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The cover photograph is of a large bronze statue of Tzar Petr the Great on horseback, Petr perhaps the central developmental figure in Russian history. Three hundred years ago, because he realized the central importance of increasing active participation in European affairs, he commanded that Russia’s ancient capital, Moscow, be physically moved West, much closer to Europe, to the current site of St. Petersburg, which he founded and had built through his own force of will, moving both the central governmental structures and Russian society to a place originally a swamp but soon the center of state affairs. In spite of tremendous roadblocks, he finally succeeded. He also had deep feelings for the people and spent time regularly down at the docks, working with the sailors on their ships, building, exhorting, and helping raise the sails together. There, he was just like one of the other working men.
# Table of Contents

**Part 1: Experience in the field**

Poem: Back the night before  
4

Chapter 1: On the Midnight Train: Moscow to Leningrad  
6

Chapter 2: Action Research with Havana: Conflict Prevention and Early Intervention in Service of Collaborative Research with the Cuban Foreign Ministry  
44

Poem: Obisbo Street  
58

Poem: Refugio  
83

**Part 2: Thinking about conflict**

Poem: Ramallah Today  
88

Chapter: 3: Transparency and Interest-Based Collaborative Negotiation About Basic Human Needs  
92

Chapter 4: How Questions Generated Six Categories of Case Study Plan Development  
143

Chapter 5: Coming Back From Polarization: Listening and Transparency in Psychotherapy and Mediation  
152

Chapter 6: Some Practical Steps for Helping Others Come Back From Polarization  
167

Poem: White, white  
172
The poem by Skip Robinson below is reprinted with permission from the award-winning collection (Josephine Miles Prize for poetry), *An Eye for an Eye Makes the Whole World Blind – Poets on 9/11*, Regent Press, Oakland, edited by Allen Cohen and Clive Matson

**Back the night before**

I yearn for the huge silver airliners to pull backwards out of the buildings they’ve slammed into, for the knives to retreat from the flesh as if they had never thought of entering,

that the blades return to their box-cutting, with no move to the left or the right. I plead with the explosions to return back into their bombs,

their hand grenades, their mortar shells, back into the airplanes filled with fuel for the long journey home. I plead that the great expanses of rubble and broken stone rise back up into the buildings they had been before the attack,

the roads back into being, leading again to the homes of loved ones. I beseech the blood, the pieces of flesh, the eyes, the guts, the skin, the organs of love-making to float up from deep in the rubble and soil
and weave themselves back into the
living bodies of family and community.
I cry that we gain the determination to climb
back before the deathly events, back the night before,

the night of September 10th, while the angry and oppressed talk
outside,
people are talking and listening with each other inside over dinner -
how to live fairly with each other, how to live fairly with the planet,
how to bring those outside in - the next day the same people
climbing onto the same airliners,

flying successfully to their destinations, the balance of things
swinging back toward a fair center, minds flooding with visions
of a new century and millennium. I reach my hands up
toward the sky and plead

that cooling rain fall down, that a bright moon may rise
into the black sky, that all the stars are luminous against the
backdrop of utter darkness and that the families are all safe and
home again, that the only fires are in the fireplaces and in the stars.
Chapter 1: On the Midnight Train: Moscow to Leningrad

It’s a late spring night, very chilly in the hour before midnight, May 1990, Moscow’s central railroad station, getting colder as full night settles in. Dark outside, yet, somehow, the sky still glows with muted light.

Around the world is California and the U.S. Around me in this huge echoing train station, I hear language sounds I’m not used to, only Russian and Slavic tongues I think, plus the language of huge loud machines -- pungent smells from trains fill the place. Big puffs of white smoke. Loud squeaks and squeals. The group of us from the U.S., our ecological negotiation studies team, utterly exhausted, has just spent fourteen hours in the air, mainly over the Atlantic Ocean – On Alitalia from San Francisco through New York and straight on to Copenhagen, then on Aeroflot (the Soviet airline) from Copenhagen to Moscow. We landed in late afternoon. Tonight we would take the overnight train to Leningrad, where we would be working/studying, preparing a full-day ecological and public policy negotiation simulation jointly with Russian colleagues. (That ecological negotiation simulation play (to be developed into an improvisation drama) would be played out for the first time a year from then.)
As our Aeroflot flight was taxiing up to the gate in Moscow, I found, looking out my oval window, a large number of Soviet soldiers on the tarmac directly in front of us, in khaki with high shiny boots, holding rifles at the ready. That very day, I thought, thousands of thermonuclear missiles were still aimed at the cities and towns of each other’s country - Thousands of Hiroshimas. The Berlin wall has just recently fallen. Gorbachev was instituting major new national policies, Glasnost and Perestroika, aimed at truth-telling by the government (which had been tested after Chernobyl) and thorough restructuring of their economy and their political methods.

After enduring interminable airport security and swimming through utterly huge, rather pushy, crowds, we finished entering the country and pushed out the airport’s front doors into fresh air. Just outside the airport we joined six Moscow-Leningrad colleagues and counterparts. Early evening – taken to a handsome restaurant - our choices of several kinds of borscht, salads, meats, good bread, excellent dinner in the midst of new joint experiences - English and Russian being spoken tentatively together. Our cordial professional colleagues are staying with us here in Moscow until we are ready to go meet our train. They will wait until the huge shiny black Midnight Train to Leningrad steams in, until we climb aboard, until we head off into the deep midnight headed toward Leningrad, due to arrive there just about dawn.
We’re so very tired and sleepy. The storied Midnight Train from Moscow to Leningrad is due to arrive soon to take us there, but in our exhaustion we feel that it’s been such a long time we’ve been standing waiting on the railroad platform they’ve taken us to. The train is due and we are waiting half-asleep, deep in jet lag, in fact, more asleep than half. I would so gladly fall into bed in a hotel right now; but we are to go to our destination tonight; and we really must go.

Our U.S. group ‘s particular focus is on co-creating with our Russian counterparts, whom we will be meeting on Monday, a full-day ecological negotiation simulation (essentially an improvisational drama) to be played out by Soviet seminar participants the following year on the last full day of the seminar we will be planning: Soviet regional planners, scientists, psychologists, negotiators, architects, engineers, public representatives, city and “oblast” (county) executives, lawyers, and others. It was to be a multi-disciplinary, active, and dramatic visceral synthesis of the week’s collaborative conflict resolution learning process.

We were to be working with Leningrad’s Lengiprogor, at that time the Soviet Union’s largest Russian public planning institute. Lengiprogor (now renamed
Urbanistica at that time had full city planning responsibilities for over 500 Russian cities.

I’m utterly drained, exhausted, near midnight, flight-addled, still, still standing next to my bags. I look down at the railroad platform. Well-washed black and gray marble floor. I want so much to go to sleep right now. The nearby locomotive diesel engines give off a loud bass hiss and a strong oily electrical smell. The odors and heat coming in waves. The intensity of the railroad sounds and smells around us increases ten-fold as the Midnight Train appears some distance away and begins pulling in on the track toward us.

The Moscow-to-Leningrad midnight train is huge, pulls up on the track right before us. With a general and loud shudder, the train stops, issuing forth a loud bang of the metal railroad car couplers, very loud metal-on-metal steely squeaks, then a long very loud pneumatic hiss. Then relative silence.

A trainman rolls the metal climb-up stairs into place below our train entrance door, connecting us on the platform with the high entrance to the shining railroad car now right in front of the group of us. From the side of this passenger car, bright yellow Cyrillic letters reach out to us in print. I stare and wonder intensely what it means.

Uniformed trainmen walk up, bow, and tell us in Russian to please climb up the metal stars to our railroad car’s high entrance. They
point up the stairs. They are encouraging, well dressed. The railroad car’s steel steps are steep, and we make metal clacking noises as we climb up. This railroad car appears well washed and in good and rather shiny condition tonight. It is finally midnight. (So long – two days - since the last real sleep at home.) At the top of the steps, I take in the intense smell of hot metal and oil and walk inside. Down the car’s narrow wooden and steel corridor, Jon Townsend and I (Jon, from Portland, Oregon, is my fellow teacher and curriculum developer on this journey and in the future) carry our heavy bags, made so much heavier by our walking the hallway in a half-dozing state. Beyond the approaching door to our space, at the far end of the car’s hallway, we can see a large silver Russian samovar, a beautiful old-fashioned water boiler, polished and shining against the far wall, ancient tradition, ready with its ornate spigot to pour steaming hot water for one’s coffee or tea. An old white-coated attendant stands by the samovar. He regards us with a nod.

Toward the end of the hallway is a small cabin on the right to which we have been assigned. I open the door and put the bags inside. Wooden slat benches stick out from its opposite sides of the room, a bench place on opposite sides for each of us. I see a rack above me and reach up and stow my belongings, hopefully for the night. Tomorrow seems so far away, almost a dream.

The hard slat benches jut about twelve to fourteen inches out from the wall. Apparently the only place to sleep. No cushion or
mattress in sight. No sheets. No pillow. No blankets. So I’ll use sweaters, coat, rolled up clothes for a pillow, another coat laid down for a cover. Cold still, holding tight with one hand to the outside slat to keep me from falling off the bench onto the floor in my sleep. Floods of thoughts. Please let the sleep come soon.

Lying still, I found myself wondering more about this profoundly different culture we were about to try to learn with, a country wrapped with us in vast and deadly paradoxes. (Now we were beyond the books, correspondence, lengthy planning. Here we were on Russian soil. But the sides still poised entwined near the edge of abyss:

Dan Ellsberg at the Lama Foundation, Summer weekend conference, 1984

“...but between ’55 and ’60, we retooled. We modernized. We put in Teller’s bombs, H-Bombs, same [U.S. nuclear] plans to hit the same cities – and the (projected) casualties ([n a full nuclear war] went from 20 million to 600 million, first strike; and, sort of, nobody noticed.”

I continued to lay there. The rumbling of the train’s wheels on the track was soothing. But sleeping was coming so very hard. For a long time I lay there tossing, turning, tossing some more. Sleep seemed to become agonizingly impossible. Then hours fitfully in
and out of exhausted semi-consciousness, sleeping, the wheels of the train ever clicking and waving below us. The hard thin bench beneath me was moving and moving with the hard constant motion of the train on the tracks. Even relatively unconscious, I was still trying to hold on, to be sure I didn’t roll off the bench. Then half dreams – the thermonuclear war threat and nowhere to hide. Then another dream feeling that somewhat distant possibility that this trip could work, could help with more resolution of conflict, explorations in developing more joint conflict resolution language and concepts. Failing into deeper sleep exploring what it might feel like for us, ending our wars, what it might feel like for us all during the first night that everyone on earth has been fed, that there was enough for all. (Tonight, says the World Bank, over 900 million are hungry.) Vaguely, falling into sleep, so groggily worrying, trying at least not to make things any worse between us all.

When, early in his being Premier, then-Soviet President Gorbachev brought out a national policy he called “Glasnost,” or truthful public reporting, one critical truth which soon began to spread around the world was the very extent of Soviet and Eastern European environmental poisoning.

Mr. Gorbachev’s parallel initiative, “Perestroika,” involved planning to functionally restructure the Soviet social order, so that it and was more humane, effective, looking for more justice for the Soviet people. Basic to
their future in successful dealing with their environmental crisis would be the negotiation of plans for the resolution of ecological crises, the development and preservation of ecological balance, and the revitalization of that which had already been severely ecologically damaged and which was presently in great danger of becoming much worse. They wanted to train more people in ecological negotiation, to develop an ecological negotiation momentum and tradition.

They were also dealing with new and fascinating democratic issues in general and also of who to consider as logical parties to sit at any ecological negotiation table, under what circumstances, with what objectives. They needed to refine and keep focused on the utter gravity of their Russian ecological predicament, developing strategies to move them beyond those mortal dangers.

I woke up to faint light against my eyelids, gentle light coming in the cabin’s small window. With some effort and grunting, I finally sat myself up. I began working on getting that special balance again of standing up on a bouncing, fast-moving train, gently shaking back and forth, sounding and bouncing to the clack-clack on the rails. I stood up and, blinking, began to look around. More light. I walked
over, balancing carefully, and opened the cabin door to the hallway. I heard the deep sounds of the train and the tracks increasing five-fold. I looked out along the long naturally lighted hallway, gleaming samovar inviting at our end of the car. I walked along the hallway toward the railway car’s center. Several travelers, including a couple of our colleagues, had gathered there, standing with others silently staring out the big car’s panoramic hallway windows, lush Russian countryside rolling by in the foggy early light. Nobody talking. Only the sound and feel of the big steel wheels rolling on the track beneath us. The sight of endless green forest life rolling by outside, mile after mile. Waking up some more. The sun’s coming up some more. All so massive, so beautiful. Gray forest fog growing less intense in the emerging light. This would be the day. Today we arrive.

•

As the train approached the increasingly urban area, before the train quite reached Leningrad and the railroad station, all of us got up and moved around, groggy, getting fully dressed, re-packing all our belongings to be ready to go. Then out to the hallway, the green, brown, and the lightening blue outside, almost a blur, the moaning sound of our train. Everyone fell quiet - and watched Leningrad Station arrive and pull around us.

As we pulled forward - loudly squeaking brakes - into the station, ornate, bright. Looking out the hallway windows, we first saw
drawing toward us, as the train slowed down, a group of maybe twenty standing on the platform. We guessed right that it was our hosts from Lengiprogor, the Lengiprogor City/State Planning Institute. They were standing there as a group on the approaching platform area, smiling, spouses and children standing beside them, beginning to wave.

The train stopped, we climbed off, and we met. Here was my host, a tall thin Lengiprogor architect, Alexandr Chiburyn, his wife, Nina, an engineer, and their teenage daughter, Masha, a student. (At that time, I had two teenage daughters of my own at home.) I was to stay with the Chiburyns. So we walked together out of the station, walked for some distance, and climbed onto public transit to cross the city to their apartment. The Leningrad public transit we took was impressive - fast, frequent, clean, very good. We reached their apartment, met their family dog, Jack, a big German shepherd who knew he was their big protector, and settled in, had good hot tea from their steaming samovar and then had a home-cooked dinner of beef and potatoes. Masha, their daughter, pulled out their Russian-English dictionary (called in Russian a Slovar); I pulled out one I’d gotten at home, among the materials I had been studying toward this day. We began to talk, a word or phrase at a time. Wife and daughter knew no English, but Masha was good with a Slovar. Alexandr knew some and made it all work.
When Alexandr turned on their television set, in Russian and English, we heard “Who You Gonna Call?” On the screen appeared a Russian language version of Ghostbusters.

So there we were, Masha, Alexandr, Nina, Jack, and me. My body had come to a complete stop in a soft chair in their kitchen. I felt good about being with them, sitting around the kitchen table, family life centered around the kitchen, the samovar bubbling across the room, Jack curled up on the kitchen floor.

Leningrad in Russian is pronounced approximately Leen-in-gradya. To me, at this beginning, I experienced Leningrad as a warm kitchen, with a kind family, people I would stay with for the couple of weeks of work. And Alexandra and I would be working together.

Over dinner, we got into a lively cross-language exchange, looking to our two-language dictionaries for apt words or phrases with which to query or answer each other. Especially Masha. We stayed at it for an hour. Then I began to fold.

Alexandr took me to their living room, where he put together their pull-out bed into the living room space, a rather comfortable bed – finally the promise of a full night of sleep in a real bed. After flying out from San Francisco two days ago, In just a few minutes, I was finally under very warm covers. I thought about the home and the country I
had left to come here. Things began to fade away, then long deep sleep.

Alexandr woke me up. It was to be our first work day together. Time for me to shower and get dressed and ready to go. “Oh”, Alexandr said: “Be sure to shower with your mouth closed. Don’t let any shower water get in. You really mustn’t swallow any. And don’t use spigot water for brushing teeth.”

I hardly remember breakfast. There we were - out the door - the first day bright outside as we began walking toward the tram.

Alexandr and I walk at a good pace for ten minutes or so to the tram stop. It’s a big cloudy, I remember. We talk a bit as we walk, with Alexandr offering his English. It’s hard but he perseveres.

The tram pulls up soon and stops. Their trams are rather thin, much like ours at home and in Europe. It is almost full. We stand and hold onto ceiling straps as the tram moves forward, headed for the nearest subway station, gets there, and stops. Everyone gets off and walks toward the subway station entrance. The subway station is big and clean, distinctive art patterns reach out from the wall tiles as we enter. The individual subway fare is equivalent to a U.S. penny. We head to the escalator in a mass and begin going down to the platform far below. It’s a long ride down. The platform walls continue the station’s ceramic and tile.
The freshly washed subway train arrived within five minutes and stopped in front of us. We got on and took hold of ceiling straps again; the car was full. In Russian, an amplified voice was asking that people move completely inside the car, that the door was about to close. Then, on that first day, I didn’t understand a thing. But I started a pattern of inquiry. “Alexandr, what does this mean? What’s the Russian word for that? (I started to listen and learn those words in Russian. We’d be at this for two weeks. I ought to learn.) Alexandr was very patient explaining things to me. The ceiling of the subway car was graced, above us, along its ceiling spine. A half dozen big beautiful lights, with pink concentric circles around the glass. So like surreal oversized nipples. Most people too no notice that Alexandr and I were speaking a very basic English. The talking all around us sounded Russian or Slavic.

The announcement came on that we were about to arrive at our station. Alexandr led the two of us through the mass moving toward the escalators, up for a long ride, then through the busy station and out the door. We began walking toward the Lengiprogor Planning Institute, the offices we would be meeting in almost every day for two weeks. (Lengiprogor was then the chief public planning organization in Russia. During the later part of the Soviet period, it had full responsibility for about 500 cities in Russia.

We were to be working on planning and writing together with their team toward developing an all-day improvisational ecological and
public planning negotiation simulation. This simulation was to be played out by Soviet participants for the final day of the week-long full-time seminar to be offered the next spring or summer.

The walking to work was helping me wake up (though jet lag was to come and go for days). As we walked up to the Lengiprogor front entrance, Alexandr opened the door for me and was smiling. “Here’s home,” he said.

When Gorbachev was head of the Soviet government, terms glasnost and perestroika were ubiquitous in American papers. The Chernobyl nuclear plant mega-disaster seemed to begin to show a significant change around Soviet public policy. For example, after about a week of the usual obfuscation, in a seeming major break from old policy, the Soviet Government suddenly began releasing seemingly accurate radiation and damage data right away, data which was very valuable for other nations to use to independently assess the situation and what danger they might be in. The whole world was frightened about possible radiation spreading. The government’s candor was shocking because the West was used to smoke and mirrors, and the West had gotten used to getting spin and propaganda from the Soviet obfuscation.

Glasnost called for truth-telling among agencies of the Soviet government and between those agencies and the Soviet and world
publics. Perestroika, in Russian literally restructuring. The policy called for major reorientations and restructuring of the national government, toward more transparency, more listening, more judicious and equitable, democratically directed problem resolution, more shared power and responsibility. It was in the frame of this opening change that we had been asked to come over. We were asked to collaboratively develop with them a week-long seminar on cooperative (non-dictatorial) ways of conflict resolution. This seminar would be given for a wide variety public leaders. Leningrad University would be brought into the potential for educational leadership there.

•

The first session of our Lengiprogor-U.S. team took place in a large room on the second floor at Lengiprogor where a circle of small tables had been formed the shape of a circle, accommodating about 40 of us. I looked around the room at the faces of the Lengiprogor team at the table. I see that it could just about as easily be an ecological professionals’ group meeting at home. Their team was about equally male and female, a variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds, both young and several stages of middle-aged.

Then we began. Greetings in both languages. We started around the room with each person on the Russian team talking briefly about their work and recent focus. Each one related professional focus on critical ecological dangers, often at personal risk. Ever since then,
I’ve thought often about that meeting as one of heroes and heroines—soil scientists, biological scientists, architects, lawyers, psychologists, public policy analysts, city and regional administrators, educators, and others. What was pouring out was this combination of a wide variety of professional disciplines showing their own ways of moving the system they were working in toward more cooperative approaches, joint research, ones which honored honesty and reform. In the recent past, before Gorbachev, Glasnost and Perestroika, many had put their jobs (and possibly their freedom) on the line in order to report, study, and correct ecologically destructive practices. What was most common in these tales was principled dialogue and action. Our team had known through Western media about Gorbachev’s declaring these radical new goals, about their first attempts to carry these new goals forward. Yet we had not seen the flow of critically important public change going on as a result and at the same time, right at the society’s grass roots. Now, here it was.

Later that afternoon, the team developing the eco-negotiation simulation (team problem-solving) first broke into work groups, our group focusing on the full-day improvisational drama we would develop, which would be for all seminar participants for a full day of the week-long seminar, playing out the simulation (or it could be called an improvisational drama) which would give them the opportunity to put together and use all that they had been learning that week about cooperative, basic-human-needs ways of negotiating—an ecological negotiation simulation involving the development of
cooperative public planning around an ecological crisis and multiple-party decision-making.

Cemetery

At one point, as the plans developed, we went out together to the Leningrad war memorial which had mass graves left from World War II, Adolf Hitler’s troops attacked and, in a hideously long siege, surrounded Leningrad, continuously bombed it, left everyone there starving, squeezed it like a fiendish boa constrictor. Hitler’s siege lasted 900 days, two and a half years. In my mind now, I still see mass grave mounds one after another after another, each mound about fifty feet wide by 100 feet long, about 2500 Leningraders to a mound, some mounds marked civilian, some military, some mounds marked 1941, some 1942, some 1943, rows upon rows upon rows. There, I counted up to 100,000 civilian mass graves in just one area (the counting took only a minute). Then I stopped, sat down, did nothing for a long while.

“Hero-City” says a main metal memorial held in stone across the front of the last rows of mass mounds, “Mother Leningrad”. It is cold. I stand there. Beyond the mass grave mounds, headed in one direction, the older historic St. Petersburg graveyard of three-hundred years goes back through the foliage there and disappears out of sight.
Babushka on the bus

As soon as I could learn to make my way, with rudimentary Russian and directions, I began to go out through the city on buses and trams. One day, in a bus crammed full of riders, I was standing, holding the strap overhead, next to an old woman, wearing a traditional babushka over her head, carrying a large bulky purse at her side. (These old women themselves are often called babushkas. As the bus made its way, at one moment she reached down into her big bag. Some riders nearby turned surreptitiously to look. Her hand pulled up, out of the bag, the happy face of a little black and white puppy, who immediately looked around with interest. Laughter broke out around her. The laughter quickly spread through the bus. People craned their necks to see. The babushka was obviously, shyly pleased. Nearby, a young couple, he in military uniform, she in pretty checkered dress, laughed and, still chuckling, kissed each other. The babushka and her dog were not our enemy. Nor were those others, laughing, smiling, pointing. I yearned that they be taken out of our thermonuclear bomb sights. This, after all, as it was turning out in my feelings, was part of our family.

Another bus ride

Another day, when I was riding on another bus, looking out at the every-dayness of those walking along outside, the buildings behind
them. I had been studying the Russian written language and its Cyrillic alphabet for some time but had no uses for it yet. (That alphabet had been developed for the Russians from the Greek a thousand years ago.) My bus was stopped for traffic. I looked outside at a store’s large Cyrillic sign. Gibberish, I thought. Then, on impulse, I took the word across letter by letter. The first Russian letter was like our P. The second like our R. The third Cyrillic letter in the sign was like our O. Suddenly, like a flash, I saw forming the word PRODUCE. I looked and saw lettuce and cabbage stacked in the front window. Here was a word (called a cognate) where two languages have a word or phrase in common (after you get through the fog, through the Cyrillic alphabet. Suddenly, everything was less of a mystery. Things could, after all, be learned. There was hope.

- Rybachye is born

‘In the region of Primor’ye, on the eastern shores of the Confederation of Independent States, just off the Sea of Japan, is the seacoast town of Rybachye. Located between Vladivostok and Dal’negorsk, Rybachye has enjoyed a relative quiet and peaceful existence for many years.’ So began the description the Russian-American team was drafting for the ecological negotiation simulation drama we had come to develop. The title became “The Problems of Developing the town of
Rybachye – Scenario of the game for teaching the method of negotiating on disputable problems of regional planning and nature protection”. As we alternatively drafted and met in committee to consider the drafts, the background reading for all negotiation game participants (the negotiation seminar participants) grew to almost 30 pages, including reports of an eye-opening initial meeting of Rybachye residents.

In our small working group, we were tackling the question of what, in our ecological simulation (our improvisational drama) the crisis we were thinking through would be about. Who would be the set of characters in the drama? Who would they represent? How would they have to struggle in the search for common ground. Slowly in our discussions a pattern began to emerge. This would have to be a struggle of ideology and action among the different groups with a primary interest in a sustainable ecological solution. Perhaps an important mining discovery, but one which could have extremely negative ecological consequences.

White nights

In Russia, geographically high up North on the earth’s globe, much nearer the North Pole, an effect is, in the winter, significantly fewer
hours of light, and, in summer, significantly more hours of light. (In early summer, at 11 pm, cars run along Leningrad streets with no headlights on, the atmosphere of gauzy light remaining in the sky, giving rise to an annual early summer festival in Leningrad (now St. Petersburg again) called White Nights. My hosts, the Chibouryns, introduced me to it. After we had been working at Lengiprogor for a few days, they suggested that I take an early evening nap. They would get me up again at 11 pm. The whole family would be going to go across the city and down to the banks of the flowing Neva River, in front of the Winter Palace. The tradition was to arrive at the river by midnight. They woke me up at 11. They were in a festive mood. We left home and walked together in this 11 pm twilight with ever-increasing groups of others toward the tram stop. The mass of the group was building as we walked, everyone seeming to be in a holiday mood. We wedged onto the tram, headed off through the cool evening air, and soon arrived at the subway stop. We got off into the growing crowd converging on it. We entered for a kopek and headed down the long escalator. The platform below was filling with those waiting for the downtown/Winter Palace train.

When we came out of the subway door, we walked just a few blocks together along a huge triumphal square and the Winter Palace and, as we turned a corner, began to see the wide Neva River all deep blue and rippling before us. We walked toward it, past the white and light blue Winter Palace and came down to a spot on the bank of the river. More and more people gathered, sat down, and spread picnics out on checkered cloths on the grass at the banks of the
flowing river. At midnight, the bridges across the river raised to let big ships come in to port from the Bay of Finland, just north. (Ships could come into the Neva during the first hour midnight to 1 am to unload. Ships could go out during the second hour, from 1 to 2.

A brightly dressed wedding couple came walking through the midnight gathering, tossing flowers, smiling broadly, and responding happily to the enthusiastic applause and cheers of the crowd. Jugglers, actors, musicians came by our spot on the grass. The huge ships flowed by. On the shore, the star-lit night around us; the picnicing folks around us began to sing.

•

Rybachye takes form

During the week of the seminar to be held the next spring/summer, the game participants were to read this, what we called the Common Data Bank, the night before the negotiation simulation game was to be played. Each of the four teams we decided to have (Rybachye town citizens team, Russian Republic’s Ministry of Economics team, Ministry of Industry team, and the Fisheries/Tourism team, each with its own priorities and interests. Our team continued drafting, writing out outlines for team and individual player descriptions.

•
Another ride on the tram

One day, thinking I had reached the stop for home, I got off the tram a couple of stops too soon, but I didn’t then realize it. I thought I knew my way back, but when I looked around carefully, soon I found the surroundings strange, unknown. I asked a young woman passing by if she spoke any English. “Just a little bit,” she said. (I knew very, very little Russian, not enough to get out of this.) I thought to explain my plight, but I could see by her face that she understood only a little of what I was trying to say. I asked her if she knew any French (which I had studied a bit in college). “Nyet,” she said in Russian. Then she said: “Just wait a minute.” She went off and disappeared. I felt so very vulnerable standing there lost.

She came right back, smiling. She had with her a fellow who spoke a little French, as well as Russian. So we began to talk, haltingly, together – Russian to French to English and back and forth. They realized that I was lost after getting off the neighborhood tram at the wrong stop. They walked me back to the tram stop. We talked and gestured about where I was going. Soon, I was getting on the next tram, thanking them both sincerely, hoping I was now remembering the characteristics of the stop I was rushing toward. I recognized the right stop. A little walk and soon I was home.
One morning a story line for the negotiation simulation began to emerge in my mind: A quite young girl, out exploring a lush woods in a Forest Preserve with her engineer father on a bright Saturday morning. She is now walking alone, following a path of flowers among sunlight shafts bearing down from between the tree branches high above, when she notices a bright outcropping, a vein of something metal, perhaps uncovered by the recent much-harder-than-usual rains. The vein is so pretty that she calls to her father. He ambles over, smiles at her, and looks down.

The story line begins to unfold. Strategic metal (in national short supply), particularly delicate ecosystem above the city’s aquifer. Mining for the nationally important metal could endanger the city and region’s water supply and cause dangerous pollution. Traditional rules apply. New rules apply. What applies? Our working team began discussing this and other plot line proposals. Ideas flowed in the brainstorming session that followed. Things were beginning to take shape.

•

Requiem

One night, our Russian hosts took us to a special event, the first singing in Russia since the 1917 Revolution of Rachmaninoff’s “Requiem”, singing requiem for what was taking place, according to
Webster’s, a mass for the repose of the souls of the dead, an act of remembrance.

“Requiem” had been banned by the Soviets ever since it was written, as part of the repression, many decades ago. Now here we are. Perestroika and Glasnost in effect, the world-class Leningrad Chorus in blue robes singing with the power of real words, celestial music. Sadness in immense personal and national loss. Joy in determination to go on.

The Russians were so anxious for us to begin to understand their love of art. Dostoevski, Tolstoi, Chekov and others created an extraordinary set of manuscripts at the end of the 19th Century. Katherine the Great had created a unique and world-class museum in her Winter Palace. This museum is called the Hermitage. She had sent her representatives to European capitals seeking the best. They were extraordinarily successful. Imagine rooms full of Rembrandts, Fauvist paintings exploding off the museum walls, some of the world’s best art. I began going there, climbing the winding white marble stairs, every time I was in Leningrad (as it became St. Petersburg again).

Nevsky Prospekt

Soonb after we arrived, our hosts took us for a long walk along one of their great boulevards, perhaps the city’s best. Nevsky Prospekt. (Prospekt means a major thoroughfare with wide vistas. Alexandr
Nevsky was one of Russia’s greatest early warriors and one of its most important historical figures. Nevsky means “of the Neva”, the Neva River flowing through town. Hundreds of years ago, he led his warriors against tremendous odds to save Russia at the last moment in the last great battle.

We walked along Nevsky Prospekt together observing the people walking along there, too. In so many ways, we seemed so similar, yet so distinct – cultures that have gotten each of our cultures through millinea. Car traffic along the street seemed less intense, less dense. Cars are distinctly fewer and, on average, older. The store windows were not filled.

I thought I began to hear a chant in the distance – I could almost identify what it was but not quite. Odd. As we walked on down the boulevard, I kept hearing the chant through the crowd. Then I thought I saw way down the people-packed street sidewalk some walkers all in white. We were walking in their direction. Then I could hear it clearly: “Hare Krishna, Hare Krishna”. A group of eight devotees all in white coming toward us. As they came by going in the other direction, we bowed to each other as they sang by.

We were approaching the beautiful Singer Building built about 1900, which planned to be the Russian national office for Singer; but, after the revolution, it eventually became a book and print store and was so when we came in. Quality wall prints of Tolstoi,
Rachmaninoff, Marx, Dostoevski, and others. Rooms of books. The fine painting print of Tolstoi one kopek.

•

Rybachiye turns bold

Our team embraced the idea that, in Rybachye, an election was recently held.

The team’s drafting encompassed clearer descriptions of the values and priorities of each of the four teams and in each team member. Group discussions became more focused. Four individuals would represent each team. Each individual’s role would be sketched out; each role, written out, would take on character. (These were background papers, some for all players, some for only certain players. When it came time, in the game, each negotiator would play out his or her own role (improvisational acting is a term often used to describe this), acting out negotiations in meetings within each team and, when ready, negotiating between the teams in meetings together.

When one is participating on a team writing an improvisational drama, dreams, wild thoughts, and brain-storming are fair game for what may turn into valuable story lines to use.

So we began to imagine: (The following is from the Common Data Bank we were drafting: “An election was recently held in Rybachye
which changed the composition of the [governing body].” The new multi-party coalition, joined by a Green group, took their places. “Approximately a month after the election, another major occurrence took place.” First, a young girl on a nature holiday with her father walked off for a moment by herself in the woods. She found a lovely, shiny vein of some kind of metal, in the ground, perhaps uncovered by the very unusual monsoon-like rains they had recently endured. She called her father over to see it. The vein glinted in the sun. Then the news began to come out. “Geologists from the Ministry of Industry [announced that they had] discovered a huge deposit of [high priority nationally needed] tin ore. This deposit is located to the northwest of Rybachye in an area between the Primorsky Natural Reserve and the wild taiga.”

The Ministry, satisfied as to the vein of tin ore’s significance, decide to mine it and build a refinement and processing plant on the site, then transferring the outcome to Vladivostok for distribution. “Green Earth, an environmental newsletter based in Vladivostok..., has called for an end to the ‘wasteful destruction of the environment.” The people of the area, including the indigenous peoples, become up in arms against the plan. The ecological conflict emerges with energy.

The team worked on the further drafting of the play’s descriptions and dynamics. The Russian and American teams corresponded for the coming year, refining the text, solidifying plans. Rybachye
would rise in conflict the next year, exploring in the all-day simulation play the methods being learned that week for how to explore the solving of complex conflicts. We called the simulation play a more visceral level of learning.

**Outside the full-size reproduction of an old Tzarist palace (the original obliterated by Nazi bombers in World War II), nearing time to go home**

Toward the end of that first stay, our team and the Russian team went together one afternoon just outside Leningrad to the faithful reproduction of a major castle of late Russian Monarchy. The Russians had rebuilt it stone by stone. Before we left at the end of the afternoon, I was standing outside talking with Larisa of the Soviet team. We were speculating while our bus was warming up. How well would our peoples be working together 10,000 years from now? Perhaps if we and our heirs could all make it through the next turbulent periods between us and world-wide, perhaps people can have been easing our mutual problems together, and we as two peoples could come to know reasonable peace. Perhaps indeed. We must walk that way.

Together, we imagined the year 3000 A.D. coming in. We imagined it thriving. A better policy for our long-future heirs.
Here it was now approaching dusk. As the sky grew darker, we climbed again onto the warm bus, sat down together, and headed back to the city.

Footnote: During our work there, and, then, based on NCA/CRI’s teachings and the collaborative seminar curriculum the exchange developed, leaders of the Russian team led the creation of the interdisciplinary academic field of “Conflictology” (a brand new term in Russian) first at Leningrad University (now St. Petersburg University.) The university developed an undergraduate and graduate program in Conflictology and began to talk about it with other senior institutions around Russia. Today, around Russia, at least 25 Russian universities have grown undergraduate and graduate Conflictology academic programs.
Now Petr rides the horse of bronze

Dedicated to my hosts: Alexandr, Nina, and Masha

(Alexandr and Masha are now dead.)

1.

Peter rides the horse of bronze.
Peter rides the sailing ship.
At dusk, the wedding couple climbs out
of the car and walks down along the river,
he in black, she in white. In the white night, he kisses her neck
and throws a red flower down into the water.

2.

At midnight in the Hermitage,
in the stillness, in the shadows,
Lorenzetto's body of a marble child
lies across a marble dolphin's
body's back. (From lost antiquity
comes the story of a child and dolphin
who come to love each other,
who came to play inseparably upon the water.
In a storm the boy's body falls and breaks upon
the ocean rocks. The dolphin comes and
desperately carries the body on his back to shore,
cannot revive him, stays up in the air,
cannot leave his playmate, dearest friend.
The dolphin stays in the air and dies,
his friend on his back, the two bodies
bathed in night.) Two young lovers whisper to their
unborn child: We will not do with life what Lorenzetto
did in marble -- Nature the child; we the dolphin.
Rembrandt's old man, white hair
all in shadow, stares off the night-wrapped canvas
and out the window through infinite air.
"Peter the Great was always down there below
building boats with his men," the voice on
the Hermitage stairs said. "He was like that."

3.
The hermit awakens. She stands at the
window with the first of the sun. Her eyes watch
the little boats rise and fall, rise and fall
on the Neva waves, Across the water,
the vertical shaft above the glinting
bulbous dome points straight up.
4.

Now the main boulevard Nevsky Prospekt is 250 years old. Huge bright baloons yellow, white, and blue rise in the early evening City birthday air. In 2003, Leningrad will be 300. Will the Neva run for a million?

5.

"It runs from Lake Ladoga to the Gulf of Finland, to the Baltic Sea," Larisa said. "Very short but very wide."

She said: "Short, but full of water."

In the early evening frost, Alexandr Pushkin, 37, more than a century back, reaches up both his hands and runs them over the cold wood grain of his outside door, over the carved wooden flowers on it. His tears are growing cold. He hears the almost silent lapping at a little Moika canal wave nearby and turns. The light in the evening sky recedes so slowly he doesn't even see it go. He walks to the water's edge and watches the sky in the little Moyka waves. He imagines himself tomorrow, sees the woods ahead, and feels his walking is a little slow. The flowers still mark the spot year around.
6.

In the Cathedral, sleek brown carved heads protrude from the wall and frame. Their eyes stare unblinking, blank in every direction.

7.

Katherine dreams of a flying horse. 
The single huge stone sleeps. 
The shovels do not exist.

8.

In the Leningrad early summer dawn, light spreads across the sky. On buildings very old and new, shadows soften and dissolve. In the light, nature is green; the Neva and the sky are blue and reflect each other without error. White clouds float like ships. Wedding couple, Peter, hermit, Pushkin, dolphin, child awaken and begin to arise. In the trees along the riverbank, young birds stretch their wings and begin to sing.
9.

Yellow sunlight fills the Leningrad sky. There is the visible Neva and the invisible Neva. Peter rides the horse of bronze. High above the sea, Peter rides the sail.
The shield

1. August 19th
It had been just like with Jack Kennedy.
It had been just like with John Lennon,
just like with Bobbie Kennedy,
just like with Dr. King.

2.
Hours and hours in front of the
flashing TV screen, driving stunned
to and from work
with the news radio up loud.

3.
Coup d'Etat. Gorbachev, family
disappeared, likely murdered.
Reformist President Yeltzin surrounded by overwhelming
dictatorship armed forces. Hundreds of gray tanks moving
on in toward the center of Moscow. The Baltics
at gunpoint. Paratroops run forward with their
rifles toward big planes that whine.
4.
Last June, with my colleague Alexandr, I am riding down the second escalator going further down below Leningrad’s Nevsky Prospekt Metro station. I see again on the wall coming up toward us from below, up towards us the massive gray and metal wall sculpture, a statue of 12th Century battle hero Alexandr Nevsky (Alexandr "of the Nevsky", of the Neva River, the main river down from Lake Ladoga, heading toward Finski Zalif (the Bay of Finland), flowing blue in waves, curving for aeons through town). In the sculpture, Nevsky’s knights are a human shield in straight line with him, all in heavy armor, all on horseback, pausing at the ready, high up on this morning wall, all of their eyes staring resolutely forward at their fate.

5.
It had been like when your precious glass falls down through the air. In a moment, it will hit and shatter all over the floor. You know that already, can't move fast enough; and now it's the second before.

A few days later. I'm driving late Friday afternoon, hot, North out of town, rush hour stop-and-go traffic up Highway 80, heading for the North hills country to write. Rolling hills green shapes increasing,
strong flickering sunshine on the dashboard
from which Russian poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko's voice
is booming out over the local National Public Radio station,
his new poem, "August 19", Yevtushenko declaiming it

in Russian, an announcer reading Yevtushenko's own
English version quietly in front. He's describing his going up
To be with his President, Boris Yeltzin on the top step
outside the Republic's national legislative headquarters

They know that the tanks may arrive against them at any moment
now. Yeltzin speaks to those assembled; then they are looking
together out over this vast and growing crowd, tens of thousands,

shoulder-to-shoulder, a growing human shield, red-yellow
flickering fires all around. I find I am crying as I drive.
Boris Yeltzin looks out over the crowd, then beyond that
out through the night over the barricades they are building.

7.
In the darkness, glints of yellow-red
across this great shield in late night bonfires.
Still standing, still growing in every direction, this shield
glints gray-pink, then shades of pure white with first dawn.
Learning Conflict Resolution with Havana - Through Joint Action Research

Challenges to Co-Developing a Bi-lateral Cultural and Educational Exchange, Learning Community, and Research Project, 1994-95, with the Senior Graduate School of Diplomacy of the Foreign Ministry of Cuba

Excerpt from *Cuba, The Making of a Revolution* by Ramon Eduardo Ruiz:

At the Cuban Constitutional Convention in 1901 in Havana, a Constitutional amendment (now usually referred to as the Platt Amendment) won. Under its terms, Cuba granted the U.S. vast rights to literally take over Cuba if Cuba got into civil turmoil, if and as the U.S. chose.

“After the vote, one delegate, General Jose Lacret, enshrined his name in Cuban history by shouting: “Cuba is dead; we are enslaved forever.”
Thanks especially to Bill Lincoln, Executive Director of the Conflict Resolution, Research, and Resolution Institute, Inc. (CRI), Takoma; John Townsend, fellow teacher and co-negotiation simulation writer; Bruce Johnsen, CRI International Programs V.P.; retired U.S. Ambassador John McDonald, President of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, Washington, D.C.; the late Dr. Oscar Garcia, physician, former Cuban Ambassador to Spain, at the time of our project Rector of the Cuban Instituto Superior de Relaciones Internacionales (ISRI), Cuban Foreign Ministry, Havana; Dr. Gabriel Perez Tarrou, ISRI; David Brown, documentary filmmaker; and the CRI-ISRI-IMTD teams. The U.S. team was made up of Bill Lincoln, Ambassador John McDonald, Bruce Johnsen, Jon Townsend, Steven Haberfeld, Susan Levin, and Skip Robinson. Two guests were Tony Robbins and Bill Galt. This subject matter was later taken up in our joint presentation to the Society of Professionals in Dispute Resolution national conference in Fall 1996 and is contained in their Conference Proceedings.
Chapter 2: Learning Conflict Resolution with Cuba Through Action Research

Challenges to Co-Developing a Bi-Lateral Cultural and Educational Exchange, International Learning Community, and Research Project, 1994-1995, with the Senior Graduate School of Diplomacy of the Foreign Ministry of Cuba

From Pagan Kennedy’s NYT review of 1-15-12 on William Gibson’s new book: “Thus as the world teetered on the edge of nuclear war in 1962, [Gibson] prepared himself for Armageddon.”

After tantalizing starts and stops, with important steps forward primarily in Fall 1994, we and our Cuban counterparts worked on developing an agreement to negotiate collaborative conflict resolution planning together and carrying out a week-long full-time conflict resolution seminar, learning community, exchange, and research project in Havana, which, as things continued to develop and change, was hopefully to be ready to take place in spring 1995.
Those involved were U.S. conflict resolution professionals under the aegis of Bill Lincoln, Executive Director of the Conflict Resolution, Research, & Resource Institute, Inc., Tacoma (CRI), and Cuban diplomats, professors, and senior graduate students in diplomatic training, plus other international personnel, under the aegis of the Instituto Superior de Relaciones Internacionales (ISRI), the senior diplomacy graduate school of the Foreign Ministry of Cuba. CRI later added co-sponsorship by the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, Washington D.C. (IMTD)

A Cuban participant: “Wouldn’t it be wonderful if ‘conflict resolution’ became another language of the world. [What if] everybody had the same [conflict resolution] language and before they resorted to force and violence and treachery to resolve disputes, [they] would say, wait, there’s another way to do this. Let’s sit down. Let’s see if we can negotiate this and have your interests and my interests somehow be satisfied.”

I am finally fully setting this down on paper from the point of view of 2010 and 2011, reflecting on this adventure through the lens of retirement. Looking through the case file now, the whole venture comes strikingly back to life.
**Refugio**

(Here are the beginning stanzas – The full poem is at the end of this chapter.)


I am walking down the narrow black marble stairs at the Instituto Superior de Relaciones Internacionales in Havana. I have come alone for a series of meetings preparatory to our planned seminar, exchange, and learning community. The stairwell itself is old and dark, black marble flecked with gray. At each level my Cuban counterpart Gabriel, and I go down, on the walls in front of us is a single stenciled black word in Spanish: "Refugio," along with a small black arrow pointing straight down.


Holding our month-old son up on my shoulder, I am walking back and forth with him across our living room, our apartment across the street from the University of Illinois, where I am a student and
where I have just bought the day’s newspaper the front page of which shows on the coffee table, the headline:

“Cuban Missile Crisis: All Sides Threaten to Use Nukes Now!”

I pace back and forth, holding my baby Jon to me, back and forth, holding his tiny warm body tight. His head lies on my shoulder, eyes fluttering closed. Our living room curtains are white with lace edges, now moving a little in the cool twilight breeze. The light is slowly leaving the sky. I hold my new son and imagine us and our tree-lined university town, at the heat of the sun, without even a whimper, all engulfed in flames at the heat of the sun.

3.
October 1962. Havana The same day

Gabriel says he was holding up his newborn son, just four days old. Outside, Gabriel remembers, the officials are trying out the air raid sirens. The sirens wail up and down. With absolutely new eyes, his son stares up into Gabriel's eyes, the world for him just begun. The new eyes blink. As it is becoming dusk outside, practice
sirens still wailing. Inside, shadows draw across their room....

(The full poem, “Refugio”, appears at the end of this manuscript.)

• How the plans for the exchange and research project developed

Late August 1994, I was flying on Mexicana from Mexico City back up to San Francisco, having just decided in Mexico City with Bill Lincoln and Bruce Johnsen of CRI over breakfast eggs and coffee that I would negotiate for CRI (with Bill and Bruce’s active participation) with the Cuban Government to see if we could get an agreement with them to co-develop a seminar/exchange/learning community/research project on interest-based, collaborative, and democratic negotiation, to take place in Havana.

In early 1992, in Washington D.C., Bill Lincoln, Executive Director of CRI, had initially met with Alfonso Fraga, Chief of the Cuban Interests Section of the Swiss Embassy (essentially Cuba’s Ambassador to the U. S.), (although, formally, the U.S had dropped formal diplomatic contact with Cuba 50 years ago). They established that a collaborative conflict seminar should be
considered and established. On July 1, 1993, in Washington, Bill Lincoln and retired U.S. Ambassador John McDonald, President of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (IMTD), met with Mr. Fraga, as John McDonald put it, to further consider “the subject of an educational-cultural project in Cuba, one which would focus on conflict resolution skill-building.” After this, John McDonald and Susan Levin had two follow-up meetings with the Cuban “Ambassador”.

As I watched out my window, down on the ground way below me vast shapes of green, brown, and blue shared the land mass; I thought of how the U.S. and Cuba are, no matter how we consider it, not only separate and autonomous national entities, but are joined inexorably in one small geographic neighborhood. Neighborhoods always work better in a state of peace.

I thought of the profound estrangement, rancor, and the Cuban Missile Crisis in the early 1960s between our two countries (taken to the very edge of nuclear war) and how this ongoing polarization was not inevitable and need not, indeed must not, be permanent. The risks of continued or deepening polarization are too great for them, for ourselves, and for the world. The benefits of normalization and cooperation between our countries are too compelling. Learning more from each other on how to understand and resolve conflict
could be part of a start. We need to work together to, finally, leave the Cuban Missile Crisis behind.

Daniel Ellsberg about U.S. world thermonuclear weapon targeting change by the early 1960’s:

“...but between 1955 and 1960, (the U.S.) retooled (our Atomic weapons). We modernized. We put in Teller’s bombs, H-bombs – same plans to hit the same cities – and the (projected) casualties [worldwide] went from 20 million to 600 million, first strike; and, sort of, nobody noticed.”

“How does it feel to be in a plane with two rival teams of hijackers?”

The Cuban Missile Crisis was then our most direct and ravaging experience of being brought right to the edge of thermonuclear war, one that could have savaged Cuba, the U.S., the Soviet Union, and perhaps, could have descended into the danger of “nuclear winter” widening across the world.
To get more perspective, let’s go back about 500 years ago. Spain conquered the island of Cuba. They ruled it until 1900, with a growing civil resistance over the last many of those years. Around 1900, Spain was driven to war with the United States, which took Cuba’s side, only to begin itself swallowing Cuba up as soon as Spain had been driven out.

Actually the United States has eyed Cuba since U.S. Revolutionary War times. It was seen as a potential U.S. colony. John Quincy Adams is said to have commented to Thomas Jefferson that Cuba was becoming “a ripe apple to be picked.”

In the last half-century, after Castro and his peasant army overthrew the cruel despot Fugente Batista, the U.S. has treated Cuba as a pariah, particularly once the Castro government gave up negotiating with the U.S. and instead negotiated with the Soviet Union. The U.S. formally severed formal diplomatic relations with Cuba then. The U.S. then tried over many years to kill its President. And then once, in the late fall of 1962, the U.S., Cuba, and the Soviet Union came, trippingly, to the very brink of thermonuclear war. Noone has entirely recovered from that, but it seems time to get back to work.

Aware of history in the past U.S.-Cuba relationship, aware of how the U.S. has used force, has been seen as carpetbaggers, aware of
how dangerous our mutual alienation grew in the Cuban Missile Crisis and after, this paper describes an approach to problem-prevention and early conflict amelioration which we specifically us in our own bi-lateral organizational planning process with the representatives of the Cuban diplomatic culture – to make our experience working and learning together more peaceful, pertinent, and productive.

If you wish, you can look at this work as an informal case study. Our aim was to creatively prepare, together with our Cuban counterparts, a strong Havana learning community week together. We just hoped we could bring it about, in spite of all the things standing in our way. To help us increase our chances, we applied our own conflict prevention and early intervention methods, which we had practiced for years in our work in the U.S. and in other countries.

We sought to anticipate and then study carefully in advance a number of expected key initial problems – ones that we would need to solve together. Early on in our planning, we would try to find, in advance, potential problems to resolve as they emerged among the project bi-lateral decision-making areas. This we coordinated with the development and carrying out date/report/act entries on our master calendar.

That way we could try to catch and ameliorate potential planning conflicts in advance - to do early intervention to reach out to
upcoming organizational development conflicts before they grew out of proportion.

As much as possible, we wanted nothing to threaten our planning for our collaborative cross-cultural seminar. We thought one benefit of this “front loading” of our anticipatory thinking responsibility would be to help get research and planning done ahead of time, before and in preparation for the key decision-making deadlines we would have to meet.

(This goodwill anticipatory diligence among us was also one way we could signal to the Cubans our larger good will and determination. Most fundamentally, this method increased the slim changes that we would be able to get approval for, plan for, and actually hold this exchange, even though it was unlikely.)

Bill, Bruce, and I knew this would inevitably be such a very hard case to bring to fruition. There were so many barriers. The U.S. had long-since put in place a very strong travel ban between the U.S. and Cuba. Our countries had already continued a Latin Cold War for decades.

I kept thinking about how we had most narrowly averted a thermonuclear war against each other, one which, according to some scenarios, could have almost mechanically expanded itself to
engulf the world. For years, over and over, using secret CIA “assets” and even Mafioso connections, the U.S. had even tried to assassinate the Cuban head of state, Fidel Castro. Assassination attempts were made over and over. He still lives.

The U.S. had been blockading Cuba for decades. (The two countries do not even now, in 2012, have formal diplomatic relations.)

Actually, the distrust and hostilities between our two cultures trace back at least 200 years, with particularly active struggles in the last century, starting at the end-of-the-19th century and the start of the 20th century, with fierce fighting arising out of the power struggles of the Spanish-American War. That struggle then became particularly intense during the last fifty, after Fidel Castro and his government defeated the cruel Batista dictatorship and came to power.

In Washington, the "Cuban Interest Section" is an organization under the aegis of the Swiss Embassy (the only “official” Cuban representation in Washington then and now). Even within this, at the time we tried to develop our “research project”, official U.S. diplomats absolutely could only talk to Cuban counterparts about the Havana-to-Florida boat people problem and, later, about interdicting drug trade. The U.S. diplomats were explicitly forbidden to talk with their Cuban counterparts about anything else.
Technically, as we developed our plans, our team was even in questionable dialogue with a government with which the U.S. was officially in such conflict, unless or until, that is, we could win official research project status from the U.S. Department of the Treasury, a status which was known at that time to be very, very unlikely, very hard to come by. (Although understanding that it was almost impossible <some said it couldn’t be done), obtaining such an official “research program” designation would be about the only way we could work in Cuba “appropriately”, as far as I knew then.)

Incredibly, the gulf between countries was so absolute that in 1994, as we began this stage of the venture, no workable international telephone system was then in operation between the two countries. (A major storm had destroyed the Cuban phone system, and apparently the U.S. had blocked outside people from going in to fix it.)

Over and over, the U.S. emphasis was on no contact combined with strong hostility and threat.

On top of this, our two organizations (CRI and ISRI) had no history whatsoever of working together. We spoke different languages, literally and figuratively. The list of difficulties in trying to do this went on and on; but we decided, nonetheless, to give it a serious try. We thought that such a peaceful, respectful conflict-resolution study and communication exchange deserved to be done, could be valuable to hold and to learn from, for us and for the Cubans.
So we started forward, in spite of it all. Who and what would we find behind this Latin Iron Curtain which our government had erected around Cuba?

**Obispo Street**

In old Havana, seven Laurel trees line a small shady square at the foot of Obispo Street. I stand here on a Friday morning. For many years past, this old Havana square on Saturday afternoons held poetry readings and novel readings, writers reading out loud to their audiences under the hot sun.

Across the square, head erect, one old thin woman stands in a light blue cotton dress behind a table lined with books, her right
hand leaning on the table's squared edge. Another woman, younger, sits behind the table, arranging each book as if it were a flower.

Around the square, old buildings, on their second floor, display lace-like black wrought iron banisters. In the center of the square stands a bronze statue of Don Francisco de Albear. He is holding a marble book in his marble left hand and a marble pen in his right. The brass marker says: "In November 1887, he invented the canals through which the waters of Havana run."


On war

Sun Tzu

About 500 B.C.:

“The best method is not to need to fight at all.”
By October 1994, after many calls with Bill and Bruce and then with the Cuban Interest Section of the Swiss Embassy, our negotiation with the Cubans progressed to planning a meeting to consider this joint research project. It was to take place at the offices of the Swiss Embassy’s Cuban Interest Section (the old Cuban Embassy) in Washington, D.C.. After phone consultations with Bill and Bruce, on behalf of CRI, I flew to Washington to hold a first, exploratory meeting with Cuba’s representative to these talks, Dr. Oscar Garcia, Rector of the Instituto Senior de Relaciones Internacionales (ISRI), Havana (the Foreign Ministry’s senior diplomatic graduate school; potentially, they would be the Cuban host institution). Dr. Garcia had flown in from Havana. Over the years, Dr. Garcia had been a practicing physician, then Cuba’s Ambassador to Spain and head of Cuba’s delegation to UNESCO, and then the head of Havana University. In Havana, now he was the head of ISRI.

Besides Dr. Garcia and I, joining us in the meeting were Ambassador John McDonald (IMTD), Washington, D.C., and Cuba’s Third Secretary of Academic Affairs, Rafael Noriega. The central question for the meeting was to be whether the two sides could seriously consider combining a U.S.-based conflict resolution team and a Cuban Foreign Ministry team - through the Foreign Ministry’s Institute Superior de Relaciones Internacionales (ISRI) - to jointly develop and hold in Havana a full-time, week-long dialogue on collaborative conflict resolution. It was imagined to be an exchange between about nine participants on a CRI team and, on an ISRI team
about 30 members of the Cuban diplomatic corps, diplomats, international specialists from other Ministries, international relations graduate school professors and senior students.

Our exchange could possibly provide one place where citizens of both countries could openly explore their perceptions of the other’s alienating ways, consider the dynamics together of how conflict gets exacerbated, and focus together on alternative ways of finding common ground and collaborating in resolution of conflicts.

In these talks, if we could pull this off, a main focus would be on designing the week to encourage extensive facilitated open dialogue between the two teams and to work on exploring methods for collaborative, interest-based bargaining (cooperative democratic negotiation).

Once inside the beautiful old marble Cuban Embassy (then literally the “Swiss Embassy Cuban Interest Section”), we were ushered up a winding white marble staircase to the upstairs and then led to an ornate sitting room. An aide brought in very strong Cuban coffee in china cups – a quiet elegant meeting room. When the four of us had settled in and agreed on our meeting agenda, we began to go over together potential outlines of what could emerge, a one-week-long full-time exchange between U.S. and Cuban participants centered in deepening and enlarging our understandings of each other and of how to cooperatively build models of conflict resolution together.
In the meeting, as we were working through the agenda subject by subject, we could see that their interest in trying to do this was clearly increasing. We were finding together some good correspondences, some important shared values.

Then in the middle of the meeting, Dr. Garcia asked me: “In this training, can we talk together about what we wish?”

(We at CRI had talked such a question through carefully, knowing that official U.S. diplomats could not yet do this – they could only discuss boat people and, later on, collaborating on drug smuggling intervention.) In fact, we definitely wanted to collaboratively design the curriculum with them; and the subject matter for our conflict resolution exchange/seminar/research project was entirely open.)

Yes, we assured him, subjects for dialogue that week were definitely open; and we wanted to design the week and its subjects together.

Dr. G’s smile widened. Then his face took on a look of delight. I found myself becoming happy in turn. I began to sense that we all would indeed try to do this joint adventure, to do it together.

This American-Cuban project was suddenly on the verge of taking on a life of its own.
Over the next few weeks, Dr. Garcia took the concept through the proper agencies in Havana. Then Cuba’s Foreign Minister agreed. We would all ready to give it our best try.

*

Joanna Macy, *Dharma and Development*

“Development, to be effective, must merge with the indigenous ethos and interact with the specific genius of a culture.”

*

• So we began.

Naturally, as we moved forward, we wanted to have as little friction generating as we could manage with our Cuban colleagues. We wanted to focus our growing energy and momentum, especially, on our positive cooperative seminar-planning -- improving our plans for the exchange and making more systematic arrangements for carrying the plans out with focused and practiced energy. We were becoming aware of the start of trying, in spite of the odds, to go through the calendar months of preparation together, step by step by step, and then hold a successful event together. We began settling in to our joint task.

I didn’t see a natural “model” to use for developing such an international learning community. So as we went, we developed our own model. Its essence was mutual respect combined with
cooperative development, aimed toward developing and holding a bi-lateral community of learners about cooperative (interest-based) conflict resolution.

In early conference calls, Bill, Bruce, and I developed a good protocol for our own internal (CRI) planning and decision-making process. We wanted to model our own methods to work when inevitable inner-team differences came up. We wanted to pull it off, so we wanted to increase the odds any good way we could, in spite of the odds.

• Seeking U.S. and Cuban Government approval

Early on, we at CRI began to develop the written applications materials necessary for official consideration by the U.S. Department of the Treasury, consideration of this as an official U.S. “research project”. We needed their ok. The Department had been given the task for approving exceptions (if any) to the U.S. travel ban. (We checked their materials through internally, then with advisors, then with legal counsel. Soon, nice and early, we sent the completed application materials off to Treasury.

On paper, we proposed what was beginning to develop into the structure of a strong bi-lateral educational exchange and research project, organized as a bi-lateral, intercultural, and bi-lingual learning community. We checked in regularly on the applications.
Little response from Treasury. We continued to wait. And then call. Meanwhile, we were learning that, on the Cuban side, their travel Visa Department was the key body we needed to put paperwork through. As soon as we knew what Cuban institution would be the one we should seek permission from for our project, we began to request their paperwork for us to fill out for them. We filled the papers out as soon as we received them and sent them back in early.

Then, we continued studying the legal environment, with an expert attorney whom we had obtained through a small foundation grant. We realized that all the way through this, we would have to step very, very lightly and carefully, mindful of the regulatory climate both here in the Treasury Department and in Cuba.

Continually soliciting issues that needed consideration.

All project-long, almost a year, we kept asking ourselves and each other what were the central and key subsidiary questions now— and (for the master calendar) when did they need to be answered for sure. This information development process came to be used, then, on both sides, on a continuing basis, sometimes emerging as joint master calendaring. This continuing search revealed, in advance, a number of potential areas of conflict almost ready to emerge, things we could work on and try to ameliorate now. Emerging problems could often be worked with before they really hit. (Managing the project, I continued to ask for questions from the others on both
sides in leadership and decision-making positions – and then passed the results around.)

We kept trying to see what questions would emerge in each of several categories. An old adage suggests that the better you can plan your work, the better you can work your plan. Through the nine months the priority questions that needed priority answers generally emerged (with encouragement) from these categories and could usually be anticipated by mentally walking through the logically and illogically necessary developments of the stages and actions – things that would have to take place (and each within certain and some implacable time frames). By having each main category established and developing, questions would continue to emerge and stimulate the work on them well before deadlines would intrude.

Analyzing and working in advance, where possible, furthered the sense that the less often and less intense the time pressure on the parties, the better. The less time pressure, the more time for the issue's ramifications to deepen and ripen naturally into view in the mind. (Still, much had to be finished inside tight time constraints. Some time pressures were built in. Some just appeared mid-route. Some matters were able to get good inner-team and bi-lateral development time, very careful consideration.)

As the bi-lateral exchange planning continued to develop, each category listed below contained important issues and questions.
Sometimes, for instance, considering a particular issue would give rise to another issue which, although we had not had it in active consideration, would have to be settled, in fact, before the issue we were directly looking at could be settled.

Working more systematically and tracking an overall calendar in advance allowed more decisions to be set up (by phone, e-mail, FAX) made consistent with other issues being worked on, and settled. (Alternatively, had we not fully engaged with the time limits and concept development needs of the planning and carrying-out process, the project would have been so very more vulnerable to the potential ravages of Murphy’s law.)

Also, by keeping one's eye on a "critical path", one could help minimize the need to subsequently have to take things back, remodel them again, and re-fit them into the whole plan (a bad move for time, money, and morale) to make them work into the necessary new development not anticipated before and in time.

Corollary-in-Development to Murphy’s Law
Murphy’s Law: “If anything can go wrong, it will.”

An apparent correlary: “Decisions Tend to Require Completion Before Enough is Known”. This being true suggests even further the importance of anticipating possible troubles and taking action together to solve problems before they start or soon after they begin to
emerge when you catch them. Think of it as preventive and ameliorative action.

Please see the Appendix at the end of this book to explore the half dozen primary areas we found for advance work on problem prevention and problem amelioration. The Appendix goes into more detail.

**The February 1994 trip**

By December 1994 and January 1995, we knew that we had an agreement with ISRI and the Cuban government. We would put on the seminar in April, if all things worked out. We still had not heard anything definitive from Washington. Cuba, through Dr. Garcia, made it clear in writing that they were preparing to move ahead with us to finish joint planning and hold the conflict resolution seminar/exchange.

Bill, Bruce and I decided that I would travel to Havana in late February to complete plans with ISRI and to spend time at the exchange site to discuss logistics and final curriculum with our Cuban colleagues.

So I found myself one midday in the big, shiny, bustling Mexico City airport, standing at the Cubana airline counter.
On the flight to Havana that late February day, I thought through again and again the approval complexity we were in the midst of.

The consulting attorney had made it clear that only if the Cubans paid for our way entirely once we were in Cuba could we declare a different kind of exception to getting written approval as a research project from Treasury. (The key was that the statute says specifically that it is not that you cannot GO to Cuba, it's that you cannot spend a penny there for any reason, or you would be subject to severe fines and penalties. If CRI, any funders, or U.S. participants contributed to the trip's cost, which almost had to be the case since Cuba was basically broke, then we to be ok must have the Treasury’s blessing. But if Cuba would pay for the expense (from goodness knows where), we thought we would have protection from the Treasury travel ban exception process.

I knew I was taking the risk that if I couldn’t get the Cubans to pay everything for our trip, we still were waiting, hoping for the Treasury approval to come and come in time. And in the meantime I was making an as-yet-unauthorized trip. What if neither of our approval methods worked?

Thus, of course, I was concerned. But at the same time I was now sitting listening to the Spanish in the seats around me, nearing my first experience of Havana and of the Cuban government.
After a good flight and smooth language, I emerged from the plane into the hot Havana air. Beautiful new airport. My counterpart, Dr. Gabriel Perez Tarau, who I’d never seen before, met me with a car outside. We got in back. His driver was cordial in Spanish. It was hot in the car too, but we let breezes in and we were in motion, headed for ISRI at the Foreign Ministry. Big heroic posters of Che, along with posters of Fidel were everywhere along our route as well as posters delivering government exhortations – on health, prevention, and politics. On the road we were driving along, cars were almost all 1959 or older American cars. Mostly Fords, Chevys, Mercurys, even DeSotos. Since 1959, the U.S. had since blockaded against any more U.S. cars going there at all. (A few shiny newer Japanese cars were entering the mix now.)

Almost everything was dusty as we drove, the dwellings generally older and in varying needs of repair. As we drove along though, I began to see beauty. Architectural forms. People, seeming to be friendly with each other and proud. The city slow-moving. In “La Habana Vieja”, the beautiful oldest part of Havana, is a working/business district. I found building after building, street after street, showing an amazing 1820’s architecture, a combination of old Spanish and very early Victorian combined into a unique hybrid building form. (The U.N. has designated this area as a “World Heritage Site”. It is being refurbished block after block to its old glory under an ingenious plan which draws grants and international investments to rehabilitate the buildings and then
rents out the beautiful restored historic buildings to provide rental income which in turn can pay to rehabilitate the next block, etc.)

For my stay, we drove first to the place I was going to stay, a rather simple but clean bed and breakfast on an architecturally interesting street within walking distance of ISRI. For civility, the first day, I began there to try out my fragmentary Spanish which I had been learning on tapes in the last months of preparation.

In the early afternoon, after I had done some unpacking, it was time to meet with Dr. Garcia at his office in the Institute Senior de Relaciones Internacionales.

In Dr. Garcia’s office, we greeted each other heartily and got right to work. Soon after we had agreed on meeting agenda and started talking together, because the matter was so important to me, I raised with him our need to see if the Cuban Government could consider covering our U.S. team costs, because only that way could we be released from the travel ban and the consideration of rare exceptions from the U.S. Treasury. At that point, Treasury was continuing to say they were considering our application - now long on file with them. We were asking as a long shot that we be considered an official exchange and research project. Our concern was that the people at Treasury would either say no (which they were reputed to be doing all the time) or would not act in time for us to go.
Dr. Garcia suddenly looked sad. He sat silent for some time. Then he said: “Would this be a deal-breaker”? (He was asking whether we would pull out if Cuba said no to our request.)

“No,” I said. “This is not a potential deal-breaker. We’re committed to this. We intend to come here to Havana to have our exchange week together at ISRI, in Havana, regardless of whether you and the Foreign Minister can find any funding.” (The issue was just that, because of the way the travel ban legislation had been written, their funding the program would help protect us from U.S. government scrutiny. Bill, Bruce, and I had spent time trying to think this through before I came.)

I knew I had to keep in mind that, since the Soviet collapse in the early 1990’s, and with it the end of the huge monthly subsidy and oil payments from the Soviets to the Cubans (the oil payment had been huge), the Cubans had become so poor that when they had lost their Soviet petroleum allocation, they had decided to resort to ancient methods and began using oxen again almost exclusively to pull their farming equipment to feed their people. They were that kind of broke.

Dr. Garcia said he would take our request to Cuba’s Foreign Minister that evening. He said he hoped he’d be ready to talk to me again about it tomorrow morning.
We met again in the morning. Our plan was to go through our agenda and then go to look over and review the seminar site, the classroom configuration, and finalize seminar learning plans.

Dr. Garcia opened the morning meeting with his sincere apologies. First, he said that they really did want us to come and would work actively with us to prepare to make the week together really productive. Still, the Foreign Ministry had had to decide, he said, after a careful discussion, that they just could not possibly afford to cover our costs. (This meant with that possibility gone, we would have to try to get Treasury’s ok., after all) But he emphasized that they wanted very much for us to come. And I said we would carry through.

Hot weather all the time, even at night. That night near midnight, I lay on my bed, hot, with covers thrown off, sweating heavily, in the dark, worrying and trying to figure a way through to a safe journey. I was afraid Treasury might end up saying no to letting us go to Cuba. What then? I felt deeply committed to the success of this project and the bi-lateral dialogue across such antique polarization. Laying there, I felt so hot and exhausted. And since I had not secured a financial commitment from the Cubans (which I honestly hadn’t really expected they could manage to afford – but I had had to try the idea), I felt myself in such a strange and ambiguous position in Havana, without U.S. approval, with our application with Treasury still only pending. I felt a little like Alice falling down the
rabbit hole. I watched on my ceiling the slow-turning blades of the fan – the last moving visual image I remember before I fell asleep.

As I fell into slumber, I could just vaguely make out a thought through the growing fog inside my head: Somehow, this really needed to be done. It deserved to be done, whether or not we finally got an ok from U.S. Treasury. This might help improve safety and understanding. The fog inside was becoming complete. Must we do this, no matter what?

The last push

As always, the program had so many last-minute details. Phone calls, e-mails, itineraries, making a dozen U.S. participant calendars continue to fit together in anticipation for a whole week overseas.

And as the days went on, we still got no Treasury Department approval. We called but it seemed to do no good.

Finally, a few days before we were planning to leave for Mexico City, we finally hit the brick wall. It was time for a final decision to go or not go in the absence of a Treasury Department approval for an exception to the U.S.-Cuba travel ban.

We polled the U.S. participants. One by one, they decided to go ahead, no matter what. They signed onto the final travel plan.
Retired U.S. Ambassador McDonald “agreed...as a former diplomat, to defy the rules and go anyway.”

Near the last minute, the Cuban Visas arrived.

On the day we were scheduled to fly to Mexico City to reconnoiter at a designated hotel near the Mexico City Airport, the team one by one rose into the air and headed for Mexico.

I had my final bag packed. I was dressed ready to go. I put my bags by the front door. Just a few minutes before I was going to walk out the door and drive to the San Francisco Airport, my phone rang. I answered on the third ring. A voice said: “Would you please go to your FAX machine?”

Out from the machine’s rollers came a FAXed document – our team’s acceptance by the U.S. Treasury Department as a research project eligible for our exception from the U.S.-Cuba travel ban. We were ok to go.

•

Coming in from the Mexico City Airport nearby, our team met for dinner and a coordination meeting in the hotel. We cheered as we passed out copies of the new Treasury Department ruling and each person’s Cuban entrance Visa. The meeting was boisterous and then
it became quiet. We wished each other a good rest. Then we found ourselves flying to Havana.

**The Exchange**

Nine experienced conflict resolution practitioners and teachers from the U.S. Thirty eight Cuban participants, government officials primarily from the Cuban Foreign Ministry but including participants from five different Ministries in the Cuban Government, plus senior professors from ISRI, and their best senior graduate students in Diplomacy.

During the week seminar in Havana, the CRI-ISRI-IMTD learning community reciprocated lectures, did small group and one-to-one work together, participated together in long expertly facilitated dialogues, and did negotiation simulations. Videotape recorded the events.

Methodology note: During the week, the study used primarily qualitative methods and generated theoretical options, explored case study material, studied as well as experienced negotiation simulations and considered possible new ones, collected narrative/anecdotal data, and engaged in a wide variety of dialogic inquiries, as well as reviewing basic epistemological assumptions and methods. A Likert Scale in Spanish tested satisfactions.
At the opening meeting Monday morning April 3rd,

Bill Lincoln opened his comments with thoughts on what happens when we speak:
“The first ingredient in a negotiation definition is to deal with proper communication. Is it noise? Are people really hearing what we're saying, in terms of fact, and in terms of the emotional context about it? Are we really sending a message that is full, that is complete, that is comprehensive, not only in fact, but tells truly where we're coming from in terms of our spirit, our hopes, our fears?” (1995, p. 19)

Dr. Garcia opened his comments with this: “We talk about the differences in US-Cuba [relations] considering the last 35 years [in 1995, he was speaking as starting from 1960], and that is part of the reality of the history; but it is not the total history. The problem is ... difficult, as it is a problem of 150 years, and must be understood also. That has to be realized (by) the United States, the government, and the people. There are things that have happened in the last 150 years in relations between Cuba and the U.S.A. (that are) necessary to understand....We must sit without conditions and...talk of everything – maybe...talk first about the things that are easier and then go to the more difficult ones.... We have to begin to do it.”
The week of dialogue began, at first with some hesitancy, some distrust, then increasingly with growing trust and strengthening dialogue. Here is the outline of study:

Monday, April 3
Working definition of conflict, conflict behavior, nature of conflict – Cuban perspective, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue

Tuesday, April 4
Interests/Issues, six needs (guest speaker), Cuban/U.S. negotiations – Cuban perspectives, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue, negotiation exercise, conflict assessment, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue, what needs to be negotiated – Cuban perspectives, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue

Wednesday, April 5
Position and proposal development, negotiation exercise, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue, human needs/psychology in conflict resolution (from reptilian brain to pre-frontal lobes/transpersonal actualization), multi-track negotiation, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue

Thursday, April 6
Obstacles to settlement of disputes, methods of overcoming obstacles to settlement, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue, procedural/substantive/psychological satisfactions, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue, preparation for main negotiation simulation for Friday
Friday, April 7
Main negotiation simulation, Cuban/U.S. teams in dialogue, characteristics of capable diplomats, closing, overall assessment of the whole week’s course of study. (The assessment was done entirely in Spanish.)

In addition to our daily seminars, we met with such public officials as Cuba’s Foreign Minister, the Cuban Parliament’s International Affairs Commission (the equivalent of our Senate Foreign Relations Committee). We were graciously received and spent intense meetings talking in English and in Spanish. We also talked about arts issues with the National Writers Union.

We were taken out for our enjoyment to such places as the Bodagita del Medio, where some of us, John McDonald notes, sat at a table where Ernest Hemingway had written “The Old Man and the Sea”. We saw the Cuban National Art Museum.

One late afternoon out swimming, I noticed an older guy floating by on his back. It turned out he was a U.N. executive; and for years, he told me, he had been spending all his vacation time in Havana. “Once the U.S. drops the Cuban travel ban, masses of people will flood in here and the Cuba we know will be ruined.”
I spent hours walking along the ocean sea wall, the Malecon, watching the waves.

Each day of the exchange, I asked Cuban participants to score their assessment of “the pertinence” and “quality” of each period during our week together in Havana.

As the exchange became more and more positive, we began wondering: If we could succeed together with them for that week, it seemed we were developing one good trust-building model that worked, at least one example for the two cultures, locked in a fifty year “Cold War” fight.

It was feasible to stop and successfully study collaborative peace-making together. Each participant during the week explored ways which might eventually become measures of aid in the evolving search for common ground upon which to build an equitable and long-lasting peace.

At the end of the week, when asked about the total week’s “quality of learning environment” they scored the week 98.82%. When asked about the week’s “pertinence to their life and work”, they scored the week 99.38%.

Last day, just as we were departing from Havana, John “asked the participants which country in the world is their favorite. Every single one said ‘the U.S.’.”
An exchange Cuban participant said to us on the last day, Friday, April 8th: “For me, the more important matter, the very, very good experience, the wonderful work, really was that you, all of you, came to Cuba as friends, as brothers [and sisters] and spent five days with us to give to us an idea how to work – what we can do. At the end, what I can pick up is, indeed, of we have a good will, we will find a way out, a possibility to talk and to understand each other.”

Retired U.S. Ambassador John McDonald:

“This is the first time, in my experience, and the Cubans verify this, that a team such as ours has been to Cuba. So it is historic.”

A U.S. participant:

[In the past] “the United States and Cuba [have been] very much partners in a dysfunctional conflict. [Potentially] each is a partner the other is looking for – not only for a resolution to the conflict but [also to build] the working relationship that we’re supposed to have.”

A Cuban participant:
“We had opposing viewpoints. [We found] a common viewing point, so, physically, instead of being this way, we began to look at the problem together, collectively and collaboratively, solving the problem. We owned the problem together, and I think that was a major shift.”

A Cuban participant:

“Wouldn’t it be wonderful if “conflict resolution” became another language of the world, if everybody had the same language and before they resorted to force and violence and treachery to resolve disputes – would say, wait, there’s another way to do this. Let’s sit down. Let’s see if we can negotiate this and have your interests and my interests somehow be satisfied.”
Refugio
(The complete poem)

1.
February 1995. Havana

I am walking down the narrow black marble stairs at the Instituto Superior de Relaciones Internacionales in Havana. I have come alone for a series of preparatory meetings. The stairwell itself is old and dark, black marble flecked with gray. At each level Gabriel, my Cuban counterpart, and I go down, on the walls in front of us is a single stenciled black word in Spanish: "Refugio," along with a small black arrow pointing straight down.

2.
October 1962. Champaign-Urbana, Illinois

Holding our month-old son up on my shoulder, I am walking back and forth with him across our living room, our apartment next to the University of Illinois, where I am a student and where I have just bought a newspaper the front page of which lies on the coffee table, the headline blaring:
Cuban Missile Crisis: All Sides Threaten to Use Nukes Now!

I pace back and forth, holding my baby Jon to me, back and forth, holding his tiny warm body tight. His head lies on my shoulder, eyes fluttering closed. Our living room curtains are white with lace edges, now moving a little in the cool twilight breeze. The light is slowly leaving the sky. I hold my new son and imagine us and our tree-lined university town, at the heat of the sun, without even a whimper, all engulfed in flames.

3.
October 1962. Havana - The same day

Gabriel is holding up his newborn son, just four days old. Outside, the officials are trying out the air raid sirens. The sirens wail, crying up and down. With absolutely new eyes, his son stares up silently into Gabriel's eyes, the world for him just begun. The new eyes blink. It is becoming dusk, the shadows lengthening across the room.

4.
April 21, 1995, Rohnert Park
"So this senior Russian general, who had been in charge of nuclear weapons on Cuba at that time, turns to them..."

I'm back from the Cuban exchange. I've just read an amazing New York Times article, and my dear friend and I are driving down the Expressway; I'm describing what the article said - that there had been meetings last year and this of former top Russian, Cuban, and American policy people from the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, in which meetings they have been exploring with each other, right now - for the sake of history - what really was going on behind the scenes by each side during the worsening of the crisis, perhaps our nearest brush with unloosing a thermonuclear World War III.

"So this senior Russian General, who had been in Cuba then, turns to them in response to a question.

(The question posed by Robert McNamera, U.S. Secretary of Defense then, had been: "Of course, if attacked, you would have sought instructions from Moscow... Right?")

- The Russian General turns to him and says "Oh, no. I was not going to contact Moscow at all. I had
nuclear missiles which were fully operational. They were clearly at my command. They were all pinpointed on U.S. targets. And, if attacked, I would have immediately given orders to fire them all."

McNamara, now white hair on his head, is sitting across the table from the General. His mouth drops open. He is silent, turns ashen. Silence. In almost a whisper, he says to them all: "I had no idea," he says. "I had no idea."

5.
Havana. February 1995

"What does 'Refugio' mean, Gabriel?" I ask, as we sit down on the old gray couch in Dr. Garcia's waiting room. "Well," Gabriel begins, "the signs are old. It's about a long time ago." He looks down and pauses. Some birds are singing in the trees outside the window. "During the Missile Crisis, in October '62, these signs went up here to remind us, if the sirens went off or we were bombed, to go down the stairs to the basement, as a shelter, as a refuge."
"Of course," he stares long out the window, "if your country had dropped on us atomic bombs, the basement refuge wouldn't have helped at all, but it might have withstood conventional weapons."

Gabriel and I were quiet together. The birds outside rustled and flew up out of the tree. Their songs echoed. If we in the U.S. were hit with atomic weapons, I remembered, our newspapers had talked of immediate nuclear retaliation.

6.

Over Mexico. April 10, 1995 - on the way back home

I pause, put my pen down, and walk up the airplane's thin aisle and get more black coffee up front. The coffee pot is carefully held in place by strong curved metal holders. The exchange is all over. I want to get back to my loved ones. I stop in the aisle, coffee in my hand, and take in how now I have loved ones in Havana too. Two children squeal for a moment and are quiet. We are flying at 35,000 feet. I walk back toward my seat. Two adolescents are asleep. Brown faces, white faces, black faces, sitting next to each other in rows, quiet, reading, dozing, staring out the windows at the strange afternoon-lit world below. One baby sobs for a moment and puts her head on her mother's shoulder and is quiet again. This plane's jet engines make a dull high hiss as
we fly. Outside I can see below us mountaintops touched with snow.

7.

On Thursday afternoon, the exchange had been almost over.

The week has obviously been very good indeed. We had done it. It had worked.

Gabriel and I are sitting downstairs. We are both smiling. We've just been negotiating something and have agreed and we are done. Above us, a ceiling fan revolves slowly, slowly. Through the slatted windows, afternoon light is slanting in. It is very warm, and green palm tree branches are waving in the afternoon breeze. We are quiet. "You know, even that week in Fall 1962," Gabriel says, "even that week, even then, we were so alive. Cubans have a kind of joy of life. We call it "agria." Cubans feel the present with such great intensity. Even then....," he says, and stops. He looks intently, silently down at the floor.

I find tears are running down my cheeks. I try to say something to him and find I can't. The ceiling fan slowly
turns and turns. Outside, high in a palm tree in the courtyard, a brightly multicolored bird is singing a long song, then repeats it. It echoes in our room. We hear a broad roar of laughter coming down from our colleagues upstairs, the buoyant laughter rolling down the stairs. The whole group upstairs is laughing and clapping. The light slanting in makes sections of the floor before us stripes of a bright white. I watch the light beginning to fall. I feel the breeze across my face. Gabriel is silently staring out the window. My breath is quiet. We sit there. I hear the turning, turning of the fan.
Ramallah today

“I have been worried about my son and his children,” Rajah said into the microphone. “See, his children are 4 and 6 and when the Israeli soldiers broke into their house, in the midst of explosions, and took it over, the children were standing there. The soldiers violated the children’s world.” He paused, himself back in that moment, Ramallah during that siege. Interviewer, Terri Gross, waited, then asked him another question. I could not leave his last reply. In my ears the words kept repeating: “They violated the children’s world.” I guess I am one of those children; I know this as I know my own name: For the rest of my life, the soldiers will
again be battering in our door. I will, little, perpetually be standing there, hearing the explosions outside, seeing as in a nightmare bayonets pointing at my beloved father. All my life in the future I will be asking myself: “Will they kill him, kill us before they leave?”

Each time, in the night before the explosions begin – it is always the same – before the gunfire and yelling, before the pounding on our dark red front door, I dream of a large yellow balloon rising slowly off the gravel and sand in the front yard, in the morning breeze.

I watch it rise, big, into the air, the yellow like the bright yellow of my dear sister’s dress, like the streaming yellow of the sun.
Chapter 3: Transparency in Collaborative Negotiation About Basic Human Needs

A Contrast of Two Negotiation Styles and their Relationship to Dr. Sidney Jourard's Concept of Transparency


This essay was awarded the Saybrook Graduate School Peace Essay Prize 1998-1999

•

"The crisis of our time is not shortage of food, space and energy; it is the failure of dialogue....The learned incapacity to hear and understand what another human being is saying and the choice to respond in dishonesty is at the heart of our dilemma on the shrinking planet we call Earth."


•
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Summary and Introduction

We read and hear about negotiation every day—negotiations among countries, among members of legislatures, among businesses, even, if we think about it, within and among families, including our own. In fact, we ourselves no doubt perform some form of negotiation almost every day. As Roger Fisher and William Ury (1981, p. xi) put it, "Like Moliere's Monsieur Jourdain, who was delighted to learn that he had been speaking prose all his life, people negotiate even when they don't think of themselves as doing so." Thus, the study of negotiation is practical as well as theoretical. In addition to helping us analyze what we read in the papers and better understand the workings of our legislators, our decision to improve our understanding of humane (or, alternatively, tragic) negotiations may have important implications for our satisfaction with the conduct of our own lives.

The negotiation process as it is practiced professionally is going through a number of transformations. Adversarial approaches have been the most common forms of negotiation in the U.S. Although adversarial negotiation is a strong method, a number of problems with this traditional method have pointed toward the value of developing more humanistic forms of negotiation. These are now emerging. This writing explores the problems with certain of the effects of the traditional method (such as lack of effective listening, distortions of perception, polarization, distortions of truth, and exacerbated conflict aftermath). It then turns to a discussion of
issues contained in a principal emergent negotiation form, i.e., collaborative basic human needs/interest-based negotiation. Sidney Jourard's concept of transparency, developed to apply to personal lives, also appears directly applicable to clarifying our understandings of why, how, and what this newer, more cooperative form of negotiation can accomplish in both the public forum and in our personal integrity.

In adversarial negotiation, the form of professional negotiation that has been the predominant tradition in the U.S. and the West, negotiator opaqueness has been prized. "Poker playing" is often used as an analogy. The assumption has been that if the "opponent" knew what one and one's side really wanted, beyond the current "position" the negotiator is showing on the bargaining table, the opponent would use this knowledge to undercut one's negotiation needs, potentially leading one's team to being cornered and one's positions "injured." The negotiators fear they would then "lose" and "lose face." They concentrate on the chess-like movements they make, one move after another. Unfortunately, Fisher observes, "as more attention is paid to positions, less attention is devoted to meeting the underlying concerns of the parties. Agreement becomes less likely." (Fisher & Ury, 1981, p. 5)

In the hardest negotiations, one can say that a Social Darwinian survival-of-the-fittest mentality has prevailed. A zero-sum game mentality assumes that for our side to gain something, we will have to take away from the other side an equal amount. Being secretive,
our job would also be to keep the opponent guessing about what we would do and what we really want, not letting the opponent in on our real strategy. We would think we were increasing our team's chances of getting the most for our side (and allowing the least to the other side) by the end of negotiations. Unfortunately, as Fisher and Ury see it: "arguing over positions endangers an ongoing relationship -- Positional bargain becomes a contest of will. Each negotiator asserts what he will and won't do. The task of jointly devising an acceptable solution tends to become a battle. Each side tries through sheer will power to force the other to change its position....Bitter feelings generated by one such encounter may last a lifetime." (pp. 5-7)

In the light of these and other limitations to the traditional approach, another style of negotiation has emerged from early work by Harvard teachers and practitioners of negotiation in what was to become the critically acclaimed Harvard Negotiation Project, and in its conscious and unconscious application of such concepts as Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of human needs. (Maslow, 1961) (Many now believe that such a hierarchy of human needs needs to be at the core of study and action which plans on a foundation of satisfying the basic human needs of the parties.)

The author writes from the vantage point of over 30 years of collaborative conflict resolution work, including ten recent years as a principal of a small conflict resolution consulting group and a number of international teaching engagements with Bill Lincoln's
Conflict Resolution Institute, most recently negotiating, project managing, and teaching in an educational and cultural exchange and research project (approved as a research project by the U.S. Treasury Department and by the Cuban Foreign Ministry) between nine U.S. conflict resolution experts and 30 Cubans (Foreign Ministry officials, other officials in such related fields as international trade, and senior professors) under the auspices of the senior institute of the Cuban Foreign Ministry (ISRI) which trains Cuba's foreign service professionals. (At a number of points, this paper makes reference to that exchange.)

The author's writing here refers to this emerging method of negotiation by three of its perhaps most common names, collaborative negotiation, basic human needs negotiation, and interest-based negotiation, which this writing will combine into "collaborative negotiation of basic human needs". With useful variations and emphases, this general method goes by an even wider number of names (such names as "collaborative negotiation," "collaborative human needs negotiation," "basic-human-needs negotiation," "interest-based negotiation," "principled negotiation," "win-win negotiation," and "transformed negotiation" (in which last case the new methods are seen to change and improve the whole foundation and gravitational flow of what negotiations can accomplish within the organization over time). In these methods, the negotiators (or negotiating teams) know that it is ethically correct, psychologically sound, and to their own advantage to seek
to understand and reasonably satisfy the interests and needs of the other side(s), the other parties, as well as those of one's own side.

This necessitates dialogue about what each side "needs" in the outcome. Each side can learn more of what each party's highest priorities are. While transparency is not employed in the adversarial model, it is of the essence in the collaborative model. In fact, the more successful the transparent acts on the parts of the collaborative interest-based process-using negotiators working for the opposite sides are, the better and more satisfying the proposals for settlement.

It is in this intersection (considering both technique and the potential for contributing to healing) that implications of Sidney Jourard's work on the value of transparency become most apparent and compelling. Given the real circumstances of each negotiation, if the parties involved seek to learn enough of what each party most needs and wants, if the parties strive (judiciously, using common sense, and based on growing trust) to tell the opposite side's negotiators what they most need and want in the negotiations -- and inquiring the same about that opposite side's key needs and wants -- and if the parties then strive to incorporate these top-priority understandings into the proposals leading to the outcome agreement, they will significantly increase the likelihood that the settlement will be reached and implemented and that it will be mutually equitable and satisfying enough to each party that the settlement can and will endure.
Adversarial Negotiation

Turkish Proverb:
"A weapon is an enemy even to its owner."

This paper seeks to walk a careful line to avoid stereotyping or oversimplifying adversarial negotiation. It is a strong method. Many have no doubt used the method over time with distinction, skill, and even with a certain empathy. But there are some common negative consequences of the method which occur so often as to have stimulated the emergence of alternative forms of dispute resolution, including collaborative basic human needs, interest-based negotiation. The second half of this paper will focus on its potential. The essay begins by reviewing some of the context, methods, and problems of a primary traditional negotiation method, adversarial negotiation.

(Note: As dissatisfaction with adversarial negotiation has grown, new light has also been falling on traditional Native American conflict resolution methods, likely the oldest traditional methods on this continent. While adequate discussion of these methods is beyond the scope of this writing, the author recognizes that (a) any discussion of "traditional" U.S. method is actually incomplete without them
and (b) they are fascinating and fully deserving of more study and presentation in their own right.) (See LeResche, 1993)

Social Darwinism

In his studies in the 19th century, Charles Darwin came to believe that, over the millennia, those members of species whose characteristics were most appropriate to the ecological niche they occupied, and who were also more flexible and adaptive as those environments changed, would fare best in passing their genes on to future generations. (late mid-1800's date to be added) He believed that this principle applied to whole species, as well. Those that fit best or adapted best to fit niches and needs had the best chances to create viable offspring having passed on to them characteristics most useful for the future. This process came to be known as "survival of the fittest." In later decades, social commentators began to apply this principle to the human social sphere. This became known as "social Darwinism," in which circumstances a kind of "dog-eat-dog" mentality was prized, with the presumption that the "fittest" would survive the competition, then breed and leave its offspring for the future. This, such theories claimed, was as it should be.

Looking at this from the perspective of negotiations, you can see how the application of this principle could lead the more dominant group to insist upon getting its own way, maximizing its own advantages, denigrating any needs and rights of anyone else, and
unambivalently enforcing its self-enhancing outcomes. Forms of Social Darwinism (pre-Darwin, before the name was used, and post-Darwin) have informed the development of negotiation theory and method.

As a point of departure, Lewis Cozer (1964) defined "social conflict...(as)...a struggle over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources in which the aims of the opponents are to neutralize, injure, or eliminate their rivals". (p. 8)

Some negotiations bear clear marks of this approach even today.

"Gesellschaft" and Buber's "I-It"

Sociology has a term, "gesellschaft," in which people are identified and valued by their place "in the division of labor and nothing else". (McWilliams, Jr., 1962, p. 76) This concept is counterposed to "gemeinschaft," defined by McWilliams as "an association of persons based upon intimate knowledge, direct contact, a day to day sharing of life, of common traditions and aspirations, of a sense that there abides a bond written in nature itself between the (persons) of that community". In this contrast, negotiations using only "gesellschaft" as the basis for relations among the disputing parties could have one party uncaring whether the other party fares well or ill.

Theologian Martin Buber (1937) understood humans as being of absolute value in their own natures. He saw each person as holy
and deserving of appropriate treatment as a bearer of that utter value. He saw human transactions as of two fundamental kinds. The first kind of human transaction he called "I-It," which occurs when one human "uses" another, when one does something to/with another human in which he/she treats the other person as a "thing," not as another holy person at all. When this takes place, when another is treated as a "thing," one does not sense it necessary to look out for the other's welfare. The other is there to be used and used up and, as expedient, to be thrown away. The "I-It" approach is of the sort that one might use if one is approaching a human transaction from a Social Darwinist point of view.

In the worst circumstances, with a low, nominal, or non-existent valuing of the other person or the other party to the conflict, the negotiation can smash ahead. As Schaller (1966) puts it, "conflict is the clash of differing points of view. A century ago ... theorists used the word conflict to describe the violent clash of irreconcilable interests, loyalties, values or opinions." (p. 73)
Conflict and adversarial methods of bargaining

William Lincoln (1995) describes adversarial bargaining as "relationships and behaviors when one or more disputants actively oppose others in a hostile manner in order to achieve specific results; uncooperative in most unpleasant ways; to be contrary in volatile ways." (p. xvi)

In adversarial negotiation, one usually focuses on one's position, the list of outcomes one is insisting his/her side must take from the negotiation. In the adversarial negotiation model, the negotiator seeks to win for that side everything possible from the list of positions one puts on the bargaining table. As necessary or "advisable," these wins are to be at the expense of the opponent's side. (Some adversarially inclined negotiation advocates even take the technique to the point of seeking to symbolically "destroy" the other side.)

Winners and Losers

Adversarial bargaining assumes that one and only one side wins. In this view, one side winning defines the other side as losing. The process of bargaining is seen as a chess game, in which the symbols are organized around the rules that, in the end of the game, one lives and is triumphant; the other is vanquished and is set to die. This win/lose balance is also called a "zero sum game" the mathematics of which always shows that one side gains to the degree the other side loses -- in each transaction and transfer.
Some Problems with Adversarial Negotiations

Thus far, this paper has briefly reviewed general problems. Now the paper will review several specific problems which often arise from the heat of adversarial negotiations. To a certain degree, problems in communication are endemic to humans as a species; but adversarial bargaining, with its emphasis on an "us-vs.-them" mentality, seems to exacerbate certain communication problems. Among them are five to be considered here: Non-listening, polarization, distortion of perceptions, concealing of self, and dishonesty. Let us start with the adversarial propensity to not listen.

Non-Listening

From Jourard's point of view, "the learned incapacity to hear and understand what another human being is saying... is (a key to) the heart of our dilemma on the shrinking planet we call home." Note that Jourard studiously uses the word "learned" in this comment. The problems being discussed here are not just inherent in the human organism; we may have predispositions, but the problems are made manifest as outgrowths of confrontations involved in
adversarial negotiation. We learn alienating habits, which then become part of a negative self-reinforcing loop.

Roger Fisher and William Ury (1981) observe that "angry people often fail to hear what others have to say. And whatever they hear, they are likely to put the worst possible interpretation on both the words and actions of someone who is seen as an adversity." (p. 24) Furthermore, anyone who has spent much time at the bargaining table understands what Jourard (1995) means when he describes much of contemporary communication as like the 'parallel play' of two-year-old children, or like the professors in Stringfellow Barr's 1958 novel who, when together socially, lecture past one another alternatively and sometimes simultaneously." (p. 68)

**Polarization**

Jourard wanted people and organizations to explore more transparency not only for the good it can do, but also because its absence can cause dysfunctional dynamics to grow, interlace, and become more complex to deal with and more complex to unravel. Not listening combined with the anger that arises in adversarial negotiation abets a number of problems, one of which is unnecessary and unwarranted polarization.

Fisher and Ury observe as ubiquitous that "In taking positions, we tend to assume that an adversary's interests and ours are directly opposed." (p. 36) This assumption is very common. It is most often
quite wrong. But the misperception that it is true can stimulate the creation of positions and actions in negotiation that are anywhere from ineffective to utterly tragic. This is the case, whether it occurs in an individual family or on the world stage. Charles Webel (1996) concludes that "...splitting self and others into irreconcilable and antagonistic poles is both infantile and pathological. It degrades and sometimes demonizes other nationals and societies, many of which have cultures and histories at least as varied and complex as our own." (p. 19)

In *Faces of the Enemy*, Sam Keen (1986) shows that once we polarize, we seem to dehumanize those at the other pole. This dynamic is particularly important because it can lead to perception distortions which can lead, in turn, to the most monstrous consequences, such as massacre and war. How does this work?

**Perception distortion**

Most of us presume that our perception is objective and neutral. Yet Miles' Law (Bloch, 1980) states that "Where you stand depends on where you sit." (p. 44) Our perceptions are often vitally dependent upon our past experience and our current position and role. Put another way, Fisher quotes a Russian saying that "everyone looks at the world from the belltower of his own village." Why should this matter?
Fisher and Ury explain that "we often handle conflict poorly because we are each prisoners of our own thinking....We tend to collect evidence that supports our prior views and to dismiss or ignore nonconforming data. This screening process has at least three levels: We selectively remember what we want to; we selectively recall what we remember; and we revise our memories to fit our preferences. The more we become convinced of our views, the more we filter out information that would lead us to question them." (p. 21-22)

Jourard recognized, in Tomson's (1996) words, that "human beings are subject to self-delusion and bias of every kind. Communication between individuals can suffer from unintended distortions or interferences, originating either from the source, en route, or upon reception." (p. 33)

Negotiation is complicated enough, in and of itself. In adversarial negotiation, the rising tensions among the parties complicates negotiation much further. The complications brought by these first two complex levels are themselves compounded when, as may happen, the very nature of the realities being dealt with begins to come into question.

Beginning this perceptual exploration shows us that, if we are going to broaden our understanding of how the positive negotiation methods discussed in the second half of this chapter can help, and if we are going to appreciate the importance of Jourard's contribution,
we first have to delve deeper into the workings of the negative complications of adversarial negotiations. This will set the stage.

**Habitual concealer of self**

Tomson's (1996) review of literature potentially relevant to Jourard's concept of transparency cited findings by Pennebaker. When Tomson reviewed Pennebaker's studies on the communication of difficult, anxious, and traumatic material (Pennebaker & Breall, 1986; Pennebaker, Hughes, & OHeeron, 1987; Pennebaker 1993; reviewed in Tomson, 1996), he found a revelation "that the capacity to confide appears to be stunted in a remarkably high percentage of people, whatever their age, class, or ethnic background." (p. 19) For Pennebaker, "... story after story revealed deceit, tragedy, and misery."

Finally, reviewing Jourard on this point, Tomson's wrote "that a large part of our misconceptions are due to the fact that man is a habitual concealer of himself. As a result, our concepts and beliefs about human behavior are organized around mistaken images of our needs and capacities." (p. 2)

**Dishonesty**

From the self-cloaking arises a dishonesty which has both outer and inner implications and ramifications.
As an example of outer implications which can confound attempts at negotiation, consider the compounding confusion possibilities of a corollary to Murphy's Law (Bloch, 1980) called Lieberman's Law: "Everyone lies, but it doesn't matter because nobody listens." (p. 75) This phenomenon can bring ludicrous distortions into the bargaining process.

In addition, and even more serious, Tomson notes that "it is important to clarify that the unhealthy consequences associated with deception include self-deception." This can bring surreal distortions into the bargaining process.

Jourard has said: "In a society which pits man against man, as in a poker game, people do keep a poker face; they wear a mask and let no one know what they are up to." Now we see that in the poker-like situation Jourard has described, the poker players can all too easily turn their own respective internal maps awry.

In his survey of pertinent research, Tomson found that W. F. Fisher (1985) has proposed the following three interrelated necessary conditions in which the possibility of self-deception arises.

The first condition is conceptualized as evidenced when one is already committed to a particular understanding of some phenomenon of one's world (i.e. its meaning has already been posited). The second condition is that certain emerging
significations of the understanding render that concept (meaning) ambiguously uncertain (our model is threatened). The third condition is that one experiences anxiety as a result of one's already posited understanding being challenged. In summary, the possibility of deceiving oneself arises when one is faced with a possible transformation of one's world as one already understands it, and one experiences anxiety as a result. In other words, when an individual is confronted with information that doesn't conform to the individual's model of reality [the person] experience(s) anxiety as a consequence.

According to Fisher, all acts of self-deception are characterized by two meanings.

They are: 1) that one turns away from the possibility of taking up and exploring one's anxiety, thereby preventing it from informing, and 2) that one denies and/or explains away the ambiguity, thereby rigidly reaffirming their previous understanding. Being self-deceptive is an effort to avoid/refuse those personal truths which would conflict with or render ambiguously uncertain other truths to which one is already committed. In essence, to deceive oneself is not to keep oneself from explicitly knowing what one already implicitly knows; it is to refuse to discover that which might undermine our preconceived notions. To be self-deceptive is to sustain an unchanging sense of one's relations to others and to the world; it is to reassert rigidly that one already knows
who one has been, is and/or can become (i.e. it is an effort to maintain stability)....We tell a kind of lie about ourselves, a lie of selective perception. (pp. 35-37)

Using the term "behavioral duplicity" Cameron and Magaret (1951) postulate that as children, we learn, in Tomson's words, "to withhold certain disclosures because of the associated painful consequences to which they lead." We learn, most likely in accordance with the laws of reinforcement, to present a censored version of our real self to others, a phenomenon Jourard (1958) termed the "public self."

To Horney (1958), we run the danger of mistaking this image for our true self. This can happen if we forget that we are playing a game of controlling our self-disclosures in a manner to affect how others understand us. We can get so busy with this that we literally forget who we really are.

By alienating and distorting communications and truth at the negotiation table, the adversarial negotiator stands the distinct chance of rationalizing himself/herself into a kind of self-alienated and alienated-from-truth illness which further poisons the negotiation table atmosphere and makes resolution on healthy procedural, psychological, and substantive terms all the more unlikely.
Looking at the phenomenon from an explicitly psychological point of view, Tomson notes that

a number of theorists have noted that being dishonest with oneself and with others (inauthenticity) is at the root of both neurotic and schizophrenic functioning (Anonymous, 1958, p. 58; Jourard, 1964, p. 64; Kaiser, 1965, p. 65).

In Tomson's view (1996), in each case,

behavioral duplicity is hypothesized as both necessary and sufficient for the existence of neurotic disturbance. Behavioral duplicity can thus be considered both a symptom and a means for achieving neurotic functioning (p. 59).

Now we can begin to see a lengthening chain of confusions and disorientations leading from an origin point (an adversarial negotiation stance with its emphasis on negotiator opacity) through non-listening, polarization, perceptual distortions, self-concealing, and dishonesty -- each link in the chain making resolution of the conflict harder.
Generally unintended negative effects on negotiation

Viewed from this perspective, the alienations and self-alienations made more likely by the chemistry of adversarial bargaining can make negotiation an unnecessarily and even absurdly complicated and confusing experience, one which can seriously erode the optimal functioning of the organizations (families, businesses, governments) for which the negotiations are intended to serve a stabilizing and planning role.

The negotiator and the observer of negotiation may ask how the negative links of chain are likely to affect the negotiations which operate as adversarial enterprises: After some agreement is completed, what is the likelihood that parties will remain angry and search for and interpret loopholes? What is the likelihood of one side continuing to "bad-mouth" the other side? What is the possibility of renewed litigation, appeals, escalation of conflict? What other kinds of conflict aftermath may occur? Note that within complex organizations, a variety of other negotiations might be taking place simultaneously or within months of the negotiation being examined. The unhappy resolution of this conflict can adversely affect other negotiations, even when the other negotiations have nothing directly to do with this particular problem or case. Group morale, dedication to the "company" goals,
individual and group illnesses, multicultural communications -- all can be affected.

The effects of what we've been considering can bring sadness, major losses in human resources and human solidarity potential, and tragedy. Groups can ignore crucial realities containing a compelling need for working together in common. We can remember the old story of four people in a rowboat, two at either end, with the boat in utter distress in a storm. One end of the boat is sinking deeper and deeper into the ocean waves, with water gushing in, flooding that end of the boat. The two people at the lower end are bailing water like crazy. At the other end of the boat, momentarily riding high up out of the water as the other end sinks, one person at the high end turns to the other and says: "It's a good thing we're not at that end!"

In fact, it appears that Jensen's Law (Bloch, 1990) applies to situations where adversarial bargaining has set off the chain of negativities I have just reviewed. Jensen's Law states: "Win or Lose, You Lose." (p. 192)

The adversarial method itself appears inherently flawed.

Johnsen (1996) thinks that it takes maintenance of reasonable adult maturity to consider a method of negotiation that has the capacity
to lessen or reverse the chain of negatives outlined in this paper's first half.

To consider a collaborative approach requires us to begin to reverse in our minds the adversarial methods to which we have previously been exposed.

**Dealing with Recalcitrance**

Before this essay focuses on collaborative, interest-based negotiation, here follows a note on dealing with those who do not open up to your offer. Hopefully, most of one's negotiations can be with those open to collaboration. But sometimes (as is true with most of life), one may have difficulties, may have to deal with those who are "closed" and combative. In this position, one can remember that not everything can or should be negotiated. Sometimes parties in conflict can't agree on how to describe the problem. Sometimes the issue is right and clear but the timing is wrong; it's not time yet for the parties to enter dialogue, negotiate, and settle.

Sometimes, in spite of the problems created by adversarial negotiation methods, and in spite of the values of collaborative negotiation methods, one may find oneself needing to negotiate with a bargaining party or parties who choose to be negative, at least in the early stages. The adversarial approach may be practiced by the other side(s) in spite of one's appeal to find ways to study
together to collaboratively solve the dispute at hand. This insistence by the other party on adversarial methods may arise from the other side's lack of successful experience with collaborative dispute resolution methods. The other side may have become at least temporarily too polarized or alienated as a result of the negative side-effects of earlier adversarial negotiation between the parties. The other party may be working from another developmental or operating stage that does not seem to fit with collaboration. Just as one example, working partly from the reptilian level of the human brain, a phenomenon not unusual when the party feels danger, significantly inhibits trust-making, assuming the other is a foe.

Faced with an adversarially oriented opponent, one may move into a mode of negotiation containing both adversarial and collaborative characteristics, offering both "carrot and stick." In collaborative negotiation, one seeks to understand one's opponent's needs and interests. This study is doubly necessary when one is faced with an antagonistic opponent. By coming to understand the opponent, one seeks to learn what will deeply motivate.

One can say: It is my preference to deal with you collaboratively. However, if I haven't gotten your agreement yet to work collaboratively, and if I can't get it soon, I may find it necessary and in my interest to escalate the conflict until we have your attention and you decide and work out with us how to study this problem collaboratively, after all (Townsend, 1998). Lincoln (Towsend &
Robinson, 1998) defines 15 dispute-resolution strategies. The later ones, if necessary, grow increasingly militant. Lincoln's twelveth listed strategy, for instance, is "direct action," which outlines depriving the opponent of "its work force,...its market,...critical electoral support,...favorable public opinion and support."

One can say: I don't want to do this. I want to work collaboratively. I want us to develop a settlement that will protect the interests of both of us and thoroughly. I will work on this if you will. If you start as being unwilling to work collaboratively, I will work on advancing my interests while studying and possibly acting on yours. When you change your mind, we will work together. (Townsend, 1998)

If one's analysis of opponent interest has been accurate and deep, a sudden interest in collaboration may emerge from the opposition, after all.

To start preparing ourselves for thinking about a collaborative method, let us remember that military genius Sun Tzu (1988) told his readers well over 2000 years ago, at the beginning of the still widely read book The Art of War: "The best method is not to need to fight at all."
Collaborative Interest-Based Negotiation

(As an introductory caveat, please note that Bruce Johnsen (1966) asks "how many people have the introspection capability to know whether they are being transparent or not? It seems that a medium to high level of maturity and self-knowledge is a necessary baseline for even considering this kind of approach.")

In the Glossary section of In Pursuit of Promises: The Practitioner's Course in Collaborative Negotiations and Cooperative Problem Solving, Lincoln (1995) provides his short definition of a more functional process of negotiation:

...a complex yet manageable process (composed) of three primary subprocesses - proper communication, effective education, and the responsible utilization of power -- intended to prevent, manage, and resolve dysfunctional conflict via interest satisfaction as provided in the development, exchange and maintenance of promises (p. xxi).
Partners we've been seeking

In *The Transparent Self*, Jourard (1964) provides a key starting point for differentiating collaborative interest-based negotiation from adversarial negotiation. Whereas adversarial negotiation seeks to be opaque, collaborative negotiation seeks to work together to find mutually fulfilling solutions. Jourard says: "I think it is almost self-evident that you cannot ... behave toward (another person) so as to foster his happiness and growth, unless you know what he needs. And you cannot know what he needs unless he tells you." (p. 3) In collaborative interest-based (basic human needs) negotiation, the negotiator actively seeks to know the other side's interests, the other side's most essential wants and needs, and to make the negotiator's own side's priority interests known to the opposite side, as well. Honest communication of priorities and, overall, an attitude seeking and providing more transparency plays an indispensable role.

Each side seeks through dialogue and confidence-building activities to develop sufficient trust for the other side(s). As this trust develops, it becomes possible for negotiators increasingly to disclose key interests which must be taken into account to develop a mutually satisfactory proposal for settlement. Knowledge of each other's perceived key interests gives each negotiator a much more realistic opportunity to conceptualize and develop proposals for settlement. These will contain provisions which will have been designed in good faith to try to satisfy the key interests and needs of
both the negotiator's side and the opposite side within a realistic overall formula which incorporates all parties' priority interests/needs.

On a practical work level of putting this into practice, Lincoln points a second level of positive function out to us when he states that "the opposing disputant (can become) the partner for whom we are looking to join us..." In this partnership, he advocates "... making and keeping promises which will resolve the conflict in an equitable, practical, and durable settlement agreement." (p. 88)

Over the years, in my own consulting practice, working with parties who often come to me in the midst of destructive negotiation fights, sometimes in strike, I find myself facilitating those parties learning how to redefine and streamline their necessary working relationships with one another. Each party can then move away from seeing the other side as "enemy to be taken from and torn down." Ideally, each party comes increasingly to see the interests of all the sides in the dispute and the negotiators on all the sides as potential collaborators, potentially searching by teamwork for answers to problems in common.

It is understandable that people accustomed to adversarial negotiations, ones unfamiliar with collaborative interest-based negotiations (or without trust in it) would be skeptical of this approach. For instance, as Jourard stated (1978), referring to cases with individuals: "One who never has known dialogue--only
deception, duplicity, and cunning--believes that a person who is open, and invites others to be open, is crazy!" (p. 49)

Collaboration based on basic human needs and interests

Wide-ranging successful experience described in such books as the best-seller, Getting to Yes (Fisher & Ury, 1981), is suggesting that collaborative interest-based bargaining has much to offer the person who is frustrated with the problems generated under the old system, as previously discussed in the first section of this chapter. These persons often want to explore more collaborative and common ground. Using a collaborative interest-based method looking at human needs often makes it possible for each party to walk away from the negotiation table, in the end, as a "winner."

The balance of this chapter considers collaboration based on the parties' interests and needs, listening, talking, understanding, looking at paradox, existence between the poles of arguments, transparency, satisfaction, and approaches which can emerge. It ends offering some preliminary speculations on this approach to negotiation being pertinent to the 21st century.

Bill Lincoln (1990) taps the chalk board insistenty. He is showing students how he insisted that opposition negotiators pay attention to his client's key human needs and interests, which he had listed
on the board in that negotiation. "Everything you say," Bill repeated for the class what he had previously said to the other side's negotiators, "everything you say and propose I and my team will look at by evaluating whether or not your proposals meet my client's key interests that I've put up on this board. If your proposal meets these listed key priority interests which we have, we will pay attention and study what you've done and try to work with you to resolve our conflict. If your proposal doesn't meet my client's key interests listed here on the board, you can be sure that we will reject your proposal on the spot and act accordingly."

In Lincoln's view, specific basic human needs and interests contain crucial principles, values, belief systems, those which "need" to be satisfied if the conflict before the parties is to be equitably, practically, legally, and durably resolved.

(Note: For simplicity's sake in these pages, I use the term "interests" to also represent "basic human needs".)

In the process of the negotiations, these interests can also be categorized by whether they are procedural needs, substantive needs, and/or psychological needs. In most struggles, all three levels of interests are involved. That is to say, negotiators and their clients must first agree upon the negotiation procedures to be used. Clients need these procedures to be implemented, as agreed, in an equitable and pragmatic fashion. Clients need to feel that the
substance of what they are negotiating is being treated with respect and worked into the proposed resolution.

This fair treatment in both content and process will help them develop psychological, substantive and emotional satisfaction with the way the negotiation has been conducted. It is also helpful for people to think of interests in terms of those outlined in Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of human needs (1968). Lincoln explains it: "Interests for each person are simply manifestations of these basic needs ... (as they) become the driving forces for that person's behavior. Interests are WHY a person acts--or doesn't act--in any particular way at a particular time." (pp. 82-84)

As one becomes more conscious of the dynamics and substance of the negotiations of which one is a part, one can increasingly look for those interests and issues which one and one's opponent have in common. In addition, one may be able to identify those which, while different, can be provided for in a complimentary fashion. As Fisher, Kipelman and Schneider (1994) put it, in looking behind the other side's positions, we will first be looking for interests which we and they may share. Both passengers in a lifeboat want to get to shore and may subordinate their differences in pursuit of that common purpose. But we will also be looking for areas where their interests differ from ours. Upon examining their respective interests, passengers in a lifeboat may discover that one
prefers bread and one prefers cheese, leading to a prompt and amicable division of the rations. (p. 38)

Seeking out the other party's interests in a negotiation can lead down useful paths. One more example is in looking deep inside the opponent's statements, studying them for underlying, implicit interests which may be driving that party's approach to the negotiations. Fisher and Ury (1981) advocate reversing roles in one's mind to try to empathize with how the other side is thinking and feeling. "Role reversal and the other techniques discussed above not only help us understand another's point of view, they help us find room to maneuver by illuminating needs and concerns that lie below the surface." (p. 46) Lincoln adds that "effective negotiators often prepare a chart that compares the elements of their proposals with the other side's interests, and then try to test the other side's receptivity to proposals before they are even offered. Areas of overlap will serve as areas for possible compromise...." (p. 202)

Interest-based dialogue opens up negotiations. Whether negotiations are occurring in the family, the workplace, or internationally, negotiators can learn to be more candid and revealing in their communications with the other side(s). Lincoln encourages negotiators to "learn why an offer is being made or resisted...for such will always be related to interest satisfaction or interest dissatisfaction." Transparency enables the parties to learn each others' priorities and thus prepares them to figure out how to
incorporate each other's primary needs in fashioning solutions. Such solutions have a better chance of being accepted with the resultant agreement having a better chance of being durable. (p. 208)

By growing candor based on growing trust, we can learn: "that no durable settlement agreement is possible unless significant self-interests for all disputants are satisfied at acceptable levels -- all things considered." (Lincoln, 1995, p. 210)

**Listening**

A common saying among traditional negotiators is that they have two gears, talking and reloading. Any "listening" which occurs may be primarily to see whether the other side is listening, capitulating, stalling, or fighting back.

Jourard (1978) could sense how important the listening process could be to developing trust and transparency. To understand the other, we must listen. Jourard said, "while education is not only listening, listening is a necessary part of it....It is no small thing really to listen, because we listen, not just with our ears, but with our entire being---our imaginations, our memories, our feelings, our bodies. Really listening means stopping the random noise with which we silently occupy ourselves. What we hear said to us can be a matter of life and death." (p. 50)
Listening and what we can discover by listening can make all the difference, even in situations of great importance. Jourard says that "when we trust someone enough to listen to them, we derigidify our model of the world. Familiar talk concretizes, or "sets," our model of what the world is like, while new language, if we hear it, remodels our image of the world as a sculptor shapes clay into new images. The greatness of Freud, of Sullivan, of Rogers, is the greatness of a great listener! They hung in and really listened to, heard, and understood people to whom their colleagues would not listen....I hear the person, and I attempt to make my imaginary model of reality correspond with his or her sensory reality." (p. 51)

**Talking**

Talking is not just preparing remarks and letting fly. We need to be taking careful assessments of how opponents seem to be taking in what we have to say. For example, when we formed a team of U.S. conflict resolution experts to meet for a week with a group of Cuban Foreign Ministry and international affairs professionals, on our first teaching day in Havana, in April 1995, Bill Lincoln's early comments had to do with taking stock of what is happening when we speak:

The first ingredient in the negotiations definition is to deal with proper communication. Is it noise? Are people really hearing what we're saying, in terms of fact, and in terms of the emotional context about it? Are we really sending a message that is full, that is complete, that is comprehensive, not only in
fact, but tells truly where we're coming from in terms of our spirit, our hopes, our fears? (1995, p. 19)

Jourard (1978) was concerned about similar questions:

What is dialogue, in that it so seldom happens? It is, first of all, catching someone's attention so he or she listens to what you are saying. And it is your dialogue partner giving you evidence that he or she hears and understands, or at least wants to do so. This implies a capacity to imagine, or tune in to the reality of what is being said, the phenomenological reality of the speaker's world. Then dialogue calls for the listener to speak truth in relevant response. The goal is to understand and make oneself understood, so each participant shares in the world of the other's truth. This sharing is an offering and an opening, not the imposing of oneself or the self-negating "swallowing" of another person's views. (p. 49)

Fisher, Kipelman, and Schneider (1994) remind us that "before attempting to communicate our own view of a problem to someone with whom we are in disagreement, it is often wise to go through his concerns and arguments first, and to convey our comprehension of them." (p. 29) Also, see Rogers and Roethlisberger (1952) as they explore dialogue methods by means of which to understand the other with more clarity and compassion.
Understanding

All of the preparation, the listening, the talking prepares us to negotiate in the most fertile ways. What we learn can enable us to broaden our capacities to serve. In Jourard's words, "education is enlargement of the capacity for dialogue and the enlargement of awareness." (p. 48)

"Understanding," Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1994) remind us, "is not simply an intellectual activity. Feeling empathetically how others may feel can be as important as thinking clearly about what others may think." (p. 33)

In considering the important negotiations they have ahead, a Cuban leader, Dr. Oscar Garcia, (Cuba, 1995) put it this way: "(We must) plan to talk about what is in our hearts and on our minds." (p. 14)

Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1994) write:

If we want to affect what is going on in the heads of others, we will want to be aware of emotions and motivations that may be surging through their hearts....Especially when we are communicating by letter, cable, fax, or telephone, we may be so concerned with ourselves or with substantive ideas that we ignore feelings on their part -- feelings that are likely to drown out rational arguments. (p. 24)
Existence between the Poles of the Paradox

In an extraordinary set of four entwined novels by Lawrence Durrell, the Alexandria Quartet (1961), one reads the fine first novel, complete in itself and told from the point of view of one of the four main characters, and one comes away with a clear sense of what happened and why. When one begins the second novel in this quartet, an eerie feeling begins to rise because, told from the point of view of a second of the four main characters, one begins to see that what one thought happened, and why, begins to alter fundamentally. Things weren't as one thought. New, different perspectives emerge. At the end of the second novel, one is convinced that one has a true picture now with the two characters' point of view combined. But then begins the third novel, told from the third main character's perspective, and all sense of reality begins to float back into the air, because the third character sees the same set of events very differently indeed. The same happens with the fourth. Each novel is a distinct and separate reality, each one quite true, at least from the perspective of one key person. In the great movie, Roshomon, four characters who each seemingly witnessed a murder give entirely contradictory accounts of the reality of what happened. Why do I cite these two works of art?

My consulting firm would often first see labor and management leaders of public jurisdictions when they were preparing for a strike,
or in the midst of one, and wanted a neutral party to help them talk
together with their opponents before the conflict got even worse.
Typically, their views would be polarized, each group feeling that its
side held the only legitimate position and that the other side was
wrong, a side populated by fools or worse.

In our work, we would coach the parties to listen to the other side
again and, deeper, again. We would begin to discover together that
there was invariably an important element of truth in each side's
position. This recognition would initially produce shock and
disorientation. If in the world there is always only one true reality,
and if the warring parties each believe an opposite reality, how can
both, opposite sides hold truth? A fine paradox emerges. What do
you do when opposites are true? If they are also right, what do we
do now?

Scott Peck (1987) tells us that "the capacity to accept ambiguity and
to think paradoxically is...one...of the requirements of
peacemaking." (p. 220)

In all the preceding discussion of ways to develop collaborative
interest-based negotiation, this essay has repeatedly focused on the
need to get in touch with the other side, to hear it, empathize with
it, grow to understand it, have compassion with it, and begin to
think creatively about how to incorporate the other side's interests
in the proposals for settlement one wants to develop. Jourard
understood that the needs for developing transparency were broad
indeed. In negotiation, as the parties learn to communicate their perspectives and needs, and study those of the other side with more open eyes, it is more likely that polarization can begin to fall away.

Tomson reminds us that individual distortions of reality are most likely to occur whenever we assume an "either/or" perspective." (p. 45) And further, "in Taoism, it is believed that when one is unaware that the two sides of a duality support one another to form the whole, he/she identifies with only one side of the polarity." (p. 25)

In the face of conflict and confusion about what to believe, Jourard (1978) tells us, "if he or she cannot speak, if I do not listen, or if I cannot understand, then we must remain suspicious strangers to one another, uncognizant of our authentic similarities and differences...."

But then Jourard goes to the possibility there, too, is the turning point: “...when another speaks to me in truth, he or she becomes a transparent self and releases in me an imaginative experience of his or her existence.” (p. 49)

This is the juncture where one can properly say the relationship unfolding begins to develop the character Martin Buber described as "I-Thou." In an I-Thou relationship, one communicates with the other in all respect, as one would wish oneself to be treated, as one would treat a beloved.
In the shamanistic view of well-being, one evolves from a state of psychic and physical dis-integration into "the still point between the pairs of opposites" (Halifax, 1979, p. 20) from which point of view one can appreciate the truth and reality of each of the conflicting points of view." Here too one can sincerely honor those who hold the other view, seeing that the other view too has a valid reality and valid interests which can be integrated into a creative final proposal.

Drawing a partial analogy from another distance, Tomson (1996) reminds us that "Jung observed that the way his clients resolved important problems was not by solving the problems logically, but rather by achieving 'a new level of consciousness' from which the problems 'faded out'." (p. 41)

Ironically, in the large scheme of things, even if one were to remain at a selfish, self-centered level, exclusively concerned for the welfare of one's own self and one's own team, one still would find that the best way to protect one's team is to find an equitable and lasting settlement of the dispute at hand. For the settlement to be lasting, it must be reasonably equitable. For it to be equitable, it must incorporate the opposite team's primary needs. Only that way is one "protected."

I don't generally expect concrete differences and problems in negotiation to completely "fade out." Yet I have seen time and time again the initial urgent feelings of polarization fall away and be
partly or fully replaced by a sense of common ground. Fisher, Kopelman and Schneider (1994) put it this way:

Conflict is inevitable. It will not disappear, nor can it be ignored. For better or for worse, we will have to cope with conflicting interests as long as we live....Fortunately, conflict is not all bad. Differences can be a source of value. The fact that we have different priorities may mean that each of us can attain something important to us without injury to anything important to someone else....Doing better is not a matter of producing good answers out of thin air, but a matter of asking a series of questions which are likely to result in coping more skillfully with an endless flow of conflicting interests....Every tool is intended to ask questions or to stimulate better questions. (p. 176)

Labor and management negotiating teams working with my consulting group rather consistently discovered in time (and with the right continuation of personnel leaders who were learning to trust each other) how to act almost as a single working group, as a developing team in the joint committee we would facilitate, to explore and research the means by which to find common solutions to problems in common. Initially called in to handle crises, our consulting group was often asked (after the hostilities were resolved which initially brought us into the case) to stay and facilitate ongoing monthly collaborative labor-management meetings for what have sometimes turned out to be years of team-intensive
collaborative planning thereafter. As Bill Lincoln has pointed out, the parties (as former opponents) can discover in each other the partners they have needed all along.

Louise Diamond (1996) (of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, in Washington, D.C., which she and retired U.S. Ambassador John McDonald started and operate) describes how she sees the potential for transforming negotiation. She defines transformed negotiation as:

...different from managing or resolving conflict. To transform conflict is to work systematically to change the very assumptions, beliefs, and perceptions of the parties in conflict, as well as to open the doors to creative solutions and new behaviors...to release the energy bound in...patterns over time, and to reshape that energy into new and more positive patterns of relationship.... (p. 2)

Whether working through a particular conflict or seeking to further transform conflicts within that organization or social system, there is the basic need to come together to work problems through with dignity, empathy, and understanding. Ambassador John McDonald focuses such a change in a description he gave during the 1995 CRI-ISRI-IMTD Cuba exchange in which we both taught:

...In the first instance, we had opposing views. And...we managed to shift (from) having opposing viewpoints to
having a common viewing point. So...we began to look at the problem together, collectively and collaboratively, solving the problem. We owned the problem together, and I think that was a major shift. (Tape 18A, p. 1)

Conclusion

We have arrived: It is the 21st century. We find escalating crises and strife on nearly every side. Our world grows smaller daily as cultures bump into each other with little understanding but with greater and greater power. Public expenditures drop while compelling basic human need across the world escalates drastically. The disparity between haves and have-nots deepens into a chasm ever more vast. All the difficulties we have to face remind us that more humane and potent methods of negotiation are needed and, hopefully, can develop.

Especially in the midst of these high-stakes challenges, Sidney Jourard was prescient in his sense of the crucial role of honest sharing and joint exploration. Jourard's quest for transparency fits the quest for collaborative interest-based (basic human needs-based) negotiation like a key in a lock.
On the last afternoon of our Cuban exchange, one Cuban participant looked out the window and wondered aloud:

Wouldn't it be wonderful if conflict resolution became another language of the world? If everybody had the same language, and--before they resorted to force and violence and treachery to resolve disputes--(they) would say, wait, there's another way to do this; let's sit down. Let's see if we can negotiate this and have your interests and my interests somehow be satisfied. (Cuban transcript, p. x.)

These thinker/practitioners have not only begun the development of linked fields with ramifications across many disciplines. They challenge us to see our way through the crises before us. They challenge us to envision our ways toward a more humane social commons developed through more humane social processes and that through these more humane approaches to conflict and its resolution, we may glimpse and attain those vistas of peace and sustainability which may lie beyond.

Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1994, p. 67) in Beyond Machiavelli tell of a story from Italian folklore. Three workers are cutting stones in the hot sun. When the first is asked what he is doing, he replies, "I am chipping these stones to make them just the right size." The second replies, "I am earning my wages." To the same question, the third replies: "I am building a cathedral."
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Chapter 4: How Questions Generated
Six Categories of Case Study Plan Development

Basically, from the beginning, almost every day I would ask myself what categories would be most important to actively manage and on what priority basis? What questions would most need to be answered – for whom and by when? Who needed to begin to think about what and during what period?

As an example, what are the questions within these categories which will need to be studied and resolved down the road during the project? How long from now? Who needs to consider them? What background materials will they need to have available to make good decisions? Who will do the research, with what deadlines? What legal, accounting, and policy inputs need to buttress decisions? When must each issue be resolved in order to maintain an orderly process forward. The decisions needed to build on each other into more complex wholes, just like language learning.

Our inner-team planning for our dialogue was primarily e-mail and phone calls, some FAX. Bill was in Tacoma, Washington, Bruce was in Monterey, and I was in the West Sonoma County countryside west of Sebastopol.

A list of a number of subjects we focused study and questions on

As I mentioned earlier, by the time I had reached home from Mexico in August 1994, I had come up with what I thought were main areas which would involve the two sides' leadership in decision-making in the time between then and the exchange (if we could carry the process to fruition). In preparing for, carrying out, and reflecting on the initial formal negotiation with the Cubans in Washington, D.C. in late October, the rest of the areas became clear. As I continued to test the set of categories with the two sides' leadership, I found that we had what appeared to be (and proved to be) a systematic set of main categories to continue to study during the
months leading up to the exchange itself: Below are six main categories we used for our continuing study: the process of decision-making (internal teams and bi-laterally), dates for the exchange (which could fit dozens of planners’ and participants’ calendars), applicability of national and international law, curriculum, choice of and preparation of participants, and communications. (Other categories we focused on were U.S. license, Cuban Visas, video-recording, plans for the duration of the collaboration, finance and fund-raising.)

With these “filters” established among us, the qualitative action research became a matter of combing these categories (several of them explored briefly below) continually to see what issues within each of them we needed to begin or continue to work on, to be noted in the master planning calendar.

The matters below are the first six main categories of issues we found ourselves focusing on in seminar development - and to which we applied conflict preventive/early-intervention thinking.

1•DECISION-MAKING•

•Who gets to decide what issues when? The first set of our questions focused in on this, almost from the beginning. How ought we to make the dozens and dozens of decisions between now and the actual exchange, and the final accounting and paperwork to complete things afterwards? We started with CRI - Bill, Bruce, and I - we worked out a CRI decision-making protocol (to be used for the Cuba case) in Mexico City before we left. Appropriately, Bill, who was CRI’s Executive Director and his non-profit Board would have the ultimate call on Cuba decisions. Bill, Bruce, and I would normally have regular conference calls, generally after I had done a work-up on a given period of time's key issues and had recommendations. (As possible, I was to fax working papers to Bill and Bruce before such conference calls.) We agreed that, as much as possible, we would take actions only when the three of us agreed. On the Cuban side, we could see that their selection of Dr. Oscar Garcia to negotiate with us about developing the project showed that the Cuban Foreign Ministry was fully serious about considering this, and we should give it our full attention. Dr. Garcia had been
Cuba’s Ambassador to Spain, President of Havana University, and was now Rector of their foreign services graduate school. Dr. Garcia reported to the Foreign Minister. With Dr. Garcia’s appointment and with the successful Fall ’04 Washington meeting, we began to trust more in our proceeding. Of course, also, we would need to seek approvals from our government and theirs.

• Perhaps the key message we had to give to Dr. Garcia at the late October 1994 negotiations in Washington, D.C., was about our commitment to the collaborative development of exchange curriculum and to the making room for topics and philosophical reflection which the Cubans wanted to include.

In collaborative development of the exchange curriculum, we (both sides) built the plan together - the collaborative curriculum development was to be complete only when we had consensus among us all. This appeared deeply satisfying to the Cubans, as well as to us. To us, they were co-equal, honored partners (and they further proved themselves so as we went through a lot together). As we worked together forward, as our trust grew, we began developing into a collaborative U.S.-Cuba team capable of jointly carrying out a fine exchange together.

• Still, we had to learn more about dealing with the unexpectedness of government decision-making and action. Cuban Migracion, in Havana, the Visa agency, did not agree to clear U.S. Visas in time to hold a fall 1994 exchange and then for the planned April 1995 exchange held Visas until the last minute. Our Treasury Department was slow to grant our research status and held the papers until the last minute, as well. Even though our deadline crises, we held to clear communications in our joint decision-making model, even when each side had to set limits about what it could do, how long it could wait, etc.

2•DATES•

• Before we could decide on potential dates for what was turning into a spring 1995 exchange, we at CRI-IMTD decided to gather and collate potential times of open space among over a dozen calendars (the potential U.S. participants). Anyone who has ever tried to book
a multi-party meeting knows that this took time - looking for, holding, and confirming dates on all parties' calendars, in fact a hair-raising process. (No doubt, ISRI faced the same there, but with 30 calendars instead of our nine.) The plan for a fall/winter 1994 gathering was stopped, in large part, by the fact that Cuban Visas could not be gained in time. Spring 1995 week was almost cancelled at one point mid-winter when the Cubans had difficulty getting final confirmation on the seminar dates from their government. Through this process, though, we stayed in positive touch with our Cuban counterparts, even when one side or the other had to interpose limits.

We kept bringing up “date issues” and keeping them on meeting agendas as early as we could see them coming, getting all decision-developers to check these potential dates with their calendars and put in tentative holds on those dates. Some of the bumps were more tolerable because we had seen them coming and were being reassured that our counterparts were "doing everything they could". The calendar tracking also allowed us a few times to set absolute dates which were "make or break" and to communicate our necessary time needs well in advance, so the other side would have reasonable time to work their decision-making process. Even when all parties found that they could not move everything fast enough to assure a Fall 1994 exchange, our growing trust in each other allowed us to turn together to begin planning to make it really occur in Spring 1995.

3•LAW•

•We listened with attention to carefully selected expert legal advisors on a host of issues. Since the event was to be international and unique, it was hard to be sure under what conditions our plan design would be workable to our two governments. So we started work early on finding structures for our plans that would be understandable and manageable for both sides. We couldn't be positive just how international law, if any, might apply, but we learned enough to make planning possible consistent with minimizing volatility. In essence, as we developed plans and tried to break down barriers, we definitely owed each other the best advice
we could find, and that would include U.S., Cuban, and international law.

We found an expert law firm through a foundation grant which guided us ahead of time on a number of key U.S.-Cuba issues.

Both CRI and IMTD were and are non-profits. We needed to clarify, as soon as we could, under what specific circumstance we might need what kind of government approvals and from whom and by when. We could not be sure when we determined we needed to apply for a U.S. license to act as a research group. Whether we'd be issued one was definitely not guaranteed. (As it worked out, the primary legal documents we would need were issuance of Cuban visas and U.S. Treasury Department papers/documents showing that we were to be regarded as a U.S.-Cuba research project.)

- Were we to understand our time together as a training, a seminar, an exchange of what? collaborative conflict resolution thinking? (How would such categorization affect our project’s legal standing in both countries?) What could we and couldn't we do in planning and especially in being there? Since Americans are generally prohibited from going to Cuba, we wanted to be positioned for doing this project within a clearly acceptable parameter, if possible - with the least volatility in status for any participant -- and, in the absence of utter clarity on standing, with the lowest profile and with the least number and scope of conflicting elements among the parties.

4 CURRICULUM 4

- What did we most want to teach each other? What did we and they most want to learn during the being-planned week of dialogue? We told them we wanted to know what they valued most. We wanted to decide things together on developing a curriculum for the week to teach and exchange ways to decide things together. We asked for their way of looking at these elements themselves. We offered to listen. We wanted to learn and share, as well as teach. We knew that collaborative process would help healing. There was so much healing needed, on both sides.
• How ought we to structure and conduct the cultural and educational exchange and research project? How and in what sequence? During a talk with the attorney, he brought up certain values of doing the event as a cultural and educational exchange. As we talked, a key potential categorization would be to be considered a research project with the U.S. Treasury Department. Holding this event and dialogue would certainly qualify as “action research”. Having it an exchange could have us teaching each other, listening actively to each other, honoring each side in equal measure – the whole group acting as co-learners. A cultural and educational exchange and research project would honor both cultures.

• Doing collaborative design and consensus decision-making, we were doing together in fact what we were talking about in cooperative, interest-based conflict resolution.

• How could we best evaluate what takes place?

• We made time for written agreements. There needed to be; we wanted to have precise and durable agreements both sides could count on when difficulties began to develop. There was time for materials to be developed and circulated. And, because, as it was turning out, our final joint curriculum was wrapped up well in advance of the week our two teams would spend together, each participant had time to prepare carefully. Because we were ready well in advance, the Cuban presenters and participants even developed a practice schedule at the Foreign Ministry for the week before we met, allowing them to become more precise in what all understood would be delicate presentations and discussions.

• Substantial time was designed into the week's schedule well in advance for both sides to make presentations and also truly lots of time for professionally facilitated open-ended dialogue.

• By anticipating problems well in advance, we sometimes had time to develop creative scenarios in quick response to those problems. There was plenty of time for collaborative discussion and for editing and further discussions on both sides of the water dividing us. Working collaboratively on and settling this crucial issue contributed to the general building of partnership and community
that was developing. In a sense, we wanted both the process and the
content to communicate to the Cubans: "We are your colleagues; we
honor you and your thought; we are building this form together
with you to allow us to talk deeply together, to overcome our old
barriers and to explore what can lie ahead."

• Dr. Garcia had said at the first meeting in Washington: "We can
only move ahead when we study and learn from our joint history
together." To have a chance of understanding Cuba and its needs
and opportunities now, it is judicious to look at U.S.-Cuba relations
over the last 200 years, and especially over the last 100. In
addition, since our culture has also not stayed in touch with their
culture, we “know” them way less than we need to. We obviously
need to reach out more.

• We wanted to focus on equity, parity, co-development in the
creation and development of the curriculum. We wanted to carry
this balance into the curriculum and activities. Thus, for instance,
we looked to balance key elements: Presentations during he week
would be of reasonably equivalent (time, subject matter) between
the two sides. A lot of time was set aside during the week for
facilitated open dialogue.

We wanted for all participants to have enough time to permit real
issues to emerge and be discussed – and to draw down the long-term
frustration. We were ready to listen.

(If published, include link to curriculum outline, the curriculum
assessment instrument (in English and Spanish) and Cuban
participant scores from the assessment.)

5 • PARTICIPANTS •

Each party had to choose its own participants. As it turned out, we
chose a balanced group of nine experienced U.S. conflict resolution
professionals to be on the CRI research team. Our team selection
then had to go to the Cuban side to work on issuing Visas and for
their review. The Cubans chose twenty six participants and five
observers, sixteen participants from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
with the balance from four other Ministries. Half were women and all spoke English. We simply accepted their choices.

• As we developed our curriculum plan together, each segment of the week’s schedule would go through a cycle: (a) It would begin with content initiatives (the nature of conflict, negotiation with the other party’s needs in mind, etc.) by CRI, (b) followed by initiatives and responses from the Cuban participant side, (c) followed by significant open/facilitated dialogue time between CRI, IMTD, and ISRI participants. In this way, time is shared and participants on both sides have time to initiate thoughts, to listen, and to synthesize.

6•COMMUNICATIONS•

• Planning and doing an international event is inevitably complex. This complexity in our case was compounded when we discovered that no serious working telephone system existed between the U.S. and Cuba. (A huge storm had knocked out Cuba’s telephone system; and the U.S. embargo had blocked the system’s repair.) This lack remained true for all the crucial early planning months; no phone system was reasonably available until the last two months. (Even then, it only worked periodically; and, as can be anticipated as a part of Murphy's Law, the more important the call to be made, the less likely the system and/or the numbers would be working at that time.) Given these radical limitations, we crafted our communiqués even more carefully, with more written detail to make more sure that everyone is “on the same page”.

We had to use the mails plus an occasional “lucky” phone call.

My log for Thursday morning, 9-15-94:

I’m sitting here remembering last night. I had finally [tried calling ISRI in Havana] between 6-8 pm Pacific Coast time, which I had come to understand from the international operator was the only time to try. As I understood the [temporary] system [a flawed term – a
non-system!], I had been told that during those times I would be able to call the long-distance operator and set an appointment to call Havana. “No,” the operator said, when she finally came on the line, “we used up our [allocated] only 300 calls from the U.S. to Cuba per day limit in 30 minutes today. Call tomorrow.”

Then we developed an e-mail line to ISRI through their Foreign Ministry. (E-mail in Cuba at that time was very tightly controlled.) This opened up the precise “heavy lifting” necessary to further late-stage conference planning communication needs.
Chapter 5: Coming Back From Polarization –

Thoughts on Listening and Transparency in Psychotherapy and Mediation

Applying Jourard, Lincoln, Fischer, Ury, Maslow, Keen, Kopelman, Rogers, and Schneider

Note that this chapter was originally drafted to be in a mediation publication to be published in Russia, to interpret current thoughts briefly to a new audience.
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Quick summary

Much of bargaining in recent times has been characterized by increasing polarization, which is common in adversarial bargaining. Cooperative interest-based bargaining about basic and fundamental human needs and interests is a good and increasingly used alternative. Transparent talking and actively listening in tandem can significantly increase progress toward fair and enduring resolutions. Final thoughts on growing steps include notes on paradox, multiple legitimate realities, and the effect of sharing tales of suffering.

Polarization and transparency

It is understandable that people accustomed to adversarial negotiations, ones unfamiliar with collaborative interest-based negotiations (or without trust in it) would be skeptical of this approach. Sidney Jourard, the late American psychologist, theorist and teacher, wanted people and organizations involved in psychotherapeutic healing, problem-solving, and peace-making to explore increasing the practice of transparency. Without it, as he saw it, dysfunctional dynamics tend to grow, interlace, become more complex to unravel, threatening resolution. Not listening, anger, distortion, and a number of problems from adversarial negotiation may lead into questionable communications and more polarization. (Note: For a study of negative psychological effects of adversarial
negotiation, such as perception distortion, see Chapter 3: “Transparency and Interest-Based Collaborative Negotiation About Basic Human Needs,” which goes into greater detail on the number of negative effects shown and developed there and noted more briefly in this chapter.

Fisher and Ury explain that “we often handle conflict poorly because we are each prisoners of our own thinking....We tend to collect evidence that supports our prior views and to dismiss or ignore nonconforming data. The more we become convinced of our views, the more we filter out information that would lead us to question them.” (pp. 21-22) In the beginning of Out of Egypt, the protagonist says that the more he feels his anger rising, the more he is convinced that he is right. (The reptilian part of our brain works differently that the prefrontal cortex.)

**Cooperative interest-based bargaining about basic and fundamental human needs and interests**

In The Transparent Self, Sidney Jourard (1964) differentiates collaborative interest-based negotiation from adversarial negotiation, as follows. Whereas adversarial negotiation seeks to be opaque for self-protection and keeping the other party blind, cooperative interest-based negotiation seeks through humanistic and transpersonal ways to have the parties work more transparently together to find mutually fulfilling solutions.
Bill Lincoln (1990) states the caution that if an “opponent’s” proposal doesn't meet the client's key interests, interests which can be clearly identified and listed, the adversary’s proposal can be dismissed on the spot and actions can be taken accordingly."

Such books as the best-seller, *Getting to Yes* (Fisher & Ury, 1981) and *In Pursuit of Promises* (Lincoln, 1995), show how the approach of collaborative interest-based bargaining has so much to offer the person frustrated with adversarial bargaining, with the old and battered standard.

These persons often want to explore more collaborative interest-based work and cooperatively search for common ground. Using a collaborative interest-based method looking at basic human needs and interests often stimulates much deeper and better conversation and hearing that can lead toward each party ending up walking away from the negotiation table as a substantial “winner," along with the others.

It should come as no surprise that principles in cooperative interest-based conflict resolution, especially mediation, regularly parallel processes in psychotherapeutic healing.

One can follow Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of human needs, going up the needs ladder step by step, from the most primitive needs (such as safe air, safe food, water, and shelter) up through self-
actualization and, empathetically, up to the high needs of our common nature, toward transpersonal actualization.

In Lincoln's view, “specific basic human needs and interests contain crucial principles, values, belief systems, those which "need" to be satisfied if the conflict before the parties is to be equitably, practically, legally, and durably resolved”.

As one becomes more conscious of the dynamics and substance of the negotiations of which one is a part, one can increasingly look for those interests and issues which one and one's opponent have in common.

Seeking out the other party's interests and needs in negotiation and mediation leads to increased clarity. It is considered imperative for the parties in therapy to gain such understanding. Fisher and Ury (1981) advocate reversing roles in one's mind to try to empathize with how the other side is thinking and feeling. How does the other person feel? How does the child understand the situation’s tension? What is the other’s reality? "Role reversal and the other techniques discussed above not only help us understand another's point of view, they help us find room to maneuver by illuminating needs and concerns that lie below the surface."(p. 46) Lincoln adds that "effective negotiators often prepare a chart that compares the elements of their proposals with the other side's interests, and then try to test the other side's receptivity to proposals before they are even offered. Areas of overlap will serve as areas for possible
Therapists often urge their clients to do this with those from whom they are becoming estranged.

Interest-based dialogue opens up psychotherapy and negotiations. Whether negotiations are occurring in the family, the workplace, or internationally, negotiators (sometimes through mediation) seek clear language to have clearer communications with the other side(s). Lincoln encourages negotiators to "learn why an offer is being made or resisted...for such will always be related to interest satisfaction or interest dissatisfaction." Increasing transparency enables the parties to learn more about each others' priorities and thus prepares them to figure out how to incorporate the other side and their side's primary needs into cooperatively fashioned solutions.

Such solutions have a better chance of being accepted with the resultant agreement having a better chance of becoming durable. (p. 208)

“No durable settlement agreement is possible unless significant self-interests for all disputants are satisfied at acceptable levels -- all things considered." (Lincoln, 1995, p. 210)
Transparent talking, non-listening, and active listening

Transparent talk is the opposite of a poker-like approach. No “dead-pan” impenetrability. Nor is talking just coming up with remarks and letting them loose. And Fisher, Kopelman, and Schneider (1994) state that "before attempting to communicate our own view of a problem to someone with whom we are in disagreement, it is often wise to go through his concerns and arguments first and to convey our comprehension of them." (p. 29)

Also, see Rogers and Roethlisberger (1952) as they explore powerful dialogue methods by means of which to hear and understand the other with more clarity and compassion.

Roger Fisher and William Ury (1981) observe that "angry people often fail to hear what others have to say. And whatever they hear, they are likely to put the worst possible interpretation on both the words and actions of someone who is seen as an adversity." (p. 24)

Vivekananda talked about our brain’s “drunken monkeys” of the mind, that we can be trying to listen to someone but that the drunken monkeys are jumping and hooting leaving little room for real listening. We need to calm down. They can too.
Carl Rogers, the late psychological theorist and practitioner, mapped out a method to develop active listening half a century ago. Quieting down inside, breathing deeply, focusing on the other person and what that person is saying, allowing for emotional room for empathy, considering the other’s being. (Harvard Business Review, Summer 1952) Sixty years later, it still may be the best writing on the subject.

Jourard (1978) could sense how crucial the listening process could be to developing trust and transparency. To understand the other, we must listen. Jourard said, "while education is not only listening, listening is a necessary part of it....It is no small thing really to listen....What we hear said to us can be a matter of life and death." (p. 50)

Listening and what we can discover by listening can make all the difference, especially in situations of great importance. It is widely felt among professional conflict resolution people that active listening, empathetic listening is the single most important skill to develop; so much emerges from there

**Across paradox – multiple legitimate realities**

F. Scott Fitzgerald: “The sign of a first-rate mind is the ability to hold two contradictory positions and not lose the ability to function.” The mediator and therapist both need to develop this basic skill for their practices. Scott Peck (1987) adds that "the
capacity to accept ambiguity and to think paradoxically is...one...of the requirements of peacemaking." (p. 220)

Paradox is a condition where apparently irreconcilable opposites both appear to be true. Yet when we study such a situation, we find that each side holds important elements of truth.

Fortunately, the paradox actually can be the doorway at the start of the next stage of deliberation together. I wondered then: What if each side were encouraged to listen again to the other side? What if each side realized that the other side had legitimate needs and interests to satisfy as well? How could both sides win. How could the “opposites” find a creative way to blend a solution? To find reasonable satisfaction for BOTH sides? ALL sides.

So, let’s take a mediation-facilitation-system redesign case in which both sides had legitimacy: a labor-management crisis on the verge of a strike in an East Bay city for which labor and management asked us to help. After finding in initial caucuses what seemed like remarkable truth on both sides, when we gathered the sides together for our first joint session, we asked each side to listen again and more attentively to the other side’s worries, suffering, and alternative ideas for resolution.

When parties did so, listened well, spoke clearly about their needs, the sides seemed to realize the other side had legitimacy in what they wanted – it ceased being two antagonistic teams - it began what
seemed more like “a single team with a serious problem in common to solve”.

**Brainstorming solutions – Exploring alternatives**

In the case just mentioned, an East Bay city, when each side reached the point of realizing the deep legitimacy of the other side’s point of view, labor and management came together to collaborate in a session in which everyone was encouraged to make proposals to advance an idea they had on how to solve problems. They soon came up with 14 proposals on heavy paper which they put up all around the walls of the council chamber. (Note that different forms of psychotherapy, as well as the Organization Development field, use problem-solving methods like this.) By asking them to begin to choose, we helped them work the preferred proposals back to two and then reached a complicated but equitable and durable solution. All parties agreed, their constituencies agreed, and we were done for the present.

**Humanistic and transpersonal psychology**

The humanistic psychology movement grew in influence in the 60’s and developed theory, clinical practice, and the national and international human potential movement. This in turn influenced the furthering of humanistic values in both psychotherapy and in
the development of the modern theory and practice in such fields as organization development and the development of cooperative interest-based conflict resolution (which is grounded in Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Human Needs).

Toward the end of his life, Maslow, of one of the parents of the humanistic psychology movement and the human potential movement, refocused his efforts almost totally toward the coming into being of a coalition calling itself transpersonal psychology.

In this last stage of his life, Maslow posited an even stronger connection among people touched on in his previous “self-actualization“ concept, at the old apex of his hierarchy of human needs. According to colleagues, he decided in his mind on a firm new “transpersonal actualization” top to his hierarchy of needs. He, Tony Sutich and others formed an association, started publications. But relatively soon, Maslow was dead. But the movement grew and has become an important internationally growing force of thought. In the transpersonal way, one develops more empathy and even can grow into identify with the other party. What might be the potential effect of this empathy growing toward compassion in the resolution of conflict?
Thich Nhat Hanh says mediation can even succeed using only one approach: The mediator goes to one side and learns all about the suffering of that side. The mediator goes to the other side and deeply learns their suffering as well. Then the mediator goes to each side and helps them listen to the suffering of the other side. According to him, then the healing will begin.

His Holiness the Dalai Lama says that the better we know people, the closer to impossible it is for us to sit by and have them suffer. This would help explain why when disputants reach a stage of becoming strongly empathetic or even compassionate about the needs of the other side, as well as their own, a more cooperative creative approach to resolution can emerge and flow with more momentum toward innovative solutions.

At this turn, the parties can find their logical and defensive and offensive primitive thought getting more settled and balanced by empathy and compassion. Another way of shedding light on this advanced stage of development, Dr. Martin Buber speaks of a deeply needed movement from I-it relationships (treating the other as a thing) to I-Thou relationships (treating others as family – and as another side of oneself). "Understanding," Fisher, Kopelman, and
Schneider (1994) remind us, "is not simply an intellectual activity. Feeling empathetically how others may feel can be as important as thinking clearly about what others may think." (p. 33). They write: If we want to affect what is going on in the heads of others, we will want to be aware of emotions and motivations that may be surging through their hearts. (p. 24)

In considering the important discussions they had ahead, a Cuban leader, Dr. Oscar Garcia, (Cuba, 1995), former Cuban Ambassador to Spain, then Rector of the Instituto Superior de Relaciones Internacionales, said that, after all these years: "(We must) plan to talk about what is in our hearts and on our minds." (p. 14)).

Here to end this chapter is a intriguing thought: Tomson (1996) notes that "Jung observed that the way his clients resolved important problems was not [necessarily] by solving the problems logically, but rather by achieving 'a new level of consciousness' from which the problems 'faded out'." (p. 41)
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Chapter 6: Some Practical Steps for Helping Others Come Back From Polarization

What if you find yourself working with one or more bargaining parties who have apparently regressed? Perhaps they have regressed to the limbic system/reptilian brain level at which the person’s thoughts and actions are operating at a much more primitive level. (One could expect significantly elevated cortisol levels and more in the blood of the parties in conflict. One could expect more anger, more wildness, perhaps disdain, perhaps aggression, and very little accurate listening.) What if you know you want to work on bringing the party or parties back to refocus on the work of resolving the conflict? What if you also want to reestablish positive and functional relationships. Tough job. But think about using some of the steps below:

(Note: Of course to start with, if you come to be in this situation, you can alter the meeting by having the parties take a good long break for breathing and for calming down, by re-scheduling the meeting, by scheduling caucuses, by scheduling one-to-one meetings, by going home to start again another day.)

STARTING POINT of the process: One can re-energize the process, ironically, through one’s own stillness - quietness – centering – slowing down - paying attention to breathing – sitting up straight posture – feet solidly on the ground. Such stillness abets grounding and re-centering,
which can be a silent model for others to consider, which is the starting point. One can even do this quietly right in a group setting. One can also take a step further and ask the other or others if they would like to try doing this together. (Note the work on this of Dr. Carl Rogers and HH the Dalai Lama.) (Note: Interestingly enough, such activities can also significantly drop the cortisol level in the blood.)

The parties will need to begin to consider developing an agreement or agreements on the procedures both sides can agree to for meeting together. By doing so, chances can increase that the talks will be safer and more productive for the participants. This in turn can help release creativity to work toward resolution.

It will be important to keep considering three key satisfactions which all parties will need during and after the dialogue: • procedural satisfaction (a sense that the meeting’s collaboratively developed procedures are working fairly), • psychological satisfaction (sense and intuition that things are getting back on target), and • substantive satisfaction (a sense that overall the concrete terms of the contract developing are going to be satisfactory). Fortunately, parties can put their own active curiosity to work on finding a better “fit”.

Employ “active listening” with the other party. Each party spends time in active listening with the other side and spends time talking transparently, honestly, deeply to the other side. Understanding and empathy can now grow better. Factual and motivational issues can become clearer with the improved listening. (Note the work of Dr. Carl Rogers).
“Transparent” talk by one side balances with the active listening and centering by the other side. (Note again the work of Dr. Sidney Jourard.). These activities so far can facilitate a more accurate mutual one-to-one communication process.

In recent brain science, it is being found that a process called “looping” begins, neural and biochemical processes in each party, the “formation between two brains of a functional link, a feedback loop that crosses the skin-and-skull barrier between bodies”. Perceptions and judgments can begin to change. (In research, this effect is so powerful and integrating between them, that parties are increasingly said to “co-create each other”.) (See the work on social intelligence of Dr. Daniel Goleman.)

During the steps below, movement increases perceptually and biochemically from I-it toward I-Thou.

At a step deeper, and in turn, each party expresses more of what deep suffering is going on among those of its own side, because of this conflict. This is done in earnest with and to each other, perhaps with facilitation, while the other side is actively listening. Both sides get heard out much deeper. Active listening makes these descriptions of the other side’s suffering of much more impact.

The parties can begin to bridge a conflict paradox – Each side begins to understand the other side (and its different reality) more and, with this, experience growing empathy and compassion. One can see and feel an
easing off of the polarization and the stereotyping.

The parties can make strides toward recognizing that each party may have a separate reality it understands and is following. This may make a case of multiple valid realities. (Rather than each side feeling they have the “only” truth.) (Both sides have elements of truth and good sense in their own positions. One studies how to creatively meld each party’s high priority needs toward a collaborative resolution which optimizes both sides’ needs satisfaction, shared success.) (Each party can better reassess the nature, character, and fairness of what the other party’s reality is seeking.) (With a little more trust, which can build in this kind of safer atmosphere, transparent talk and active listening each way can increase and intensify.)

The parties can begin to reframe the matters to be negotiated into basic human needs and into needs they believe they have in common. (There may also be elements that are complementary or different.) (This can be a change from priority “positions” in negotiation toward satisfaction of priority “interests” each is trying to solve for.) (Even opposed interests can ease as more can be worked on in common.)

Opponents begin to appear more like “the partners we have been seeking”. (Note the work of Bill Lincoln.)

Beyond self-actualization, transpersonal actualization begins and increases. In transparent actualization, the person realizes that he/she actually joins in and becomes aware of a literal kind of union with the
other party.

Parties increasingly cooperate in collaborative research they need to follow together and integrative proposal development they become able to do.

(When the steps above have taken place, a problem may literally “dissolve”. Note Dr. Carl Jung’s observation that this dissolving happened regularly in his psychiatric practice.) At least, by this point, the parties will certainly be more amenable to working things out – and probably have more ideas about how to resolve the conflict.

The parties creatively find ways to agree on a settlement they have been developing together using their growing collaborative skills, which they have tested and which they believe will prove to be durable and sustainable. Productive dialogue channels again open and flow.
White, white

1. The Marin hills woods

The dancers turn and turn
in a circle, the party guests
at Sat Santokh's 50th birthday.
(I join in and remember with a sign,
I will be fifty in a few weeks.)
In the white and yellow light,
sweat shows on the dancers' foreheads.
The Sufi song ends. Shams takes a breath,
has been beating the drum,
announces a new dance.

In white turban, long beard,
white clothes, Sat Santokh beams.
"This next is one of my favorites," he says. "One night, years ago,
when we were dancing this next dance,
I was doing the dance with my eyes closed.
While we danced, I found myself in a circle of
ancient elders. It was night. In the darkness,
we began dancing to the right
in a circle together around and
around a bonfire, bending down together
and raising up together, everyone
flickering in the light."

2. Juneau, Alaska

Falling all about me,
snowflakes the size of
pure white half-dollars,
white, white falling before my eyes,
riding up and down the icy wind,
mounds of white loading evergreen
tree branches, white trees in
thick stands in every direction
covering the surrounding mountains rising,
from the nearby edges of the small town,
rising almost straight up into the
freezing early evening air.

3. Oakland downtown, not far
   from the Cypress Structure

I sit silently at my desk
looking out over the city,
The end-of-the-day glancing sunlight
is almost white against the ornate
high wall of the 1906 building
across the street and almost
green against the fall hills in the distance.
The earthquake begins like any other.
Sarahjane and I say to each other "oh, an earthquake", as we turn to go on with
our work. This one begins to shake the building harder ("this one is big," we say, turning back
to each other), then still harder, and harder.
Our seventh-floor office has begun leaping up
and down, throttling us awake like children from
our beds, then, growing beyond bounds, a raging giant
thrashing back and forth as if frenzied to shake off
its clothes and come apart.

4. Leaving Juneau

The silver and white airplane
hurdles us up into the morning air,
rising above the white-laden mountain
forest that disappears quickly
below banks of billowing white clouds.
Below the airplane, the clouds part
and snow-capped mountains one after
another appear. A white land,
punctuated by white-on-gray
jutting mountains, stretches
as far as I can see. A huge bay
of light blue and white water
reflecting the sky and clouds
floats by below before the clouds
close their curtains again,
then open again. Dozens, then literally
hundreds of white-capped mountains appear
like vast unmoving herds of granite moose
and elk in counsel. A glacier pours
without motion from their midst,
its mile-wide ice flow held still
by the white-gloved hand of time.
"Not now," it whispers. "Not now."

Multi-veined waterways appear
criss-crossing the landscape below with
white ice and blue. A long river-width
waterway runs toward the horizon and
disappears among the mountain-after-
mountain-after-mountain track.

5.

The giant's frenzy thrashes our
fifteen-story brick building up and down,
back and forth, mad to get out of its cage
of brick and steel and blast in every direction.
Sarahjane and I dive for the floor in a doorway
by the hall and hold each other tight, covering
each other's heads with our hands.

6.

My plane dips down toward Cordova.
Miles and miles of pure white,
mountain upon mountain --
Out my window, miles long, a huge
slap of absolute black against the white,
then another, like some immense
black paint river has washed over the lower
altitudes of these mountains-after-mountains:
everything else white, but for these
vast poison rivers of black.

7.

Our windows explode as we hear
fifteen floors of glass crash out at once.
The mountain of glass flies down
toward the pavement below and hits
like a huge glass bomb. Stories of
stairway walls are breaking apart
and falling down the hall.
We captives are heaved wildly about.
The building can't possibly
shake any harder or must surely
collapse around us. Huddled on the floor, we hold on as tight as we know how.

8.

A young woman from Cordova, writing about what she sees right after the oil spill:
"(Mom), the entire ecosystem has died (here) or is dying. The deer and bear (are gone)....

Ninety percent of the vast natural area around me is as silent as death."

9.

The wild thrashing continues then begins to slow, then slows some more. Then, for a few minutes, the floor vibrates like a huge bell, then quivers and quiets to a halt. The room becomes very, very still.

10.

In a small wooden house
just up the snowy street
from the State Capitol,
an Alaskan ecological defense fund lawyer
describes her work coordinating law suits.
She is very tired but precise,
determined, animated.

11.

Over lunch later, a young man and woman,
two leaders of Alaskan environmental organizations,
weave their study plans, their Greenprint, their vision
of pure ancient and future mountains, forests, animals, waters.

12.

While it is zero outside, the Chair
of the Alaska Oil Spill Commission sits
at a plain folding table on a folding chair
in his unadorned white conference room at the end
of our meeting and contemplates the outline
of his impending Report to the legislature,
weighs points in silence. We shake hands again
and begin putting on our heavy outer wraps.
I thank him for his unsung work.
I know of those outside Alaska who continue
counting on his Commission's impact
for their safety and that of their future generations.
He smiles, jokes about other things,
like what he'd have otherwise liked to do
with his Christmas, then says goodbye
and walks away slowly toward his office,
his back a little bent, his coat collar up on one side.
His eyes appear to be somewhere else, maybe up some white mountain pass way above the city.

13.

As early morning light slants across a makeshift room,
an already oily worker leans against the wall, stares across the long room at the rows upon rows of open-mouthed dead bodies of wide-eyed blackened animals
and begins to cry for souls.

14.

The pilot, panting, steers the fireboat toward the raging Marina shoreline.
A fireman crawls inch by inch under the crumbling house to hold a terrified woman in his arms until she is freed just before it crashes down with a roar.

15.
People climb the Cypress freeway structure
like a mountain, then quickly crawl
under the concrete into the debris
even as the gas fumes begin to fill
the crushing space. They are calling out, calling out.

Human chains lift people up, carry other people
down. All around, people are standing
in shock, holding each other,
searching for loved ones,
staring in disbelief at the ruins.

16.

It is late, time to go home.
I am tired. So much has happened;
so much to do. I close Sat Santokh's
front door behind me. In the deep darkness,
I and a new friend walk down the long row
of fragrant wooden steps,
the music above and behind me.
We walk carefully down the steep longer driveway.
Below, as I reach the road in the blackness, I turn
Around toward Sham's drumbeat one last time.
In the upper room, soft yellow light
suffuses out the windows into the night air, like mist.
I can see the moving dancers near the windows, still in a circle, their line bobbing, moving slowly to the right together, bending down together, singing "Yah," then raising up in unison, all arms and hands reaching up, pointing up past Sat Santokh's painted ceiling, singing "Allah!" stepping together to the right again, in unison bending down, "Yah", the yellow mist of light almost white against the dark green night trees, all bodies, all hands, movements framed in the windows together reaching up, all singing "Allah!"
On the Midnight Train

"Time has changed the Soviet Union and Cuba. One exists no longer (1991) and the 54-year-long sanctions on Cuba are coming to an end (2015). Yet, the decades-long communism in both countries have left their scars. Dr. Skip Robinson's objective and revealing memoirs of his work in the emerging Russian field of "konfliktology" with his colleagues in Moscow and Leningrad just before the Fall of the Berlin Wall are testimony to and often a window into today's still existing problems. The same is true of our unique and successful dialogue with Cuban government officials in Havana, a true example of how people with divergent points of view still can get together respectfully to probe each others’ beliefs in an erudite and civilized way.

“How to build a more peaceful world comes to life in the author's description of how other fields such as a humanistic and transpersonal psychology will, without doubt, play an ever greater and more important role in the future of peace-building. Also, poetry and theater adds, as Dr. Robinson so skillfully shows, other dimensions to the work with the simulation of case studies and subtle expression of "touching the heart".

Dr. Skip Robinson, an international expert with remarkable skills in peace-building, and his colleagues have left through their teamwork a palpable legacy wherever they worked together. This book is a great contribution to the history of conflict resolution and peace-building. It also encourages the reader to think globally to achieve a better understanding of the ever-expanding field of citizen diplomacy.”

John W. McDonald, U.S. Ambassador, ret., Chairman and CEO, Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy, Arlington, VA and Christel G. McDonald"
“For everyone who truly cares about striving to develop sustainable peace systems, Dr. Robinson presents two memoirs on how it was possible to do so in a team approach between 1990 and 1996 both in Russia and in Cuba. He not only accounts what occurred, but relays the ‘whys and hows’ most conflicts often can be humanistically resolved — and does so effectively and convincingly due to his 30 plus years as a conflict resolution practitioner and academician.”

William F. Lincoln Senior Lecturer, US Naval Postgraduate School; Adjunct Faculty, US Federal Executive Institute

"Skip Robinson is a powerful, moving writer whose poems are capable of focusing both on the extremely concrete and specific as well as on, through sequence and juxtaposition of specifics, much larger issues: the recent California earthquake, the Persian Gulf War. His poetry requires both solitude and meditation for its accomplishment and is one of meditation through clear visual perceptions. The poems often take place in the present tense, and they seek to move us, by way of the immediacies of his life, toward a powerful sense of real presence. His poetry continually open us to the world."

Jack Foley, Editor, Poetry USA