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Objectives: This commentary had 3 main objectives: to introduce the idea of intersecting narratives in the context of violence; to outline some research-based considerations about how narratives might play a role in the aftermath of violence; and to do so using a format that reflects intersecting narratives. Method: We review findings from research across multiple disciplines interwoven with practice related experience and personal experiences. Results: Narratives intersect at multiple levels, from within the same individual to across different cultures and nations. Negotiating conflicting narratives across those intersections may be key for moving forward after violence. Using narratives in this way requires maintaining a complex story, one that includes potentially irreconcilable perspectives. This requires creating contexts for negotiating that complex story. Conclusions: Consideration of stories and the way they intersect has the potential to inform research and practice, and to transform individual and collective experiences.
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Humans understand themselves and make sense of the world around them through stories (Bruner, 1990; Ricouer, 1991). This is one way to understand what happened during our attendance at a conference on “Values, Narratives and Resilience” at Sewanee, TN (organized by Sherry Hamby, Victoria Banyard, & John Grych). Researchers, practitioners and community activists and members came together to share individual stories, and through telling and listening across three days our stories intersected with one another, and all our stories evolved. This process highlighted that narratives are dynamic and fluid, changing across telling, contexts, and time. To understand how all of us tell our stories, we must reflect on how narratives that we tell, and that we listen to, are always in the process of being negotiated, contested, negated, and confirmed. In this commentary, the three of us came together as professionals, as women of different ages, in multiple roles in our own personal lives, and of different class, country of origin, racial and ethnic backgrounds, to talk about what it means to live within intersecting narratives—particularly when those narratives concern violence. We discuss narratives at three levels: the intrapersonal, the multiple, and sometimes conflicting narratives individuals tell themselves; the interpersonal narratives told between individuals, often with competing story lines, and collective narratives, the narratives created over time by communities and cultures that are help define a collective understanding, especially of difficult histories. We structure this commentary as a conversation among ourselves, as a series of narratives within narratives, that helped us to explore these ideas and that we hope will set the stage for ongoing exploration for others.

Before diving into the conversation, we first provide a bit of background. Narratives create meaningful sequences of events by integrating what happened with people’s subjective perspectives on what those happenings mean, and why they are important (Fivush, 2001; Fivush, Habermas, Waters, & Zaman, 2011; McLean, Pasupathi, & Pals, 2007). Multiple theoretical perspectives, including intersectionality theory (Shields, 2008), dialogic selves theory (Hermans, Rijks, & Kempen, 1993), and feminist narrative theory (Fivush, 2000, 2004; Gergen, 2001), converge on the idea that narratives emerge in particular contexts for particular reasons. It matters who is telling the event, to whom, and for what reasons (Bordo, 1990). Moreover, the very act of narrating changes the way the teller (and listener) subsequently understands the event (Pasupathi, 2001). Thus, narratives are always evolving, both process and product of ongoing interactions. There is no one “right” narrative that captures “what really happened” but always multiple narratives and these multiplicities exist at various levels, intrapersonally, interpersonally, and collectively.

But to say that there are multiple narratives is not sufficient. When events are contested and consequential, it is crucial to negotiate those intersecting narratives toward a narrative that everyone can accept and live with. Violence of the sort focused on in
this journal is consequential and has great potential to be contested because both individuals and groups have an investment in viewing themselves as not culpable (e.g., Baumeister & Hastings, 1997; Schüttz, 1999). We need to consider how such narratives can be negotiated, and what we know from research findings about conditions that could facilitate this process. Failure to negotiate intersecting narratives of violence is a barrier to healing and moving on—for victims, perpetrators, and witnesses alike.

The good story, the story that helps people to move on, will be complex, not easily resolved, and not unitary. Holding this complexity may be difficult given how we have learned to tell stories. Research on memory and stories tends to show that stories get simpler and less detailed over repeated tellings (Bartlett, 1932/1995). But for consequential stories it may be important for the story to contain dissent, to acknowledge multiple, sometimes divergent, and sometimes irreconcilable, perspectives on the events (Hammack, 2006). And that is somewhat at odds with a straightforward positive resolution. So the need for complex stories requires people—individuals, groups, and communities—to work hard to avoid losing complexity and over simplifying. This is what we try to achieve in our conversation: complexity through telling, listening, negotiating, and restorying. Our conversation ranges freely among the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and collective levels in exploring how intersecting narratives mean for our profession and our practice, and how telling our stories to and with others and listening to their stories, can help heal experiences of violence. We weave together our own viewpoints and research findings, and we struggle with how to bring these ideas into the research and practice communities.

**Intrapersonal, Interpersonal, and Collective Intersecting Narratives**

MP: Perhaps the most obvious level of intersecting narratives is the interpersonal one—the one reflected in the notion that there “two sides to every story.” Different people have different experiences of the same event—as witnesses, as victims, as perpetrators, and all can become narrators of those experiences later. In fact, researchers have shown that perpetrators and victims narrate the same events of harm in quite different ways—at least when you are talking about everyday harm (e.g., Schüttz, 1999; Baumeister, Stillman, & Wotman, 1990; Wainryb, Brehl, & Matwin, 2005). But there are also different, but intersecting narratives intrapersonally, within each of us, about the same event (Hermans et al., 1993). In our lab, one of our students’ masters theses (Bourne, 2013) showed that children asked to narrate about harming someone when the harm was their fault or not their fault often change their perspective in the course of narrating—this suggests that they often hold two different stories about the harm (it was my fault, and it was not) and actively try to put them together. So perpetrators can be of two or more minds.

RF: Holding different intrapersonal narratives reflects different kinds of multiplicities. As discussed by intersectionality theory (Shields, 2008), each of us sits in multiple places simultaneously, so the way I narrate any given experience will depend on which place I am narrating from, more stable positions such as a person of a particular race, class, and gender, with a particular developmental history, and more fluid positions, such as sitting in a particular role at this point in time as a professional, a friend, a partner, or a parent. Other commentaries in this volume also highlight the importance of “social location” (Shaw, McLean, Taylor, Swartout, & Querna, 2016) and the transactional and contextual nature of narratives (Chan, Hollingsworth, Espelage, & Mitchell, 2016). Intrapersonal narratives also shift over time, as we think about events, but especially as we talk with others. Neuroscience demonstrates that each time we call up a memory and discuss it with others, the neural signature changes (Dudai & Edelson, in press), and there is a great deal of research from developmental and social psychology demonstrating that conversations with others changes our subsequent narratives of an event (Cuc, Ozarau, Manier, & Hirst, 2006; Fivush et al., 2011; Pasupathi, 2001; Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2010).

MH: An important aspect to consider is the time of the event, and the context in which the event occurred, which also influences the version that a person, a dyad or at times, an entire country will choose to share with others. As more fully discussed by Chan et al. (2016), the role of culture in shaping our narratives is critical. For instance, in Latin America there have been different wars and civil conflicts over the past several decades that have forced those of us from these countries to have different versions of the events. A couple’s incident(s) of violence could be explained as part of, or a result of, the violence occurring in the country around them (Martin-Baró, 2012). For instance, in the 80s, in my native country, during the last civil war, there were many violent incidents in which women were abused and victimized by their partners. For example, it was well-known that the Minister of Finance at that time battered his wife. He was never prosecuted or charges were never brought against him for his violence. One primary reason could have been that at that time, any action that a woman would have taken to protect herself, and her children would have been perceived as an act of disloyalty, betrayal, and disobedience to “the revolution.” Furthermore, any kind of violence perpetrated by those “in charge” was accepted and justified. Because the violence against his wife was occurring during time of war, many would say that it was necessary or just given the circumstances. In other words, the violent context in which it was happening justified its occurrence and lack of response.

MP: These different narratives about a single event—both between two people, and within the minds of each individual—as well as the example of justifying domestic violence within a violent cultural context, call into question the idea that there are always clear distinctions between perpetrators and victims—and a lot of research on victim and perpetrator accounts of everyday harm shows that the same individual tells a different story as a perpetrator and as a victim (e.g., Baumeister et al., 1990; Wainryb et al., 2005), which just underscores that we are all victims and we are all perpetrators.

RF: Yes, and these differing versions matter. Especially when they are contested, the question arises as to which one becomes the “accepted” version of what happened, in what we tell ourselves, what we tell others and what others believe. This raises the issue of power, who has the authority to author the story (Fivush, 2000, 2004, 2010). Those who are allowed voice, who are allowed to both say what happened and what it means, have power, real power to create and maintain economic, political, and cultural structures that perpetuate certain belief systems and silence others (Bordo, 1990).
MH: And please let’s also consider that there is a risk of perceiving the suffering caused by violence as an “individual suffering” (Bracken, Giller, & Sumnerfield, 1995) and not as an interpersonal experience. Suffering should not be seen as an individual construct but as a collective experience. This is an important theme that is developed throughout many of the commentaries in this volume (Chan et al., 2016; Howell et al., 2015; Shaw et al., 2016).

MP: Martha’s points about the larger context of violence and that suffering is collective encompasses another narrative level—the collective level—and of course, it’s also important for people to agree on what happened in a collective violent episode, and it matters for current concerns. Consider that there is broad consensus on what happened during the Holocaust, which has allowed for efforts at reparations, memorial-building, and other collective approaches to coping (e.g., Young, in press). At collective levels, media coverage, historical research, and formal structures (e.g., the truth and reconciliation commissions in South Africa and other places) provide a forum within which contested narratives can be negotiated (Villa-Vicencio & Verwoerd, 2000). But narratives can also be silenced at the collective level. For example, in the United States, government efforts to annihilate Native cultures and peoples have often silenced Native American stories, and Native individuals are shockingly absent from all kinds of public media (Leavitt, Covarrubias, Perez, & Fryberg, 2015).

MH: But it is not only in the United States, another good example of a collective narrative that was silenced is what happened in Chile long after the coup d’etat in 1973. Years after the change in government, the world learned how many people were taken and tortured during the 80s (U.S. Department of State, 1985), and how Chileans learned to live in fear, denial, and guilt (Comas-Diaz, & Padilla, 1990). So it is not just one person or group that can be silenced by another, it can also be an entire nation that chooses to silence a collective memory.

RF: Absolutely. How cultures interpret and reinterpret their own history, both the dominant narratives and the emerging marginalized narratives inform both collective and individual memory (Erll & Nunning, 2008). We see this, for example, in how individual Germans tell their own stories about the Nazi atrocities depending on if and how they understand their parents’ and grandparents’ involvement (Tschuggnall & Welzer, 2002), or how young Palestinians and Israelis’ shape their individual stories through the cultural narrative (Hammack, 2006). For narratives to become collectively shared, they must be listened to and heard. This happens at the collective level, as just discussed and also at the interpersonal level. Work from my lab has shown that, during the preschool years, when mothers validate their children’s versions of events, children show higher levels of emotional understanding (Fivush, 2004), and as children enter adolescence, families that are able to negotiate and elaborate multiple family member’s perspectives on stressful events have adolescents who show higher levels of self-esteem and psychological well-being (Bohanek et al., 2009; Marin, Bohanek, & Fivush, 2008).

MP: That work shows that the negotiated narrative has real impact on well-being. Importantly, as Howell et al. (2015) discuss, well-being must be conceptualized as a positive construct; it is not the absence of illness, but the attainment of satisfaction, having a sense of meaning and purpose in life. Negotiated narratives also impact what people remember going forward. But it’s worth thinking about how listening, and being heard, might happen. We know that at the interpersonal level, people who listen can foster exploration of distressing experiences—this is true for friends, romantic partners, and parents (Jennings, McLean, & Pasupathi, 2013; Pasupathi & Hoyt, 2009; Weeks & Pasupathi, 2011), as well as for interviewers (Josselson, 2003; Twali, 2013). Sometimes listeners help people do that exploration just by being there, attentive, and responsive—but other times, they help foster particular perspectives—asking the narrator to consider alternative explanations for the experience. In fact, listeners who express disagreement effectively can help people consider alternative perspectives on events and avoid an overly simplistic story (McLean & Jennings, 2012; Hirt & Manier, 1996). But it’s tricky—we need to allow people to tell their own narrative in their own way, and also in their own time; forcing people to talk about their experience when they are still too “raw” can backfire, as discussed by Taylor, Jouriles, Brown, Goforth, and Banyard (2016). Disagreement can also result in more rigid and polarized views, as narrators sometimes respond to disagreement from listeners by elaborating the reasons for their own view (Pasupathi & Rich, 2005). Because we are all listeners, we can strive to be open and help people explore when possible.

RF: This kind of “negotiated narrative” exists intrapersonally as well. We see this in studies where individuals are asked to narrate stressful events across several days. Individuals who are able to create more coherent narratives across time, but especially those who can integrate multiple perspectives into their narratives, seeing it from multiple people’s points of view, show higher levels of both psychological and physical health (Graci & Fivush, 2015; Pals, 2006; McAdams, 2006; McLean et al., 2007; Pennebaker & Chung, 2007).

MP: Work on forgiveness often emphasizes the process by which victims explore and consider the perspective of the perpetrator—not in dialogue with the perpetrator, but rather within their own minds—again, suggesting that people have multiple stories “inside” their own heads (Knutson, Enright, & Garbers, 2008; Twali, 2013). Moreover, in these cases, coming to that story that also includes the perpetrator’s perspective is an important aspect of eventually reaching a kind of forgiveness. Some people think that open, responsive listening from another person actually enables the varying internal narratives and voices within the person to be heard (Castro, Cohen, Tohar, & Kluger, 2014; Kluger, 2015; Rogers, 1961). On that note, when groups make space for constructive dialogue between people, about difficult, traumatic, and violent events, that can allow varying narratives between different individuals to be heard. For example, victim-centered aspects of court cases are, in part, about allowing victim’s stories to be heard. And restorative approaches to justice both at the interpersonal and the collective levels often involve creating a context and process for negotiating all the different narratives about violent events that exist. The prototypical example, really, is the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC; Villa-Vicencio & Verwoerd, 2000; Pennebaker & Banasik, 1997). For me, some of the most interesting ideas here actually come from thinking “across levels”—about how the collective and interpersonal contexts can make space for more versions of the story to be told even intrapsychically. There’s certainly a lot more work researchers can do here—it’s hard to evaluate whether efforts like the South African TRC have been effective, because there isn’t any way to easily
compare with the alternative approaches. One can compare across different historical conflicts, but this of course introduces a lot of differences that make it complicated to draw conclusions. And you can look at perceptions of effectiveness, but again, that may fall short of a full accounting (Vora & Vora, 2004). So of necessity, researchers interested in collective issues will need to be doing interdisciplinary work, with sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, lawyers, and historians.

MH: Yes and even the South African TRC has not been exempted of critiques regarding its effectiveness on bringing reconciliation (Summerfield, 1997). And I totally agree it is vital to have a space where different versions or opinions of a story can be heard, and I would add to that the need to include the community and utilize the notions of traditional justice as vital elements that have proved to make a difference, such in the case of the Liberia Truth and Reconciliation Commission (De Ycaza, 2013). And we need to really understand how the community defines their own problems and how they think resolutions needs to be achieved, as discussed by Yuan et al. (2016). In my work in domestic violence prevention with Latino men, I have found myself witnessing the value that community involvement and dialogue can have in addressing difficult issues or creating a narrative around violence. A couple of years ago, I facilitated a conversation with one group about how to engage Latino men in prevention efforts against domestic violence. This was possible because we created a space for a constructive dialogue by not diving into the problem immediately. As an icebreaker, we asked people to talk about who they were, where they came from, what challenges they faced as well as about what -their expectations of the meeting were. This icebreaker was really the key to our conversation; it allowed the group to feel comfortable enough to admit that domestic violence was an issue in their community. Instead of avoiding or denying that violence happens, the group termed violence as a “problem.” Some even acknowledged witnessing or knowing couples who were dealing with it. From there, the group began to discuss the reasons why violence happens, listening to others and expressing their agreement or disagreement with their viewpoints. When one of the men used the term “power” to describe the experience of violence caused by perpetrators, another man in the group challenged that idea. For the second man, power did not have anything to do with violence. Both men exchanged words for a few minutes, until the man who brought the term of power made this comment: “Oh, my brother. Brother, when women die, it is a problem, and it is all about power. Sorry but it is true.” I will never forget that exchange, we had some minutes of silence, and it was really intense I could feel that it was very emotional for all of us. However, after one of them broke the silence, I saw in these men an impetus in trying to offer ideas about what we needed to do to engage other men in prevention efforts. That day, at that meeting we had the context and the space to open ourselves to a constructive dialogue and the ideas that emerged from that dialogue have become the cornerstone of our engaging men initiative—Te Invito (I Invite You; National Latin@ Network, 2014). We were all able to talk through difficult topics and to listen to one another’s narratives. I have heard similar stories from our advocates about how important it is to have the right space and to create the moment. In our shelter, that moment is always in the evening, after all the tasks are completed. Participants sit around the kitchen table and talk. As one of our more senior advocates said, “That is when the real work is done, when we get together and have the chance to talk and let things out.” This experience of talking and sharing has proved to be so vital for us that it is now part of our new staff orientation. We make sure that we have the time to listen to others and to listen to ourselves. Otherwise, we think, it would be difficult or even impossible to do the work that we do every day.

RF: So active listening is key. As we tell our stories to others, to those who agree and validate what we say, to those who disagree in a respectful and constructive way, and to ourselves over time, the narrative changes. And as individuals and groups change the narrative, the cultural narrative begins to shift, and begins to provide different “master narratives,” different ways in which individual experience is cast as meaningful for the collective (Fivush, 2010; Thorne & McLean, 2003; McLean & Breen, in press). In a very real way, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and collective narratives are always intersecting, always influencing each other. So listening to any individual narrative means simultaneously listening to our own narrative and the collective narrative as frames for what we are hearing.

Narrative Research as Intervention

Community practitioners understand the power of intersecting narratives and use it, at least implicitly, in their work. This is a theme that resonates throughout the commentaries in this volume. But within the academic research community, we need to reflect on how and what we are asking of our research participants and how we enter into a narrative world with them in ways that are meaningful for the research context, as well as for the researcher and participants as individuals interacting in a significant interpersonal exchange (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The majority of research within psychology takes a logical positivist position, assuming the researcher to be an objective observer of some standardized behavior produced by a subject. This is never an accurate assessment of the research interaction (see Rosser & Miller, 2000, for a full discussion), but especially not for narrative research (see Fivush, 2013, for a full discussion). Here, the researcher and the participant come together in an interaction in which the researcher asks the participant to share intimate and often difficult details of their life experiences, and this interaction changes, even if subtly, both the researcher and the participant. As illustrated in our conversation above, through the very act of telling and listening, individuals influence each other. Here, we provide personal accounts and reflections on ways that the conference and our broader experiences have changed our narratives:

RF: I had done a good bit of research on narratives of various forms of traumatic events, but in this one study, I was interviewing women who had been severely sexually abused by a family member during childhood (Fivush & Edwards, 2004). I started with my “research protocol,” the standardized set of interview questions, as I sat down with each of these women. The women knew why they were being asked to participate, yet they asked me if I was sure I wanted to hear what they had to say, especially the details. Many expressed concern about how hard it would be for me to hear their stories. The interviews quickly changed from a researcher–subject standardized protocol to two women discussing very difficult experiences. Although I had not experienced childhood sexual
abuse, their openness to sharing their stories with me changed me, both as a person and as a researcher. I began a process of understanding how individuals who participate in research are an integral part of the research process, essentially co-researchers in exploring what these events mean and how to understand them. By listening to their stories and really trying to hear them, I changed (I hope) in my ability to listen and to be open to what they were saying rather than to my preconceived notions. Just as the participants were really co-researchers, as a researcher I was really also a coparticipant; these “lines” that we create are blurry at best; interacting with others through narratives is always a process that changes all the interactants; as Martha put it in one of our conversations, “We are all subjects. We never end where we start; there is always transformation.” This changed my theoretical understanding of how and why narratives of trauma may be beneficial and/or detrimental, and helped me as a researcher to develop new theoretical models that I believe better express lived experience. (Fivush, 2004, 2010) Importantly, I think the research experience changed many of the women too. Many of the women said that this was the first time they told many of the details of their stories, and that the telling itself was healing. In fact, there is evidence that simply participating in a research study and telling difficult narratives of violence and trauma just once to a researcher has positive benefits for the teller (Legerski & Bunnell, 2010; Newman & Kaloupek, 2004). What I take from this, and subsequent experiences, is that who we are as researchers, the questions we ask, and the theoretical frameworks we use to interpret our data are interleaved with who we are as individuals; our own intersecting personal and professional narratives are dialectically related both intrapersonally and with the narratives of our multiple research participants. Research occurs within the tapestry of complex lives, in which researchers and participants come together, all with complicated histories and agendas, to create new ways of understanding. Knowledge is not imposed, but created in these moments of intersecting narratives (Gergen, 2001). And each time we are involved in a narrative interaction, both researcher and participant leave that interaction changed, each contributing to the other in significant ways.

MH: Yes, absolutely, in my case in my own personal experience with war, poverty, immigration, and with a mother who was a survivor of domestic violence, all these events and circumstances have always affected my work. It is impossible and unrealistic for me to try to separate my own experience from my research (Martin-Baró, 2012). I am always trying to understand what happened, what was going on during the war, what were the conditions in which I grew up, were those conditions the ones that have allowed the violence to persist and to spread to other places? Has my native country been able to create a narrative where other participants are included? Is there a space for dialogue and recognition of different narratives? Have we been able to move and create a different future? Unfortunately, I do not have answers for these questions, but I am glad that I am able to express them, because for those like me that have lived through these experiences the first step in healing is being able to talk and then to share our narrative with the rest of the world to learn.

MP: Martha’s and Robyn’s points here raise, for me, the ways that even laboratory research is an intersection of participant’s stories, researcher’s own stories, and the larger world we all live in. For me, I came to the conference feeling like, for the most part, I do research on what interests me, not on what will help anyone else or make the world better. And this has increasingly nagged at me over time. So I was interested in trying to understand whether I am positioned, as a researcher, to offer something of value in trying to make a more just world. In talking about intersecting narratives, across the intrapersonal, interpersonal, and collective levels, I think there are important and unanswered questions about what level of consensus in narratives is required—how much contested meaning can be “held” within a relationship or a collective?

Agreeing to disagree means holding a complex narrative—one in which there might be no satisfying resolution. That is hard to do. It also seems likely that how much disagreement can be “held” is not some constant—it is likely to be contextual—for example, at the interpersonal level, are the perpetrator and victim to maintain a relationship? What kind of relationship—in the case of domestic violence—is this coparenting or trying to salvage a marriage? At the within-person level, we seem to have a capacity and tolerance for internal inconsistency of which we are not aware (Shoda, McConnell, & Rydell, 2014), but less tolerance for internal inconsistency of which we are aware (Festinger, 1957). So, the more we are aware of competing narratives within ourselves, the greater the press to organize those competing narratives. To make matters more complicated, our tolerance for ambiguity and uncertainty also seems to vary by persons (Neuberg, Judice, & West, 1997). In the case of collective violence, what levels of dissent can leave different factions on relatively equal grounds for opportunity and life in the future? Group differences in perceptions about negotiated narratives may or may not be congruent with actual remaining disparities in society—in South Africa, the group most satisfied with the effectiveness of the TRC may arguably still have the least economic and political power in the current, post-Apartheid era (Vora & Vora, 2004). So, I think that for myself as a researcher, it may be important to start addressing the kind of questions about consensus that our discussion raises for me across all levels of intersecting narratives.

The End of One Conversation and the Beginning of Another?

The three of us came to this conference and this writing project with different stories and different agendas. What we gained through our conversation for ourselves is the beginning of a relationship and a dialogue. What we hope sharing our conversation with others will accomplish is a reflection on how the stories we tell ourselves and others matter for how we understand the ways in which narratives of violence both perpetuate and hopefully heal those experiences for individuals, communities, and cultures. We underscore several key points raised in this commentary:

1. Both research and community practice highlights the need to provide a safe space for individuals to tell their own story in their own way. This, in turn necessitates that all of us reflect on what it means to come to these interactions with our own stories, and that our own stories shape what we hear and what others can tell us.

INTERSECTING NARRATIVES ABOUT VIOLENCE

53
2. Any given story is, by definition, a snapshot. We must always keep in mind that stories are told differently in different contexts, with different listeners for different reasons, and that stories evolve over time. Stories are always a process.

3. Individual narratives are embedded in cultural and historical narratives that constrain, and sometimes silence, what can be said.

4. Especially for narratives of violence and trauma, the process of coming to a shared cultural and historical story is difficult, and we must acknowledge that stories are complex and sometimes irreconcilable. We must be cautious about privileging any one version over any other, but rather, we must strive to be able to hold complexity and discrepancy as valuable tools for healing.

5. We can all invest on our own well-being by investing in our narratives, giving ourselves the chance to develop our resilience in stories.

We need to start investing more in opportunities for real and difficult dialogues among all of us, in all our roles, and through all our narratives. We are all survivors, perpetrators, and witnesses, although to differing degrees. Perhaps, through this dialogue and story sharing, we will all find a way to heal.
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