

*Jes: When we are in a conversation where there are nuances in how we understand an issue and differences in how we understand an issue, we have different language, of how we talk about it. And so, we have to be really conscious of what kind of language we're using. Because of the polarized society, often we'll use language that is common to us, but it might be triggering language to the people that we are in communication with.*

Meghan: That was Jessica Stoltzfus Buller, a facilitator, trainer, mediator and peacebuilder who is also the outgoing Peace Education Coordinator for MCC U.S. and the author of MCC's Peaceful Practices curriculum.

Today on the show, we're delving into how to talk about climate change. With Canadian thanksgiving just past and the United States election just around the corner, some people are having or are psyching themselves up for the awkward conversations that can come up with family, friends and community.

Sometimes this means talking about difficult topics. Bumping elbows with people who have conflicting worldviews. Maybe it involves passing gravy to an uncle that likes to play contrarian.

Today we're doing something a little different. We're taking questions from listeners. To reflect on and learn how to join family dinner and perhaps enter conversations with more curiosity and compassion. Because as climate scientist Katherine Heyhoe says, the most important thing you can do to fight climate change is to talk about it.

If you're not yet subscribed to this podcast, take a moment to go into your podcast app and click "follow." This makes sure you won't miss an episode.

I'm Meghan Mast and you're listening to "Relief, development and podcast," a production of Mennonite Central Committee.

(MUSIC FADES UP AND THEN DOWN)

Meghan: The way we interact with one another in conflict matters. It creates habits in us that begin to influence the way we see people who think differently than we do.

So often when we find ourselves in situations of conflict and difference of opinion, we want to listen, but our frustration gets in the way. We forget to put into practice the kinds of basic skills that are helpful in communicating through a conflict, such as active listening and "I-statements." We can quickly become defensive and after the conversation find ourselves regretful of the way things went. This fall, as part of its ongoing Climate Action for Peace campaign, MCC is encouraging folks to talk to the people in their lives about climate

change. Unfortunately, this has become a politicized issue and tempers can burn hot on the topic. So, we've brought in an expert to help.

Jessica Stoltzfus Buller spent eight years in Colombia working for an MCC partner called Sembrandopaz, which means "sowing peace." The organization does conflict transformation work, peacebuilding at a communal level, working with communities displaced by violence and massacre. Jes has committed her life to peacebuilding and that includes helping people handle interpersonal conflict better. She's developed a curriculum for MCC called *Peaceful Practices* to help address the increasing polarization we're seeing today. To bridge some gaps and give people the tools they need to maintain relationships and navigate differences. She's going to help us apply these tools to our conversations around climate change.

Thanks for joining me, Jes.

Jes: Yeah, it's great to be here.

Meghan: Now, we have some listener questions to get to, but before we hear those, I wanted to set the context. Could you start by explaining why this work is so important to you?

Jes: Sure. I grew up in Goshen, Indiana in the United States, with a pastor for a mother and a guidance counselor at the local Mennonite school for a father. So, I was raised steeped in Anabaptist Christianity and peacebuilding has been a really central space of understanding my faith. For me, I think, from childhood. Often, I think we think of peace as something that's far off and large scale, but actually I have learned that in many cases, the very same skills that are needed to solve large scale conflicts are the ones that we also need to work through our interpersonal arguments. And really the way that we do conflict at an interpersonal level that ripples out into larger contexts and shifts the larger context of violence, of conflict and of peace in the world. So I think this work is important because I believe that there is real potential for transformation and for change, that when we change our conversations, we change ourselves, and we start to change the environment around us. Succinctly put, I think it's important, because I think it is possible to create change through our conversations.

Meghan: Thanks Jes. Now let's go right to the listener questions. This next question is from Ken in Ontario:

Ken: *"Hi Jes, my question is around agriculture. In my community we have a lot of farmers and folks involved in agriculture and generally there is a strong feeling of, yes we have to*

*care for creation, but agriculture is often named as the bad guy or a major emitter in climate conversations, so there is a bit of pushback against that narrative. Like, why are we the bad guys, we are feeding the world? We are more connected to the land than you guys in your urban offices cranking out these numbers. How do we have this conversation and how are we fair to our farmer friends? And how do we have this conversation in a way that's compassionate for all? Thank you."*

Jes: Thanks, Ken. I love this question. I absolutely love it. I think because it is so common. My two word answer, is get curious, or get others curious. Get everyone more curious. In conflict, identities get flattened, and we see people not as the complex human that they are, but as that one issue that we disagree with or the one perspective that we're hearing from them. And often we start to critique the other person, rather than critique the other issue. And what we want to do is not even critique the other person or the other issue, but understand the other person so that we can understand their issue, right?

Humans have a tendency to group, we group with people who are like us. And this is not all bad. Community is extremely important and satisfies many needs, but our need to belong sometimes pulls us into an "us and them" dichotomy that can get harmful quickly. And in our context today, polarization is rampant, and we are constantly being pulled into categories of "us" and "them." Everyone we know has a box that we put them in. We categorize people as we meet them, and as soon as we know one thing about someone, we make lots of assumptions about them, based on who we know they voted for or where they go to church. Or where they live, or what their profession is. And the work of curiosity is literally to see beyond.

John Paul Lederach talks about curiosity as being the work of seeing beyond what is immediately visible. So, it's the work of complexifying identities and narratives that are being told to us as a single dimension. So how do we do that? We do it through storytelling. We do it with relationship building, by getting to know the person that we are talking to. This is, perhaps you could say, the work of empathy in peaceful practices. In peaceful practices, the practice is to seek to understand, rather than to persuade. So, that means that we start to ask questions that shift from a posture of, what do you believe, or why do you think this? Or why do you think that, to questions that ask, what's your story? Tell me about your value system. Tell me where you learned this. So, with this farmer, or with any quote "other." Let yourself get curious about who they are. How did they become a farmer? What values were they taught growing up? What is their relationship to the land they farm? I think as we can practice getting curious and asking for story from one another, we can go beyond the us/them, dichotomy, and we can go beyond assumptions of who we think they

are and what they believe and what they do based on one tiny piece of their identity that, yeah, may be part of their identity, but it's not all of who they are.

We can look for, where are there overlaps under the surface? Where are their connections between you and I, rather than categorizing you as over there and I as over here? Who are we together, and what makes the “we” between you and I, and can we have a conversation in that space? I think that's where I would suggest beginning.

Meghan: You said: “Our need to belong can pull us into an us and them dichotomy, which can be really harmful.” GET CURIOUS! Such a good reminder. This next question is from Marta.

Marta: *Hi. My name is Marta Bunnett Wiebe and I'm calling from Winnipeg, Manitoba. I've been in a situation in which community that is generally very eager to get things done in their neighbourhood, wants to start taking some action on climate. But they're anticipating pushback from a few individuals who are skeptical about climate change. Folks in the community are interested in building bridges across this difference while still moving forward with some type of climate action. What would you suggest these folks consider doing in this situation?*

Jes: Thanks, Marta. I'm really glad for this question, because I think it takes us to the work of process. How do we have these conversations? How do we structure them? In peaceful practices, the curriculum, this is session nine, the last session of the curriculum. We talk about it as the work of transformation and the practice of welcoming creativity. I think we need much more careful creative process design, when we are doing community conversations and community projects. Our processes way too often can alienate people instead of bringing people in.

So, a couple of key points I would maybe reflect on with process. One is that when we're thinking about setting up conversations, we always have to consider power dynamics. And in any conversation, even an interpersonal conversation, the dynamics of differences of power that exist in the world around us are present. And so, when you're thinking about how to create spaces in a community where you would dialog around issues that are divisive, or where people have differences of opinion, it's really, really important to ask the question, who is in the room? And not just who is in the room when we're having the conversation, but who is in the room as we're planning the conversation? Because if people do not feel represented by those inviting, it's likely that they won't show up. It's likely that they won't feel welcome.

I have often been part of processes where groups of individuals in the community are trying to bridge gaps in a community. And they get frustrated because they really, really want to be open to the perspective that they disagree with, but they can't get them to show up to the meeting. And my first question is always, who's inviting, who's part of the planning process? Because when we hold all the cards and make all the decisions about how a conversation is going to happen or how a project is going to happen, then necessarily the folks that don't feel represented by us will not feel like they were part of it. Will not feel like it really represents what they care deepest about. And so I would say one first step is to shift or grow the planning committee. Pull up a couple extra chairs around the discernment table as you are planning, and really ask yourselves carefully, who is in the room and who is not in the room, who needs to be at this table that's not yet?

I think also, when you're planning a community dialog or community project, whatever it is, thinking about the location is really important. Are you organizing to meet in a place that actually feels neutral? Are you meeting in a place that everyone will feel welcome in? Are you meeting in a place that has the physical creature comforts? Do people have what they need, are their needs satisfied? These are little things. We can be intentional about the spaces that we create when we're trying to bring people together across difference. Make sure there's water and food even. How can you mimic the kind of feeling that you get in a coffee shop? How can you mimic that in the space that you're creating in your community?

I think another piece to setting up community process or community conversation is what I talk about as managing polarities. Making sure that there are not only two perspectives are represented. Because as soon as there's only two, then it's easy to polarize. It's easy to divide between us and them. But generally, people are way more complex than two perspectives, so allow for the complexity. Create space intentionally to welcome the complexity so that the group doesn't divide into us and them, but they can see in nuanced ways how this sits with different groups or different people. Having people know one another as individuals, and not just the issues that you're talking about. Patty Digh says that the shortest distance between two people is a story. I love that. The idea that we get closer to one another when we learn our stories and so create space that opens for story. And I think when you do that, you're creating something different than what people may expect when they show up, and that unexpected surprise will often trigger something for people to disarm a bit and be interested and want to participate.

So those are a couple of the tips I would think of, I would suggest, as you think about process and pulling together a community. It's really, really fun and powerful work, I think, to bring a community together to talk about things, and it can be really transformative if we do it with care and creativity.

Meghan: Sounds like there's really no shortcut, hey? *(laughs)* Thanks Jes. The next question is from Zacharie in Quebec.

Zacharie: *I live in Quebec and my province is very proud of its comparatively clean energy. While Québécois don't generally doubt the realities of climate change, it can be hard to talk about the downsides of hydroelectricity, like its potentially negative impacts on wildlife and Indigenous communities. How can I bring up the issues around something people in our province are so proud of without alienating them? Is there a cure for complacency?*

Jes: Okay, yeah, thanks. Zacharie. Here, I think we're getting into some of the nitty gritty skills of how we do the communication when we're in dialog with someone. So, I would say to start, validating someone else's opinion is going to be really important. That's a very important place to start. This is actually the work of empathy and active listening. Part of active listening is to paraphrase back. Can we actually repeat what they just said to us? And can we validate their perspective, their experience, their opinion?

We don't have to agree with someone to listen well to them. I get push back a lot on that, that listening necessarily means agreeing, but I don't think so. I think that we can listen to someone and disagree vehemently with them, and we can say thank you for sharing your opinion. I don't agree with that. I'd like to share my opinion, right? And then you go into your work. But I think if we can't authentically hold someone else's story and opinion, it will be very, very hard to enter into healthy conversation and really transform the conflicts that we have. And actually that's backed by brain science. There's, there have been lots of studies that look at the brain and what happens in the brain in conflictive conversation, interpersonal conflictive conversation. If you're interested in learning more about that, I would encourage you to read *Conversational Intelligence* by Judith E. Glaser. They look at the ways that when we listen to someone, it actually shifts the ways that their brain is functioning. And as we build trust with people, our bodies physically relax. We start to breathe slower, our pulse starts to slow down, our hands stop sweating. Like, when we're in the midst of conflict and we feel listened to, actually, physiological changes happen in our body and brain. And so, in many ways, it's important to listen simply because if we listen well to someone, the chances are they're going to be able to listen better to us also. And that slowing down of the conversation benefits both me and the person I'm in communication with, right?

And after we've listened, then how do we communicate? So, you know, to come into a conversation like you're suggesting here Zacharie. To say, hydroelectricity has negative impacts on wildlife and indigenous communities might not be well received, right? So, we have to break it down. Like what's under that iceberg for you? One of the ways to do this is to separate our observation from our evaluation or our opinion or our judgment. So, the

work is to name the observation. Which, you might name, how hydroelectricity is impacting wildlife or Indigenous communities, which you yourself know and are witnessing or seeing.

So, we make that observation, and then you communicate what that means to you, how you interpret that, why that's important to you, what your values are that underline that concern, what your feelings are, your needs. When we can name feelings and needs, we disarm people. We're now talking about what's underneath the surface for us, and people start to hear us for who we are as individuals and how we experience something, rather than the issue that's up at the top of the iceberg, right?

And we can't stop there. We do get to state an opinion, right? And not just to critique another opinion, but to say, what would you actually hope to see happen? But I think too often in conflict, it's very common that we critique the other perspective, but we don't get far enough to say, this is what I would hope would happen instead, or this is what I would like to see. And so, if we can name what we're seeing and connect that with our story, our values, our feelings, then we have to get to a point of saying, this is what I think about it. This is what I hope for, because otherwise we're just critiquing, critiquing, critiquing, and no one can hear that. It can't be received because we're not giving them anything new to grab on to.

So, the key is that we communicate the things that are below the surface. And so if at some point, as long as we can get to stating, this is why I believe what I believe, and this is how. I think, not just the critique of, in this case, hydroelectricity, but what you would hope to see happen will get you a lot further when you can take people on the journey with you of all that's underneath your own surface, there's a much higher chance that they will hear what you're trying to communicate. So, that's what I would suggest. First listen and then kind of break down what you want to say and see where that gets you.

Meghan: I love how you said, "We don't have to agree with someone to listen well to them." I'm gonna let that soak in a bit. The next question here is from Jonathan.

Jonathan: Hi MCC. My name is Jonathan and I'm calling from Prince Edward Island. One of the things that churches here in Atlantic Canada that churches do really well is they share a great deal about Jesus. And that's such an important thing for the local church to do and I'm proud to be a part of a community that does that well. As I talk about climate here in Atlantic Canada, that's one of the questions that I run into regularly. What does this work have to do with Jesus? So, I'm just wondering if somebody might be able to shed some light on that. When we advocate for change surrounding climate action, what does that have to do with Jesus. How are we advancing the message of the gospel when we engage in climate advocacy? Thank you.

Jes: Yeah, thanks. Jonathan, good question. One of the things that happens in a polarized society is that we get information from sources that we already generally agree with. And so what happens is we start to use the same language that “our people” use, right? And there becomes language that's associated with certain ways of being or certain understandings or certain political perspectives. And one of the things that is challenging in conflict then, is that when we engage with someone who we disagree with. When we are in a conversation where there are nuances in how we understand an issue and differences in how we understand an issue, we have different language, of how we talk about it. And so, we have to be really conscious of what kind of language we're using, because often, because of the polarized society, often we'll use language that is common to us, but it might be triggering language to the people that we are in communication with. And so, I think doing the work of empathy in this situation, you know, the work of active listening, really authentically, knowing who your audience is. Who are you talking to? What do they believe? How do they believe it? And you know, all of that work is paraphrasing back. I hear you saying that Jesus is really important. I hear you saying right and connecting with that. I also really value this and trying to use language that might be less familiar to you but more familiar to them in order to contextualize something into the framework that they hold.

I think so often we have, it's like we have two different models of a framing in two people who are engaging, and instead of trying to take the core of what we want to understand and say and fit it into their framework, we want to replace their framework with our framework. But that's going to be really hard to do, and it's going to be much more effective if we can really understand what their framework is, because we don't need them, I would argue, you don't need them to argue for your position to be the person you're not going to change someone's passion project to become your passion project, right? But we can talk about what's underneath the surface for us and say, this is how I see it. This is how I connect it with Jesus, this is how I understand it as part of the gospel, using the language and the framework that people have.

Meaning is held in the listener. So often we think that meaning is conveyed by the speaker, because the speaker is the one communicating, saying something, right? But in the end, it really doesn't matter, for example, what I say here, because what matters is what you heard. What you take away, what you leave from this podcast, from this conversation, is what you heard. And so it's the work of the speaker to work super hard to find the framework of the listener so that they can hold it in a way that that I'm trying to convey you.

Meghan: Thanks Jes. You talked about being careful about language. So perhaps in the context Jonathan is describing, he can use language of “creation care” instead of “climate



change. I'll also add, we have resources on the MCC website that I'll link to in the show notes. This next question is from Sarah.

*Sarah: Hi, I'm Sarah calling from Northeast Kansas near Kansas City. My question, I find that many well-meaning people don't connect their consumption habits to their values of conserving the earth's resources. For instance, they may be really be a verbal advocate about the effects of climate change, but they may also have a really big yard with fescue where they apply a lot of fertilizer and chemicals which harms important pollinators and insects for birds to eat. How do I tactfully bring up how their choices are contradicting their values. I don't want to appear to be judgement and harm our relationship.*

Jes: Yeah. Thanks, Sarah. So as we were just talking about how we communicate, something is really important. You said you don't want to harm the relationship, which I assume means that you have a relationship with this person, which is a good place to start. I wouldn't necessarily recommend diving into this conversation with a neighbor you don't know, right? Relationship is really important, and that's and that's something to work at at the beginning if there isn't a relationship, right? I also know that I think there are a lot of assumptions at play here in this situation that you're talking about. I'm just curious, you know, have you seen them spray chemicals? Are you assuming they spray chemicals? If they use chemicals? Have you have they told you why they use them, or do you have some assumptions about why they use them? I think that's one place to start right to reflect yourself on what is assumption and what is observation and what is knowledge? What you know? What are all of the what are the differences there?

But for the sake of the question you know, I'll go out on a limb and offer some of the ideas without knowing exactly what is assumption and what you have already talked about. First would be to again, make an assumption without judgment, right? So to say something like, I noticed you putting chemicals on your lawn. I assume that is so that you can keep it beautiful and clean. Or you could say whatever you know, whatever reasoning you have there, I would throw in something like, it always looks so immaculate, right? Like, you want to draw yourself closer to the other person, not push yourself away from that, from them, right? And so you name that, you name that observation, and then go into you know, what you understand about that, what you see, how you experience that, to say something like, one of the things I'm concerned about is making sure there are pollinators and insects in the natural habitat for birds to eat. I'm fearful that a lot of chemicals are creating an environment that doesn't allow for their well being.

And now here you're at an important juncture. So you've made an observation, you've said something about your concerns or your feelings about it, and then you again, have to get to this place of saying, what is it that you are wanting? Do you want to ask them not to spray

chemicals on their lawn. You know, in that case, you could say something very simple, like, I would appreciate if you wouldn't spray chemicals. Or, I wonder if you'd consider not spraying chemicals, right? Maybe, if that's what you if that's the direction, maybe you offer to help weed, like, maybe talk about how you manage your lawn care without using chemicals. You know, continually trying to bring yourself closer to this person, rather than pushing yourself away from this person. Or maybe you don't want to ask them to stop spraying chemicals, but maybe you're more interested in a conversation with them about the decisions that you each make for taking climate change. You've named this person as a verbal advocate of climate change, so like that would be a place I would start right? Highlight that and humble your own position a little bit, rather than informing them of your more knowledgeable opinion, which is generally not a great way to engage conflict or dialog in general.

Ask them how they decide what kind of conscious what kind of climate conscious practices they live into. Like, how do they make decisions? I think, just like with many other issues with climate, it's so hard to draw a perfect line and say this is what it means to go green, or this is what it means to be someone who cares about the climate, because everyone is going to have different ways that they work on it, and different understandings of what is more important or what is less important, or what is more effective or what is less effective. And so I think, um, having a conversation, inviting a conversation where you are saying, I'm really passionate about this. And you know, on one hand, this is what I observe, and this is what I'm worried about, and on the other hand, you also are passionate. I know that. I know that you're passionate about this, and I wonder if we could learn together, how could we improve together? Right?

I think it is so easy and very dangerous to put ourselves always in the posture of superiority. This is what happens in conflict over and over. We do it on accident, but we say, how do I help them understand better? How do I show them what they're doing wrong? How do I teach them, right? And I think we're going to get a lot further in conflict if we can say, how do we improve together? How can I learn from you, and how can you also learn from me? How do we live into a posture of humility. And you know, can you invite that question? Can you invite that conversation and ask how they see inconsistencies in your life? Right? It's going to be a much more fruitful conversation if there's mutuality in it and not superiority, even if unintentional, sometimes implied.

Meghan: Thanks Jes. As you talk, I notice how much I'm tensing up imagining having some of these conversations. And it strikes me, so many of us in Canada and the United States are so unused to conflict.

Jes: You know, we don't technically have a dialog muscle in our brains or in our bodies, but I often talk about a dialog muscle because I think conflict transformation is much like any other training that we would do with our muscles. We have to practice this stuff, and the more we practice it, the easier it gets. These skills, we can get better at them. And that, to me that's the whole point of peaceful practices as a curriculum is to help churches get better at doing these things. It's normal. I think that's normal to feel that tension and to feel that relax. Like the more we practice, the better we're going to be at it. So I yeah, I encourage the practice.

Meghan: It's helpful to think about this skill as a muscle that can get stronger. Now, I have a question of my own. No doubt we've all had the experience of hearing someone make a comment that we disagree with and we feel pulled to respond. How can we do so in a way that's respectful while also maintaining our own integrity by defending what's important to us?

Jes: Yeah, I think this is so much what you're talking about, just even there, as you know, your own tension of feeling that scenario where someone says something and, you know, we flip our lids, our emotions skyrocket, I think, especially in an era of polarization that's happening more and more just in our interpersonal conversations. As we scroll on social media, in what we read in the news. You know, this happens constantly, and we really are confronted daily with the need to engage opinions and individuals that are really different than how we understand things. And I think first and foremost is that this really is a heart change. It's an internal transformation. It's a move from simplistic understandings to complex understandings. It's a move from superiority to curiosity. It's a shift that happens inside us. I love the scripture in Psalm 19:14 that says, "may the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable to you oh God, my rock and my Redeemer." I think that's a real guide for us as we think about engaging in conversation, because it's not just our words. We have to do the practice of the skills of speaking well and listening well, but it's also the meditations of our hearts that we actually shift how we try and engage someone, and we see them not as enemy, but as friend. We see them as companion on the journey that we learn with, not that we teach to, right?

And I think it's so interesting because so many of the questions I've heard here today are a much more nuanced version of the question, how do I change their minds? Right? I've heard very little, how do I listen better? How do I practice curiosity? What is inconsistent with my position? And that's not a critique of the individuals calling in so grateful for your questions. I think it's more just a note that this is what we all do all the time. So that work of self awareness, of conscientiousness, that work of intentionality, I think that's really important. You know, when you get on an airplane, there's always the announcement, put

your own mask on first before you would put on your neighbor's mask, right? Or the biblical version of that is Luke 6, where Jesus asks us to take the speck out of our own eye first, right? I think that's a really, really important basis. And as we shift how we enter a conversation, we will inevitably shift the person we are engaging with, because people mimic one another, they mimic our postures, they mimic our energies. And so as we enter with curiosity. People start to relax. People start to be more curious about us.

There's an image that I love of a hand position where one hand is facing palm up towards the ceiling and one hand is facing palm out towards the other person. I think that's a really powerful image to think about dialogue. That with our hand that's facing up, we are holding the other person's story. We are doing the work of listening and authentically recognizing their humanity their history, like truly listening to who they are. And that we don't only do that work, but we also say this is what I have to offer. And that's the other hand that's facing them to say this is what I bring also. I think working at constantly finding that balance between when and how we listen and when and how we communicate. I think that balance is really powerful and can be really transformative.

Meghan: As I'm listening to you, I have to admit, I keep thinking...so much of this requires being the bigger person and working hard to extend people grace and respect. And I can't help but think, what if someone doesn't deserve it? Sometimes people act in bad faith and won't engage respectfully. What do you do in those situations?

Jes: I would be really cautious about saying, if someone does not deserve respect and dignity of being listened to, I think often that would that comes from a place of pain, or it comes from something that's under there. Ever since I was little, my mom used to say, you can only control yourself. You can only control yourself. And I think that's the essence of dialogue work. Like, we bring what we know to be authentic and transformative, and people can choose to engage with us or not. I do think when we apply the skills of healthy dialog, we do have some power to start to shift the other person a little bit. But even more so to me, the question is, how do I practice this? How do I do it? Because it's not only to change them or the issue, but it's because it also changes me. It makes me a better person. The longer that I have been working on this, the better I am, because I see the humanity in someone else more quickly, more easily, because I'm practicing it, because I'm thinking about it. It just shifts how I see the world. And even if that's the only reason to do it, I think it's worth it because, because it's transformative, and that I just believe that will ripple out. I do. I believe that.

Meghan: Thanks Jes for all your thoughtfulness on this topic. You've given us so much practical and useful advice. Thank you.

Jes: Thank you so much. It's been really wonderful. Thank you.

Meghan: That was Jessica Stoltzfus Buller. A facilitator, trainer, mediator and peacebuilder who is also the outgoing Peace Education Coordinator for MCC U.S. and the author of MCC's Peaceful Practices curriculum.

If you're not yet subscribed to this podcast, take a moment to go into your podcast app and click "follow." This makes sure you won't miss an episode.

This episode of Relief, Development and Podcast was produced on Treaty 1 territory, the original land of the Anishinaabeg, Cree and Dakota peoples, and the homeland of the Métis Nation. This episode was hosted and produced by me, Meghan Mast. The head producer is Leslie Boctor.

A lot is happening in the world right now. This is a difficult time for many. May you experience God's provision and protection as we work together to share God's love and compassion for all in the name of Christ. Thank you for listening.

(MUSIC FADES UP AND THEN DOWN)

-----

#### SHOW NOTES:

- This fall, MCC is encouraging our supporters to talk about climate change. Sign up here to receive resources on building peace through climate conversation, including a virtual workshop with Jes Stoltzfus Buller on November 13th: <https://mcc.org/what-we-do/initiatives/climate-change/talk-climate-practice-peace>
- Link to Peaceful Practices document: <https://mcc.org/resources/peaceful-practices-guide-healthy-communication-conflict>
- A video about MCC's partner Sembrandopaz: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tQ0cE4gZK4g>