The Peacemaking Paradigms of Ritsumeikan and Rievaulx: Reflections on the Sixth International Conference of the International Network of Museums For Peace

Dr Clive Barrett

The Peace Museum, Bradford, UK

and Leeds Metropolitan University

The Way of Expectation

Peace is not only our goal; peace is the way to achieve it. Peacemaking is a journey. Sometimes journeys can be part of peacemaking.

It began with a journey and ended with a journey. Yet in one sense the peace museum journey is never-ending; it will always be part of the bigger peace journey, of oneself, one's accomplices, the world itself.

Whether one's journey was, like mine, trans-continental, or internal within Japan, the destination for this temporary community was Kyoto, specifically Ritsumeikan University, for the Sixth International Conference of the International Network of Museums for Peace. Some of us had come before, not only to Ritsumeikan in 1998, but to other temporary communities from Bradford 1992 to Gernika 2005. Each experience was different, but continuity was developing and those temporary communities were shaping into a permanent network. This was no longer a journey into the unknown, but a movement together of friends, old and about to be new. As Risa Ikeya, the long-suffering conference organiser remarked, 'you are not a proper conference at all; you are a meeting of friends'; friends gathering in expectation…

… In expectation of change, in ourselves, and for the museums from which we had come, and in the nature of our relationship together. As such, this was not just one week like the other fifty-one weeks in a year. This was not a business conference for alienated workers to discover new ways to create more profits for their employers. There were workers, certainly, committed workers, together with volunteers, managers, academics, campaigners and enthusiasts; there were those whose employment was in the museum sector, and those who gave their own time to bringing to reality the vision of peace museums. There was no alienation here, rather a passion for that shared task which brought the conference together. In the course of the conference that passion too would be shared, as each heard the vision that stimulated the other, and learned of the ways in which that vision was being realised in every corner of the planet.

Who visits museums, and why? Specifically, why would anybody want to visit a peace museum? The impulse of a passer-by; the need to keep the children occupied in school holidays; the reputation of the café or the gift shop; a way of passing a couple of hours when one is in an unfamiliar town… Alongside these casual motivations, people come for education and stimulation, responding to the human longing to learn and to understand. And people come because of that deepest of all human longings, the longing for peace, in their being, in their lives, their relationships, their society and our world. Peace museums are at the forefront of popular peace education; peace museums are in the vanguard of the building of a culture of peace. People visit a peace museum in order to be changed.

People and Places; Stories and Artefacts; Challenge and Change

Where there are people, there are stories. At a peace museum conference the people are special, the stories special. In Kyoto there were those who came to tell stories from opposite sides of past conflicts: from Japan and Korea, from Vietnam and the United States, from East and West in the Cold War. There were those who engaged with Power at the United Nations, and those who lived alongside the powerless in Rwanda, Sri Lanka, Cambodia. Some were remembering battles from centuries past (Austerlitz, Solferino), others educating children to prevent violence in the future (Karachi). There were Muslim and Christian, male and female, those long established in peace museums and others engaging with peace museums for the first time.

Each brought a story: always a personal story and often a contextual story. The stories that were told reflected lives that had been affected by violence or were committed to peacemaking. They showed individuals and institutions dedicated to remembering and documenting the horrors of the past, recovering the power of memory to prevent such horrors being repeated. There were stories of reconciliation and peacemaking from Islamabad to the UK The function of a museum is to present artefacts which tell stories. In a peace museum conference, the people are living artefacts, carrying their stories with them. The conference becomes a living museum, with living artefacts illuminating their own stories, both in the formal public presentations and in the informal personal conversations in the foyer, in cafes, and on coaches.

As varied as the stories themselves were the media chosen to relate those stories. Of course, in a museum conference, there were artefacts, images, film and words both spoken and written. Yet during the course of the conference there was also music, art, theatre and, most memorable of all, there was magic. An illusionist's trick:

never take the political world at face value; always check out what is claimed; an impression may not be reality. Perhaps peace, too, is not so easy to grasp; like a hologram it almost looks within reach and yet... More than just a moral lesson, though, magic is a world language. From museum professionals in Kyoto to refugee camps in Darfur, magic is a medium for laughter, education and wonder. Wonder is part of peace: being able to imagine a different world, a nonviolent world, and having the persistence to live and work to bring it closer to reality.

Wonder and imagination are most definitely part of the process of building peace museums. Peter van den Dungen delivered an outstanding keynote address documenting the story and the continuing expansion of the peace museum movement.[1] Vision and imagination have fired the enthusiasm of those who have created peace museums in such diverse cultures as those of Dayton and Tehran. I was sitting next to someone for whom this was his first engagement with the peace museum story. He was hugely impressed. Peace museums can change the culture of the world; we must spread this word.

The size of the conference was both its strength and its weakness, as one could not be in several places at once, to hear presentations that clashed on the schedule. A world of experience was on offer. There were updates from successful European institutions at Gernika and the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Museum in Geneva. But what does it mean to be a museum for peace in Rwanda, with its history of genocide? Answer: be mobile, and take touchable, unforgettable objects out to young people in order to promote discussion on values and diversity and to broaden young minds. What does it mean to be a museum for peace in Guatemala after thirty-four years of internal armed conflict? Answer: museums can help with remembering

[1] Van den Dungen, Peter, *Keynote Speech*; The Sixth International Conference of Museums for Peace, *Programs and Presentation Papers* (hereafter, *PPP*), 2008, p17-27.

the causes, remembering the consequences, and promoting reconciliation. What does it mean to be a museum for peace in Vietnam? Answer: the War Remnants Museum, which receives five hundred thousand visitors per year, recalls mass demonstrations in the United States demanding an end to the Vietnam War; there have been reunions between ex-soldiers of opposite sides and international children's art exhibitions.

The strongest presence was from the host nation. What were the Japanese stories, the Japanese memories? Conference participants were not only based at the Kyoto Museum for World Peace and the Kyoto University of Art and Design, they also visited the peace museum in Hiroshima, one of the most remarkable museums in the world. Like the sites of many peace museums, the story of the city of Hiroshima is the story of an act of war, in this case like no other single act of war before it. The museum within the peace park is called the Peace Memorial Museum; a memorial, a memory, a remembering.

There are three kinds of remembering:

- remembering what
- remembering why
- and remembering in order to.

How did the host museums score in these three kinds of remembering?

How does one convey the immensity of the inhumanity committed at Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945? The Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum tells the story of the city before and the city after. It shows in photographs, artefacts, artwork, film, the human cost of the devastation. Here is a watch, a shoe, a shirt; symbols of a human life, a human story - a story that ended in atomic hell. The artefacts tell the stories and the stories demand stillness – difficult when surrounded by parties of schoolchildren – stillness and reflection. Some I saw close to tears. There was a

shattered Buddha, a sign of mortals daring to presume they were divine, with hellish consequences. Reflection on the cold facts evokes painful questions: how could they? More scarily, could I?

Facts, though, are not enough for a peace museum. Dare one remember more? Dare one remember *why*? It takes courage to go where one would rather not travel, along roads that are painful, where memory is more conveniently forgotten or denied. It is not enough just to see Japan as victim, to see 6 August 1945 only as the start of a new era and not as the end of a previous age, with all its unacknowledged imperfections. For courage in daring to ask why, the Ritsumeikan museum deserves recognition and respect. Here is the story of Japan in the 1930s and early 1940s. Here are the stories of the brave few who resisted militarism even as it swept over a whole nation; the militarization of the masses and the courage of the few. May their stories be remembered like the stories of anti-militarist peacemaking minorities the world over. The journey travelled by a visitor to the Ritsumeikan museum neither starts nor ends with 1945. That was not the beginning of an age of peace. From Korea, Vietnam, and on to the present day, stories of inhumanity, violence and war have continued. In one conference subgroup I also heard of the ongoing militaristic nationalism of the national shrine and of new war museums in Japan. The reasons *why* live on.

Their factual stories alone, however, would not qualify Ritsumeikan and Hiroshima museums to be called Museums for Peace. Motivation matters; one must remember *in order to*. Here there came a health warning, that the consequences of peace museum exhibitions, especially in sites of war remembrance, can actually work contrary to the cause of peace. Ikuro Anzai’s Commemorative Address urged caution in displaying the tragedies of war and the suffering of its victims. Wrongly interpreted,

such displays could provoke hostile feelings against the perpetrator. Unwittingly, 'the peace museum may function as grudge generator or hatred enhancer'.[2]

For The Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum the purpose is clear: 'Never again'. As exemplified by the wall of protest letters by the mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki against every nuclear test ever conducted, to remember Hiroshima is to commit oneself to the unconditional abolition of all nuclear weapons. Every president, prime minister, emperor and monarch the world over should come to Hiroshima to remember, and to commit themselves never to use, threaten to use, or even possess nuclear weapons. And at Ritsumeikan, tucked away on an upper floor, are artefacts and stories of hope, stories of peacemakers, stories to inspire and encourage.

In the peace museum with which I am associated, in Bradford and also in Leeds in the UK, our artefacts tell stories. Bradford is the home to the original drawings of the anti-nuclear logo, known simply in many parts of the world as the peace symbol. That broken cross in a circle was drawn in 1958 to indicate the semaphore (signalling with flags) signal for ***N*** *and the semaphore signal for* ***D****:* ***N****uclear* ***D****isarmament. Those drawings from within the UK Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament allow us to tell the story of fifty years of western peace campaigners working for a world free from nuclear weapons.*

Our collection, like the stories it tells, is inclusive. These stories cross frontiers of gender, faith, geography and history.

- *There is part of the original fence keeping a 1980s women's peace camp away from US Cruise missiles at Greenham Common, England, a famous campaign*

[2] Anzai, Ikuro, *Commemorative Speech, PPP*, p30. See also, Anzai, Ikuro, *Definition of Peace, Peace Museum and Museum for Peace with Reference to Peace-Related Museums in Asia*. Ikuro Anzai, Joyce Apsel and Syed Sikander Mehdi (eds.) *Museums for Peace: Past, Present and Future*, The Organising Committee of the Sixth International Conference of Museums for Peace, Kyoto Museum for World Peace, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, 2008, p111.

to 'take the toys from the boys'; there is a colourful quilt depicting a bridge (another peace symbol), made up of many individual squares woven by Mothers for Peace, women who reached across boundaries to reduce Soviet – Western tension in the Cold War years.

- *There are religious banners with peace prayers from the Upanishads, or representing Christian pacifist groups, or Jews Organised for a Nuclear Arms Halt (JONAH); there are images of local Muslim and non-Muslim people working for peace and harmony in the diverse racially, culturally and religiously mixed communities around Bradford and Leeds.*
- *There are artefacts of peace from around the world: gestures of friendship from visiting Ukrainian schoolchildren in our Bradford gallery, a Mozambique sculpture from discarded weapons and a Japanese Article 9 fan in a Leeds gallery.*
- *Historical diversity is provided by artefacts from the nineteenth century, by materials belonging to 1916 conscientious objectors to military service, by the possessions of a Nobel Laureate (Joseph Rotblat of Pugwash), through to campaign materials of the peace movement today.*

Our artefacts tell stories, largely of peacemakers, their actions and motivations; we remember what and remember why. We remember in order to educate, to inspire, to induce change. But the experience of visiting the Ritsumeikan and Hiroshima museums produces a question that could change us. What stories are missing from our museum? The Ritsumeikan museum, especially, throws up a challenge; it dares to acknowledge the historic faults of its own people. Have we in the UK the courage to admit the crimes of British imperialism? In war, winning means never having to say sorry. Perhaps the UK, more than anywhere else, is stuck in a past from which it can

never escape unless it apologises for its historic (and current) military abuses. It has recently become acceptable to apologise for the slave trade. But can a nation apologise for imperialism when it is still engaged in imperial wars in the Middle East?

Does The Peace Museum, Bradford, have a role not only in opposing today's wars but in challenging national understanding of a glorious imperial past, even to the point of demanding a national apology for foreign abuses committed by the forefathers of today's armed forces? That goes to the heart of national consciousness of what it feels like to be British. Given the unpopularity such a move would engender, dare we do this? It's the Ritsumeikan challenge to Bradford; an indication of how this International Conference can affect the direction of museums across the world.

A Peace Museum Within a University

Peace Museums are part of a worldwide process to build up what UNESCO has called a 'culture of peace'. They are a powerful medium of peace education for a mass public. Popular education, however, is no less rigorous than university education, despite being expressed in such language, images and concepts that can be grasped by a general population. Indeed, it is important that the academic rigour that goes into understanding the causes, conduct and consequences of war and peace should be applied equally to the means by which a wider public can be enabled to share in that understanding. In other words, there needs to be – and is – an academic credibility in the pursuit of ever-improving museums for peace.

A conference and its presented papers are part of this process of academic credibility. There could not have been a better start. Upon arrival, participants were presented with the volume, *Museums for Peace: Past, Present and Future*, a volume of papers edited by Ikuro Anzai, Joyce Apsel and Syed Sikander Mehdi. This stands

alongside the report of the Fifth International Conference of Peace Museums in Gernika as the best collection of academic writing on peace museums yet published. It marked something of a coming of age for peace museum publications: despite being published by the Organizing Committee of the Sixth International Conference, this significant reflection on the theory and practice of peace museums had been produced independently of a conference report. Not only did it set the tone for the conference to follow, but it raised a further question about whether such publications should become a regular part of the international peace museum movement. Could *Museums for Peace* be seen as the first volume of an annual peer-reviewed journal?

Museums for Peace considered the various contexts in which peace museums are operating, or attempting to operate across the world. Not surprisingly, the Japanese context was the most analysed. Junko Kanekiyo and Kazuyo Yamane explored the rise of Japanese museums, how they were founded and funded, their exhibitions and educational activities, the continued reasons for their existence - simply to commemorate war experiences, or actively to promote peace education? Morio Minami warned against complacency in a culture that promoted an unhealthy nationalism and still possessed the potential for militarism. By way of contrast, from the United States, a country with modest representation in peace museum circles, Tom Flores explored a variety of peace-related institutions and the potential of several proposed grand schemes for Washington and New York. All such institutions, he suggested, were related to struggles over national identity, of who the nation is, its values, and who and what it chooses to commemorate. These articles and others, including African and European contributions, all raise the question posed by Carol Rank at the very beginning of the symposium, ‘What is a peace museum?’ Despite attempted definitions by Toshifumi Murakami, Ikuro Anzai and others, it appears that

a precise classification could be culture-specific. It may be better to ask, 'How would the concept of "peace museum" appear in any specific culture, place and time?' It is a question to be shared by academics and practitioners. As Peter van den Dunken indicated, the study of peace museums has become a recognised subject for academic research.[3] Such research at its best is not conducted in a vacuum, but is pursued by academics who are themselves peace museum practitioners and who reflect on their experience as such. The ideal setting is a peace museum within the context of the pursuit of academic excellence within a university, the model of Ritsumeikan.

The Kyoto Museum for World Peace is its own artefact; it has its own story with which visitors can engage and by which they can be inspired. It is, to date, the only example of a peace museum within an academic setting, upheld by the intellectual pursuit of peace studies. As such, it is a world leader in this model of peace education. It may be the outcome of a passion from the heart, but it is backed up by reason from the head, reflecting the intellectual rigour of its academic setting. Here is a credibility that demands to be taken seriously by the society in which it is set. This museum cannot be dismissed as reflecting the misguided passion of campaigners, those whom one right wing UK politician once derided as 'woolly hats on woolly heads'. There is no woolly thinking in the Kyoto Museum for World Peace, and it is the stronger for it.

The Ritsumeikan model of a peace museum within a university context is one that is being pursued in the UK. The Peace Museum in Bradford is looking for a major development, probably to be completed in 2011 in the neighbouring city of Leeds. A partnership has been established with Leeds Metropolitan University (probably soon to be known as Leeds Carnegie University, a name change that

[3] Van den Dungen, Peter, *Keynote Speech*, *PPP*, p21.

reflects, in part, an affinity with the peace passion of that earlier education pioneer). The Peace Museum will be based in a prime city centre location in Leeds, one of the largest UK cities. This base will be known as the Senator George Mitchell Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution, after the US politician who was pivotal in bringing about an end to hostilities in Northern Ireland in 1998. Senator Mitchell is a Visiting Professor at Leeds Metropolitan University. An important feature of this partnership is that The Peace Museum is not regarded as merely an add-on to the University. Awareness of the partnership and its potential is growing across the University, with a result that expertise from a number of faculties will be co-opted in developing the new museum premises and the activities that take place within them. The Peace Museum is in the consciousness of the whole University, and promises to become part of the future identity of the University. Planning for the Centre is well advanced. As well as peace studies research from within a School of Applied Global Ethics (SAGE), aided by members of an Institute for Spirituality, Religion and Public Life – both of which are groupings within the university - The Peace Museum will have the opportunity to engage with various NGOs which will share the same building. Work is currently underway to secure the financial base for the project.

The roots of the UK peace museum go back to the first International Conference of Peace Museums in Bradford in 1992. The same Quaker-inspired group who organised that conference, started to set up The Peace Museum in Bradford the following year. Gerald Drewett, Secretary of that group, remains on the Board of Directors. The necessary legal and practical processes to be recognised as a museum in the UK were satisfied, and a small Bradford gallery was established. Working within UK regulations, the definition of 'museum' is a given, involving the careful collecting, cataloguing and conserving of artefacts, and making that collection

accessible to the public. This led to the mission statement that 'The Peace Museum is to be the national centre for promoting peace, nonviolence and conflict resolution through its exhibitions, presentations and educational outreach, for the benefit of all.' It is clearly a museum FOR peace, and that peace is not seen as a goal to be achieved by any means, violent or nonviolent; The Peace Museum is overtly a museum for peace by peaceful means. Such peace is holistic, embracing personal and spiritual peace, interpersonal relationships, community harmony and international relations. These facets are interconnected: India-Pakistan clashes in Kashmir cause tensions in diaspora communities in Bradford; spirituality and religion can be sources of both hatred and healing; nations possessing nuclear weapons - and the associated 'might is right' philosophy - cannot hope to stop child bullying in schools.

Even in its existing small gallery in Bradford, The Peace Museum already has experience of working with teachers and groups of schoolchildren. In the new setting in Leeds, this will be a priority, with exhibitions tailored to the curriculum and teachers on the museum staff leading children to engage with the collection and its stories through drama, role-play, debate and discussion to discover how choices can be made to change lives, to change society and to change the world.[4] *How can individuals and communities choose to live non-violently and work together for peace? How can structural violence be challenged and justice promoted The link with Leeds Metropolitan University, an institution which trains teachers, means that the relevant expertise is at hand. Also, the benefits of such peace education activities need not be restricted to the local region, as university IT expertise should enable virtual resources to be developed to enable new pedagogical tools to have an international impact.*

[4] The need for exhibition designers to take into consideration the psychological impact on children, especially where cruelty and violence are depicted was noted by Ikuro Anzai, *Commemorative Speech, PPP*, p30.

Given all this, the scope of the collection is broad, although in practice the majority oft items are associated with peace movement campaigning. There are currently over five thousand items in the collection, including those artefacts mentioned above. Temporary exhibitions were held in Bradford and Leeds - for the exhibition at the Royal Armouries, Leeds, see my paper 'Loving Your Enemy' at the Sixth International Conference.[5] *A number of travelling exhibitions were developed, particularly on art in peace movement history, on Nobel peace laureates, and on women peacemakers, all of which are still available for loan to other museums and institutions. Throughout all that time there has been the aspiration to establish a larger, more significant peace museum in partnership with others. Several attempts to find partners in Bradford, either with that university or with the private sector, came to nothing and so attention switched to Leeds. At first it looked as if the Royal Armouries would be the unlikely partner, but now Leeds Metropolitan University has taken up the baton and hopes are high that The Peace Museum within the Senator George Mitchell Centre will become an inspiration to others across the world. One recent setback has been the death in December 2008 of Elnora Ferguson, Chair of the Board of Directors of The Peace Museum. She had been the indefatigable champion of the project for many years, and will be hugely missed. Her passing, however, increases the determination of the remaining directors to ensure the successful establishment of a peace museum within the Senator George Mitchell Centre.*

The International Network

As well as the conference program and *Museums for Peace*, there was another book participants received in their initial presentation pack: *Museums for Peace*

[5] Barrett, Clive, *Love Your Enemy: Working with Military Museums on Peace Education*; *PPP*, p48ff.

Worldwide, edited by Kazuyo Yamane and once again published by the conference Organizing Committee.[6] With the previous 1998 United Nations handbook long out of date in a rapidly shifting landscape, this volume is an important marker. A chronological table reveals that one hundred of the one hundred and forty non-Japanese peace museums listed have been founded in the past thirty years, with the rate seemingly increasing annually. The figures for Japan are even starker, with sixty out of sixty five institutions created in that time. The peace museum is a concept whose time has come. From Australia and Austria to Uzbekistan and Vietnam, it is recognised that public education through peace museums can be vehicles for remembrance and reconciliation.

How can such numerical growth enable solidarity between museums? The answer is through the International Network of Museums for Peace. Originally another outcome of the First International Conference in Bradford in 1992, the Network has struggled on a shoestring budget and Peter van den Dungen's boundless commitment for many years. Iratxe Momoitio's enthusiasm led to steps being taken towards more efficient organisation at the Fifth International Conference in Gernika in 2005, including the beginnings of a new website, www.museumsforpeace.org. However, there was still an urgent need for consolidation and further development to strengthen the International Network to enable it to become a competent means of supporting existing museums and promoting the growth of new museums around the world. The two-part Assembly of the International Network was therefore a major item in the programme of the Conference. It was a privilege to co-chair the Assembly alongside Kazuyo Yamane. The outcomes should stand the International Network in good stead for the years ahead. Peter van den Dungen was confirmed as the

[6] Yamane, Kazuyo (ed.), *Museums for Peace Worldwide,* The Organizing Committee of the Sixth International Conference of Museums for Peace, Kyoto Museum for World Peace, Ritsumeikan University, Kyoto, 2008.

continuing General Coordinator – one of his tasks will be to develop a new international office, probably in The Hague, where the Peace Palace, like Leeds Metropolitan University, is also associated with Andrew Carnegie; a new constitution was approved, including a clause allowing subscription charges to be levied; a new Executive Board and a new Advisory Board were appointed; and, needless to say the most problematic of all, a new logo was adopted. A butterfly with pink and blue heart-shaped wings, symbol of fragility and love and the need to work together for peace, had originally been designed by Yusuke Saito, a Tohoku student, for the Sixth International Conference. After much debate and a recount of votes it was adopted as the logo of the International Network of Museums for Peace, a simple yet visible sign of the Network's coming of age.

Consolidating the structures of the International Network was without doubt one of the lasting achievements of the Sixth International Conference. There is now a firm framework which can be built upon in the years ahead, perhaps allowing the sharing of expertise, exhibitions, and personnel between museums. There is now the prospect of serious fundraising being undertaken to enable museums in different countries, continents and cultures to work together on joint projects for peace. With a secretariat in The Hague, with a champion/ambassador, Joyce Apsel, maintaining a presence at the United Nations in New York, and with an active and strong Japanese heartland, the International Network of Museums for Peace is well placed to go from strength to strength in building an international culture of peace.

Living the Dream

Structures, however, are nothing without people, and people carry with them their life experiences; those stories which define who they are. For those who

participated in the Sixth International Conference there is a shared experience. It is for enabling this shared experience, which included but which went far beyond the formal conference programme, that the conference organisers deserve most credit. This shared experience of the participants is the basis for future relationships, mutual commitment, the development of a collective culture, and the true foundation of the International Network. The lives of change-makers were themselves touched, shaped, changed. One no longer thinks solely of impersonal 'museums' or 'places' but of people, individuals one has met and with whom one has engaged, conversed, laughed and danced; individuals whose stories have moved one, challenged one, inspired one. If the Conference was a Museum, the artefacts were the people and the power was in their stories. We attended out of the passionate belief that peace museums change lives, change cultures and can change the world. The Sixth International Conference touched the lives of those who shared in it and reinvigorated that passion.

Close to Leeds and Bradford is an old ruined Christian monastery, Rievaulx. Aelred, the twelfth century abbot of Rievaulx, wrote a paean of praise to 'friendship', based largely on the writings of the Roman author, Cicero. Aelred believed that "in friendship eternity blossoms, truth shines forth, and charity grows sweet".[7] *In other words, friendship is the basis of peace. Perhaps Risa Ikeya was right: we were not a proper conference at all; we were a meeting of friends. I give thanks for those who made that gathering possible, and I look forward to journeying to meet friends once again at a Seventh International Conference wherever and whenever that may be.*

[7] Aelred of Rievaulx, *Spiritual Friendship*, 1.68; cited in M. Basil Pennington, *Aelred of Rievaulx*, New City Press, New York, 2001, p160.