Servant-Leadership Applied to Balance World Inequalities and Enhance Global Forgiveness and Restoration

—Christian B. Cabezas

Many years have passed since the end of World War II. In this war that stemmed from hate, unhealthy ambition, and a sense of superiority from within different cultures, millions of lives were lost. Some authors, including a number that were survivors of that war, have documented and described the horrors and atrocities committed. Wiesenthal (1998) raised the dilemma of the possibility of forgiveness to the perpetrators of the massacres committed in this war. Mandela and Tutu (1999), with their experience in South Africa and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, have shown the world that it is possible to forgive even the most hardened perpetrators of evil acts, but have also pointed out the imperative need to find truth before forgiveness and restoration can be obtained.

History about both world wars has been widely shared through generations and cultures, and currently there is a general collective sense of remorse and fear of repeating those mistakes that makes us believe that we are far from suffering similar wars. In fact, in recurrent cycles violence continues to haunt us, forcing us to experience the devastating effects of people's agency that is producing similar consequences: the loss of millions of human lives, caused again by unhealthy ambition and a sense of superiority from within cultures. On a global level, economic and social inequalities increase every year with fatal consequences. Globalization, with its utopian promise of opportunity for development in every country, seems to have only further accentuated inequalities and economic crises in developing countries. Yates (2004/2006) suggested that, contrary to what is promulgated by international financial organizations, inequality among countries is growing every year. He mentioned as an example that in the United States, life expectancy for women is about eighty years, and in Switzerland it is eighty-two; but in Afghanistan it is forty-six, and in Sierra Leone it is thirty-nine. Infant mortality per 1,000 births is 3.98 in Norway, but it is 101 in Ethiopia.

189

This paper will first explore the current tragedies that developing countries face as victims of postcolonialism. It will also look at the imperative need humans have to find and communicate truth to achieve justice, so as to forgive and break the oppressive cycle that currently enforces inequalities. These inequalities, which are supported by ill-formed human agency, lead to the loss of an enormous quantity of lives of innocent people every year. It is our obligation as human beings to hold ourselves accountable for injustices that are currently being perpetrated, and to enforce restoration. Some decades ago, Greenleaf, referring to servant-leadership as the new form of leadership needed to heal societies, stated, "The servant-leader is servant first...it begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first...that person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions" (Greenleaf 1977/2002, 27). Currently, the world seems to need more of this type of leader; one who is not solely concerned with making their nation an empire that economically and politically dominates other nations, but rather a leader who shares in the responsibility of global development. As Ferch stated, "The servant-leader transcends himself or herself to become the steward of others, capable of raising up future generations, and confident in building community" (Ferch 2012, 155). There is an urgent need for leaders from both developed and developing countries to work together and share accountability in regard to solving global inequalities that affect the majority of people in the world.

UNEQUAL RELATIONSHIPS IN THE GLOBAL SCENARIO

Bullbeck stated, "The third world is a category produced and reproduced by capitalist imperialism, referred to in oppositions between industrialized north and developing south, or core and periphery" (Bullbeck 1998/2006, 38). This assumed distinction between countries depending on their economic growth has also influenced the manner in which their citizens treat each other. Dominant cultures have assumed a hierarchical position of power and influence over those considered weaker ones. The defining difference between these cultures resides in the accumulation of capital. Yates defended the idea that the inequality among countries is endemic to the effect of capitalism. He stated, "Capitalism is an economic system in which the nonhuman means of production are owned by a small minority of all persons. Wealth inequality in a market economy must, again as a consequence of the nature of the system, generate income inequality" (Yates 2004/2006, 337).

He also suggested that capitalist economies espouse egalitarian values, but the consequences of their normal operations are extraordinarily inegalitarian and this contradiction is apparent in relationships among nations. When referring to the same issue, Mies proposed that the economic, social, and ecological costs of constant growth in the industrialized countries have been and are being shifted to the colonized countries in the South. She stressed that there is a catching-up myth enforced by the colonizers. According to Mies, "[T]he very progress of the colonizers is based on the existence and the exploitation of those colonies" (Mies 1993/2006, 153). Mies also suggested that the poverty of underdeveloped nations is not a result of natural lagging behind, but is rather a direct consequence of the development of rich industrial countries that exploit the so-called periphery in Africa, South America, and Asia.

Williams analyzed the interaction that imperialist nations have with weaker ones. According to Williams, "Superior economic power subjects an inferior political economy to its own preferences" (Williams 1980/2006, 83). He suggested that this unbalanced relationship existed between Great Britain and Argentina between 1870 and 1914, in former years between the United States and many countries in the Western Hemisphere (such as Canada, as well as Cuba and Panama), and between all industrial powers and what has become known as the third world.

In current times, people from different cultures have automatically assumed their dominant/dominated role in the global scenario without wondering about or challenging this unequal relationship or how they achieved that role. Analyzing history along the path that consolidated this relationship, it is possible to infer that their positions were defined based on previous abuses that had been committed against people from certain dominated cultures and also on environmental destruction. Kloby stated, "One of the major reasons for the development problems that exist in much of the world today is the destruction of indigenous social relationships and productive economic practices, as well as the evolution of various patterns of relationships that were established during the era of colonialism" (Kloby 2004/2006, 99).

It is clear that colonialism has left important traces in the world's interactions that have molded unfair and unequal relationships between countries and their people. For instance, a long time has passed since the Latin American countries' colonization and exploitation by the European empires. However, this unfair interaction and Latin America's passive role remains today. As Galeano pointed out:

It continues to exist at the service of other's needs as a source and reserve of oil and iron, of copper and meat, of fruit and coffee, the raw materials and foods destined for rich countries which profit more from consuming them than Latin America does from producing them. (Galeano 1997/2006, 127)

Considering this unfair interaction, it is misleading and even deceiving to talk about free trade between these nations. Galeano (1997/2006, 129) also put a lot of emphasis on the economic and cultural richness that was sacked from Latin American countries during colonization, which has also affected the current condition of these countries. He put forth the example of Bolivia, stating that this country, being one of the world's most poverty-stricken countries, could boast of having nourished the wealth of the wealthiest. He also mentioned the example of Mexico, stating that the economic surplus drained from it between 1760 and 1809 through silver and gold exports has been estimated at some five billion present-day dollars. In this country, just in Cerro Chico, Potosí, eight million lives were lost over the course of three centuries. Galeano stated, "The Indians, including women and children, were torn from their agricultural communities and driven to the Cerro. Of every ten who went up in the freezing wilderness, seven never returned" (Galeano 1997/2006, 136). According to Galeano, the massacres of Indians that began with Columbus never stopped. It continued in the next centuries in all Latin American countries and also in the Indigenous territories in the United States.

Rothenberg defended the idea that the inequalities of wealth and power that orchestrate relations between countries in the world today cannot be understood unless we place them in the context of colonization and its consequences for development. This author also stated, "The challenge that faced the English and other European empire builders and U.S. imperialism somewhat later, was to find a way to justify this process" (Rothenberg 2006, 77). She also underlined the rationale that the dominating nations have used to justify their imperialistic actions. According to her, on one hand, they emphasized the importance of color, maintaining that those who are not white are inferior. On the other hand, they justified their actions with Christianity and the need to either convert or destroy heathens who are portrayed as agents of the devil. According to Mies, in the colonization process (old and modern), not only the colonizers but also the colonized must accept the lifestyle of those on top as the only model of the good life. According to this process of acceptance of these values, the lifestyle and standard of

living of those on top is invariably accompanied by a devaluation of one's own culture, work, technology, lifestyle, and often the philosophy of life and social institutions. Regarding this very subject, this same author stated, "In the beginning this devaluation is often violently enforced by the colonizers and then reinforced by propaganda, educational programs, a change of laws, and economic dependency, for example through the debt trap" (Mies 1993/2006, 151).

The new forms of domination are more subtle and sophisticated. They are not practiced directly by developed countries, but by third parties that represent their interests, such as the international financial organizations. Yates (2004/2006) manifested that, contrary to what is promulgated by the international financial organizations who are mainly influenced by developed countries, inequality among countries is growing every year. According to Black (2006), during the last half of the 1980s in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, and much of Asia, foreign aid and new loans and investments did not begin to compensate for the amounts of debt service payments from those areas into the coffers of first world banks. Joseph Stiglitz, a Columbia professor, Nobel Prize recipient in Economics in 2001, former chief economist, and senior vice president of the World Bank from 1997 to 2000, critically expressed how globalization was promulgated by developed countries as a solution for developing nations. When referring to developing nations, Stiglitz mentioned, "These countries were told by the West that the new economic system would bring them unprecedented prosperity. Instead, it brought unprecedented poverty: in many respects, for most people" (Stiglitz 2002/2006, 421). He also suggested that Western countries have pushed poor countries to eliminate trade barriers, but have kept up their own barriers. This paradox prevents developing countries from exporting their agricultural products, thus depriving them of desperately needed export income. This in turn reinforces economic underdevelopment.

Black (2006, 326) also mentioned that income poverty is found in combination with other deprivations, since the poor are less able to defend their rights to services, to personal security, even to the best things in life that we used to believe were free, such as relatively unpolluted air and water. For instance, Black pointed out that the water supply per capita in developing countries was only one-third in the late 1990s of what it was in 1970, and that 40 percent in those countries lack proper sanitation. He also mentioned that in these countries, seventeen million people die each year from curable infections and parasite diseases; HIV/AIDS kills another twenty-three

million, fourteen million of those in Sub-Saharan Africa, where half the population lacks access to medical services (Black 2006, 328).

Even when it has been denied for centuries, according to Rodney, in recent times, economists have been recognizing in colonial and postcolonial Africa a pattern that has been termed "growth without development" (Rodney 1972/2006, 119). This consists of finding a developing country that has more enterprises, but almost all the profit goes abroad, and the economy becomes more and more a dependency of the metropolis. He also stated that "there was growth of the so-called enclave import-export sector, but the only things which developed were dependency and underdevelopment." Majavu (2006) explained that the international financial institutions' debt trap also strongly affected African countries. According to him, each year, African countries spend about $15 billion repaying debts to the IMF and World Bank and their creditors. Servicing these debts diverts money from spending on essential things such as health care, providing citizens with clean water, and education. Majavu stated that African countries pay $1.51 in debt services for every $1 they receive in aid (Majavu 2006, 507).

The underdevelopment caused by colonialism was also perpetuated in the educational systems. According to Rodney the main purpose of the colonial school system was to train Africans to help man the local administration at the lowest ranks and to staff the private capitalist firms owned by Europeans. He stated, "It was not an educational system designed to give young people confidence and pride as members of African societies, but one which sought to instill a sense of deference towards all that was European and capitalist" (Rodney 1972/2006, 122). According to this author, "In Africa, both the formal school system and the informal value system of colonialism destroyed social solidarity and promoted the worst form of alienated individualism without social responsibility" (ibid., 125).

Sachs (2006, 365) underlined the impossibility of developing countries providing better health services and attention to their citizens because they are obligated to use most of their budgets to pay debts to other governments, the IMF, and the World Bank. They are immersed in the paradox of not advancing because they have to pay for their debts accrued to "advance" and "develop." El Saadawi also mentioned that international institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank implanted the so-called development policies that continue to increase poverty, and perpetuate an increasing flow of money and riches from South to North. He stated as an example that, "From 1984 to 1990 the application of structural adjustment policies in the South

led to the transfer of $178 billion from the South to the commercial banks in the North" (El Saadawi 1997/2006, 401).

These international financial institutions, even though they were created to support development and avoid economic crisis, have only deteriorated the condition of developing countries. They have secured the prevalence of power of the Western developed countries at the expense of the developing countries. Unfortunately, the ones who suffer the consequences are people from the lowest social status in developing countries. Farmer (2003/2006, 383) referred to structural violence as the tragic conditions in which people from developing countries have to live as a result of poor political and economic decisions made by their governments, which were especially influenced by the interests of developed countries. Farmer also pointed out that the poor are not only more likely to suffer, they are also less likely to have their suffering noticed. He insisted on the responsibility we have to identify the forces conspiring to promote suffering.

In a related issue, Booker and Minter defined "Global Apartheid" as

[a]n international system of minority rule whose attributes include: differential access to basic human rights; wealth and power structured by race and place; structural racism, embodied in global economic progress, political institutions and cultural assumptions; and the international practice of doubled standards that assume inferior rights to be appropriate for certain others, defined by location, origin, race or gender. (Booker and Minter 2001/2006, 518)

They also noted that to change the Global Apartheid there are some priority steps that are clear and immediate, such as addressing the AIDS pandemic through adequate funding for treatment and prevention, canceling illegitimate debt, stopping the imposition of catastrophic economic policies on poor countries, and halting trade rules that value corporate profit over human life. They concluded, "[G]enuine globalization requires that global democracy replace global apartheid" (Booker and Minter 2001/2006, 522).

It would be unfair to blame the citizens of developed countries for the harmful decisions that their governments sometimes make to enforce inequalities in the world. However, there is a shared responsibility as human beings to be aware of disparities that affect other citizens. One of the identified characteristics of the servant-leader is awareness. Ferch stated, "Servant-leaders notice their own faults, promote reconciliation not only in the family but across races, cultures, and creeds" (Ferch 2012, 160). The cultural unawareness that affects many people from developed countries,

and that is impeding the halt of the inequality cycle, could be produced by their cultural context.

DEVELOPED COUNTRIES' LACK OF AWARENESS AND PERCEPTUAL BIASES AFFECTING EQUALITY

Social scientists have argued that individualism is more prevalent in industrialized Western societies than in other societies, especially those more traditional societies within developing countries (Wibbeke 2009). Individualism formation has been explained by its origins in Protestantism and the process of civic emancipation in Western societies that resulted in social and civic structures, which elicited the role of individual choice, personal freedom, and self-actualization (Inglehart 1997). Studies measuring cultural dimensions have found that the United States is one of the most individualistic cultures in the world (Chhokar, Brodbeck, and House 2008). Concerning perception and attribution style, individualism assumes that judgment, reasoning, and causal inference are generally oriented toward the person rather than the situation or social context. On the other hand, collectivism definitions suggest that social context, situational constraints, and social roles figure prominently in personal perception and causal reasoning (Choi, Nisbett, and Norenzayan 1999).

Other authors also support the idea that individualistic societies put more weight on personal attributions and not on situations, which is a contrast to collectivistic societies. This difference causes attribution errors that affect fair judgment of individuals, and consequently perpetuates injustices. Morris and Peng (1994) tested the hypothesis that dispositionalism in attribution for behavior is more widespread in individualistic than collectivistic cultures. In their study they found that English-language newspapers were more dispositional and Chinese-language newspapers were more situational in explanations of the same crimes (mass murders in newspapers). The same authors in a survey found that Chinese respondents differed in their assessments of personal dispositions and situational factors as causes of recent murders and in counterfactual judgments about how murders might have been averted by changed situations. In addition, as these authors predicted, American reporters showed the pattern of the "ultimate attribution error" which is defined as "the tendency to underestimate the impact of situational factors and to overestimate the role of dispositional factors in controlling behavior" (Pettigrew 1979). In this study, American reporters attributed

the causes more to personal dispositions and less to situational factors for the out-group (Chinese) than for the in-group (American), while Chinese reporters did not show differences. These findings suggest that Americans (an individualistic culture) are more influenced by attribution error than members of a collectivistic culture. Furthermore, they are even more influenced by this error when the target of the evaluation is a member of another culture, who in most cases might be a member of a minority group.

Another perceptual bias attributed more to people in the United States is "selective processing," which occurs when ambiguous acts are given more negative interpretations (e.g., aggressive) when performed by a minority target (of stereotypical attributes) but are given more positive interpretations (e.g., playful) when performed by a white target. In an experiment involving jury decision making (Bodenhausen 1988), the defendant's ethnicity was subtly revealed either before or after the other case evidence had been processed. The analysis of the results revealed that the stereotyped defendant (a minority) was seen as more likely to be guilty than the nonstereotyped one (a white person) only when the stereotype (revealing the ethnicity) was activated before the evidence was considered.

Other studies referring to perceptual biases have assessed the assumption that people in individualistic cultures can experience higher levels of these perceptual errors than people from collectivistic cultures. For instance, in a series of experiments, Gelfand (2002) predicted that self-serving biases of fairness would be more prevalent in individualistic cultures, such as the United States, in which the self is served by focusing on one's positive attributes to "stand out" and be better than others (an unrealistic assumption). Three studies that used different methodologies (free recall, scenarios, and a laboratory experiment) supported this notion. All of them found differences between the two cultures' (individualistic versus collectivistic) participants with significant effects.

Perceptual biases and their consequent cultural unawareness, which affects many people from developed countries, could be produced by their cultural contexts. Schwalbe stated that at the top of the list of the American privileges, he can put

> not having to bother unless one chooses, to learn about other countries; and not having to bother, unless one chooses, to learn about how U.S. foreign policies affect people in other countries. A corollary privilege is to imagine that if people in other countries study us, it's merely out of admiration for our way of life. (Schwalbe 2002/2006, 604)

This author also stated that this obliviousness can be very harmful. He noted, "We then lose a mirror with which to view ourselves. Combined with power the result can be worse than innocent ignorance. It can be smug self-delusion, belief in the myth of one's own superiority, and a presumed right to dictate morality" (ibid., 604).

When analyzing the reasons why there is no current visible solution to these evident inequalities, it is clear that developed countries lack awareness of the developing countries' conditions. One of the identified characteristics of the servant-leader is awareness. Ferch stated, "Servant-leaders notice their own faults, promote reconciliation not only in the family but across races, cultures, and creeds" (Ferch 2012, 160).

Since this unawareness seems to be prevalent in dominant individualistic cultures from nations that own the power in the global scenario, it appears to be a little pessimistic to think that this unawareness cycle would end by their own initiative. Why would people who hold positional power spontaneously decide to share their power with powerless people and gain knowledge of the less privileged? I considered responding to this question from a more qualitative and personal approach by sharing personal experiences that are directly related to the inequality problem between cultures and the possibility of restoration.

PERSONAL EXPERIENCES OF UNEQUAL TREATMENT AND POSSIBLE RESTORATION

In the global scenario, inequalities are perpetrated in the form of developed countries' economic policies and international financial organizations that affect developing countries' conditions. On a more personal level, inequalities are enforced by a perceived sense of superiority of citizens of developed countries that causes them to commit acts of discrimination against citizens of developing countries without even noticing. Cultural ignorance plays a very strong role that produces perceptual biases against people from developing countries. Continuing on this personal level, I can describe what I experienced as a member of a minority from a developing country while visiting a developed country when I was a graduate student in the United States some years ago. As the only international student coming from a developing country, I felt that I was treated differently. The experience that affected me the most was when I was challenged by a professor who publicly mentioned that I was inferior because of my Latin American origin. He was the professor of the most difficult class in the masters program I studied, and which many

students usually failed. He constantly asked me questions about content that we had not reviewed in class or been assigned to read, with the sole intent of publicly ridiculing me for not knowing the answers. When I was not able to answer those questions, he said that the reason was because I was from a "poor undeveloped country." Because I received a scholarship while studying that program, I had the obligation to pass all courses with a high grade. I can recall that when I had to present a research paper to an important audience from different universities as a part of that course, the professor became very disappointed when he realized that I had done an excellent job and the audience congratulated me. He publicly said that he disagreed with the audience's evaluation. I had studied and worked the hardest in my life during that class mainly out of my fear of failure. I felt very lucky that this professor did not grade the tests himself because he had teaching assistants who completed that task for him. I obtained outstanding grades on all the tests. I could overcome that enormous challenge in my life, and I obtained an A in that class. I doubt that I would have obtained that grade if he had been the one who graded the tests because I understand that his biased perception about my performance and his unfair judgment about my intellectual inferiority were due to my country of origin.

I remember that under all the pressure I felt during that semester I could not sleep well at night and also that my dignity as a human being was hurt. When I finished the program and graduated I realized that this particular experience had made me grow. However, I realized that this person in that position of power would negatively affect other students from developing countries. I sent him an electronic mail explaining how I felt during his class and also stated that I already forgave him for treating me unfairly. I did not receive an answer to that message. Taking into consideration the words of Tutu, it is possible not to consider this person as evil but to understand his behavior considering the possible context that made him react in that specific form. Tutu suggested that we "had to distinguish between the deed and the perpetrator, between the sinner and the sin, to hate and condemn the sin while being filled with compassion for the sinner" (Tutu 1999, 83).

Another personal experience that touched my life was when I was treated differently by my future in-laws when I first met them. When I initially met my wife (an American) we both felt that we had an enormous personal connection that made us want to be together even with the difficulties that we could face for being from different cultures. We started with a long-distance relationship, with visits every time we could afford to pay for

tickets to travel between countries. Our relationship progressed and became more serious. Her parents manifested to her that they were against us having a relationship because of my country of origin. On my first visit, I wanted to calm them down by telling and showing them how serious I was about my commitment to the relationship. Unfortunately, they did not care about this and openly expressed to me that they were against our relationship based on my culture and race. They told me that they knew that all Latin Americans are lazy, alcoholics, and physically abusive toward their partners. I felt humiliated because I felt discriminated against on the basis of my origin.

After some years, we got married and my relationship with my parents-in-law improved on the surface. However, I felt that deep inside I still held resentment for the things they had told me years ago. I realized that I had not healed, and needed restoration in our relationship. They never apologized for what they had said. On different occasions when we met again, I realized that I could not freely be myself or openly demonstrate affection, even when they treated me with respect. I had some wounds that needed to be healed, not through time but through real forgiveness. I also realized that we were only ignoring and denying what had happened, so the issue was unresolved.

About three years ago I started a doctoral program in Leadership Studies at Gonzaga University and had the great opportunity to familiarize myself with the concepts of servant-leadership and restorative justice. One of the courses that most affected me was called "Leadership, Restorative Justice, and Forgiveness." During this course we also learned the difference between retributive and restorative justice. In retributive justice people look for retribution for damages by punishing the perpetrators, but this does not usually heal wounds. The perpetrators receive punishments that generally do not help them improve as human beings. In restorative justice, however, people do not seek revenge. Instead, they can heal their wounds and grow mutually with the perpetrators of the damages. In this different type of justice, restoration and reconciliation is obtained as a result of human understanding and healing between individuals. Tutu described the success of reconciliation by saying that it is achieved "when we will know that we are indeed members of one family, bound together in a delicate network of interdependence" (Tutu 1999, 274).

From the learning gained in this specific course at Gonzaga, I was inspired to obtain restorative justice in my own personal situation. I realized that after being hurt, I was expecting some type of retributive justice

that was probably never going to come. I also realized that I had unresolved issues and that my own level of self-awareness had been affected by my past. However, learning about servant-leadership and restorative justice opened new possibilities to obtain something far more valuable, which is to heal and be healed. Ferch stated, "Just as the servant-leader is servant first, the servant-leader asks forgiveness first and does not wait for the other to take the initial steps towards reconciliation" (Ferch 2012, 139).

This personal experience of learning about forgiveness and reconciliation was also an excellent way to prove to myself that people from developed countries could actually change their perceptual biases and support equality between cultures. They only needed to be accompanied in this process. We needed to be accountable for our own pain and recovery together. Greenleaf stated, "Love is an indefinable term…its manifestations are both subtle and infinite. But it begins…with one absolute condition: unlimited liability. As soon as one's liability for another is qualified to any degree, love is diminished by that much" (Greenleaf 1977/2002, 52).

With a new optimistic desire to heal and be healed, I decided to talk to my parents-in-law. First, I wanted to ask for their forgiveness for my coldness toward them. I also wanted to offer them my own forgiveness for what they had said and done. Their initial reaction was total denial mixed with an attempt to minimalize the conflict. Their response was that they did not remember the things that I was affirming they had said, and they expressed that they had always accepted me for who I was. I did not want them to avoid this issue because I felt that in that case real forgiveness could not be really granted, since truth was not acknowledged. As I reminded them again of their initial attitude and their words, they finally admitted what they had done. They affirmed that they were influenced by their cultural unawareness and that they were sorry that their words and attitude had hurt me. I forgave them for their initial unfair treatment. I was greatly surprised that they finally admitted that they were wrong and that they were also glad that it was I who brought up this topic because they were too ashamed to do it. They also told me that they admired me for my bravery for talking openly about this, and they felt very lucky to have me as their son-in-law, a member of the family. This healing event came at the most appropriate time, as my wife and I are expecting our first child. This new member of our family will come into the world from a different generation based on equality, forgiveness, and mutual respect between our cultures. We will make sure that this happens with the help of our parents.

The personal experience described in the previous section might not provide
clear evidence of a world that is changing rapidly in a positive way toward
achieving equality among all people. However, this experience demonstrated
that with restorative justice and the application of some servant-leader char-
acteristics identified by Spears (1998) such as listening, empathy, healing,
awareness, stewardship, commitment to the growth of others, and building
community, it is possible to achieve real change in societies. As Greenleaf
stated:

> All that is needed to rebuild community as a viable life form for large
> numbers of people is for enough servant-leaders to show the way, not
> by mass movements, but by each servant-leader demonstrating his or
> her unlimited liability for a quite specific community-related group.
> (Greenleaf 1977/2002, 53)

From this personal experience I can see that people from dominant cul-
tures would probably not be able to understand their perceptual errors when
judging people from dominated cultures if there is not a responsible accom-
paniment from the latter. People from developing countries cannot remain
silent or passive. We must accompany people from developed countries in
the responsibility of healing our societies. Ferch stated, "Power then is not
only the power to forgive, but the power to evoke in others the tenacity to
respond to darkness with light, to respond to evil with good, and to respond
to hatred with love" (Ferch 2012, 45). People who suffer from cultural igno-
rance and commit injustices based on their perceptual biases cannot be left
alone to solve these problems by themselves. They need to be understood,
considering their limitations, and they also need to be guided to overcome
their lack of awareness.

Martin Luther King Jr. defended the idea that people from minorities
who were discriminated against had to love their oppressors to change their
condition. Ferch quoted him saying, "[W]hen we love the oppressor, we
bring about not only our own salvation, but the salvation of the oppres-
sor" (in Ferch 2012, 13). In practice, it is very hard for people who suffer
different types of abuses to express love to the people who perpetrated the
abuses, but it is the only way to break the dominating/dominated interac-
tion by obtaining a common healing. There is a lot to do to achieve equality
in the world. Especially because some abuses between cultures have left

inner hate and misunderstanding. However, this healing process should start immediately from our own personal cases, by recognizing our suffering and facing accountability in the world's healing process. Ferch stated, "In facing ourselves, especially in the darkness of our experiences of unavoidable suffering, love can touch even our deepest wounds" (ibid., 177). If we adopt this practice of mutual forgiveness in our personal lives, it is probable that together, being from different cultures, we can heal the soul of the world. People from developing countries should not look for retributive justice after having experienced abuses from dominant cultures.

On a global level, the representatives from our different nations, with our different realities, can learn and practice real forgiveness and restorative justice and become servant-leaders who contribute to change the condition of a current unequal world that affects everyone. As Ferch stated, "True leadership heals the heart of the world" (2012, 194). Global inequalities are not going to be changed by only poor or rich nations. This is a challenge in which both developed and undeveloped countries need to engage together. This is the only way to find sustainable coexistence among countries in the global scenario. There is an imperious need to start working toward breaking the oppressive cycle that affects most of the world's population. We, people from developed and undeveloped countries, need to start holding ourselves accountable for our shared future and start the healing process together immediately.

WORKS CITED

Black, J. K. 2006. "Inequality in the Global Village." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 323–30. New York: Worth. (Original work published 1999).

Bodenhausen, G. V. 1988. "Stereotypic Biases in Social Decision Making and Memory: Testing Process Models of Stereotype Use." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 55: 726–37.

Booker, S. and W. Minter. 2006. "Global Apartheid: AIDS and Murder by Patent." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 517–22. New York: Worth. (Original work published 2001).

Bulbeck, C. 2006. "Fracturing Binarisms: First and Third Worlds." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 37–40. New York: Worth. (Original work published 1998).

Chhokar, J. S., F. C. Brodbeck, and R. J. House, eds. 2008. *Culture and Leadership across the World: The GLOBE Book of In Depth Studies of 25 Societies*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Choi, I., R. E. Nisbett, and A. Norenzayan. 1999. "Causal Attribution across Cultures: Variation and Universality." *Psychological Bulletin* 125: 47–63.

El Saadawi, N. 2006. "Women and the Poor: The Challenge of Global Justice." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 400–408. New York: Worth. (Original work published 1997).

Farmer, P. 2006. "Suffering and Structural Violence." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global issues* (pp. 368–393). New York: Worth. (Original work published 2003).

Ferch, S. R. (2012). *Forgiveness and power in the age of atrocity.* New York: Lexington Books

Galeano, J. (2006). "Open veins of Latin America." In P. Rothenberg (Ed.), *Beyond borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 127–41. New York: Worth. (Original work published 1997).

Gelfand, M. J., M. Higgins, L. H. Nishii, J. L. Raver, A. Dominguez, F. Murakami, S. Yamaguchi, and M. Toyama. 2002. "Culture and Egocentric Perceptions of Fairness in Conflict and Negotiation." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 87: 833–45.

Greenleaf, R. 2002. *Servant-Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness.* Mahwah: Paulist Press.

Inglehart, R. 1997. *Modernization and Postmodernization.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kloby, J. 2006. "The Legacy of Colonialism." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 99–106. New York: Worth. (Original work published 2004).

Majavu, M. 2006. "Debt, Reforms, and Social Services in Africa." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*,edited by P. Rothenberg, 507–509. New York: Worth. (Original work published 2004).

Mies, M. 2006. "The Myth of Catching Up Development." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 150–57. New York: Worth. (Original work published 1993).

Morris, M. W., and K. Peng. 1994. "Culture and Cause: American and Chinese Attributions for Social and Physical Events." *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology* 67: 949–71.

Pettigrew, T. F. 1979. "The Ultimate Attribution Error: Extending Allport's Cognitive Analysis of Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 5: 461–76.

Rodney, W. 2006. "How Europe Underdeveloped Africa." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 107–25). New York: Worth. (Original work published 1972).

Rothenberg, P. S., ed. 2006. *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues.* New York: Worth.

Sachs, J. 2006. "Macroeconomics of Health: No Health Available at $7.50 per Person per Year." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 364–67). New York: Worth.

Schwalbe, M. 2006. "The Cost of American Privilege." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 603–605. New York: Worth. (Original work published 2002).

Spears, L. C. 1998. *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Stiglitz, J. 2006. "Globalization and Its Discontents: The Promise of Global Institutions." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 419–31). New York: Worth.

Tutu, D. 1999. *No Future without Forgiveness*. New York: Doubleday.

Wibbeke, E. S. 2009. *Global Business Leadership*. Burlington, MA: Elsevier.

Wiesel, E. 2006. *Night*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Wiesenthal, S. 1998. *The Sunflower*. New York: Schocken Books.

Williams, W. A. 2006. "Empire as a Way of Life." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 81–88. New York: Worth. (Original work published 1980).

Yates, M. 2006. "Poverty and Inequality in the Global Economy." In *Beyond Borders: Thinking Critically about Global Issues*, edited by P. Rothenberg, 330–39. New York: Worth. (Original work published 2004).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Christian B. Cabezas obtained his degree as a psychologist at the Pontifical Catholic University of Ecuador (PUCE), where he currently occupies the position of director of continuing education and community relations, and also works as a faculty member in the psychology department. He obtained a Masters degree in psychology at the University of Idaho and later an MBA at the University of Alcalá in Spain. He is currently a PhD candidate in the doctoral program in leadership studies at Gonzaga University.