried over to the final version of Article 16 as an "an implicit reference to a divinely created and universal human nature."[xxvii] Malik himself explained that "[t]he family was the cradle of all human rights and liberties. It was in the family that everyone learned to know his rights and duties and it would be inexplicable if everything were mentioned except the family's right to existence."[xxviii]

Thus, as reflected in the precise and elegant terms of the Universal Declaration, the family – vested with fundamental rights and powers antecedent to those of the state – is the "cradle of all human rights and liberties."[xxix] The family, moreover, is not subject to any and all regulatory intrusion and control, but rather is entitled to "*protection* by society and the state."[xxx] So conceived, the family stands as a bulwark against possible tyranny and oppression (in thought, belief, or action) by individuals, groups or government.

This understanding was vitally important to the men and women who drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. They had seen – first hand – how perversion of the family's role could lead quickly to intolerance, hatred and complicity in genocide. Take but one example: the education and enculturation of children. The Nazi regime required all children (despite parental wishes) to be indoctrinated in its vicious racial theories;[xxxi] theories that eventually led to the extermination of perhaps as many as 17 million human beings.[xxxii] By establishing the family as the cradle of rights and liberties, the drafters of the Universal Declaration sought to insure that organized evil would never again be able to pervasively spread the venom of intolerance and hatred unimpeded throughout society. The family stands as the repository of those essential norms and values that check and counter oppressive or tyrannical action, thereby preventing civil society from veering too far off course.

III. Tolerance and Shared Values

I have reviewed the need for, and the elements of, the values of understanding, respect and tolerance. I have also suggested that the family has a profoundly important role to play in the creation and maintenance of a culture of understanding, respect and tolerance. What is the relevance of these concepts to this conference?

The promotion of understanding, respect and tolerance is most likely to succeed when supported by a foundation of shared values. A forum on inter-cultural and inter-faith dialogue is a uniquely appropriate venue for promoting tolerance because – despite their differences – the world's great religions share similar views with regard to the centrality of family life and the importance of tolerance. On many issues interfaith dialogue explores differences of viewpoint and opinion. When it comes to family and

tolerance, however, our views are remarkably similar. Our shared values related to family life and tolerance have the power to change the world.

The profound importance of the natural family transcends religious and cultural boundaries. The Qur'an states that "Allah has made for you mates from yourselves and made for you out of them, children and grandchildren."[xxxiii] The Bible, in the second chapter of Genesis, reflects the same truth: "And the Lord God said, It is not good that the man should be alone."[xxxiv] The profound importance of the family unit established by Adam, Eve and their children is recognized in The Torah[xxxv] and explained in the Catechism of the Roman Catholic Church:

> The family is the original cell of social life. It is the natural society in which husband and wife are called to give themselves in love and in the gift of life. Authority, stability, and a life of relationships within the family constitute the foundations for freedom, security, and fraternity within society.[xxxvi]

The fundamental truth that the natural family is the basic unit of society, furthermore, extends beyond the great monotheistic religions. The classic Taoist text, The Chuang Tzu, explains that familial ties are the basis of any stable society because "[w]hen people are brought together by Heaven, . . . when troubles come, they hold together."[xxxvii]

The world's religious faiths also hold shared views regarding the centrality of tolerance to a just society. In a widely noted (and quoted) Hadith, the Prophet Mohammad, peace be upon him, once told a man: "You have two qualities which God, the Most Exalted, likes and loves. One is mildness and the other is toleration."[xxxviii] The Catholic catechism expounds seven virtues,[xxxix] two of which – charity and kindness – are defined using the essential elements of understanding, respect and tolerance.[xl] Judaism, for its part, has a rich theology emphasizing the need for and the practice of tolerance. Rabbi Hillel the Elder, renowned in Jewish tradition as a sage and scholar, once

summarized Jewish faith as follows: "That which is hateful to you, do not do to your fellow. That is the whole Torah. The rest is the explanation . . .."[xli]

Hindu tradition, in explicating the Dharma or moral duty of individuals, emphasizes not only altruism and peace, but also the concept of "universality," which is understood to involve "[s]howing tolerance and respect for everyone."[xlii] The Sublime Attitudes of Buddhism, which set out four essential virtues, inculcate the values of loving kindness toward all, compassion, joy and equanimity.[xliii] In addition, the first four elements of the Noble Eightfold Path of Buddhism – Right view, Right Intention, Right Speech and Right Action – all promote mutual understanding, respect and tolerance.[xliv]

We thus stand united as we discuss "raising the new generation with a foundation of values and tradition."[xlv] Sheikha Mozah Bint Nasser Al Missned has wisely counseled that "[w]e need to construct an ethic that we can agree upon, based on our shared values, to guide our solutions."[xlvi] We can construct just such an ethic to provide solutions here. As people of faith we understand the meaning and importance of tolerance. We also understand the central role of the family in promoting understanding, respect and tolerance. We must take this much-needed (but simple) message to a troubled world.

IV. Conclusion: Apples and Cheese

My remarks today have focused on a range of heady – and sometimes head numbing – concepts, including a brief survey of philosophy, an analysis of international declarations and history, and an overview of shared religious norms. While I hope this effort has not been too tedious, it has been (at the very least) somewhat abstract. I will conclude with a simple story, drawn from my own life, which shows that – within the

family – abstract philosophical, historical, legal and religious principles can be taught to a young boy with a bowl of apples and a chunk of cheese.

My paternal grandparents lived in Ramah, New Mexico, a small rural settlement in the United States located about 40 miles southeast of Gallup, New Mexico. Ramah, with a population of about 400, is situated between two Native American Reservations: one for the Navajo Nation and the second for the Zuni Pueblo. Religious services in Ramah were held in a small church down a dirt road from my grandparents' home. Inside the church, the residents of Ramah would usually sit clustered together, with Zuni and Navajo Native Americans likewise congregated in separate groups.

There did not seem to be much mixing between the residents of Ramah and their weekly visitors, or at least that is how it seemed to me; a young boy of eight. The Native American women would arrive at church in heavy velvet skirts and blouses, adorned with large silver and turquoise jewelry. The Native American men wore Levis and cowboy shirts, often with cowboy hats pulled low over their brows. Such dress was a real contrast to the dark wool slacks, white shirts and ties and cotton dresses worn by the men and women of Ramah. The contrast continued with language, as the visitors did not even seem to speak English, or so it seemed to me. They spoke to each other with sounds unintelligible to my young ears. After church services, the Native Americans would pile into trucks, for a dusty ride back to the Reservations, while my Aunt Sarah and I would run back to the house to help with dinner.

One such afternoon Grandma sent Sarah and I to the garden to pick lettuce and tomatoes for a salad. Sarah, who was only five years older than me, was a good playmate and friend and we soon had picked more than enough produce. As we went back into the

house, a truck full of Native Americans rolled up to the front door and a large woman, carrying a small child, climbed out. Sarah ran to answer the door and I followed her eagerly, for I had never seen a similar visit to my grandparents' home.

Sarah exchanged a few words with the woman and then turned to me. In a loud whisper she said, "Go tell Grandma that Mrs. Begay is here begging again."

I found Grandma busy in the kitchen working on dinner. I gave her Sarah's message and she told me to take a big bowl of apples from the kitchen table out to Mrs. Begay. I grabbed the bowl of apples and headed toward the front door. As I turned the corner from the kitchen, Sarah grabbed my elbow and said, a little too loudly, "Don't take that bowl out there or she will take the whole thing!"

Grandma heard Sarah's uncharitable remark and quickly pulled the two of us into the kitchen. "Sarah," she said, "I meant for Mrs. Begay to have the whole bowl. Her children have been sick and they may be hungry. God has been good to us and He expects us to share His blessings with others." With that, Grandma took a wheel of homemade cheese from the refrigerator and the *whole* bowl of apples out to Mrs. Begay.

A bowl of apples and a chunk of cheese, accompanied by wise counsel from a loving grandmother, taught me – not only kindness – but respect for people whose skin, dress, language and culture were significantly different than my own. This event, more than any essay, legal principle, philosophical analysis or sermon I have ever read, studied or heard, taught me "respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human."[xlvii] Let us use our own homes and families – and urge, assist and support others to use theirs – to promote this vital message of understanding, respect and tolerance.

[i] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 16(3).

[ii] "Civil Discourse in the Classroom," Teaching Tolerance (a project of the Southern Poverty Law Center), Chapter 1, http://www.tolerance.org/handbook/civil-discourse-classroom/chapter-1-civil-discourse-classroom-and-beyond (last visited on 13 October 2010).

[iii] *Id.*

[iv] The concept of tolerance was a fundamental aspect of the Greek notion of the "good society:"

> Socrates taught that conflicts within society should be resolved through public argument using 'dialectic', a form of rational dialogue to uncover truth. According to Socrates, public argument through 'dialectic' was imperative to ensure 'civility' in the polis and 'good life' of the people. For Plato, the ideal state was a just society in which people dedicate themselves to the common good, practice civic virtues of wisdom, courage, moderation and justice, and perform the occupational role to which they were best suited. It was the duty of the 'Philosopher king' to look after people in civility. Aristotle thought the polis was an 'association of associations' that enables citizens to share in the virtuous task of ruling and being ruled.

"Civil Society," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_Society (last visited 13 October 2010). The Roman philosopher Cicero explicated that the concept of tolerance – or civility – "does not mean politeness." "Civil Discourse in the Classroom," note 2, above. Cicero emphasized that, for the good of civil society, there "are certain standards of conduct towards others and . . . members of the civil society should comport themselves in a way that sought the [common] good . . .." *Id.*

[v] For a survey of the views on civil society and tolerance held by a range of philosophers, scholars, theologians and political theorists from the end of the Medieval period to modern (and "post-modern") history, *see* "Civil Society," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_Society (last visited 13 October 2010).

[vi] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Preamble ¶ 1 (emphasis added).

[vii] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 18.

[viii] *Id.* Article 19.

[ix] *Id.* Article 26.

[x] Declaration of Principles on Tolerance Proclaimed and Signed by the Member States of UNESCO on 16 November 1995, http://www.un-documents.net/dpt.htm (last visited 13 October 2010).

[xi] *Id.* at Article 1.1.

[xii] *Id.* at Article 1.2.

[xiii] *Id.* at Article 1.4.

[xiv] *Id.*

[xv] The Declaration, in discussing the "social dimensions" of tolerance, notes that, because of the modern world's "increasing mobility, communication, integration and interdependence," "tolerance is more essential than ever before." *Id.* at Article 3.1.

[xvi] *Id.* at Article 3.2.

[xvii] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26.

[xviii] *Id.* at Art. 16(c)(3).

[xix] When the draft Declaration reached the United Nations Third Committee in the autumn of 1948, the present-day language of Article 16 began to take its final form. This language appears in the Universal Declaration "largely due to the influence of two men: René Cassin and Charles Malik." Allan Carlson, **"THE FAMILY IS THE NATURAL…UNIT OF SOCIETY: EVIDENCE FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENCES,"** Paper presented at the European Regional Dialogue for the Doha International Conference for the Family, 23-25 August 2004 (copy on file with the Doha International Institute for Family Studies and Development) at 2. As scholar Allan Carlson has noted, "Cassin of France was a specialist in international law," had served on the Commission on Human Rights and "had a large hand in shaping the early drafts of the Universal

Declaration." *Id.* Charles Habib Malik, who played a similarly large role in the crafting of Article 16, "was born in a Lebanese village to Greek Orthodox Arab parents" and throughout his life "worked to build bridges between Christianity, Islam and Judaism and between Middle Eastern and Western cultures." *Id.* at 3. Etienne Gilson, in describing both Cassin and Malik, wrote that:

> From his birth to his death, each man [was] involved in a multiplicity of natural social structures outside of which he could neither live nor achieve his full development… [Most prominent for both men was] the family, the child's natural place of growth.

Einaudi & Goguel, 1952, at 126. Perhaps the most lasting (and profound) achievement of both Cassin and Malik was the final elegant language of Article 16 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

[xx] Carlson, note 19, at 4.

[xxi] As Dr. Carlson explains (*id.* at 4-5, citation omitted):

> Language from the Soviet delegation proposed that "marriage and the family shall be protected by the state and regulated by law…on the basis of equal rights for men and women." Consistent with Communist doctrine, this approach would actually subordinate the family to both state and feminist ambitions. As USSR delegate Alexandre Bogomolov explained: "in marriage in the twentieth century the free will of the two parties was no longer the essential question. The question of marriage should be examined from the protection which the state must give the home, and the main emphasis should be placed on the protection of children." . . . In this formulation, parental rights and family autonomy were clearly of little concern.

[xxii] *Id.* (emphasis added).

[xxiii] *Id.*

[xxiv] *Id.*

[xxv] *Id.*

[xxvi] *Id.* at 6. Minutes kept from this session offer Malik's explanation for the proposed change:

> [Malik] maintained that society was not composed of individuals, but of groups, of which the family was the first and most important unit; in the family circle the fundamental human freedoms and rights were originally nurtured…. Regarding the second sentence…, he said that he had used the word "Creator" because he believed that the family did not create itself….He also contended that the family was endowed with inalienable rights, rights which had not been conferred upon it by the caprice of men.

Morsink, 1999, at 255.

[xxvii] Carlson, note 19, at 6.

[xxviii] Morsink note 26. Despite its ultimate acceptance, Dr. Carlson notes that "Malik's reference to the 'natural' family stirred up debate at each step of the process." Carlson, note 19 at 7. Dr. Carlson explains (*id.*):

> Importantly, at the Commission's third drafting session, the delegate from Uruguay specifically urged deletion of the word "natural" from the new sentence, arguing that "the essential point was to state that the family was the fundamental group unit of society and that it was the cell around which the state was formed; the way in which the family was constituted was of secondary importance." This last passage is a key part of Article 16's "legislative history." For in rejecting this idea, in choosing to retain the word "natural," the architects of the Universal Declaration did recognize "the family" as having a normative, traditional form.

[xxix] Carlson, note 19 at 7.

[xxx] Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Art. 16(c)(3) (emphasis added).

[xxxi] See, e.g., Mary Mills, "Propaganda and Children During the Hitler Years," http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/Holocaust/propchil.html (last visited 14 October 2010):

In the introduction to Die Judenfrage im Unterricht, which was published in 1937 by Der Stürmer, Julius Streicher made the following statement: "The National Socialist state requires its teachers to teach German children racial theory. For the German people, racial theory means the Jewish problem." The teacher's manual on the Jewish problem maintains that German children have an inborn aversion to Jews that is intensified by references made to Jews in the newspapers, conversations, and songs sung by members of the SA and HJ. Intermarriage between Germans and Jews is portrayed as unnatural because it does not follow the Nazi perversion of the natural biological order, which does not allow for intermixing. Storks mate with storks; swallows mate with swallows, etc. The Nuremberg Laws are depicted as a return to the natural order that God intended, and the Jew is thus shown as a threat to God's order.

[xxxii] "How many people were killed in the holocaust?," http://wiki.answers.com/Q/How_many_people_were_killed_in_the_Holocaust (last visited on 14 October 2010):

Holocaust is a word meaning "great destruction resulting in the extensive loss of life, especially by fire." It is usually reserved for man-made disasters (e.g. "nuclear holocaust"). When used to refer to genocide, the word generally refers to the deaths of Jews and other victims of Nazi Germany during World War 2. (It is also often used to describe the genocide of the Armenians in 1915-1917 by the Ottoman Turkish régime). Although the exact figure will never be known, here are estimates:

* The figure of 11 million people dead is often given but it is completely unclear where this figure comes from, and how it is calculated. It is far too low. One also encounters the range 11-17 million.

* 6 million of these were Jewish (close to two thirds of Europe's Jewish population) and about one quarter of these were children under 15.

* Up to 270,000 were Roma/Sinti (Gypsies).

[xxxiii] The Qur'an, Al-Nahl (Sura 16:72).

[xxxiv] The Holy Bible, Genesis 2:17.

[xxxv] The Torah, Bereishis 2:18 (explaining that man was not intended to live alone, but to marry).

[xxxvi] Catechism of the Catholic Church, ¶ 2207 (1994).

[xxxvii] The Chuang Tzu: A New Complete Translation of the Classic Taoist Text (Martin Palmer and Elizabeth Breuilly, trans. 1996).

[xxxviii] Riyadh us-Saleheen Volume 1:632, http://www.islamgy.netfirms.com/products.htm#MODERATION%20IN%20FAITH (last visited 14 October 2010). The Prophet Muhammad also said: "God is kind and likes kindness in all things." Riyadh us-Saleheen Volume 1:633, *id.*

[xxxix] The seven virtues are chastity, temperance, charity, diligence, patience, kindness and humility. "Seven Virtues," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_virtues

[xl] "Charity" is defined as:

Love, in the sense of an unlimited loving kindness towards all others, is held to be the ultimate perfection of the human spirit, because it is said to both glorify and reflect the nature of God. In its most extreme form, such love can be self-sacrificial. Confusion can arise from the multiple meanings of the English word "love". The love that is "caritas" is distinguished by its origin – being divinely infused into the soul – and by its residing in the will rather than emotions, regardless of what emotions it stirs up. This love is necessary for salvation, and with it no one can be lost.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Seven_virtues (last visited on 14 October 2010).

"Kindness" is defined as:

Charity, compassion and friendship for its own sake. Empathy and trust without prejudice or resentment. Unconditional love and voluntary kindness without bias or spite. Having positive outlooks and cheerful demeanor; to inspire kindness in others.

Id.

[xli] "Virtue," http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virtue (last visited on 14 October 2010).

[xlii] *Id.*

[xliii] "Brahmavihara" (or Sublime Attitudes), http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brahmavihara (last visited 14 October 2010). The four virtues, or Sublime Attitudes, are loving-kindness, compassion, joy and equanimity. *Id.*

[xliv] "Virtue," note 41 above. The first four elements of the Noble Eightfold Path emphasize such notions as "commitment to mental and ethical growth in moderation" (Right Intention), speaking in a "non-hurtful, . . . truthful way" (Right Speech) and "avoiding action that would do harm" (Right Action). *Id.* The concept of Right View is explained as seeing "thing simple, as they are" and involves "an open and accommodating attitude." Introduction to Buddhism, http://www.buddhanet.net/e-learning/intro_bud.htm (last visited 14 October 2010). All of these concepts involve basic notions of understanding, respect and tolerance of diversity in thought, opinion and action. The last four elements of the Noble Eightfold Path are Right Livelihood, Right Effort, Right Mindfulness and Right Concentration.

[xlv] Doha International Center for Interfaith Dialogue, 8th Annual Doha Conference on Interfaith Dialogue, "Raising the new generation with a foundation of values and tradition: Religious Perspectives," 19-21 October 2010 (Doha, Sheraton Hotel).

[xlvi] Her Highness Sheikha Mozah Bint Nasser Al Missned, "From Illusions of Clashes to an Awakening of Alliances: Constructing Understanding between 'Islam' and the 'West,'" at 12 (14 February 2007, London, England).

[xlvii] Declaration of Principles on Tolerance, note 10 above, Art. 1.1