

This is a part of the 'interview' that was not included in the Tricycle version:

A larger understanding will only be possible when all parties are engaged in acceptance and understanding. At least that is my current feeling. The writer and psychotherapist James Hillman wrote in Loose Ends--if I remember it accurately enough: "Forgiveness is no easy matter. The ego can't forgive just because it should. Waiting may be all we can do. However, forgiveness is only meaningful when one can neither forgive nor forget. And forgiveness is so difficult, it needs help from the other persons. The wider context of tragedy calls for parallel feelings from all the parties."

There are a number of quite separate--and, I think, important to see as separate--demographic, historical ingredients in the Zen Center situation. There is the way the Zen Center folks and particular individuals understood and experienced--and now currently understand and experience--what happened. And there were and are various constituencies within Zen Center that found expression through the crisis. There is the way I then and now understand and experience what happened. And there are third parties (outside the immediate Zen Center community)--from the past and newcomers--with various and often powerful karmic investments in the situation.

All of these views have to be understood and accepted, at least to some extent; if not, forgiveness and resolution will probably never be possible. And as long as people are mostly in their own biases or protecting their own needs there will be no resolutions. I actually don't see this as likely changing or even possible to change. At the same time, I haven't given up hope. But certainly a larger understanding will only be possible when all parties are committed to and engaged in acceptance and understanding. At least that is my current feeling.

Something really did happen at Zen Center in 1983. Sometimes I think that it would benefit the whole Buddhist--and alternative and now not so

alternative--scene if it were better understood. Sometimes, I think it is better just forgotten about. However it doesn't forget very easily. The story is tracked--and unfortunately not maturing much--in many minds.

Looking it up in the book, I see what I remembered is no where near as rich as what Hillman actually wrote:

We must be quite clear that forgiveness is no easy matter. If the ego has been wronged, the ego cannot forgive just because it "should", notwithstanding all the wider context of love and destiny. The ego is kept vital by its *amour-propre*, its pride and honour. Even where one wants to forgive, one finds one simply can't, because forgiveness does not come from the ego. I cannot directly forgive, I can only ask, or pray, that these sins be forgiven. Wanting forgiveness to come and waiting for it may be all that one can do....

Forgiveness is meaningful only when one can neither forget nor forgive. And our dreams do not let us forget. Anyone can forget a petty matter or insult, a personal affront. But if one has been led step by step into an involvement where the substance was trust itself, bared one's soul, and then been deeply betrayed in the sense of handed over to one's enemies, outer or inner, then forgiveness takes on great meaning.

It may well be that betrayal has no other positive outcome but forgiveness, and that the experience of forgiveness is possible only if one has been betrayed. Such forgiveness is a forgiving which is not a forgetting, but the remembrance of a wrong transformed within a wider context...But forgiveness is so difficult that it probably needs some help from the other person. I mean by this that the wrong if not remembered by both parties--and remembered as a wrong--falls all on the betrayed. The wider context within which the tragedy occurred would seem to call for parallel feelings from both parties. (James Hillman, Loose Ends, pages 78-79)