Jayedydraft1jan11

"Experimenting with ARIA globally: Best Practices and Lessons Learnt"

This article aims providing an overview of the Center for International Development and Conflict Management of the University of Maryland (CIDCM) wide use of A.R.I.A. in different continents across and within borders. A rough estimate for about two decades of experimentation has included using this technique of consensus building in more than fifty workshops. Focusing heavily in Latin America and the Middle East, we have done our share of ARIAs in Africa, South Caucasus, South and Central Asia with participants directly involved in the opposite sides of conflicts, to a large extent ethnopolitical and strongly identity driven. We have also conducted perhaps even a larger number of workshops for training purposes around the world and yearly at College Park, often including participants from the selected case studies. We have worked with different "Partners in Conflict", a term that we use to stress that while the participants are coming from contending sides, they nevertheless are selected because they share a common denominator across the divide, such as "influentials" (rectors of universities, editors of newspapers, priests, environmental and human rights leaders), professions (journalists, academics), age (student and young political leaders), civil society organizations (NGOs and social movements), gender (women) and more. There have been a variety of issues at stake. Just to mention from memory the ones that we have been involved in facilitation with "Partners in Conflict": A new paradigm for prisoner exchange/release (Palestinian/Israeli); Refugees (Palestinian/Israeli); Jerusalem (Palestinian/Israeli); Opening borders (Armenia/Turkey); Falkland/Malvinas conflict (Argentina/United Kingdom); environmental damage from a new paper mill factory, (Uruguay/Argentina); A long-term fishing calendar (Galapagos, Ecuador); Separation barrier/security fence/Apartheid Wall (Palestinian/Israeli); Muslim/Hindu riots in Gujarat (India); post-Cenepa War peacebuilding (Peru/Ecuador); local elections (Lesotho);
Introducing Sexual Education in school system (Paraguay); Ngorno-Karabach (Azerbaijan/Armenia); Autonomy/Independence (Abkhazia/Georgia; South Ossetia/Georgia); Bilingual high schools (Kazakhstan); Stopping Political Violence (Venezuela), normalization (Cuba/United States); Jewish democratic/all citizens state (Arabs and Jews, Israel).

The structure of the articles is divided into four parts:

a) Introduction: how did we get familiarized with ARIA – first exposure in Jerusalem (Truman Institute) and then CIDCM (University of Maryland?) Jay's legacy was a structured process for identity driven conflicts, moving from adversarial into the search for common ground. First attempt included Jay as facilitator in 1993, with student leaders from Bethlehem, Bir Zeit and Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Palestinian Territories and Israel). The novelty attracted university authorities, other colleagues, the issue was Jerusalem. Since then, we worked in perfecting it and adapting across cultures and issues that included additional aspects to the identity driven core issues introducing resource and objective levels. Placing ARIA within other used consensus building tools (interpersonal and community mediation- ho'oponopono, unilateral best offer, minimal common denominators).
b) Innovating and adapting the ARIA framework: Checking preliminary propositions/hypotheses about methodology; a systematic comparative analysis of Jay's original to the adjusted model (Kaufman, chapter 11), checking each of the four phases: Adversarial/ Antagonism; Reflexive/Resonance; Integrative/Invention; Action/Re-entry.
c) Selected case studies will illustrate the application and results: At the aftermath of a war (a four- year project with 'influentials", Peru/Ecuador); Common ground among traditional chiefs and political parties for introduction local elections (two-year project in Lesotho); Prisoner release/exchange (three workshops from simulation to "Partners in Conflict", University of Maryland, Tantur and Beit Berl, Israel and Palestinian Territories- an unfinished process);
d) Conclusions: Best practices and lessons learnt – An introspect into the potential and actual use of the ARIA framework. Re-visiting its impact in identity driven conflicts worldwide. Adaptation to high context cultures. The need of preliminary stages (trust and skills building). The viability of moving from dyadic to multi-party conflicts. Following up on consensual agreement- the weakness of implementation when re-entering participants' habitat, addressing GIBI real time in addition to action evaluation.

CHAPTER ONE

(DRAFT, DRAFT, DRAFT!)

What is Identity-Based Conflict and Why is it Useful to be its Own Category?

Identity based conflicts, both within countries and transcending borders, present a fundamental challenge to a more peaceful world order (Gurr, 2000). They are similar to all conflicts in that they include struggles over resources or, politically stated, struggles over who will get what, when, and how (Lasswell, 1935). Moreover, like most conflicts, they are about clashing and competing goals and priorities (Wilmot and Hocker, 2000). However, identity-based conflicts are also a unique class of conflicts that require special handling because unlike goal or resource conflicts, they are deeply rooted in historical fears and frustrations over groups' existential needs and values (Rothman, 1997). It is important to operationally distinguish between identity conflict and other types of conflict if it is indeed substantially different and requires different procedural treatment as is asserted by all of us in this handbook. Those who have tried to negotiate or manage identity-based conflicts using conventional tools of negotiation or even interest-based bargaining also offer a simple proof. They get worse. At the deepest level, this type of conflict is about existential threats and frustrations. These include the sense – on both sides – that their dignity, well being, and safety are at risk. Disputant's need for some kind of predictability and control over their destiny are compromised. Identity conflicts reside at the level of "Why." When we deeply ask parties why they are experiencing a conflict, or why a conflict strikes them so deeply, we may discover the values, needs, motivations, aspirations, and beliefs, hidden underneath. In short, disputants may recognize their very identity is at stake. When the identity of the participants feels threatened or frustrated by the *other*, there is little (often no) room for negotiation or compromise. This sets up a difficult dynamic where the conversation often revolves around a set of issues without actually addressing the deepest concerns of those involved.

A good place to start with identifying Identity-Based conflict is with some cogent definitions (while one will not do since the topic is too deep and complex for that, on the other hand selecting a few is a challenge). In a recent volume devoted to the topic, identity becomes "conflictual when two identities are negatively interdependent, in a zero-sum or threatening relationship. When my being me depends on you not being you, or when your being you threatens my being me, there is an identity conflict" (Zartman and Antsey, page 1). This is a straightforward and common understanding of identity-based conflict. Using a medical model, such conflict is viewed as an illness to be treated. If not, mortality may follow.

In the approach to identity-conflict provided in this book, identity is also viewed as one of the most powerful sources of cooperation and creativity that may be forged out of such conflict situations. That is, our goal in our theorizing and intervening in to identity-based conflict is at least in part to foster a new reality in which my being me is in part contingent on your being you and vice versa. Not in the negative sense that I am I

because I am not you. Rather in the sense that I as a feeling, caring, meaning making and meaning seeking me am me in part because of the positive, loving and human you that is you. The difference is in the way such conflicts are handled. In the first, individual and collective identities are seen as facing off in largely oppositional and mutually exclusive ways. Such opposition must be contained. In our approach, identity is viewed as a source of encounter, learning and development. Not always cooperative and often very conflictual. However, such conflict is not viewed as a closed and developmentally fixed attribute whose main purpose is self-preservation against all resistance. Rather it can be and often is the richest source of self-awareness and a vehicle to understand and empathize with others. How we do this in theory and practice is what this book is about.

Levels of Analysis

To operationally distinguish identity-based conflicts from other more routine conflicts such as those over goals and resources I describe three levels of conflict. If a dispute is about resources like concrete, tangible, and measurable goods or services, one set of actions will satisfactorily address it. If the heart of the conflict really revolves around antagonists' objectives – and the tangibles of the conflict are less salient than the goals they represent – then treating it will require a different sort of action.

At the third and deepest level, on the other hand, some conflicts are really about threats to the most fundamental human issues of existential meaning and physical survival of oneself and one's group - in short, about identity. Such profound, identity-based conflicts require still other, and much more complex, means for engaging the issues at stake, especially if the engagement itself is designed to transform the conflicting and mutually exclusive identities in to cooperative and inclusive identities.

While the need to use different approaches for different kinds of conflicts may seem self-evident, the conflict management and resolution fields that have emerged over the past few decades have paid insufficient attention to these distinctions. In contrast, we have developed over time a fairly simple typology for determining at what level a conflict is occurring and selecting the most useful analytical and applied focus for engaging it.

The ROI Diagnostic Tool

To help conflict analysts, interveners, and disputants to usefully define the primary level at which a given conflict resides, prior to seeking a solution we have through practice employed a diagnostic acronym ROI. The acronym refers to three kinds of conflicts: Resource-based, Objectives-based, and Identity-based. (Not coincidentally, we've chosen this acronym because of its resonance with the business world's Return on Investment (ROI) analysis, designed for evaluating and comparing investments. We believe that using the ROI diagnostic tool is a wise investment that ultimately saves time and increases the chances of long-term success in dealing with conflict.)

In ROI analysis, we refer to readily diagnosed disputes over tangible, observable, and finite resources as Level One conflicts. At Level Two lie more complex conflicts over

objectives, goals, and preferences. Objectives-based conflicts also arise over tangible resources, but more fundamentally, they are over antagonists' particular reasons for wanting to possess those resources. Well beneath the surface, at Level Three, reside issues of personal, cultural, and national identity, and conflicts over people's deeply held values, needs, and motivations.

Asking the Right Questions: Determining a Conflict's ROI Level

Not all conflicts fall so clearly at one level or another. Sometimes a conflict that at first glance seems obviously to be over tangible resources may turn out to have deeper roots – and sometimes not.

To use a prosaic illustration: imagine a business environment in which a corner office with large windows on both outside walls becomes available. Two people with the same job classification – let's call them Jim and Karen – qualify for the office. And both want it. The issue gets complicated as both parties take their case to the department manager, complete with reasons why the other party should *not* get the office. The manager, Rhonda, wants to settle the issue before tensions escalate any further, but *how* does she make a decision about who gets the office? Part of the answer lays in whether this is at heart a resource-, objectives-, or identity-based conflict.

On the surface, it seems like a simple resource-based conflict: two employees want the same office (a tangible resource). Yet if Rhonda asks the right questions and digs a little deeper, she might find that the dispute is also about conflicting objectives. Perhaps one or both disputants see the window office as providing necessary space for working more efficiently and productively (their objective or goal). Or, the conflict may even be rooted more deeply in the employees' sense of self-worth (or identity): "Having the window office will make it clear that my supervisor recognizes and acknowledges my value to the company."

Following are some of the issues that Rhonda might consider in undertaking the ROI analysis:

Resource-level conflicts – These conflicts are tangible and observable. If each party wants the corner office simply because it is large and comfortable, this is clearly about the resource itself. Such conflicts are fairly routine and relatively easy to “fix,” perhaps with a decision based on a tangible measure such as relative number of years with the company. Conflicts occur frequently over competition for scarce resources and who will get them when and how. With effective and timely negotiation and problem solving resource conflicts also can commonly be settled and mutual gains achieved for all parties.

Objectives-level conflicts – The causes of these conflicts are a bit more hidden and may require some digging to determine what they are really about. Is it just a question of preference, or does one or both parties have some underlying reason for wanting the

office? When an intervener asks the right questions to uncover them, and does so proactively, conflicts over objectives can become a source of clarification and joint problem solving. "I want the corner office so I can meet with clients in an aesthetically pleasing and quiet environment – and I need the space to keep my files and books at my fingertips." Or, "I want the corner office because natural light affects how well I am able to work; I get headaches from the fluorescents in my current work space." Perhaps other solutions can be found to meet those objectives, aside from the office in dispute. Objectives-based conflicts are commonly about mismatched goals. Goals, in their most elemental form, are those things we seek to accomplish or attain. Problems or conflicts, most essentially, are those things that keep us from fulfilling our goals. In a widely quoted operational definition of conflict, Hocker and Wilmot (1985), suggest that *conflict is the interaction of interdependent people who perceive incompatible goals and interference from each other in achieving those goals* (see also Folger, Poole and Stutman, 2005). Like the iceberg beneath the water, they are opaque. You can't quite see goals of the other side and often even one's own goals are ill defined or too complex to articulate simply. However, unlike identity-based conflicts, when engaged proactively and in an environment of good listening, problem solving and effective communication, goal-based conflicts need not be too troubling or difficult to manage successfully. Rather, without a great deal of emotional content, disputants with or without third party assistance can often dispassionately and fairly rationally manage goal-based conflicts.

Identity-level conflicts – These, of course, are the most emotionally laden and difficult to engage and convert into opportunities. However, when handled effectively the creative rewards can be great. When mishandled, deeply destructive outcomes are common. One party may believe, "I deserve the corner office in recognition of my accomplishments and value to the company." The other may respond, "But I've been here twice as long as you. I've paid my dues and deserve, finally, to receive respect and appreciation for all I have contributed." One or both may believe, rightly or not, that they are being judged by their age, sex, race, social standing, or other factors. In any case, a creative solution that goes beyond the original point of contention may be called for to address the conflict in a manner that doesn't result in one "winner" and one "loser." Identity-conflicts, are often far beneath the surface, they can't be understood or seen empirically. In short, identity-based conflicts are about threats and frustrations to existential needs and values that are threatened, frustrated or pursued in conflict between groups. The needs approach to identity-based conflict suggests that the main cause of such conflict and the reason they are often unresponsive to conventional negotiation, and even to interest based bargaining, is because they are rooted in the threat and frustration to based human needs and their fulfillment. Such needs are various defined by various negotiation, peace and conflict theorists. John Burton (1979, 1990a) articulated them as irreducible collective human needs for security, predictability, recognition, distributive justice meaning and control. Negotiation theorists Dean Pruitt and Jeffrey Rubin (1986) defined them as needs for security, identity, social approval, happiness, clarity about one's world, and physical well-being. Peace studies pioneer Johan Galtung (1990) articulated them as needs for security, freedom, welfare and identity. Anstey and Zartman define them as needs for *protection, participation, power, privilege*, and *purpose (in this volume)*. Legal expert of minority affairs, Yousef Jabarin (2008) summarized needs in to one main category,

"participatory equality." They are commonly mired in deeply rooted and emotional issues that make straightforward solution seeking extremely difficult at best.

This ROI levels of analysis approach suggests an important feature of identity-based conflicts that distinguishes it from the other two. Identity-based conflict contains within it the other two levels of conflict as well. A conflict for example over *home* and ones access to and control over it (the root of many international identity-based conflicts), will also be about goals (e.g. goals to accomplish sovereignty and territorial integrity) and resources (e.g. ways to protect and promote economic resources). On the other hand goal conflicts will be primarily about goals and resources (e.g. to establish an independent state in order to be able to gain and control economic and military resources). And resource conflicts, while also having seeds of goal disputes and even identity-issues if and when they are poorly handled, are fundamentally about tangible resources and who controls them, when and how (e.g. gaining access to and control over scarce resources).

Another way of differentiating these conflict levels of analysis is to think about Identity-based conflicts as the ultimate set of "Whys"? Why do we care so deeply? Why are we feeling threatened and frustrated? Goal conflicts are about "What for?" What are we seeking? What are our goals and priorities that are at stake? Resource conflicts are simply the "What" of conflict. What are we seeking to get or preserve?

With such a levels of analysis approach, the next step before focusing on solution seeking – in the form of negotiation or some other problem solving process that seeks to foster collaboration and coordination between conflict parties and reduce destruction and violence – is determining the right kind of approach for which level of conflict. In their classic article, Sander and Goldberg describe the importance of "fitting the forum to the muss."(1994) Fisher and Keashley describe the need and outlines of a contingency approach to conflict analysis and resolution (1991). I believe this is the cutting edge of the dispute resolution field.

Anyone who has dealt with identity-based conflicts, whether at home or abroad, knows they are deeply emotional and require a special type of handling. Applying conventional interests-based models to them can make them worse. Why? Because they are rooted in the deep past and the indignities, physical suffering and psychic wounding that has occurred to stimulate them in the first place. They fester and worsen if not addressed. When the antagonism of the past is engaged so too all the hurts and emotions of that past break forth and are volatile. However, surfacing identity-conflicts is essential if they are not to fester and explode, and can be very therapeutic (Rothman, 1997, 1992). On the other hand, if a premature focus is made on solution seeking, or common interests beneath conflicting positions (Fisher and Ury, 1981), such conflicts can deepen and worsen for the "treatment." When identity-conflicts are identified and can be evaluated carefully and surfaced safely (first within groups and then between them) they can be rationalized and viewed as also including contending goals and competition over resources. Then identity conflict can begin to be moved towards more negotiable goal or resource conflicts where conflict management and interest-based bargaining may become possible. For indeed, while deep conflicts are about identity and identity is by

definition not easily negotiable (though not static by any means), recall that the ROI analysis says they are also about goals which may be coordinated when well articulated, and about resources which indeed are often, or should often be, the focus of bargaining.

Having safely surfaced antagonism – which is commonly done in a process of interactive and narrative articulation of core needs and values that each side feels has been threatened or frustrated by the conflict with the other side and some acknowledgement of that subjective reality (see Kelman, 1987, Rothman, 1998, Kaufman and Davies, 2002) it is now for parties to engage in some form of coordinated goal-setting process. Finally, having articulated goals and to some degree engaged in integrative bargaining such as log-rolling and other forms of goal trade-offs, only now can parties who were locked in identity-conflict engage in a more formal bargaining process over resources.

Identities and Goals - Past or Future Orientation

The main difference between goal-based and identity-based conflicts is their respectively past or future orientation. The former looks toward some new future. Differences in goals arise over definitions, interests and priorities. My colleague Gary Klein and I talk about such goals as mired in a "conflict goal-field" in which contending goals compete with one another for primacy (Klein and Rothman 2008, and Klein, 2009). Often times, as will be discussed in some depth in this volume (see chapters XXX), a major reason for goal conflicts between groups is that there are ill-defined and unresolved goal conflicts *within* each group that then spills over in to goal conflicts between sides.

Identity-based conflicts are often rooted in some set of "chosen traumas" from the past and the way in which they continue to influence and cloud the present. Volkan suggests that in all ethnic conflicts parties select certain historical traumas they have suffered and hold fast to those as ways of defining their distinctive identity. They are often symbolized in specific historical events and sometimes with artifacts. An example of the latter is a key commonly found among Palestinian refugees representing their exile from their homes (Volkan, 1988). A narrative example of an identity conflict was shared with me by my colleague Benjamin Broome in an encounter he had with an old Cypriot man.[1] In response to Ben's question about the hurts of his past, the old man waved his hand forward past his right ear saying "right before my eyes." Ben inquired, "don't you mean your past is behind you" (waving his hand backwards past his left ear). "No," the old man responded continuing to wave his hand forward, "my past is before my eyes like it were today, my future (now joining Ben in waving his hand behind him) is very unclear." Indeed identity-based conflicts are often those with high emotional content that live on in memory and deeply, often negatively, influencing the way life is experienced in an ongoing basis. Another classic example is the story of Palestinians with a key to the family home from which parents or grandparents were exiled. "When my grandfather was on his deathbed," began Khwala, one of my Palestinian-Israeli students[2], "he took the key from the house from which he was exiled in 1948 and went for a last visit. The Jewish woman in the house was alarmed when we knocked on the door and asked us to leave." My student told this story with a burning anger in her eyes. I asked her why this story was so important to her. This kind of why question is a delicate – often all about

identity can sound controversial, or deeply caring (Friedman, Withers and Rothman, 2003). I think I struck the right chord as she answered quietly with a tear in her voice, "Because my grandfather died a month later and never saw the inside of his home again. Because my family is scattered. We don't live in our home. We are exiles here in Israel."

In the field of conflict resolution there is a common distinction made between positions and interests (Fisher and Ury, 1981).[3] The former are those unbridgeable attitudes and beliefs about a conflict that divides parties from each other. The latter are understood as underlying concerns that often overlap in interdependent ways that can be met through cooperative and functional solutions. Distinctions between identities and goals are more complex and therefore should be more precise. This is partly the case because all identities contain goals and resources. In fact, some would say identities are constituted of specific goal configurations in which, as an example, someone could have intraspsychic conflicts within their various internal goal-fields (e.g. as a hardworking professional and a devoted parent and the competing time demands and constraints upon each role), just as groups could have internally and externally contending goals (see chapter four in Jones and Brinkert, 2008). This complexity is what commonly leads people to believe that all conflicts are identity-based. But I believe this is an important mistake that leads to imprecision in conflict analysis and intervention design, part of which a good contingency model could help correct. I believe it important to understand that while all identity conflicts do contain goal and resources issues, the reverse is not necessarily the case. That is sometimes a cigar is just a cigar and sometimes goals are not deeply rooted in existential issues, they are, for example, just about "getting it done." But "higher" level conflicts can fairly easily move downward. Or to put it another way, simpler conflicts can easily become more complex if they are not handled proactively and effectively. For example, when resource issues are not addressed there is a reverse trajectory that commonly occurs and contending goals begin to emerge. Moreover, when goal conflicts are not proactively or effectively addressed, threats and fears commonly emerge and identity-conflicts follow. Thus, getting the analysis as right as possible and in timely matter on a contingency basis (if we have a conflict at this level we should use this type of intervention) is important.

I suggest that a more nuanced and differentiated way of viewing resources, goals and identities could be a key in preparing for effective intergroup negotiation in identity-based conflicts. I believe a major problem in intergroup negotiation where identity issues are key is that parties, while ostensibly bargaining over how best to meet overlapping or competing goals, are actually engaging indirectly in deeper disputes regarding their historically threatened or frustrated identities. If so, then it is important to keep them conceptually and practically distinguished

Beyond Subjectivity in Identity Conflict

One of the attributes of identity conflict is that it is intangible. Another way of putting it is to say that such conflict is deeply subjective; disputants locked in identity conflict often have a very hard time explaining the nature of their conflict to others who have not

experienced it in the way that they have. When the parties involved in an identity conflict describe its significance in historical terms, observers may believe that different histories are being told. In many ways they are. The subjective experience of disputants in conflict is shaped by and shapes their particular cultural realities and historical narratives. Moreover disputants' experience of self and others in conflict is subjective. One side's freedom fighter is very often another side's terrorist.

Seeking the objective truth about such a conflict, its history, and the merits of one side's interpretations and experiences against another's is futile; this approach regularly leads to a fruitless debate in which each side asserts its reality, the other side counter asserts, and no listening or learning occurs. However, it is possible and potentially transforming to discover the meeting points between the subjective experiences and interpretations-the intersubjective intersections between adversaries. In pursuing the work of articulating conflict's deep meaning to one's identity through this process of reflexive dialogue, wherein disputants strive to articulate to each other the impact of conflict on their self-definition and experience, respectively and interactively, what becomes profoundly clear is that subjective renderings of conflict can have an intersubjective resonance between disputants. "1 was afraid," says one side. "So was 1," says the other. While reframing starts with frame introspection, shifting frames from external to internal, such a start is a necessary but insufficient first step. The more profound first step is when disputants incorporate their different subjective frames of the conflict into a shared intersubjective definition of the core narratives, meaning and motives: "We were afraid." I call this process reflexive dialogue, or interactive introspection.

In identity conflicts, such meeting points can regularly be discovered in the respective articulation of disputants' hopes, fears, needs, and motivations. One of the reasons identity disputes are so protracted and intransigent is that the stakes are very high: They have to do with disputants' needs for safety, dignity, control over destiny, and so forth (Maslow, 1943; Burton, 1990). Such needs regularly resonate negatively between disputants locked in identity conflict, who share in common an experience of threat or frustration around such needs. At the core of such conflicts is the destructive relationship with the other side, viewed as the cause of threatened or frustrated needs.

Reflexive Dialogue

The transformational potential that can be forged out of such negative conflict cycles is that one side may become an ally in fostering or fulfilling the other side's needs, instead of damaging them. This cannot occur, however, until both sides become explicit and articulate their motivations in the conflict (such as, the fulfillment of their needs).

Disputants may be able to explain the external attributes of their conflict and the suffering it has caused them, but they are often hard-pressed to verbalize the conflict's inner meaning. Moreover, it is uncommon for disputants to try to do so since other forms of explanation are simpler, and blame is apparently rhetorically appealing and psychologically comforting. While identity conflict is subjectively perceived and intangible, it also has an objective or external component that is more tangible and

describable. Thus, disputants rarely articulate the deeper significance of conflict to them and instead describe its attributes and effects, and the underlying significance of conflict often remains at the tacit level (Polyani, 1966).

If disputants operate out of apparently incommensurate subjective realities, which may not be fully comprehended even by themselves, how then can constructive communication, intersubjective agreement, and conflict resolution be initiated? First and foremost, we can help disputants articulate and frame their own concerns so that they themselves are clear about the deep structures of their conflict and can educate the other side about them.

The approach that I use to harness the potential of deep conflict for trans- formation and enduring creative change is reflexive dialogue. Such dialogue is a form of guided and interactive introspection by which disputants speak about themselves in the presence of their adversaries, and about their needs and values as viewed interactively through the prism of the conflict situation. Reflexive dialogue can be transforming, for not only does it nurture an expression of disputants' underlying motivations for conflict, but it may also help them articulate to themselves, while they communicate to the other side, what they care about and why. It can be, in its richest form, a kind of consciousness raising by which disputants come to know and express themselves in ways that may not have occurred had the conflict not provided an opportunity, or necessity, for such articulation.

Reflexive dialogue can lead to a fresh start toward reconciling identity- driven conflicts that may have become protracted in part due to methods (like negotiation or problem solving) used previously to discuss and manage them. Whereas in conventional adversarial conflict framing, parties typically identify the locus and source of the conflict in their opponents, in reflexive reframing, parties begin, or start over, with themselves. They inquire foremost into what the conflict "out there" means to them "inside," and how their own internal processes and priorities have negatively shaped and can be channeled to positively reshape the course of that exogenous conflict. This is a reflexive process.

There are, however, two forms of reflexivity, and distinguishing between them clarifies the meaning intended here. The common form of reflexivity is reactive and thus akin to blaming. It is a kind of single feedback loop between actions and reactions. This is knee-jerk reflexivity of the kind stimulated by the rubber mallet in a doctor's hand. Such single-loop reflexivity, in which we react instinctively to a stimulus, making sense of data and operating out of a predetermined cognitive map, is a conditioned response. The second type of reflexivity has the opposite meaning, though it builds on the first. It is a slowed-down and self-conscious analysis of the interactive nature of reactions (for example, "Hey, what is going on here that I care about so much? Why is it getting such a rise out of me?"), which potentially provides needed space for deciding how one wants to react, instead of simply acting in accord with how one is conditioned to react. We can be active agents, making decisions about our responses, learning to encounter stimulus contemplatively, questioning our own assumptions, anticipating our own reactions prior to enacting them, and, finally, choosing how to proceed (Steier, 1991).

We can build on single-loop cognitive or emotional reactions to develop double-loop decisions about our actions (Argyris and Schon, 1978; Argyris, Putnam, and Smith, 1985). We can move from somewhat blind or tacit assumptions to profound self-awareness and volition. Single-loop reactions, like adversarial conflict framing, are those based on a given frame that may be refined and improved ("How might we better gain what we want from them?"). Double-loop reactions are based on inquiry into the nature of the frame itself, assumptions underlying it, and whether an alternative frame might be prefer- able ("How might we reconceptualize our conflict so that we view ourselves as in it together and therefore getting out of it together?"). Reflexive dialogue is a valuable tool for helping disputants who are locked in identity conflicts-where who they and other such existential issues are at stake, whether in national or organizational settings-to honestly express what they care about and why, who they are, and, given their identity definitions, why the conflicts matter so much to them. Having expressed themselves in this way, disputants may begin to inquire of each other about their concerns, needs, values, motivations, and identities, providing a foundation for agenda setting and coordinated next steps-further meetings, functional cooperation, joint problem solving, program development, and so forth.

In reflexive dialogue disputants reframe their perceptions and analyses of each other and their own identities: In short, they learn to articulate their own voices clearly and to recognize each other's voices as valid. Where blame was, mutual responsibility enters. Where us versus them dynamics prevailed, the way in which the disputants were locked into a relationship and in part defined by it becomes both clear and potentially constructive with a new use of we. Where negative attributions clouded all differentiation of the other, a new analytical empathy may emerge in which the other is viewed as "like self" with respect to motivations, needs, and values. Finally, where pernicious projections were entrenched, a new awareness of disputants' own imperfections are acknowledged and accepted, promoting a less self-righteous or judgmental battle and more tolerance for failings of the other side as well.

Kurt Lewin (1948), in his classic book Resolving Social Conflicts, suggested that when disputants are locked in bitter battles, they must somehow "unfreeze" cognitions about each other and their situation that perpetuate the fight in order to view them afresh and enable a new beginning. Reflexive dialogue is one tool that can produce the kind of transformational process they promote, whereby parties learn a great deal about their own needs and values by articulating them in guided dialogue, and they come to reflexively recognize the needs and values of the other side as well.

Conflict and Creativity: The ARIA Framework

Carrie, a white woman, planned to file a sexual harassment complaint with her office human resources manager about Milt, an African-American coworker. After drinks at a staff retreat six months earlier, Milt had said something that upset and frightened Carrie; the encounter had since snowballed into an increasingly caustic relationship. Simmering tensions and antagonistic interactions between them spiraled into overt hostility that

made working together virtually impossible; their hostility spilled over into the workplace, causing problems for other coworkers as well.

The departmental supervisor persuaded Carrie to wait and pursue mediation before filing a complaint. She tentatively agreed, but Milt was skeptical about the usefulness of a mediation process. Further, he saw race as an underlying factor in Carrie's accusation and was threatening to resign or perhaps to file a lawsuit for defamation of character. "If I weren't so Goddamned furious at her," he told their supervisor, "I would quit. But I'm not going anywhere until my good name is restored. Besides, if anyone should leave it's her, not me."

Milt and Carrie's situation was a toxic mix of race and gender, anger, and seemingly irreconcilable differences – making the possibility of conflict "resolution" almost unimaginable. Yet over the past three decades, my colleagues and I have developed a model for conflict engagement, the ARIA Framework, that has helped people like Milt and Carrie, and thousands of others who found themselves in "impossible" situations in businesses, communities, nonprofit organizations, and public institutions; at home between family members; and in political hotspots around the world.

A major focus of ARIA is its disciplined approach to *conflict as opportunity;* that is, its practitioners seek to transform the negative dynamics of conflict into positive opportunities for learning and constructive change. With music – the "aria" – as an organizing metaphor, ARIA represents four complementary phases in conflict intervention: Antagonism, Resonance, Invention, and Action. Together, these four make up the "aria," the creative process that enables antagonists like Carrie and Milt to find a way through the rancor and to start building a productive way forward.

Another central characteristic of ARIA is that *how* it is applied in a given conflict is contingent on the circumstances specific to that situation. That is, before conflicting parties, with or without a mediator, begin any of the phases of the ARIA, they first diagnose the level or type of conflict they're facing. Only when the true nature of a specific conflict is understood can mediators and disputants begin to formulate the most creative and effective ways to engage it.

The Most Difficult Type of Conflict

The dispute between Milt and Carrie was unquestionably an identity-level conflict. Like most such conflicts, however, it also manifested certain characteristics of less complex conflicts. It included, for example, an element of objectives-level conflict: both parties wanted to pursue an action (harassment complaint or lawsuit) in order to achieve a particular goal (cessation of harassment or restoration of reputation). Without a doubt, however, the heart of the conflict went deeper, to the disputants' very sense of identity and personal security.

Such identity-based conflicts occur not only between individuals, but also between and among groups of individuals. Perhaps the most well known are hostilities among large national, religious, or ethnic groups – hostilities that can erupt into violence at almost any time. For example, in 2001 I served as Special Master to a US Federal Judge in Cincinnati, working to mediate between police officers and members of the African American community after a shooting incident caused long-simmering tensions to erupt into full-scale civil unrest. Each side pointed fingers at the other (See chapter xx).

"You treat us as perpetual suspects," said members of the Black United Front, filing a class-action racial profiling lawsuit against the city and its police department. "You pull us over for minor infringements like a missing taillight and then treat us disrespectfully as you search for drugs and weapons."

"And you," respond the police, "make our jobs miserable by treating us with disdain. You teach your kids to run from us. You see us as part of your problems, instead – as we seek and want to be – as part of the solution to crime and disorder in your neighborhoods."

In short, both sides saw the other as their adversary, and this expectation, admittedly bolstered by some experience – often became self-fulfilling and self-perpetuating.

Identity-based conflicts also comprise many of the same attributes as resource- and objectives-based conflicts. As with resource conflicts, they involve tangible issues: inner-city poverty – a scarcity of resources – is one condition that leads to crime and disorder, thereby feeding the deeper conflict. From another point of view, the police have a very difficult job to do, usually under tight budget and staffing constraints – again, a question of resources.

The Cincinnati riots involved conflicts over objectives, as well. Police wanted to do their jobs effectively and not feel reviled as they try. Citizens wanted to feel protected and respected, and not feel they were receiving unfair treatment at the hand of authorities.

Yet at its deepest level, this type of conflict was about the kinds of existential threats and frustrations that are tied up with people's very identity and sense of self. Many in the African-American community felt threatened and disrespected because of their race, an important part of their identity; likewise, many on the police force felt threatened and disrespected because of their profession, which was, for most of them, intertwined with their own sense of identity.

Disputes between large ethnic, racial, and national groups are perhaps the most common source of identity-based conflict throughout the world: Israeli and Palestinian; Irish Unionist and Irish Nationalist; Black and White; immigrant and native-born citizen. Yet such conflicts also occur on a smaller scale when, for example, teens seek to determine their own paths and choices, and their parents resist. They occur between individuals in business and social environments – as with Milt and Carrie.

Identity conflicts, in short, are ubiquitous, and they hold the most destructive potential of any conflict, especially when they are not engaged in an appropriate, timely, and creative manner. Consider that if a deep, identity-based conflict is "solved" with a simple distribution of resources or a set of rules imposed by an authority – without regard to the underlying issues – then that conflict is unlikely to stay solved for very long. Returning to the hypothetical window office: the department supervisor could simply assign the office to the employee with the longest tenure. But if the "loser" suspects the decision is based more on prejudice or some other unfair measure – but has no opportunity to voice that concern – then resentments will eventually resurface, and the next conflict will be harder still to address.

Identity-based conflict happens at every level of social organization from individual to international. ARIA builds on its musical metaphor by addressing individuals and inviting them to engage in "solos" and "duets" around interpersonal conflicts. It talks about conflicts within and between ensembles (i.e.). And it describes the intervention process as one of "conducting." Without over appealing to this metaphor, one important conceptualization that ARIA brings to identity-based conflict is the notion of creativity. Many theorists and practitioners who do have the temerity and insight to view identity-conflict as its own class of conflict requiring its own distinct treatment, nonetheless view it as mostly a negative dynamic to be overcome. The notion of "tribalism" is often linked to identity-conflict with all the ethnocentrism and violence between Us and Them that this implies (Shapiro, 2010; Zartman, 2010, Susskind, 2010). Surely ARIA does the same in its attention to Antagonism. However, ARIA also views identity conflict, and more to the point individual and group identity as expressed and even developed in and through conflict as potential creative, dynamic and life-enhancing.

The ARIA: From *What* to *Why* to *How*

Once a given conflict is diagnosed as being primarily resource-, objectives-, or identity-based, it's at this point that the ARIA part of the methodology comes into play. Particularly for difficult identity-based struggles, ARIA can help transform the dissonance of conflict into the resonance of creativity and cooperation. The process consists of four steps or phases, with each phase revolving around several key questions:

Surfacing Antagonism

What got the parties in conflict in the first place? What is the presenting problem? If the disputants feel their needs and values are threatened or frustrated, then a dialogical approach that allows them to safely surface and recognize the antagonisms of the past may be most useful as a first step. Given that such conflicts, rooted as they are in past hurts and indignities, are often deeply contentious, this type of intervention begins with bringing to the surface the antagonism beneath the conflict. *Some of the conflict intervention processes used in this phase include dialogue, empowerment, mediation, confrontation, and facilitation.*

Fostering Resonance

What does each side care about most, and is there any overlap (or "resonance") between their main concerns? If a conflict has to do with the underlying purposes for which disputants are pursuing conflicting objectives, then a sustained effort to clarify both their separate *and* overlapping goals and values is essential. "Resonance" in this phase connotes the internal clarity about an issue which, when expressed well, often forges mutual understanding about where the parties' concerns overlap. Fostering this resonance through internal and interactive goal clarification and collaborative planning is a useful way forward. *Some of the conflict intervention processes used in this phase include narrative mediation, storytelling, and transformative processes.*

Generating Inventions

What type of solutions should be applied in an effort to convert the negative dynamics of conflict into opportunity and creative change? By sharing their concerns, disputants realize that they can creatively solve their problem in mutually satisfying ways. This phase is about seeking creative ways to foster and promote greater resonance through concrete fulfillment of needs, values, and goals. It requires disputants and third-party facilitators to think creatively, even to entertain options that may previously have seemed utterly impossible. *Some of the conflict intervention processes used in this phase include interest-based bargaining, collaborative visioning and goal setting, and action research.*

Planning Action

Can all parties agree to an action plan that will clarify who will do what, when, and how? This phase of the ARIA is the process of concretely designing and implementing ways to sustain and further creative inventions. While (previously) conflicting parties might prefer just to ride the wave of good feelings generated in the Inventions phase, it is crucial for disputants and facilitators to have the discipline to translate those feelings into tangible, achievable goals. *Some of the conflict intervention processes used in this phase include negotiation, action planning, and techniques drawn from organizational development.*

<u>Putting it All Together: The ARIA Framework for Conflict Analysis and Engagement</u>

But *who* begins and carries out the process? Do disputants use ARIA to address their own conflicts unassisted? Is a third-party mediator required? Does it work with conflicts between individuals, as well as between groups? Does every conflict require all four steps? The answer to all these questions is, "it depends."

The level of conflict, as indicated by the ROI analysis, suggests an appropriate phase at which to begin the ARIA process. For a straightforward resource-level conflict without any significant underlying antagonism, disputants can often begin immediately to invent creative solutions for mutual gains. An objectives-level conflict, on the other hand, usually calls for the two parties to begin by uncovering the resonance between their

respective objectives – perhaps with assistance from a third party – before moving on to seeking solutions. For complex identity-level conflicts, disputants will almost certainly require a third-party mediator to help them safely bring the underlying antagonism to the surface before attempting to foster resonance and invent solutions.

Yet flexibility and adaptability are keys to the ARIA approach to conflict engagement. So a relatively simple resource-based dispute, for example, might call for disputants to first seek resonance between their shared goals; likewise, a given objectives-level conflict might call for them to begin by surfacing antagonism. The ROI-ARIA toolkit provides a framework – not a rigid set of rules – for analysts, interveners, and parties in dispute to work with conflict and transform it from a destructive burden to a creative opportunity for learning, growth, development, and planned change.

The Self-directed ARIA as Solo or Duet

Although an aria usually refers to a piece for a solo voice, as noted we stretch the musical metaphor by asserting that ARIA can be effective as a "solo" or a "duet" when used to address conflicts between individuals. That is, one person can work through all or part of the process independently and then engage the other party to work through, perhaps, the last two phases (Invention and Action) together. Or, depending on the specifics of the situation and its particular antagonists, the parties might work through the entire process (Antagonism, Resonance, Invention, Action) in tandem.

Either of these approaches, in which the solo and duet are self-facilitated, are often appropriate for resource-based conflicts (which may not require the parties to engage in the Antagonism phase at all). Complex identity-level disputes, however, almost always require a third-party to intervene and facilitate the ARIA. It is difficult to imagine Milt and Carrie, for example, working through their conflicts without assistance. Their antagonism was too deep and too raw (see chapter Two).

At the middle level – depending again on the specifics and complexity of a given situation – parties in conflict over goals and objectives may be able to successfully address their own dispute, or they may also require third-party intervention. That might be the case in Karen and Jim's window-office dispute. In one possible scenario, they might begin with an attempt to work through ROI-ARIA on their own, and then later decide they need assistance from an outside mediator.

In short, two individuals engaged in conflict might facilitate their own solo or duet ARIAs. Or – to stretch the metaphor even further – they might perform more successfully with the help of a third-party mediator or "conductor."

ASPIRATIONAL ARIA

In the second part of this handbook, authors describe ARIA with an emphasis on its Invention and Action aspects. In engaging Identity-Based Conflict surfacing the past, dealing with Antagonism and not particularly focusing on problem solving or solution

seeking is necessary to put "first things first." However, when this is done, to move from the world of relationship to the world of enactment, more concrete focus is necessary to sustain new insights and translate the interiority of each sides' passions, hopes and fears that have been surfaced during Resonance in to sustained and peaceful action.

Over the years, beginning with my dissatisfaction with the "GIBI" problem of my own work in conflict resolution (Good ideas; Bad Implementation), in which despite new and profound insights participants gained about themselves and the other side, they too often failed to carry these new insights in to sustained practice. I have struggled for ways to support ongoing and concrete action for most of my career. For decades now I have been working with colleagues to develop a systematic way to sustain and evaluate effective implementation and practice. Underlying this pursuit is the question what is success? How is it defined in ways that are contextually relevant and practically useful? How is it self-consciously monitored and evolved? Too often goals quickly grow stale and even false if they are not held up to evolving standards of success that implementation reveals and requires. And finally, how is it evaluated? In short, how can we develop a reflexive conflict resolution practice that effectively defines, promotes and evaluates success?

To answer these questions, in addition to developing and applying ARIA over the last 25 years for addressing deep identity based conflicts rooted in pain and trauma from the past, for almost that long a number of us in this volume and beyond us have worked together to develop a more future-oriented and goal-focused and evaluative variant of ARIA. This has gone by a number of names (Action Evaluation, see Rothman, 19xx, Rothman and Friedman, 19xx, Friedman, Rothman and Withers, 19xx), ARIA-C3 and Collaborative Visioning (see http://www.ariagroup.com/?page_id=5) and simply ARIA-Aspiration (see chapter xx in this book) [see endnote - to be written - for descriptions of each of these and their differences]. It has been applied hundreds of times in dozens of countries with thousands of participants. It is described and illustrated in more detail in the second half of this handbook.

ARIA-C3 has been used when groups are emerging from a conflict (e.g. see chapter xx Cincinnati, and chapter yy on Israeli-Arab nursing students) and are ready to work together to forge a new and cooperative future. It has also been used when there is no deep identity-based conflict in the background but rather when people understand that there are many goals, some contending, more often simply not articulated. Thus going through a systematic process can be invaluable to assist individuals, their groups and the systems they constitute to reach deep agreement on the nature of success, how to promote it and how to assess it -in an integral way. The biggest conceptual difference between ARIA for conflict engagement and ARIA for cooperative evaluation and goal-setting is in the first letter. When it is about identity-conflict from the past ARIA proscribes, and quite adamantly, that Antagonism needs to be surfaced self-consciously, systematically and bravely. When it is about goals and cooperation and evaluation in the future, the first letter of ARIA stands for Aspiration: seeking to "predict the future by creating it."

Origins and Evolutions

Action Evaluation as it first evolved came directly out of my work with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In the fall of 1993 it seemed peace would finally prevail in the ME. I was invited to witness signing of Principles of Agreement between Israeli Prime Minister Rabin and PLO Chairman Yassir Arafat at the Whitehouse in recognition of my work fostering and legitimizing grassroots and track two diplomacy in the Israeli-Palestinian setting, I wrote opinion editorial in Philadelphia Inquirer in the afterglow of the famous albeit short-lived hand-shake between these adversaries, proclaiming that Conflict Resolution (described a bit narrowly as track two diplomacy in this case) had made a difference. Here's what I wrote:

> **Unofficial Talks Yielded Mideast Peace (The Philadelphia Inquirer, September 14, 1993)**

Viewing the secret talks in Oslo between Israelis and Palestinians as a kind of fluke lessens them. Their success wasn't a case in which the stars all happened for one brief moment to line up and finally smile on the troubled Middle East. It took decades of toil.

The media have discussed in detail two of the three factors that converged to help bring about the peace agreement witnessed in Washington yesterday by Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Yasir Arafat, chairman of the Palestine Liberation Organization.

One factor is the currents of history that finally swept the two sides together-from the 1967 war to the Camp David Accords, from the Gulf War to the Madrid talks. Another is the converging self-interests of Rabin, his foreign minister Shimon Peres and Arafat, who were pressed to make peace or move over for hardliners.

But the third, and equally important factor, is much less known. This is the "track two" unofficial diplomacy and its part in what Secretary of State Warren Christopher called the "conceptual breakthrough" achieved in Oslo.

It involved many hundreds of "academic" meetings, in the U.S., in Europe, even in the outskirts of Jerusalem through which a new agenda articulating the human dimension of the Middle East conflict-the hopes, fears, motivations, values and needs of the people, not their politicians-was gradually constructed.

The participants in these meetings-academics, businessmen, leaders of community groups, artists and analysts, among whom I number- insisted that in existential conflicts of this type, political deals at the highest level could be consolidated only through confidence and commitment from those whose lives and destinies were at stake.

Not until Oslo were these insights really formally incorporated into the broader peace process that had been running out of steam. This "track one" diplomacy, guided by the Kissingers, Sadats, Carters, Bakers and other "big names," was necessary but insufficient to bring real peace to the Middle East. Former Secretary of State Jams Baker acknowledged as much at the end of the Madrid talks, which he initiated: "Formulas, terms of reference and negotiations are not enough. Support for a negotiating process will not be sustainable unless the human dimension is addressed by all parties."

The PLO had to be included in peace talks. Without them, there would be no progress. And without an agreement on that front, talks with Syria would also be stymied.

The success in Oslo resulted from talks among a small group of academics, with sanction from the top. They generated interesting ideas that were handed off to Peres, Rabin and Arafat. Desperate for a breakthrough, these leaders got one. Three factors led to success:

- First, with the support of third party facilitators to assist the process and help foster a calm and peaceful environment, the meetings were held in absolute secrecy, freeing participants of constituency constraints and enabling creative exploration of new ideas. The talks were "safe" because if leaks had occurred, the higher-ups could deny their significance by relegating them to what in fact they were: analytic and exploratory discussion among academics.
- Second, the talks focused on a different type and style of discourse than is possible in formal political negotiations. This involved establishing an agenda that moved away from exclusive positions (e.g., statehood vs. autonomy) to underlying and overlapping needs and interests (e.g. safety, control over destiny, mutual problem-solving, economic development and well-being.).
- Third, when new ideas were generated, they were communicated to the right channels and given concrete expression in policy.

The broader meaning of these dramatic events, so potentially earth-shaking and peace-building, is that what these "underlings" did in Oslo was neither sudden nor serendipitous.

Track two diplomacy is studied in universities and diplomatic academies. It helped set the stage for peace between Israel and Egypt prior to Camp David. It has been ongoing, at unofficial levels for several decades between hundreds and thousands of Israelis and Palestinians. It is happening now with enemies in Cyprus, Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka and parts of the former Soviet Union.

The success at Oslo does set a precedent, but it is not unprecedented.

The next day I received a call from Steve Del Rosso, then a program officer at the Pew Charitable Trusts. He explained that his foundation had spent more than $20 million on conflict resolution funding in the Former Soviet Union and in part because of the false promise contained in the name "conflict *resolution*" his board of directors were unsure what had really been accomplished (it is useful to note that one of the reasons I talk about conflict *engagement* is to get away from what the populizer of the term conflict resolution, Kenneth Boulding, wrote when reflecting on his mistake in naming his new, breakthrough journal, "The Journal of Conflict Resolution." 19xx). He asked if I would be prepared to say which interventions in ethnic conflict resolution worked and which did not. I replied that it was a more important, or at least a prior task, to articulate visions and *criteria* of success and failure for the field as a whole through a disciplined focused on goals, values and action strategies for specific initiatives. Along with my colleague Marc Ross, I edited a book on this topic (See Ross and Rothman, p. 3, 2000). Over the next decade and a half our efforts to address this lack in the field, led to the development of a computer assisted social technology, to be called ARIA-C3 in this volume, for helping key stakeholders in conflict resolution and community development initiatives work individually, in groups and across the groups as a community of practice to define, promote and assess success.

In the second half of this book, devoted to promote understanding and creative engagement of the phenomenon of identity-based conflict, we will present a number of case studies and evolutions of the ARIA-C3 methodology as it has evolved from a way to understand and evaluate success in complex conflict resolution initiatives, to a more generic process for supporting groups to either sustain conflict engagement work, or more broadly work together for a better future - all the while using insights and opportunities to build on the creative resonance of individuals, groups and their systems to invent and enact it.

Narrative in Conflict and Collaboration

In the beginning was the story. The *story* which organizes a people's collective history and gives individual members of a people a way to connect and perpetuate themselves as *narrative*. Narrative gives way to *tale* as a people envision a better future and a new grandeur awaiting them. In Anthony Smith's terminology about nationalism and its evolution this process of moving from story, to narrative to tale is referred to as a universal "Mythology of Origins and Descent" (19xx).

I conclude this chapter which sets the stage for the rest of this handbook on identity-based conflict and cooperation, with a narrative about narrative, because this is the glue in the work of ARIA across cases and across conflict-focused and past oriented variants and goal-focused and future oriented ones. As Jerome Bruner eloquently described, "All life is narrative," and conflict, as many chapters in this book illustrate, it is often a

crucible for narrative and therefore of life. In conflict the narratives are usually about pain and loss and injury. In visioning the narratives are usually about discovery and self-realization (though these too can be rooted in painful experiences). In short, Resonance is really the heart of ARIA and the core contribution it makes to creatively engaging identity-based conflict and forging identity-based cooperation.

My narrative about this book: for more than 5 years I have been trying to write the sequel to my 1997 book *Resolving Identity-Based Conflict*. I have probably written thousands of pages already. But I couldn't finish it. I had a contract with Springer, but found the process never-ending. I hired two editors. I wore them out. Finally, I realized that my work is at its best about collaboration and community building. I realized that to escape from the loneliness of the long-distance (i.e. perpetual) writer, I could invite colleagues who have worked with me and more to the point, with ARIA, to share their journeys, discoveries, challenges and innovations and would set me free and perhaps ARIA too.

My Dear Readers and Writers,

All together now:

Let's sing!

[2] Personal communication during Fulbright Fellowship at Jezreel Valley College in Israel, 2006, shared with permission

[3] In many of my previous writings I have suggested the distinction between interests and identities. I believe the distinction between goals and identities is more useful and precise. See in particular Rothman and Olsen, 2001.