


Vol. 3 Number 2 – Spring, 2021

# MAC Arrow

Unitarian Universalist  
Multiracial Unity Action Council  
(UUMUAC)



“For the Unity of the  
light and dark skinned  
people of the world.”

**Mailing Address: UUMUAC**

**1448 E. 52nd St., Box 267, Chicago, IL 60615**

**Editor’s email: [uusj@sbcglobal.net](mailto:uusj@sbcglobal.net)**

## **The Mission Statement**

It is the mission of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Caucus to carry out and foster anti-racist and multiracial unity activities both within and outside the Unitarian Universalist Association through education, bearing witness and other actions, and expansion of our membership both within and outside the walls of our congregations.

We also seek to defend our UU Principles against those who seek to undermine them.

## **The Vision Statement**

We envision our congregations, denomination, and society as not being color blind but color appreciative; as judging and treating members of the world’s rank and file by the content of their character, not the color of their skin or their cultural heritage; and as treasuring diversity in the context of the “Beloved Community.” We call this vision Multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

**To unsubscribe please send a note to [uusj@sbcglobal.net](mailto:uusj@sbcglobal.net).**

## **On the Evolutionary Emergence of the Geneva Project—UUMUAC as the Nucleus of the Progressive UU Association of Congregants (an overview: March 2021 - April 2021)**

*By Rev. Dr. Finley C. Campbell, UUMUAC President and Spokesman*

Here is the background to this essay: the wonderful and contradictory, historical nature of the month of April—April 4, 1968, the assassination of Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. and the birth of a multiracial group to carry on his vision; April 9, 1865, the surrender of the white supremacist Army of Northern Virginia; April 23, 1943, the beginning of the heroic Warsaw Ghetto Rebellion and in April 1945 ... the grand alliance of Soviet, English, French, and US American forces bringing down to ruin those very same Aryan supremacists. And now April 20<sup>th</sup>, former police officer Derek Chauvin, was convicted of killing George Floyd. All showing the power of multiracial unity.

The purpose of this essay is to narrate a story about the evolutionary emergence of what I have called the Geneva Project, a vision raised by members of our Religious Professionals Task Force of creating a kind of Progressive Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregants (PUUAC), a vision which emerged during the timeframe March 6, 2021 to April 17, 2021. I call this the Geneva Project, referring to the fact that during the time of the Christian Reformation, Geneva, Switzerland became the refuge and center of the radical forces of the Reformation. [I will cover three points](#): What were the political dynamics reflected in these events, especially the April 17 Convocation? [How did the March 6, 2021 workshop on the Seven Principles indicate the possibility of creating this new progressive UU association?](#) And why did the UUMUAC Convocation reveal the potentiality of the emergence of such an association sooner rather than later?

First of all, from a political perspective, what has been especially demoralizing to me and other truly committed UU religious professionals is the sight of so many of our younger and newly minted UU ministers, the supposedly future of our theological ministry, joining with the absurdity of what some of us in UUMUAC call Whitesupremacyology. They are becoming eager proponents of the Authoritarian Anti-Democratic Culture or Cancel Culture used to defend that absurdity. As a child of the 40's, I am reminded of the Nazi-capitalist Jungen in their anxiety to show their commitment to this bad cause. Finally, and most important, we must constantly remind ourselves that it is this political nature of our work, as involved in our theological approach, which is the most important, a fact which makes us a potential Geneva for our UU Reformation Movement: the eventual elimination of racism as an ideology within our denomination, especially in its final guise, neoracism.

How did the March 6, 2021 workshop on the Seven Principles indicate the possibility of creating this new progressive UU Association, this Geneva in US America, as it were, the refueling the flaming chalice as a part of understanding the importance of multiracial unitarian universalism? One of the reasons that neoracism has been so successful has been the lack of a deep commitment to those principles, what our workshop leader Brother Gregory Rouillard, called the concepts of Embodied Learning, a way to provide a starting point for the ongoing individual and collective journey from Principles to praxis in the following manner:

1. First of all, this involved a process of assessing our individual understanding of each the Seven Principles and our individual level of engagement with each Principle;
2. Then we were Introduced to the framework of Universal Human Values as a basis to refine, deepen, and enhance our existing understanding of each Principle, such values as love, openness, solidarity, civility;

3. Lastly, this methodology helps to develop individual and collective strategies for bringing these Principles to life within ourselves and in our congregations and Association. Moreover, I assert that without such embodiment, we cannot have a true understanding of multiracial unitarian universalism, on the one hand, and building UUMUAC in our congregations and communities, on the other. Without this embodiment, we cannot really be the Geneva of a UU Reformation Movement. By the way, some thirty people attended this workshop.

Finally, why did the convocation of 2021 reveal the potentiality of the emergence one day of this possibility? We began with my welcoming, where I described the influence of Martin Luther King Jr, a Baptist, and his non-violence ethics, and Wally Linder, a communist, and his revolutionary vision, on my commitment to multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

This was followed by Brother Jay Kiskel's presentation detailing the reasons why he is running for the first time as an "outside candidate" for the UUA Board of Trustees, running boldly on the Fifth Principle, and he was followed by Brother Rev. Todd Ekloff, who gave us a moving, compelling overview of his new book, *The Gadfly Affair*.

Then Cousin Rev. Kate Rohde described the role of the pseudo-left in the Unitarian Universalist Ministerial Association who recently suspended her without due process, despite the fact that she has had wonderful history of fighting all forms of oppression, nationally and internationally, especially against sexism and gender-based oppression within the UUMA. And as Brother Rev Wesley Hromatko pointed out, that without due process, there can be no true justice.

Our next set of speakers dealt with the issue which is the keystone of the mission of the Unitarian Universalist Multiracial Unity Action Council, the fight against racism:

1. Sister Marie Cobbs, a MAC board member, gave an overview of the new neo-racist initiative from Black Lives of UU (BLUU, the moral leadership of the neo-racist Cabal) called "Harbors and Havens" which is just another way of creating racial separation in the UUAC. She pointed out that these programs were unanimously endorsed by the UUA Board of Trustees. More information in a later article;

2. Sister Professor Anne Schneider brought us up to date on the ongoing impact of the ideology of White Supremacy Culture in and outside of the UUAC – it is intensifying;

3. Brother Professor Alan Spector gave us a wide-ranging analysis of the nature of the new academic racism (Critical Race Theory, Cancel Culture, Identitarianism), arguing that the best way to respond to the attacks upon us, was, first, to be the best anti-racists on the block and, second, to recruit more blacks and people of color committed to multiracial unitarian universalism to our work;

4. Our youngest MAC board member, Brother Carl Wolf, a major leader in the First Unitarian Universalist Church of Hobart, Indiana, argued that we could also counter these attacks by fighting back through demonstrations, marches, forums, and most of all, participation in anti-racist actions in our local communities, and, most of all, by showing how racism hurts white members of the rank-and-file – workers, students, and professionals – like himself.

But the main truth of this our **S**econd UUMUAC Convocation came from new member Kelvin Sandridge, the black chair of the Chicago Area Chapter of UUMUAC, who as a participant gave a wonderful testimony about the power of seeing so many white brothers and sisters and cousins (60 or more attended). committed to Multiracial Unitarian Universalism.

With great emotion, he explained how this inspired him to commit himself even more to the struggle. This showed me, to use my language, our possibility of being the new Geneva, specifically by creating a space for building authentic racial justice warriors, like Brother Sandridge.

### III. Conclusion

To conclude: even the most visionary plan must have organization, and so we closed out the Convocation with a business meeting designed to prepare our work for GA 2021, including such important issues as the role of our petition drive in creating this new Geneva, and upcoming third and final workshops dealing with the Seven Principles. Very dramatic was the report from MAC board member Sister Fahima Gaheez, Director of the Afghan Women's Fund, describing the incredible progress being made on the building of a new school for girls and young women in Achin Province. On the negative side, she gave her analysis of the dangers to the peace process caused by the pullout of US/NATO troops without an agreement from the Taliban. We also heard the dismaying news that we have had no response from the GA 2021 Exhibit and Advertising Committee, neither giving us a nay or a yay.

Then it was over: we had last words, then closing words by Sister Rohde, and the extinguishing of the chalice. As traditional, our two key musicians, who did such a wonderful job of creating our musical interludes, Lia McCoo and Keryn Moriyah, sang that mind- inspiring hymn RANK ON RANK, #358 in the Gray Hymnal. With this and some ringing in our ears, it was clear that what was not over was the idea, now clear, now dim, that if there were a mass expulsion of multiracial Unitarian Universalists and what I call the **Sevenprincipalians** from the UUAC, then the idea of a Progressive Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregants will become more than feasible –it would become inevitable.

Note: Zoom copies of the Convocation are available and, as soon as we get our YouTube video station up and running, WMAC TV, it will also be available there.





## Update from the Afghan Women's Fund

*By Fahima Gaheez, Executive Director*

The Afghan Women's Fund has a special goal in 2021: to build a small school in the Achin district of Nengrahar province in Afghanistan. This area was destroyed by the [most powerful conventional bomb](#) in the American arsenal in 2017. In 2019, Fahima/AWF built an outdoor school here, the first girls' school in over 4 decades! The school has 200 students meeting in the open and under a rented patio cover, and there are 500 girls on the waiting list to attend. As we all recover from the pandemic, let us remember that many areas of the world have such significant challenges. We take school, even if it is virtual, for granted but many, especially girls, are not able to go to a school at all. The villagers want to reclaim their independence and educate their children so they will have a better future. The villagers have donated the land for the school and they have promised to protect it.

The construction of the school began on February 4 2021 while we still were raising funds. We have raised enough funds to finish the first floor and the facilities so that the girls can have a safer environment to study. Recently we talked to the engineer and building material company and requested they to help us with some construction supplies on credit with at no interest. They accepted our request and we agreed to pay them in full by the end of the year, that way it will free up some funds for the labor costs for now. We hope, in the next few months, we can raise enough funds to pay off our loan. If everything goes according to the plan, the building will be ready for use at the end of July.

We need your help to keep our promise . . . Whereas none of us individually can build this school, there is power in the community to affect the lives of the girls in Achin for years to come.

**Our Foundation's mission is empowerment of women, and the key to it is education . We are working very hard to educate girls and women in Afghanistan towards a better future and self-sufficiency.**

**Please, visit our website to learn more about us and access the report of our work in the last 20 years: <http://www.afghanwomensfund.org>**

**Every dollar counts! We will send the donors a picture of the school once it is built!**

**In gratitude for your contribution!**

**Afghan Women's Fund**



## Update on the Jay Kiskel campaign for a UUA Board seat

My campaign for an at-large position on the UUA Board of Trustees officially began on April 19 at a Zoom Meeting when my opponent and I met with the UUA Election Campaign Practices Committee. Elections for at-large board members are typically not held at General Assembly. Despite our Fifth Principle dedicated to the right of conscience and the democratic process, our Association's bylaws have a provision that structurally limits democracy in selecting our UU leaders.

Each year about three board positions become open due to the expiration of a member's term. A Nominating Committee typically only identifies one candidate for each open position. A provision buried in the bylaws indicates that "if only one person has been validly nominated for an elective position at large, the person so nominated shall be declared elected and no voting shall be required." The net result is that voting members of our UUA Board of Trustees are not "elected" by delegates at General Assembly; they are effectively "appointed" by the nominating process.

My candidacy by petition for an at-large position provides this year's General Assembly delegates an opportunity to vote for at least one new board member.

### Why I am Running

With the help of UUs across the country, I submitted my petition to be a candidate because I am concerned about the ongoing drift away from our UU liberal values. I have an unshakeable faith in the power of our Principles, our liberal values, and the guidance offered by our heritage Unitarian and Universalist denominations.

We need a voice not selected by the existing nominating process, but by UUs just like you. Lacking a democratic renewal of leadership, a culture of isolation has evolved, leaving us a leadership team unaccountable to the congregations they are supposed to serve.

All UUs endorse UUism's aspirational goals of diversity and inclusion. I believe that changing the character of UUism is not the best approach to achieve those goals.

There are many opinions on the current situation within UUism and many opinions on what should be done. I believe the first step is restoring democracy in the governance of the Association by inviting everyday UUs, through their vote, to participate in setting the direction of UUism.

I have taken to heart the stern warning made by the 2009 Fifth Principle Task Force Report.

*"The future of our UU movement can ill-afford to continue the ways of faux democracy and unaccountable representation that have characterized Associational governance, including the content and process of General Assembly."*

I ask for the support of your congregation's delegates. Every Voice Deserves a Vote.

***Editor's Note: There follows two reviews of Used to be UU, one shorter and more dispassionate, the other longer and more passionate.***

## ***Used To Be UU***

by Frank Casper and Jay Kiskel

A Five Star Amazon Review by Dr. Kenneth Christiansen

The Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations (UUA) is facing a major crisis. For the past 10 years, not a single person on the national board has been elected. Under a system adopted in 2011, board members formerly elected by districts were replaced by at-large board members chosen by a nominating committee. The nominating committee is in turn appointed

by the board. The ingrown nature of this process has facilitated the introduction of a particular kind of "antiracism" that separates white people and people of color.

The core of Unitarian Universalism has been the seven principles which include: The Worth and Dignity of Every Person (now challenged by the assertion that white UUs are, knowingly or unknowingly, supporters of White Supremacy Culture); The Free and Responsible Search for Truth and Meaning (now challenged by the idea that logic and reason are part of White Supremacy Culture); and the Use of the Democratic Process (now challenged by the argument that white UUs need to be accountable to, and monitored by, people of color). This book includes many quotes from the 2020 report of the UUA Commission On Institutional Change (COIC), the official roadmap for the future of Unitarian Universalism. These challenges to the Seven Principles and other aspects of UUA life and practice are well documented.

A question comes to mind, what do the terms antiracist and antiracism mean? These terms have two very different meanings in common experience. The classical meaning refers to stopping discrimination based on race. It has always required broad coalitions of people and institutions from all racial backgrounds working together over time to effectively change unjust laws and institutional policies. This is the antiracism approach of the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s as well as the approach of Rev. William Barber, Stacy Abrams, and community organizations identifying needed changes and working effectively to get them.

The alternative meaning of antiracism capitalizes on white guilt. It involves an assumption that only white people can be racist. White guilt is amplified in books like *White Fragility* published by the Unitarian Universalist Association's Beacon Press in 2018. The author, Robin Diangelo, writes on page 149, "a positive white identity is an impossible goal. White identity is inherently racist; white people do not exist outside the system of white supremacy."

The path toward redemption as proposed in the 2020 report of the UUA Commission On Institutional Change is for all Unitarian Universalists to submit to a system of accountability and monitoring by an "an independent body ... to consist of one representative and one alternate from identity-based groups" (COIC page 131). No group that admits white people as members is included in the list of identity-based groups to be charged with this monitoring process. By-law changes and an 8<sup>th</sup> Principle that will codify this kind of monitoring are in the discussion stage with final approval possible in the summer of 2023.

*Used To Be UU* is a very readable book. For members of the UUA it offers essential knowledge. For anyone else it is both a provocative story and a wake-up call to talk more about the values you hold and why you hold them. It is well worth your time to read.

Link to order the book: [https://www.amazon.com/Used-Be-UU-Systematic-Liberalism/dp/B08ZBFFBVG/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?dchild=1&keywords=used+to+be+uu&qid=1617314498&sr=8-1](https://www.amazon.com/Used-Be-UU-Systematic-Liberalism/dp/B08ZBFFBVG/ref=sr_1_1?dchild=1&keywords=used+to+be+uu&qid=1617314498&sr=8-1)

## **“The Inside Story on the Moral Collapse of the UUA”**

A Review by Dick Burkhart of

**“Used to Be UU:**

**The Systematic Attack on UU Liberalism:**

**What You Need to Know and What You Need to Do”**

by Frank Casper and Jay Kiskel (2021)

The saddest story in contemporary liberal religion is the moral collapse of the Unitarian Universalist Association over the last several years, sinking into the cesspool of the ne-oracism and conspiracy theories spawned by the “whiteness” studies of Critical Race Theory. Casper and Kiskel are UU lay leaders from the Atlanta area who became alarmed after the vicious cancel culture attack that led to the resignation of UUA president Peter Morales in 2017, and the even more vicious witch-hunt against Rev Todd Eklof in 2019.

Kiskel, being an historian, knows how to dig into archives and soon discovered that this spectacular failure of the UUA Board was rooted in the collapse of democracy when the Board size, structure, and nominating process were changed a decade ago. This led to a totally in-bred, unaccountable Board (no contested elections), subject to narrow-minded group-think. The Board became increasingly out of touch with the congregations, subject to capture by zealots for faddish ideologies, even dogmas at odds with the core of our 7 principles. Note: I am quoted on p 27 as warning against the new nominating process at the General Assembly in 2011.

The first result of their work was the “Fifth Principle Project” ([fifthprincipleproject.org](http://fifthprincipleproject.org)), the UUA fifth principle being “the right of conscience and the use of the democratic process...”. In addition Jay is now running for the UUA Board but is already being slandered by the zealots, despite the fact that a UUA task force had already critiqued the democratic deficit and made constructive suggestions to the Board back in 2009.

Now Frank and Jay have added to the earlier recommendations. One easy idea is for the 5 regions to elect board representatives, mirroring the 19 district board members of yore. Another is for all UUs nationally to vote directly for top officials (president, moderator, at large board members) and key bylaw changes, like Article II, which contains the 7 principles and 6 sources. And I might add that, as a professional mathematician and voting expert, digital voting for national offices could easily be done by asking voters to rank or rate their top candidates, resulting in better minority representation for at-large positions.

Now to the controversy. As Casper and Kiskel point out, the recent report from the “Commission on Institutional Change” (COIC) was wildly biased by design. It was entirely couched in both the language and controversial doctrines of Critical Race Theory (CRT), yet CRT was never mentioned and has never been debated by the General Assembly, let alone the congregations or in publications. Why not tout CRT? Or is there something to be ashamed of, or that must remain hidden? And why impose it in a highly authoritarian fashion, complete with witch-hunts and cancellations targeting dissidents, reminiscent of the inquisitions of old?



The answer is that the UUA has good reason to hide this ugliness. Many who've looked at CRT with a critical eye have concluded that while claiming to be the gold standard in anti-racism, CRT actually includes strong threads of racism, particularly in the "whiteness" studies which are at the core of UUA doctrine. In fact, some African American public intellectuals call it "neoracism". This includes a prominent UU black elder, not just well-known critics like John McWhorter. McWhorter sees insincere theatrical performances among "the woke", plus blacks treated like children or forever-victims by CRT. Instead McWhorter sees adults, though sometimes still struggling, who've come a long ways since Jim Crow, despite lingering external and internal obstacles. Others point to the abandonment by CRT of MLK's vision of "black and white together".

But to back up a bit, this got going after the 2017 hiring fiasco, after President Morales threw up his hands over the highly racialized vitriol and resigned. The UUA Board then declared that the UUA "harbored structures and patterns that foster racism, oppression, and white supremacy," followed by a series of continent-wide teach-ins to discuss "the realities of racism and white supremacy in our congregations, in our Association, and in our Faith". However there was a huge problem with all this, as pointed out by Casper and Kiskel: the claimed "realities" were assumed not proven. A prime illustration of this harmful attitude is the hiring controversy itself, where nasty allegations were made but never substantiated.

An unexpectedly small number of racial incidents now have one-sided documentation in the COIC report, but to this day I have never heard of a validated incident or practice of white supremacy as commonly defined ("one who believes that white people are racially superior to others and therefore should dominate society"}, especially as associated with extremist groups like the Proud Boys. The UUA Board was aware of this deficiency, in that it commissioned the COIC study to "to conduct an audit of the power structures and analyze systemic racism and white supremacy culture within the UUA". But by assuming what was to be proven, the Board was asking for a biased report – only data to feed their "confirmation bias", a disaster of methodology from a social science point of view.

What a missed opportunity! We could have had an objective report - an independent, impartial assessment of whether or not systemic racism or white supremacy culture actually exists in the UUA, and if so, to what extent and in what forms. In fact solid evidence for a "white supremacy culture" in the UUA is non-existent, so this claim comes across as some kind of conspiracy theory to many UUs. It was this craziness that caught the attention of Casper and Kiskel.

So what kind of dope was the UUA Board smoking? Well, we're right back to McWhorter's "neoracism". It appears that a small cabal of "People of Color" and their "white allies" are ardent acolytes of the Church of Critical Race Theory, centered on the sect of "whiteness studies". Note: Many have noted the cult-like flavor of CRT, but McWhorter sees it as an actual religion while James Lindsay has demonstrated how it functions as a religion for legal purposes, even if it differs from the traditional institutional forms and rituals of religion. Combine this with white guilt, and it looks like any Board members who may have had reservations were quickly caught up in the religious fervor that blames "whites" for all the world's ills.

Note: This racial “white blaming” is not the hyperbole you may suspect – just consider the opening sentence of Charles Mills book “The Racial Contract”, a seminal CRT text on white supremacy: “White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today.” The implication of Mills’ astonishing premise is (1) that he considers the modern world to be irredeemably bad, and (2) that this miserable state of affairs is due to an evil form of white identity that exercises its muscle to overpower all political opposition to impose a harsh regime of oppression and exploitation on all the people of color it can lay its hands on, based on their presumed racial inferiority.

Really? – in the 21st century, and how about before white identity was even a recognized concept? As if John Calhoun’s ante-bellum South defined not only the present but the past of the entirety of all European-related civilizations. Now consider the common definition of racism: “prejudice or discrimination based on race”. Clearly Mills statement, considered factually, is patently absurd, but it makes perfect sense as racial prejudice – in this case, the kind of anti-white prejudice that is the prime characteristic of neoracism. Note: I chose to quote Mills because he was cited in the UU World as a key source of white supremacy doctrine.

Another comment on terminology: The champions of “white supremacy culture” are actually quite aware of the absurdity of their claims but the accusation of “white supremacy” is such a powerful weapon, and they are part of such as ruthless and power hungry movement, that they attempted to redefine this phrase to make it more defensible. But this has produced non-sensical results, such as the 15 “traits” of “white supremacy culture” proposed by Tema Okun. It turns out that none of these traits has any obvious racial content, that all of them could be considered good or bad, depending on one’s point of view and on the situation at hand, and their prevalence in society varies widely. Some are issues that arise in certain bureaucratic environments – that could happen in any racial setting, some are words like “objectivity”, highly valued for uncovering the facts, especially in scientific, legal, and scholarly circles, but demeaned by the acolytes of CRT.

Instead the acolytes of CRT put their faith in “lived experience”, called “anecdotal reports” by social scientists – good for motivating or illustrating research but otherwise subject to severe biases. In fact, when CRT people are asked, “Whose Experience” they typically end up retreating into the select few – the “woke” - the 1%, not the 99% - or if this fails they’ll cherry pick some numbers that misrepresent the overall situation (it’s not hard to “lie with statistics”). When real scholars debate they dig deeply into the numbers, looking for “omitted variables” and how to measure all the factors that might contribute to a perception of “systemic racism”, for example, to see what’s real and by how much. In summary, for real social scientists these purported redefinitions of “white supremacy” are so bad that they fail the laugh test. But they persist as raw insults.

Casper and Kiskel give a good overview of many of these issues in the context of “applied postmodern philosophy”, summarizing key points from the Lindsay and Pluckrose book “Cynical Theories”. They also illustrate attacks on the 4th UU principle (“a free and responsible search for truth and meaning”), such as certain UU ministers labeling academic-type criticism as “hate speech” in order to shut down debate. In addition there are several powerful documents, such as the public letter of protest by a number UU ministers who resigned from the UU Ministers’ Association to protest the highly unethical treatment of Rev. Eklof.

One of my favorite quotes is about the nasty consequences of CRT: "...this is about how the experience of oppression is weaponized against the very liberal values that supply legitimate avenues for redress" (p 139), not just mob suppression of imagined heresy (the Eklof witch-hunt) but of also the overt abandonment of legal due process (the UMMA kangaroo courts).

## Genealogy of the Seven Principles

Rev. Richard Trudeau

This is how the Unitarians were describing themselves right before the consolidation with the Universalists in 1961.

### Purposes and Objectives of the AUA (revised 1959; roots, 1894)

SECTION I. In accordance with its charter, the American Unitarian Association shall "be devoted to moral, religious, educational and charitable purposes." In accordance with these purposes the American Unitarian Association shall:

1. Diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of religion which Jesus taught as love to God and love to man;
2. Strengthen the churches and fellowships which unite in the Association for more and better work for the Kingdom of God;
3. Organize new churches and fellowships for the extension of Unitarianism in our own countries and in other lands; and
4. Encourage sympathy and cooperation among religious liberals at home and abroad.

SECTION II. The Association recognizes that its constituency is congregational in polity and that individual freedom of belief is inherent in the Unitarian tradition. Nothing in these purposes shall be construed as an authoritative test.

--AUA Annual Report, 1959-60

One thing that strikes me is how little this says, when you compare it to our current list of seven principles, six sources, and more. The reason is that this statement was produced to heal a schism. It is anti-schismatic: it wants to set a bar that is very low, making the tent as big as possible.

Let me tell you about the schism. When the original American Unitarian Association (AUA) was formed in 1825, it was an organization of individuals, not of congregations. It did not correspond to the UUA; it was something like UUs for a Just Economic Community, or UUs for Jewish Awareness, or another of those many groups we have. The Unitarians did not have an organization of congregations until 1865, when they formed the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches. It is clear from the name that the majority of Unitarians thought of themselves as a kind of Christian. But there were, in the middle of the 19th century, people we would today call humanists, and humanist congregations; and just two years after the formation of the National Conference, about two dozen congregations seceded and formed the Free Religious Association. This schism lasted for a quarter-century.

The schism ended in the early 1890s, when the three Unitarian organizations combined into a single organization of congregations--individual membership was phased out--and took the name of the oldest: the American Unitarian Association. So the AUA became an organization of churches, and adopted, in substance, the statement whose 1959 version I quoted above. The Christian majority was mollified because of the references to Jesus and God (in 1), and to the Kingdom of God (in 2). And the humanists were mollified, too. Reading closely, they could see that

the term "religion" in 1 was undefined, with Jesus' definition offered as only an example that didn't require them to accept Christian ideas. And they could accept the mention of "Kingdom of God" in 2 because some biblical scholars were saying that on Jesus' lips that expression referred not to an afterlife or anything supernatural, but to a vision Jesus had of what this world could be like if there were peace and justice and enough to go around.

One other thing that strikes me about the 1959 Unitarian statement is that it makes no mention of what I will call the Unitarian taproot--the original religious concern of American Unitarianism: *salvation by character*. Let me tell you about that.

The European Unitarians in general, and the English Unitarians in particular, were not, in my opinion, so much our religious ancestors as our religious cousins. For the English Unitarians the central concern was to deny the doctrine of the Trinity, making the name "Unitarian" appropriate. But the religious liberals who around 1800 emerged from the Puritan-heritage churches in New England were named by their opponents, who said in effect, "Oh, you're just like those Unitarians," referring to the group in England. The American liberals accepted the name, because they did have doubts about the Trinity; but their central concern was to deny Predestination--the Calvinist doctrine which says that before we are born, God has already decided whether we are going to heaven or hell, and there's nothing we can do to change God's decision. The American Unitarians said, in effect, "That's so unfair. We don't believe in a God like that--a tyrant whose whim seals a person's fate. We believe that each person has the power to earn their salvation by living a life of high moral character." They summarized this line of thought in the slogan, *salvation by character*. Not, *God is one. Salvation by character*.

It's not surprising that there's no mention of *salvation by character* in the Unitarian statement, because the term "salvation" would have been radioactive to humanists. And though I think the Unitarians could have included much of the substance of *salvation by character* in language that would have been acceptable to everyone--for example, "the dignity of each person"--the fact is that they did not.

\* \* \*

Here is how the Universalists were describing themselves right before consolidation. The numbers are mine.

Universalist Declaration of Faith  
(1935; revised 1953)

We avow our faith in:

- [1] God as eternal and all-conquering love;
- [2] the spiritual leadership of Jesus;
- [3] the supreme worth of every human personality;
- [4] the authority of truth, known or to be known; and
- [5] the power of men of good will and sacrificial spirit to overcome all evil and progressively establish the Kingdom of God.
- [6] Neither this nor any other statement shall be imposed as a credal test.

--1953 General Assembly, Andover, Mass.



This is another anti-schismatic statement. Universalists were challenged by humanists, too--not so much in the 19th century, but early in the 20th (for which the term "humanist" is correct). There was no schism, but Universalists had experienced one in the 1830s, and they had no taste for another; plus, they saw what had happened to the Unitarians. Many of the leaders appreciated what the humanists were saying, but at the same time felt that Universalists had spent 150 years developing a very liberal form of Christianity, and they didn't want to give that up.

The resulting statement is a synthesis of liberal Christianity and humanism. Points 1, 2, and 5 proclaim liberal Christianity, while points 3, 4, and 6 are humanistic. The majority of Universalists saw themselves as a kind of Christian, and were satisfied by the references to God, Jesus, and the Kingdom of God. Humanists were satisfied, too. Looking at 1, they thought, "If what is meant by 'God' is love, there's no problem, for love certainly exists." Looking at 2, they agreed that the man Jesus was certainly a spiritual leader, and worthy of respect; and looking at 5, they understood the Kingdom of God to be Jesus' vision of how this world could become.

The Universalists were more successful at including a version of their taproot. Their central concern was, of course, to proclaim universal salvation: everyone goes to heaven; God somehow finds a way to save everybody, even Hitler; no one goes to hell. They couldn't say "no one goes to hell" if they wanted to satisfy humanists, but they could say something very close, and this is point 3, which says in effect: no one deserves hell.

\* \* \*

In 1961 the two groups got married, and produced this description of their union. The underlining is mine.

#### Principles & Purposes of the UUA (1961)

The members of the Unitarian Universalist Association, dedicated to the principles of a free faith, unite in seeking:

1. To strengthen one another in a free and disciplined search for truth as the foundation of our religious fellowship;
2. To cherish and spread the universal truths taught by the great prophets and teachers of humanity in every age and tradition,  
immemorially summarized in the Judeo-Christian heritage as love to God and love to man;
3. To affirm, defend and promote the supreme worth of every human personality, the dignity of man, and the use of the democratic method  
in human relationships;
4. To implement our vision of one world by striving for a world community founded on ideals of brotherhood, justice and peace;
5. To serve the needs of member churches and fellowships, to organize new churches and fellowships, and to extend and strengthen liberal religion;
6. To encourage cooperation with men of good will in every land.

--"The Six Principles," Warren Ross, *UUWorld*, Nov.-Dec. 2000

The 1985 revision of this into our current Principles & Purposes was motivated in part by a desire to remove the gendered language. Another motive was to add a principle that would express concern for the environment; my understanding is that it was Rev. Paul L'Herrou who suggested the wording of our resulting 7th Principle.

The first part of #2 (before the comma) is an innovation. Both the Unitarians and the Universalists had been investigating world religions since at least the 1820s, but had never said so in a denominational statement; at last, this practice is acknowledged here.

In the current (1985) Principles & Purposes of the UUA, #2 has been removed from the list of Principles and expanded into the list of Sources. It was Rev. Harry Hoehler of the UU congregation in Weston, Massachusetts who suggested doing so; though a Christian himself, he saw that continuing to single out the Judeo-Christian tradition in the list of Principles would cause needless controversy.

In 1961, the phrases free faith (line 2) and liberal religion (end of #5) were well-understood to mean what one of my seminary professors meant when he said that Unitarianism and Universalism were "religious manifestations of the Enlightenment." UUism is the result of applying Enlightenment values--reason, evidence, free expression, the right of conscience, democracy, etc.--to religion.

The free and disciplined search for truth in #1 has become our current 4th Principle: "A free and responsible search for truth and meaning." Much has been made lately of the word "responsible." In the 1961 statement "disciplined" meant "intellectually rigorous." Some have suggested to me that the change to "responsible" in 1985 reflected an attempt to introduce an ethical dimension. While this may be so, there was no thought whatever, as some assert today, that "responsible" implies that one's search for truth should be pursued with an eye to the wishes, or feelings, of outside observers.

The language at the beginning of #3--"affirm ... and promote"--is used at the beginning of our current Principles & Purposes. I have underlined the three parts of #3 that come afterward. The first, the supreme worth of every human personality, lifted directly from the 1953 Universalist statement, expresses, in humanist language, the Universalist taproot. The second, the dignity of man, expresses in humanist language the Unitarian taproot. In our current 1st Principle, "The inherent worth and dignity of every person," these have been combined, making our 1st Principle a concise statement of the most important parts of our religious heritage.

Our current 5th Principle, "the right of conscience and the use of the democratic process within our congregations and in society at large," derives from the last underlining in #3 and the right of conscience that is implied by the phrases free faith and liberal religion, as mentioned above.

\* \* \*

Here are our current Principles, unchanged since 1985. (Later revisions were confined to the Sources and guarantees of non-discrimination.) I have added the numbers and underlining.

Principles & Purposes of the UUA  
(1985; revised 1995)

We, the member congregations of the Unitarian  
Universalist Association, covenant to affirm  
and promote

- [1] the inherent worth and dignity of every person;
- [2] justice, equity and compassion in human relations;
- [3] acceptance of one another and encouragement  
to spiritual growth in our congregations;
- [4] a free and responsible search for truth and  
meaning;
- [5] the right of conscience and the use of the

[6] the goal of world community with peace,  
liberty, and justice for all;

[7] respect for the interdependent web of all  
existence of which we are a part.

--Bylaws of the UUA

\* \* \*

Since this essay originated as preparation for a UUMUAC event, held February 6, 2021, titled "The Struggle for Unitarian Universalism: Defending Our Seven Principles," let me end with the observation that the 1st, 4th, and 5th Principles are under attack by the UU national leadership. This is why those three are underlined above, and why I underlined corresponding parts of the 1961 UUA statement.

That the 1st Principle is under attack is clear from the following excerpt from the 2018-2022 Congregational Study Action Issue: Undoing Intersectional White Supremacy. While CSAIs come up from the grassroots, they do not see the light of day unless approved by the UUA Board of Trustees.

*Decentering whiteness calls us to  
decenter individual dignity  
for our collective liberation.*

( <https://www.uua.org/action/process/csais/undoing-intersectional-white-supremacy/2018-2022-csai-undoing-intersectional> )

That the 4th Principle, and Enlightenment values in general, are under attack is clear from this excerpt from a letter, signed by more than 300 "white ministers" within 24 hours of the initial distribution (June 21, 2019) of Rev. Todd Eklof's book *The Gadfly Papers*. Ultimately more than 500 signed.

*We recognize that a zealous  
commitment to "logic" and "reason"  
over all other forms of knowing  
is one of the foundational  
stones of White Supremacy Culture.*

( <https://www.muusja.org/reprint-an-open-letter-from-white-uu-ministers> )

That the 5th Principle is under attack is clear from the behavior of the UUA Board of Trustees over the last decade or so. Around 2007 the Board appointed a Fifth Principle Task Force to investigate concerns that General Assembly (GA) is not very democratic. The primary conclusion of the resulting report, issued in 2009, was that

*GA is not really democratic.*

(for the full report, type "Fifth Principle Task Force"  
into the search box at [www.uua.org](http://www.uua.org) )

Today the UUA is even less democratic. In 2012 the admitted unwieldy UUA Board of about 25 Trustees, most of whom represented specific geographic areas, was reduced to about 12 who are all elected at-large. With no Trustee having a specific constituency, it has become so difficult to be elected Trustee that since 2012 no candidate for Trustee (candidates are chosen by a Nominating Committee) has been opposed. In other words, not a single Trustee serving today has been elected.

A final attack comes in the form of a proposed 8th Principle.

*[8] Journeying toward spiritual wholeness  
by building a diverse, multicultural Beloved Community  
by our actions that accountably dismantle racism and  
other oppressions in ourselves and our institutions.*

(proposed by the 2017 General Assembly)

This unwieldy statement (1) is not a principle, (2) is implied by the existing principles, (3) smuggles in terms from Critical Race Theory that are not widely understood (like "accountably" and even "racism"), and (4) would make the Principles less inclusive than they are at present by requiring everyone to prioritize racism over other concerns.

## **REVIEW OF THE CLAIM THAT BLACK PEOPLE, INDIGENOUS PEOPLE AND PEOPLE OF COLOR ARE HARMED IN UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ORGANIZATIONS THAT IS MADE IN THE REPORT "WIDENING THE CIRCLE OF CONCERN"**

Allan Pallay, 5 April 2021

### **Introduction**

In the report called "Widening the Circle of Concern" from the Commission on Institutional Change, the claim is made that Black people, Indigenous people and people of color (BIPOC) are harmed by biased behaviors by Unitarian Universalists (UUs) or by UU cultural features; and the report implies that this harm is both substantial and common in UU organizations. This statement will subsequently be referred to as the claim. This claim is based on data collected from BIPOC on self-perceived oppressive treatment in UU organizations. This review evaluates the degree to which the presentation of these data supports this claim.

The claim is the reviewer's summary based on a variety of statements in the report. The following are a sample of some of those statements: "The vast majority of people of color and others from identities marginalized within Unitarian Universalism had experienced discriminatory and oppressive incidents..." (Page xxv); "... gathering spaces for people of color are essential to help counter the ignorance and aggression these beloved UUs encounter within so many of our congregations" (Page 60); "...Black people, Indigenous people, people of color and members of other historically marginalized groups are injured over and over again." (Page 129); "... this report has endeavored to gather data on the current inequitable and oppressive treatment of people of color within Unitarian Universalism..." (Page 117); "Religious professionals of color experience these conditions alongside aggressions, disregard for their authority, and outright discriminatory and racist conditions..." (Page 72); "Black people, Indigenous people, and people of color encounter ignorance and aggression in many Unitarian Universalist organizations..." (Page 37).

The word "substantial" in the claim summarizes the words oppressive, aggression, discriminatory and racist used in the report to describe harm. The word "common" in the claim is used to summarize the assertion that a "vast majority" of BIPOC are harmed in "so many of our congregations." It also relates to the assertion that BIPOC are "harmed over and over again", and to the phrase "current and inequitable oppressive treatment." Those phrases imply each BIPOC experiences multiple incidents of harm.



It should be noted that the aim of the study was to "... oversee an audit of racism within UUA practices and policies and set priorities and make recommendations for anti-oppression strategies...while holding the Association accountable ..." (Page xxvii). This review evaluates only a narrow aspect of the report that is related to the characterization of racism: is the claim defined above consistent with the presentation of the data that came from the audit of racism? The review also briefly comments on the anti-oppression strategies.

### **Assumptions of Commissioners**

It was not the aim of the study was to determine whether the claim was true. It appears that the commissioners believed it to be largely true at the beginning. This can be seen in two of the "premises" that the commissioners stated at the start of the study: 1) "The covenants that bind us together, both within our own faith and to our partners in the world, are frayed and broken by the domination of white supremacy culture among us"; 2) "To keep Unitarian Universalism alive, we must center the voices that have been silenced or drowned out and dismantle elitist and exclusionary white privilege, which inhibits connection and creativity." (Page xviii).

The work of any researcher is influenced by their preconceptions. Thus, it is possible that the commissioner's prior beliefs affected the methods and the analysis techniques used to characterize the extent and severity of racism in UUism. Therefore, the strength of the case for the claim is partly related to whether enough detail about the methods of data collection and analysis techniques are given to enable their evaluation.

### **Assessing Data Collection and Analysis Methods**

Specifically, in order to assess whether BIPOC commonly experience oppressive treatment, we need to be able to assess whether the participants in the study were a reasonably representative sample of the 19,000 BIPOC members of Unitarian Universalist congregations. Thus, we need to know the details related to how the participants were recruited. We also need to know how information was solicited. In addition, it would be necessary for the report to show clearly described summary statistics to back up verbal summaries. This is particularly important since the commissioners decided that the raw data will not be available for review for the next 5 years.

### **Three Sources of Data**

The report used three sources of data to characterize the harm done to BIPOC by UUs.

#### **Call for Testimony**

The first source of data was referred to as a "Call for Testimony." These calls were issued repeatedly on the commissioner's website and other venues throughout the three years of collecting data. Testimony took the form of individual interviews and submitted statements. The testimony was solicited as follows: "The commission ask you to respond to the following question with specific examples. In what ways have you or your group or community been hurt by current racist and culturally biased attitudes and practices within Unitarian Universalism?"(Page xxiv). Clearly, this method did not produce a representative sample of the opinion of BIPOCs. It only included data from those who felt themselves harmed.

#### **Focus Groups**

The following is a quote from the report that defines the second source. "Focus Groups—For the first two years of our work, we convened focus groups in a variety of settings, including the 2018 and 2019 General Assemblies, regional and district meetings, meetings of professional associations, Finding Our Way Home (the annual meeting of religious professionals who are Black, Indigenous, and people of color), and online. These were designed to elicit feedback from a variety of groups. In 2019, we also extended invitations to those who had voiced concern about

anti-oppression work. At the 2018 General Assembly, all participants were invited to take part in focus groups.”(Page xxi)

As indicated above, at the 2018 General Assembly (GA) all attendees were invited to participate. It should be noted that at this GA the speakers and workshops (on the topic of race), the prior communications from the UUA (e.g. the UU World) and the commissioners all promoted the white supremacy culture paradigm. In this atmosphere it is a reasonable possibility that some of the attendees at GA who disagreed with the commissioners might have felt uncomfortable participating in the focus groups. To help evaluate this, it would have been helpful if the wording of the invite were given. At the 2019 GA the commissioners decided to “also extend invitations” to those who had concerns about the commission’s anti-oppression work.

No information was given on how people were recruited in all the other focus groups; particularly how BIPOC were recruited. It is therefore not possible to evaluate whether the methods used were likely to produce a representative sample of the population of BIPOC. However, we do know that at the beginning of the study the commissioners stated a number of “commitments” that guided their work. One of them was “to... collect stories of those who have targets of harm or aggression because of racism within existing UUA culture” (page xviii). That is, the commissioners were committed to find the stories of harm. There was no mention of a commitment to collect a representative sample. This is consistent with the premises of the study described in the last section.

Taken as a whole, based on the information given, it is unclear whether the participants in focus groups were a reasonably representative sample. [But there is a reasonable possibility that it was biased toward those who felt harmed.](#)

Finally, the wording that was used to solicit responses from participants in focus groups was not described. We therefore can not evaluate how it might have influenced the reports given by the participants.

### **Surveys**

The following is a quote that defines the third source. “Surveys—We conducted several surveys at General Assembly, one through the GA app, which was accessible to all General Assembly participants.” More will be said about this in the results section.

### **The Interests and Knowledge of Participants: the Accuracy of Testimony**

We would expect under-reporting of racism from white participants because those who have acted or spoke in racist ways or were racially insensitive are likely to rationalize or deny that behavior. In addition, we would expect that white participants would be unaware of all the racism BIPOC suffer. We would expect some degree of over-reporting by BIPOC due to the recognition that reporting racism could encourage special programs from which they could benefit (as do exist in the commissioner’s recommendations).

### **Results of Study**

There were 3 types of data presentations that were used to illustrate and support the claim.

## **Avatars and Other Testimonies**

The Commissioners report that they collected many stories of harm. The main way they report these stories was by the creation of what they call avatars. Each of the avatars reads like a story from an individual. However, the commissioners state, "The avatars are composites of the testimonies that were submitted and also those that came out of the focus groups." (Page xxv). There were approximately 30 discrete incidents across the five avatars. Three of the avatars related to BIPOC. They also reported incidents that directly quoted testimonies from about 11 respondents. Almost all the incidents involved BIPOC.

Some of the incidents were clearly racist. Two examples include: a member of a church told a participant that they "liked coming to a place where almost everyone was white." (Page 60). "During seminary, I was called a quota filler, was told it would be easier if I were not there." (Page 66). Some that have resulted in distress could possibly have little to do with race or culture. Examples included differences of opinion: one respondent was distressed because, "my ideas on how to accomplish the objectives..." were not accepted (Page 76). Or mistakes: one respondent writes, "I was invited to preach at a colleague's church and he put a fellow woman of color colleague's picture on the front cover with my name." (Page 66). Or differing political philosophies: one respondent was distressed because her suggestion that the church should work on "ending white supremacy culture" was not accepted (Page 46). However, the majority of the incidents appeared to this reviewer to have a negative racial/cultural component. But the reviewer can't judge whether the incidents amounted to substantial harm. Finally, it is likely that for some of these incidents the offending party would tell a different story.

There are a number of problems with this presentation of data; 1-With regard to the avatars, we can't assess how accurately they reflected the testimony actually given by the respondents. 2-The commissioners could not assess the accuracy of the testimonies. 3-We do not know how many BIPOC are represented in these stories. However, this data shows that some number of BIPOC felt themselves harmed (and some multiple times) by biased attitudes and behaviors by some UUs. This is a significant finding.

## **Statistical Table From a Survey**

The report presents results from the following survey question. It was asked at one or more General Assemblies. "Has your community experienced an incident of tension around race or other forms of oppression?" The responses were: 56% yes; 21% no; 23% I don't know. There were 621 respondents.

There are several things that need to be considered in evaluating this result. The question in the survey asks about "communities." Since there are usually multiple attendees from each congregation we don't know how many communities were involved. Nor do we know how many BIPOC were involved. We don't know how many incidents are associated with each "yes" response since the question asked whether "an incident" was experienced and the number of incidents was not requested. Also, there was no time frame was given. Finally, since the question highlighted the word "tension," it is unclear how consistent an answer of yes is with the claim that uses words like aggression, racist and discriminatory.

In addition, we don't know how representative the 621 respondents to this survey were, given that thousands attend a single GA (2,814 attended the 2018 GA). Therefore, it is important to be able to assess whether the wording used to invite participants seemed to encourage those who had views consistent or inconsistent with the claim. Minimal information on this was presented in the report. Also, we don't know how the opinions of people who attend GA are representative of the larger population of UUs. Clearly, to determine the opinion of white and BIPOC UUs in general, a total or random sample of all UUs would need to be surveyed (say based

on the mailing list of the UU World).

Nevertheless, 348 people reported an incident in their community. We can therefore infer that some number of BIPOC felt themselves harmed in these incidents. This is a significant finding since even a single incident of harm is reason for concern.

### **Summary Statement Supporting the Claim**

The following statement was made in support of the claim. "The vast majority of people of color and others from identities marginalized within Unitarian Universalism had experienced discriminatory and oppressive incidents or cultures within Unitarian Universalist circles." (Page xxv).

The word "majority" in the above statement implies a proportion: some number of BIPOC who experienced discriminatory and oppressive incidents in UU circles divided by the number in a sample. To assess whether the proportion implied by the above statement is informative about whether discriminatory and oppressive incidents were common in UU circles we need know who was in the sample. This is needed to enable us to assess whether the sample was likely to be reasonably representative of BIPOC in general. This information was not given in the report. However, we can consider each of the 3 sources of data to evaluate whether they could be used to support the above statement.

First, participants who submitted testimony of harm: Unless this group's number approached the total number of BIPOC (about 19,000) it would not support the assertion of a vast majority since it only included those who experienced harm. However, it would be informative in assessing the magnitude of the problem. Unfortunately, this number was not revealed. Next the focus group participants: It is unclear whether the participants in focus groups were a representative sample. But there is a reasonable possibility that it was biased toward those who felt harmed. (see: Focus Groups section).

Finally, the survey: The report shows the response to two questions. One was uninformative about the statement we are considering. The other question (Has your community experienced an incident of tension around race or other forms of oppression?) was partly informative. Note that it highlights the word tension and refers to the respondent's community. That question only partly relates to the assertion of discrimination and oppression of individual BIPOC. In addition, it was not clear that the sample in the survey was reasonably representative (See section: Statistical Table from a Survey). Thus, the data given in the report give only very weak evidence in support of the assertion stated above.

### **Harm to BIPOC Due to Specific Policies and Practices**

The report asserts that a number of specific practices or policies cause harm to BIPOC. For the assertion of harm by a practice or policy to be demonstrated as true, a necessary condition for this review is that at least one participant report that they feel harmed by it. For the harm caused by a specific policy or practice to be considered widespread or common, a reasonable case needs to be made using presented data, that most BIPOC feel the same way. The data to enable such cases to be made is not given in the report for any specific policy or practice. Therefore, this review does not consider specific policies and practices in evaluating the claim.

### **Commentary on Implications of the Conclusions: Transformation, Truth and Reconciliation**

The commissioners write, "The time for reconciliation may be passed. What may be needed is a ... truth and transformation process ..." (Page 167).

Truth: I agree with the need for "truth", although in this case, I would say accuracy. I believe we need to be very careful not to minimize the harm experienced by BIPOC in UU circles



At the same time, we need to be very careful not to overstate the racism of white UUs or racism in the culture associated with white UUs. It is simply unfair to do otherwise. The report has not been careful in its use of words since it implies that harm to BIPOC by white racism or racism in cultural features associated with white UUs is both substantial and common; when it is unclear how common it is.

**Transformation:** In the report the commissioners propose many changes aimed at transforming UUism's alleged white supremacy culture to one that they believe is more equitable and inclusive. It is beyond the scope of this review to evaluate the merits of the specific proposals. But it is fair to say that many of them will increase the importance of identity in UU life. This increase has the following potential implications: more of a focus on what divides us and less on what unites us; more of a focus on judging people based on their group identity and less on their character and abilities; more of a focus on evaluating policies based on the interests of identity groups and less on their overall merit. Some UUs, may see these implications as problematic. If racism in UU circles is common the argument for general transforming policies is strengthened despite these potential downsides. But if substantial bias is limited to a relatively small number of UUs in a relatively small number of congregations then policies that focus on these problematic congregations and emphasize reconciliation may be of greater value. Below I consider this point of view.

**Reconciliation:** This review concludes that the report shows that some number of BIPOC were harmed by biased behaviors by some UUs or by some UU cultural features. It is unclear how many, but any number is too many. The racism that our fellow black brother and sister UUs face in society at large makes their lives, on average, more difficult than whites. Our standard should be that all UU churches are places of complete welcome and comfort. Therefore, below I outline an approach that has the following values: it supports BIPOC and at the same time is respectful of white UUs; it is likely to be useful regardless of whether white bias is common or not; it will improve our understanding of the nature of the problems since the alleged harmers will have a chance to tell their side of the story; and most of all, it aims at reconciliation.

I suggest that UUs should be encouraged to bring up any problem related to race or identity at their churches and try to work them out between the parties involved. If either side in a dispute feel that it is not getting resolved to their satisfaction (be it a BIPOC or a white person) the UUA should have trained mediators that can be brought in. The job of a mediator is to attempt to fairly evaluate the point of view of both sides. If racism is clearly the source of the problem, it should be called out; but it should not be assumed a-priori that whites are oppressors and BIPOCs are victims. If racism is not involved, or there is ambiguity about whether racism is involved, the mediator should encourage understanding, compromise and reconciliation. Importantly, mediators should be trained to understand both the white supremacy culture ideology and alternative ideologies (example: traditional liberal ideology), but should not view problems solely through the lens of any particular one. I recognize that this requires a mediator to have a nimble flexible mind and there are times when a compromise can't be reached; but I think it should always be tried. Always tried because I believe that the only way UUism can thrive as a multiracial multicultural organization is by working toward a meeting of hearts and minds across identity groups.