

2020

Interview with Barbara Tint

Barbara Tint

Patricia A. Schechter

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/conflict_oralhist



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Oral History Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), and the [Public History Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Tint, Barbara and Schechter, Patricia A., "Interview with Barbara Tint" (2020). *Conflict Resolution Oral Histories*. 8.

https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/conflict_oralhist/8

This Interview is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Conflict Resolution Oral Histories by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Narrator	Barbara Tint (BT)
Interviewer	Patricia Schechter (PAS)
Date/Location	29 May 2020
Date range of events	Approximately 1990 to present
Length of Interview	Approximately 1 hour
Also participating in interview	Stephanie Vallance (SV); Alex Ibarra (AI); Jake Hutchins (JH); Alex Berg (AB); Oona Fisher Campbell (OFC); Liza Schade (LS); Lady J (LJ); Cleophas Chambliss (CC)
Transcribed by	P. Schechter
Date of Transcription	16 July 2020
Audited by/date of audit	Carolee Harrison, October 2020

Project Keywords	Conflict resolution, peace studies, COVID-19 pandemic, activism, psychology
Specific Keywords	Australia, psychology, Reed College, Israel, Palestine, interdisciplinary studies
Proper Names Mentioned	Oscar Arias, Johan Galtung, Mary Zinkin, Rob Gould, Tom Hastings
Headnote	Barb Tint was an early faculty hire into the Conflict Resolution program at PSU, around the year 2000. This interview describes her path to her academic career from the counseling world into conflict resolution in a number of international settings. The interview took a theoretical turn when students probed the philosophical underpinnings to Tint's work.

PAS: Today is May 29, 2020 and I'm Patricia Schechter. We have PSU students researching the history of Conflict Resolution. We are going to be interviewing Barb Tint, a faculty member. We'll introduce the interviewers and then we will begin with a round of questions.

[Liza Schade, Alex Berg, Alex Ibarra, Jake Hutchins, Stephanie Vallance, Lady J, Cleophas Chambliss, and Oona Fisher Campbell introduce themselves]

SV: As Patricia said, we have now heard from nine individuals, and one of the most fascinating things that we have all heard is how each person came to the field of conflict resolution, as well as the actual program. So I am curious as to what drew you to the field of conflict resolution?

BT: Like many things, sometimes in life it was a bit of a happy accident. I was a practicing clinical psychologist at Reed College and doing a lot social and political work on the side. I kind of knew that I was antsy to be doing something else; that clinical work was no longer really the work I felt called to do. My daughter was four years old at the time and I wanted to go live abroad before she started school. Nobody wanted to pay me to live on a beach and learn a language—go figure!—and a very long story short, I went to a lecture one night to see Oscar Arias speak at Reed. He was the former president of Costa Rica and he won the Nobel Peace Prize for demilitarizing Central America. He had used all the Peace Prize money to start a Foundation for Peace and Human Rights in Costa Rica. Some bells went off, and I just knew that that what I was called to do.

At the time, I was also looking for that “What am I going to do if I take a year off?” And I ended up, somewhat accidentally, with a fellowship to study abroad, and I ended up starting my Ph.D. in international conflict resolution at the University of Melbourne in Australia. And the rest is, as you would say, history.

SV: I wonder if you would be willing to share a bit more about the language of “being called” as well as “happy accidents”... and there is some synergy [with how others have described their process]. I wonder if you could describe what was missing in your work in clinical psychology that you felt needed to be filled by something else, even if you didn’t know what it was.

BT: I think it’s a personal thing for everybody. It’s where you feel alive and where you feel less alive.

Being a clinical therapist was to a large degree very passive, sitting and listening all day long. And very heavy work; not that the work I do now isn’t heavy. So I think I always knew I would enjoy teaching and facilitating and working in dynamic group processes more than being one-on-one.

And, I felt the micro of individual problems was not what I was most passionate about. I mean, I was good and I helped people. But I was more drawn to the social and political issues facing our world, and even when I worked with people individually I always had that lens on. So I was happy to be able to shift my lens in that direction. When I got to Australia, I had no idea that this was a thing. When I got there, there was a group of peace psychologists that meet every two years somewhere around the world, and the year that I went to Australia, Melbourne, where I was doing my Ph.D., was the one hosting that meeting. So I got to Melbourne and I met 50 people from all around the world to an invited-only symposium who called themselves peace psychologists. They were psychologists, but using that discipline to look at issues of peace, conflict and violence. It was a thing and I didn't know it! And there I was in its lap. I was very lucky.

SV: I hope I don't step on anyone else's toes—there is something that you mentioned there that is interesting to me, about the individual nature of what you were doing and the larger scope. We've heard about that even within the department. Could you speak a little bit more to the relationship between Conflict Resolution on an individual scale versus the international lens?

BT: The micro and the macro are connected, obviously; any individual is living out the stories that they have been part of. The women in my individual practice who were struggling with eating disorders were struggling with issues related to gender and all the things that came along with that. People of color in my practice were struggling with internalized oppression. I don't know that we named it that at the time, but that was what it is. Or class issues. Or all kinds of issues. We are all walking the stories that we have been in, and that we have been told and that society has told about us. A lot of that is not always in people's awareness. It's in some people's awareness more than others. I'm not sure that my lens at the time that I was doing clinical work was fully attuned, but I was always interested in systemic issues. So even as a clinician I had done a lot of systems training, family therapy training, intergenerational issues; so looking at systems of which we are a part, so we could be part of a family system, we could be part of a community system, we could be part of a social system or political system. But at the end of the day none of us are individuals without being part of the systems that have informed our life experience.

AI: You've talked about how you have done various different aspects of Conflict Resolution working with different systems of oppression. In your experience, do you feel, having worked in all these different areas, that there is a

difference between conflict resolution and peace? That these two different categories are separate or together in your mind?

BT: They are connected. Again, I think a lot depends on how you define these things, which I'm guessing you've spent some time doing. Even the language [is fine-grained]. There is conflict management, conflict resolution, conflict transformation, peace studies, and peace research. There's all kinds of things. Conflict resolution is dealing more with the micro, whether it is more interpersonal or intergroup.

Conflict transformation tends to be more looking at the systems and structures that we are in. Peace? There's negative peace, there is positive peace. I think if your question is "are they connected," I would say yes, of course.

AI: Can you elaborate on what your definition of negative and positive peace is?

BT: This distinction comes from Johan Galtung, who was one of our foundational scholars and thinkers in the field. Negative peace is the cessation of direct violence. If people stop killing each other, we no longer have wars, we no longer have direct violence; then it's negative peace. Negative peace is a part of positive peace; you can't have positive peace without negative peace, but you have negative without positive peace.

Positive peace also includes structures of violence that are replaced with structures of equity. Addressing environmental degradation, and economic inequity and issues of poverty, and issues of race, and patriarchy. So if we have no more direct violence in the world but we still have the structural violence where people are dying every day from preventable disease, or people are dying from unjust racial laws, then we don't have positive peace. That's traditionally how those two concepts are thought of.

JH: Something we've been trying to capture with this project is addressing what it is that the conflict resolution program itself was attempting to address when it was formed. The best way we found to put that is if conflict resolution was the answer to something, what is your sense of what the question was when Conflict Resolution was being formed?

BT: I'm sure you have heard from others that the name went through a few iterations, and it was actually going to be Peace and Conflict Resolution, and the word "peace" was taken out, because I think it was kind of a hot button at the time as we were, I believe, just during or just

post-Iraq I. We were trying to get into the University and trying not to be controversial, so that's the decision that was made at that time.

I think that Rob Gould who was our core founder had a very strong peace activism background. I think it was the language of the time. I think that Conflict Resolution was seen as a new growing discipline, and I think it was language that was used in order to be much more umbrella than it might be seen as now, in order to deal with issues of conflict, war, violence. All of it. I think the goal was to address the micro and the macro; the practical as well as the theoretical; and the activist dimension.

JH: One thing that has come up multiple times is this pivot point around the Gulf War and how it impacted the development of the program. We've received varying degrees of answer on the relevance of it. Could you unpack why you think it was so controversial, or how the Gulf War created the use of the language of peace in the development of the program?

BT: I wasn't around for that exact decision. I was the third one in the door, so Rob and Mary [Zinkin] co-founded and I came in a year or two later. I'm not sure, but my guess is that universities are not attempting to

be political, so the goal was to create a program that wasn't going to hit those hot buttons of being too political. So if we were seen as advocating for peace at a time when our country was at war, it could clearly have been seen as more of a political agenda. But who could have a problem with "conflict resolution"?

JH: That's interesting, because it seems that separating peace, either micro or macro, but especially macro, would be a difficult thing to separate from politics.

BT: Well, it's not that we weren't perfectly happy to acknowledge that we were going to be discussing politics, but we had to be seen as not having a particular political agenda. Conflict resolution is not value-free. It's not. But I think a lot of it is also university politics and what was going to open the door and what's going to close the door. I think a decision was made at the time—again, I wasn't part of that decision—but my understanding is that [university politics] was a lot of it. Rob and Mary would have the skinny on that.

AB: That was a lovely discussion on the macro of conflict resolution, or the purpose of conflict resolution. and how it came to be. Could you say a few words about your sense of how it might have either answered or met student demands or interests on campus? Specifically, how it fit into the fabric of the PSU campus and what the students were wanting at the time in terms of conflict resolution.

BT: At the time, we started as a master's degree only, which was the trend in the field. So we were seen as very interdisciplinary. We were in the Philosophy department. Rob was a philosopher, I was a psychologist, and Mary actually had a Ph.D. in interdisciplinary conflict resolution. We had sociologists, political scientists. So we were very interdisciplinary, which was an advantage for reaching a wide variety of students.

We offered classes that really, again, met the spectrum of all kinds of things; so my very first class was Psychology of Conflict Resolution, and I taught it at both the micro and the macro, so that students who were interested in figuring out how to be better at work were getting what they needed and students who wanted to be dealing with issues of global war and peace were getting what they needed. So, a lot of the classes transcended both the micro and macro. I think that just the concept of conflict resolution had a broad appeal because most people would like to be better at this practice. It was new, it was cutting-edge and in not very much time we were the biggest program on the West Coast. I think it was also good timing. The world was ready for more of this. Again, the field was growing, so we hadn't been an active academic discipline much prior to that. So we were early adopters.

AB: Do you see a connection or a fit with the conflict resolution program and student anti-war activism, which might be considered outside of the academic mainstream, or kind of adjacent to it. Do you see a connection there?

BT: Of course. As an interdisciplinary faculty, all of us have our different orientations. So Tom Hastings lives very heavily in the world of activism and very clearly, transparently, in the world of nonviolence and that's his practice. I would say that it is not separate from academia. The field of nonviolence and the field of activism are supported by theory and supported by engaged scholarship; they are supported by rhetoric. There are all kinds of ways in which that intersects multiple academic arenas. So even though people are on the street, it doesn't mean that it is not informed by good academic thought and scholarship. Again, everybody in our department

has a bit of a different focus and different orientation. So the students who are really driven by [activism] are going to find Tom.

PAS: [holding *PSU Magazine* with article on 1970 strike] I just have to do a public service announcement. Every history project, every research project, as we know, is shaped by its own moment. This is our moment—in terms of our buzz about our own campus or our own understanding of our campus—I think this group, including me, has been refocused on narratives about PSU as an activist campus and students as mobilized and globally conscious. I think that's been both boiling and slow-bubbling in our inquiry this term, in a way that it might not have had this bright red issue [holding magazine] not come out in the last month. That's a little of our own context.

BT: I don't think I've seen that.

PAS: This was the student strike at PSU in 1970 in protest of the Kent State killings. There was a peaceful encampment here and as it was called off and as the encampment broke down, the police got very aggressive and there were some injuries and a melee. And then there was a march and a protest at City Hall and subsequent about the police violence. And there is a beautiful documentary film that the students shot at the time. There is much to say about this moment, not the least of which is that it is the 50th anniversary of this event on our campus this exact year! And then Rob is not in here, as someone who had been a draft counsellor for years on campus. So part of what we are trying to do is fill some of those silences—as you say, people live with that story that they are told or given or that they read in a textbook—and then we [historians] come back and we dig a little deeper.

BT: The magazine is probably sitting in my mailbox on campus.

PAS: It's also online, because of the pandemic. This is the PSU alumni magazine. If you go to UComm you can find it. We were very taken with the documentary [*The Seventh Day, 1970*] that the students made. It's just haunting, and the grainy black and white just takes you right back in time. Very powerful. And just so you know, this anniversary is going to be good for CR because next spring [in 2021] hopefully when we do our celebration, this [protest] anniversary is being postponed, so it will be an interesting confluence of those two commemorations.

OFC: Talking about origins: the alumni magazine was talking about PSU as an activist campus. One question we have is, what is one thing about the origins of the Conflict Resolution program that you think would be most important for the PSU community and the Portland community to know?

BT: I'm thinking of a few things. One is that I want to circle back to the last comment and question about activism. Activism is not just taking to the streets. I think teaching is a form of activism; bell hooks writes about teaching to transgress; it's one of her books. I want to be clear that when we talk about activism [in the context of CR], it's not just Tom because he's on the streets. All of us who are trying to change the world are activists in some way. We are just using different tools to do it. I do think that teaching is a form of activism.

Back to the question you've posed, one of the important things is that we made something of nothing. Rob, in particular, and Mary had a vision, brought it to campus, found people to support it, and moved forward. As I said, I was the third one in the door, but they were already in, and I think it was remarkable. And we lived for many years as a self-support program which meant that whatever we made, we made. Whatever we didn't, we didn't. We had large numbers of students; we were speaking to a large constituency of people who were interested in this material. We found a way to really address theory, research, and practice in this area. We were early enough in the field—as I said—we were the largest program on the West Coast; for a while, I think maybe we were the only program on the West Coast.

Also, we really did it by interfacing with a large aspect of the campus. Our entire initial cohort of adjunct faculty came from political science, came from anthropology, came from communications, came from philosophy, and came from different dimensions. We had to really insinuate ourselves, insert ourselves in a way that we were kind of a square peg in a round hole. We started very backwards from a lot of units and there was good, bad, and ugly of that. But here we are. So I guess that's my answer.

OFC: I've been looking into a lot of other programs... When Portland State's program was formed, the field of Conflict Resolution and Peace Studies were very new, but we weren't the first. So I'm interested to know how much communication, if any, with other universities that have similar programs, like Kansas University has a program that is similar, and there are some others. Was there much communication between those programs; was there any crossover?

BT: Sure. At the time there weren't that many programs. George Mason was the first, and obviously we were in conversation with them. But since we began, there have been many, many programs started, and in fact we were instrumental in helping the University of Oregon launch their program [in dispute resolution]. I actually still teach for them occasionally as an adjunct. We were very core to their development. We had cross-disciplinary faculty—Vandy Kanyako—comes from Notre Dame and Eastern Mennonite. At a time when a number of years ago when we went through a program review, we were certainly in conversation and looking at other programs.

LS: Before I get to the last question, I wanted to ask about your experience in Australia compared to the United States. I'm assuming you did conflict resolution for your Ph.D. in Australia, right?

BT: My Ph.D. was in international conflict resolution, yes.

LS: So what are some of the differences or similarities between the two countries? Is it the same kind of issues that they deal with? What's your opinion of that?

BT: Are you asking about the comparison of the academic programs, or are you asking about the social issues that the different countries are facing?

LS: I would ask specifically more about the programs... what are the differences in the two programs between the two countries?

BT: Australia has the British system, so when I went there it was more heavily research-based. I went for a year and took four seminars and then the rest was research-based. It was very different from the U.S. system where you are doing a number of years of course work and comps and all those things. It was both a blessing and a curse that I landed there, but it was more heavily research-based.

LS: What kind of research were you doing?

BT: I did my research on Israel and Palestine, on collective memory and conflict resolution.

LS: The last question on our list is the open question on our list. Is there anything else—a story, an accomplishment—that you want to share? Anything that is really important to you that you want us to know and to maybe include in our exhibit, etc.?

BT: I guess, as you know, history is important; and I think that understanding the context of where things were when we started is important. Understanding that we were often kind of seen as the bastard child on campus. I think there were programs that were threatened by us because they saw us coming in and doing our own thing and not being in the system, right? That was both innovative and different. I think really our development went from that to becoming more a part of the system. I think that has its advantages and challenges, needless to say.

I also think that maybe that one of the things that is wishful thinking on my part is that the campus and the university would see the importance of what we bring to life on campus. There are all kinds of things that I think what we see, what we know, what we do, can help on campus.

And I think often there are missed opportunities there. I guess that's what I would say.

LS: I have one more question. We have talked about this issue with other interviewees, and that is how we can make PSU a more inclusive campus. I was just transcribing another interview that I did and we were talking about how on campus there is the air of "Everybody's there, but they are kind of separated" into different centers. That's part of the conversation. What do you think about how we can make the campus more inclusive?

BT: So when you say inclusive, do you mean "less siloed," or do you mean inclusive around diversity and equity?

LS: Both! Less separated—so we are all coming together more—and then also programs of inclusion.

BT: Well, the silo phenomenon is unfortunately pretty endemic to higher education because of the way we are structured in systemic courses. So if we don't get any time to collaborate across departments, or any benefits for departments to cross-list things, it [breaking down silos] is not likely to happen because people are busy, already overly busy. So the cross-pollination and the collaboration and the breaking down of silos, which I share as a value, is something that will have to happen above and beyond people's already over-burdened plates. I have collaborated with different people and different departments. Collaborative scholarship, collaborative projects, serving on committees where people from other departments are there... there are ways [to collaborate], but it's a big campus and unless there are structural or systemic forces creating the conditions for [collaboration] I think it is going to be very difficult for individuals do that.

And as far as the larger question of equity and inclusion, we are again, a microcosm in a larger world, needing to continue to work at it very intentionally, very deliberately, very consciously. We need practices that reflect our values. We need leadership to be naming and practicing the kinds of things that are going to create more inclusion. We need our hiring practices to be intentional. We need voices to be heard and represented. We need to address things on a cultural/systemic level. If we want to have more inclusive practices, what about a system that says the only scholarship that counts is if you are the first author? So it's those kinds of things that have to really be addressed at the systemic level.

We have to listen to each other, I guess would be the short answer.

LS: Thank you so much for answering all of our questions!

PAS: I'd like to open up to Cleophas and Lady J. They've been very dedicated members of this history project and have the advantage of being actual or former CR students. Happy to give some time...

CC: It's good to hear you talk about the systemic issues, but I think that is part of the problem. The systemic nature of it all. We keep talking about it and having consulting about it, but we are not doing the "breaking down of the systems" that create these issues. Even as we were talking earlier about peace and violence and racism, there was a reporter in St. Paul this morning, a CNN reporter who is African American, he ended up getting handcuffed and arrested because the police did not believe that he was a reporter! Then you have this thing at [Central] Park with this bird-watcher who just wants to abide by the rules and told this lady to leash her dog,

which is a rule! And then she calls the police and almost says that he was raping her to get the police to draw their guns on him. We just keep seeing these images, but what we are not seeing are the changes that need to come about to resolve these conflicts but also to dismantle the system. Even the idea that that woman thought that she had the right—and she knew what she was doing! She lives in New York [City] and she knew exactly what she was doing. But just to *do* that! Because someone asked you to leash your dog? It's just ridiculous. Until we get to the... I think we have to talk about to bring it about... it has to be in your face for change. Otherwise it is not change. They didn't get change in St. Paul until they burned the police station down last night? Is that what we have to do? Is that what we have to do? Do we have to burn it all down?

BT: Sometimes. I'm just going to say, sometimes we do. And sometimes people don't wake up until it is so much in their face, and people don't wake up until it costs them something. I think that the systemic issues... the problems are at the micro and the macro and the solutions have to be at the micro and the macro. We need solutions that are systemic and that work with the structures, but we also need people to be educated and listening and in dialogue and being made aware... and unfortunately, like we often see, the people who are most willing to do those things are the people least likely to need it, right? So the people most needing to have a bit of an awakening around this are not necessarily the ones who are going to come to the table. It's bit by bit. But this is where the relationship between activism and leadership have to come hand-in-hand. Because either one alone is less likely to make the kind of change we are talking about.

CC: I was talking to one of my friends, and leadership has to come from the top. This administration is not leading us. I don't know where he is trying to lead us to, but it is not the straight and narrow. He is always adding vinegar to the wounds, every day. And it's hard to feel like this is our country, because you are seeing this; it's like the "revolution is being televised" or "this ignorance is being televised" and nobody is doing anything about it. And if they do something about it, there are so many conflicts! He is refusing to finance the postal service?

BT: So, CC, here's the core of conflict resolution. For many of us, as you say, it is hard for us to feel like this is our country. For others, hard as that might be to hold in our hearts, they are saying, "Finally, we have our country back."

CC: I know.

BT: And this is the essence of our work. How do we bridge that divide?

CC: It's building those bridges. How do we engage with those folk that don't want to engage? They just want...

LJ: Can I ask a question that fits in here? I heard your very eloquent comments on the micro and the macro, but I'm curious... but how do you see the "meso" being filled in? That's what I think needs to be filled in. Within the structure we can identify micro problems, we can identify macro problems, but defining what the "meso" solutions are is a lot more challenging. Everyone has their own angle of how they can come into it. In particular—since I am wrapping up the interview in a public history/CR element within an academic setting, I'm curious about what role—as a tenured member of the faculty, what is your perspective on the role that academic prestige has in thwarting—or lubricating, anywhere on the spectrum—the effectiveness of the conflict resolution work?

BT: Well, I think any of us need to use our privilege and power, in my opinion, for good, and certainly being a tenured faculty member is a privilege. It gives me a fair bit of power. The irony is that I didn't realize that I didn't have it before because I was as loud-mouthed before I was tenured as I am now. So I guess I didn't realize the game I was in [laughs] until I was already... I don't know, winning! It was very bizarre. I think the concept of academic freedom was not even in my consciousness, which is why it is a miracle that I'm still here.

I think we absolutely have to use our power in academics. Academics are considered "Track II diplomats." Track I is government and official level; Track II are citizen influentials—clergy, media, academics, and community leaders. People who have—maybe not official decision-making power—but have a lot of influence. And I think we have a lot of influence. We have a lot of influence when we speak. We have influence when we write, we have influence in the partnerships we develop, [in the community] and I think it is very important to take a stand. I think that's why, in closing thoughts, conflict resolution theoretically is a discipline where some people say we are supposed to be neutral. I don't. I don't think we are able to be neutral, and I think that we have to be conscious of our biases and conscious of our advocacy orientation, and acknowledge that our field is not a neutral field. We have values. We have values toward nonviolence, we have values toward communication, and we have values toward equity; we have values implicit in our discipline that we are promoting. So we need to be transparent about that, and articulate why and use the pulpit we have.

I have gone through a few cycles of despair in my career about wondering if anything I do will ever make a difference; after the talks broke down in Israel / Palestine, after Trump was elected. Right now, actually, in the face of violence against minorities—not that it wasn't already there—but now in the public face more because of social media. So for me the question isn't, "Is anything I do ever going to make a difference?" It is, "What can I do?" And that may be focusing my impact on a fairly narrow sphere, like where can I impact? Because if I think I am going to end racism, I'm going to go to sleep frustrated and weary every night. But if I know that I can speak up in this situation or that situation, I can feel agency. So I think that is the balance; activating our agency without putting ourselves in such a level of frustration and fatigue.

LJ: So what I hear you saying is that the “meso” aspect is just showing up where you are, and living the experience through a peace-oriented lens of CR values?

BT: Can you clarify how you are using the term “meso” ?

LJ: Just sort of as the sort of gray area between micro and macro.

BT: OK, I wasn't sure. I would say first of all that I'm not sure micro and macro are distinct anyway, right? They are different reflections of the same whole. Every act is a political act.

CC: It is!

LJ: The personal is political.

PAS: This is wonderful! I want to be a little mindful of our time and thank everyone for wonderful

Probes, and Barb for a very compelling series of narrations. In our closing breath: from your point of view—maybe with an example, because we love stories in public history—what does CR do for students? What is the student added value from your point of view, with your years of experience? If you had to sum it up...

BT: There are a million stories and the ones we know and the ones we don't know. I will tell one that I didn't know until way after the fact. This is where we get back to that idea that you don't actually know where you are having impact, so it means that you have to act in every moment in the direction that you want, not knowing whether or not there is going to be impact.

I had an international student in our program and in some of my classes from Taiwan. In my psychology class, we had to do group projects and presentations as one of the assignments. And one group went and did a very nice job, and he was in a group later in the term and he came up to me. He was absolutely almost in a panic. He said that he just couldn't do it. Part of it was language; his English wasn't native and he was very insecure. He said he was never going to be able to do that, he was never going to be able to get up in front of the class. He was never going to be able to do a good job. And he was really spinning out in a very serious way, and he was very isolated as an international student far from home. And only in retrospect now do I remember what I told him, because it came back to me much later. Which was, "I want you to go home [and remember]: Who at home matters to you?" And he identified his parents and his close friend. "I just want you to call them and talk to them, and then I want you to email me and let me know how you're doing." Because for me the essence of what I saw was his sense of disconnection. I knew he was perfectly capable of doing this project, but it was his sense of disconnection and isolation that was informing his anxiety and his fear.

I completely forgot all about that. I barely knew that I done it. He went on and did his project and it was fine. A year and a half later I got an email from one of my faculty colleagues, Rachel Cunliffe, who had been his thesis chair or project chair. And it turns out that that event was pivotal for him, and what he ended up doing was going to the office of international student affairs and working with them on helping international students feel less isolated and disconnected. He did his entire master's project on that. He developed a whole program for them on that. He delivered a beautiful presentation for his master's degree, and this was because of something that I had done that I didn't even remember.

PAS: I was there. That was Diawan Hu. I think I can say that here. I don't know if Rachel told you, but almost everyone in the room was in tears that day. [BT: I didn't know that.] You and I have been here a long time. I have been to my share of master's presentations and defenses. Almost everyone in the room was crying, including Rachel. I don't think she would mind if I told you that.

BT: Well, it's very moving for me, and very gratifying, and to me the core of this story is again, take one action to make one person's moment better. You don't know where that's going to ripple. And to me, I might never have known that if Rachel hadn't circled back to tell me. I wasn't in the room. That was her gift to me.

But this is the meso. This is the meso! Because his world was changed, he went on to change the world at the university, which is going to have a ripple effect for other students. And there are plenty of things that I've done that may have had no impact! But all I am saying is that we don't know, so we have to act as if every moment is our opportunity to make somebody's world better.

PAS: What a lovely final thought. Thank you. Thank you everyone! What a beautiful Friday. You have all given me a gift today. Great job, everybody. Thank you, have a beautiful weekend!