

***New Narratives through Dialogue:  
Two Cases Studies from a practitioner perspective***

**Zachary Metz  
Director, Peace Building Practice  
Consensus**



**8/19/2007**

**Prepared for Division for Social Policy and Development of the United Nations  
Department of Economic and Social Affairs**

**Expert Group Meeting on Creating an Inclusive Society: Practical Strategies to  
Promote Social Integration**

## INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Dialogue is, at the core, an experience of focused social interaction. At its most effective, dialogue offers a space for disparate social narratives to meet. What emerges from this interaction is never pre-determined and is difficult to predict. The peace builder, conflict resolver and inclusion-seeker have goals for dialogue of positive, inclusive outcomes, but control over outcomes is anathema to real, lived dialogue. It is the *potent ional* for the emergence of new social narratives that makes dialogic processes powerful, opening perceptions, interactions, and, most critically, actions.

This paper offers an anecdotal investigation into two lived experiences of intentional, facilitated dialogue<sup>1</sup>. It is written from the perspective of a practitioner of dialogue and other interactive group processes, rather than from an academic or policy-oriented vantage point<sup>2</sup>. Given this, the data are reflections of the facilitator and selected comments of individual participants. Context, methodology, outcomes, selected participant reflections and moments of significant change or transformation will be discussed. Recalling and emphasizing the narrative quality of dialogic interaction, the paper uses a story-telling approach to explore the two cases. I believe that the micro shifts that occur in a dialogue can and should be unpacked and understood in relation to the macro changes such initiatives are intended to influence.

The two dialogues were designed for and implemented in regions in which people are struggling to build peace in the face of violence, dislocation, and long-term social narratives of intractability between various groups, namely Iraq and Lebanon. These are the settings that push the potential of facilitated dialogue to the limit.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is important to note that dialogue happens all of the time, even in the most conflict-ridden environments, i.e. some people are always interacting even when many people are fighting. The distinctions between less-formal dialogue and what is examined here often include: intentionality, facilitation, methodology and institutional engagement. Less formal dialogue has many potential benefits, including indigenous location in social systems, which can significantly increase relevance and legitimacy. Formal facilitated dialogue can be most effective when it partners with and learns from less formal and *in situ* dialogic practices.

<sup>2</sup> The work and experiences discussed here were efforts of Consensus, a consulting organization specializing in conflict resolution and peace building ([www.consensusgroup.com](http://www.consensusgroup.com)) where I am the Director of Peace Building Practice and the Columbia University Center for International Conflict Resolution, where I was the Director of Education and Training from 2001 to 2006.

They also highlight two different methodologies. Methodology acts as a “container” for dialogue, the architecture for a unique space in which people may interact.

The paper looks at the potential for dialogue to support key elements of social integration in deeply conflicted societies: interaction between people, building of trust, recreation of social norms, offering of traditions, ritual spaces and symbols (ancient and radically new), establishment of safety, social networking, breaking alienation, and occasions for resource sharing.

The paper concludes that participatory facilitated dialogue in conflict settings offers two key contributions: a) opportunities for “conflict” narratives to emerge, interact and change and b) possibilities for “hope building” even in deeply conflicted and bleak social realities.

The paper also observes that dialogue is necessary but by no means sufficient for peace building and the pursuit of social inclusion. Critical Issues of structural violence, including injustice, inequity, lack of access, corruption and power imbalance cannot be fully addressed in dialogue. Political and social institutions (including civil society actors as well as state and international institutions) must take up these issues in concentrated, long-term ways, and public policy is needed to sustain and magnify the hope and change that can be built in dialogue.

## **TWO METHODOLOGIES**

This paper discusses participatory dialogue initiatives which involved two different participatory dialogue models. Following are brief descriptions of the methodologies. Both of these models are also discussed in the recent important publication “Participatory Dialogue: Towards a Stable, Safe and Just Society for All”, published in 2007 by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat.

### *Open Space Technology*

Open Space Technology<sup>3</sup> helps people in groups, communities and organizations listen to each other and address the challenges they need to with creativity and passion. Open Space is built around a series of core principles, all emphasizing freedom to define the content of the process. Open Space empowers groups to self-organize and interact with intensity and focus. Starting with a central opening question or theme, the group

---

<sup>3</sup> See [www.openspaceworld.net](http://www.openspaceworld.net) for more background and information.

defines its agenda and then addresses the issues that need attention in intensive concurrent small-group sessions. It has been used with increasing frequency in conjunction with more traditional conflict resolution and peace building approaches, including training.

### *Public Conversations*

Developed by the Public Conversations Project<sup>4</sup> (PCP), this is an intensive, highly structured approach to dialogue. It is designed to help groups have constructive conversations about deeply divisive issues that often polarize people. In Public Conversations, the facilitator first leads the small group (large groups can be sub-divided into groups of 8-10) who have strong opinions and feelings about a topic through a highly designed process. Public Conversations are framed as a pursuit of increased mutual understanding, rather than problem-solving or solution-seeking.

Norms and process agreements are central to the Public Conversations process, and the facilitator plays a strong role in creating and maintaining safety for the difficult discussions. The facilitator uses a series of scripted, focused questions to encourage participants to articulate the lived experiences that have led to their current views on the issue being discussed. These question and response rounds lead into a more unstructured dialogue, once participants have become comfortable with the focus on lived experience rather than rhetoric and debate. The hoped for outcome of a Public Conversation is increased self awareness and understanding of the others' views, however shared action does often come after a series of ongoing dialogues.

### *Training*

The two dialogues discussed were a part of longer (5-10 day) conflict resolution and peace building trainings. I have found that the power of training is augmented significantly with the inclusion of an explicit dialogue module, and also that participants in dialogue sessions are often better prepared to enter a dialogic space if they have participated in training.<sup>5</sup>

## **THE STORIES**

---

<sup>4</sup> See [www.publicconversations.org](http://www.publicconversations.org) for more background and information.

<sup>5</sup> The role of training in peace building and conflict resolution work is a rich area of inquiry, beyond the scope of this paper. I note though that by training here I mean a highly interactive, participatory and elicitive effort in which empowerment, self awareness, cultural competencies and dialogue within the group are primary objectives, in addition to traditional skill building.

## ***I. IRAQ: Dialogue as space for true democracy***

### **Context**

In 2005 I convened a day-long Open Space as the final module of a multi-day workshop on peace building and conflict resolution with a group of twenty Iraqis involved in community development.

The Open Space was held in the Kirkuk Women's Center, a nascent civil society organization that had taken over the former Baath Party Women's Center in Kirkuk. The group was reflective of Kirkuk's demographic diversity, involving Kurds, Shiaa, Sunni, Christians, Turkmen, and Yazidis<sup>6</sup>. The number of women was unusually high for such a gathering.

### **Process**

The opening question that catalyzed the event was "*How can we engage full community participation in development initiatives?*" People identified the issues around this question that they felt passion and responsibility for. They flooded into the center of the circle to write down their issues. The agenda was created from this outpouring of energy and ideas.

Participants spent the entire day addressing issues like gender inequities, violence and security, alienation of youth, employment initiatives, and education in lively concurrent small group sessions.

A central theme of Open Space is freedom from constraint. Small groups engage, develop ideas, and move in directions needed in the moment to deal with the issues at hand. The guiding principles encourage dynamic movement during the process. In the Kirkuk Open Space participants moved with urgency from group to group, beginning and ending as they needed, engaging the inspiration and indigenous expertise of each of the people who came to the groups.

As is customary in group gatherings in Iraq, people drank endless cups of tea, smoked in the gardens of the building (surrounded by a high concrete wall and "protected" by puzzled local police), and shared local foods throughout the day.

### **Narrative Transformation**

---

<sup>6</sup> A significant Iraqi minority group.

At the conclusion of every Open Space, participants are invited to a closing circle in which they pass a symbol around the circle, each speaking out to briefly reflect on the experience.

In Kirkuk we passed a branch cut from a nearby olive tree. When the branch reached a Turkoman woman, she began reflecting on her Open Space experience in the Turkoman language. An Arab man interrupted, scolding her for not speaking in Arabic. He insisted sharply, "Iraqis speak Arabic! Why are you here if you are not a *real* Iraqi?" I reminded the group to not interrupt. As the branch moved around the circle, people spoke in Arabic, Turkoman, Kurdish and English.

When the branch eventually reached the gentleman who had interrupted earlier, he held it for a moment. He started to say a blessing: "*Bismillah ir-Rahman ir-Rahim* - In the name of Allah most Gracious Most Merciful." After several words he faltered. The group offered the next words, but he held up his hand for silence. He started to cry, unable to complete his thoughts, passing the branch.

I experienced that moment as transformative for the group, bringing to the surface the profound tensions of identity, difference and suffering that bound and divided them as Iraqis. Later, the same man who had interrupted the Turkoman woman asserted strongly that during this Open Space experience the group had "truly practiced democracy...because we were allowed to speak in our Mother tongue and say what we needed to."

### **Drawing Lessons**

In these exchanges, the room was electrified in a way that it had not been during the standard conflict resolution training, or even during the Open Space itself. These had been articulate expressions of a renewed sense of the power of pluralism and truly democratic, participatory engagement to generate freedom, creativity and peaceful interaction, in the face of grinding violence.

What happened in Open Space? In observing the **context** (a diverse group of people intentionally struggling to find *creative* solutions for peace building), the **process** (a freedom-infused participatory dialogue) and the **outcomes** (an increase in respect for diversity, pluralism, and democratic engagement), I believe the experience fulfilled Brazilian

education philosopher Paolo Freire's vision for *praxis* in dialogue. Freire described *praxis* as,

*"...a complex activity by which individuals create culture and society, and become critically conscious human beings. Praxis comprises a cycle of action-reflection-action...Characteristics of praxis include self-determination (as opposed to coercion), intentionality (as opposed to reaction), creativity (as opposed to homogeneity), and rationality (as opposed to chance)."*<sup>7</sup>

The action-reflection-action cycle is absolutely vital. The participants acted together in Open Space, to name and identify the critical issues facing their communities. They *reflected* together at the end of the process, allowing the tensions to be fully expressed, and they committed to *acting* together again, as they emerged from the participatory dialogue renewed and ready to implement the ideas generated in the process.

Ultimately, Freire asserts, this experience of *praxis* is liberatory, seeking "to transform the social order."<sup>8</sup> The social order was indeed transformed when the elderly Arab man broke down in tears, embracing the power of the group and its diversity to push against the walls of violence pressing in on Iraqi society.

## ***II. Lebanon: dialogue as space to build hope***

### **Context**

In August of 2007, a diverse group of thirty university students from Lebanon, the West Bank, Yemen, Kuwait, and Egypt came together for a ten-day summer institute focused on conflict transformation and peace building under the auspices of Lebanese American University's (LAU) Center for Peace and Justice Education<sup>9</sup>. The students worked on several "core competencies" of conflict resolution, including conflict analysis, communication skills, and self-awareness. I acted as the Resident Trainer, facilitating the integration of knowledge from each session, and highlighting the overarching themes.

---

<sup>7</sup> Heaney, Tom, "[Freirean Literacy in North America: The Community-Based Education Movement](http://www.paulofreireinstitute.org/Documents/freiren_pedagogy_by_Tom_Heaney.html)" *Thresholds in Education* journal, November 1989, also found at [http://www.paulofreireinstitute.org/Documents/freiren\\_pedagogy\\_by\\_Tom\\_Heaney.html](http://www.paulofreireinstitute.org/Documents/freiren_pedagogy_by_Tom_Heaney.html)

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.lau.edu.lb/academics/centers-institutes/ipje/>

The institute was held at the LAU campus in Jbail (Byblos), Lebanon, an idyllic site perched at the crest of a small mountain in a beautiful seaside town north of Beirut.

## Process

In the second half of the program, I facilitated a Public Conversation with the participants, focused on questions related to participants' experiences of conflict in the Middle East, Lebanon or their own communities, and how these experiences have shaped their current views.

We divided the group into three smaller groups. Two groups worked in English and one worked in Arabic<sup>10</sup>. The facilitators first reminded the groups of the norms for the process, which they had shaped and agreed to on the first day of the workshop. These included the following<sup>11</sup>, with additions made by participants in italics:

- Speak for yourself, from your own experience
- Actively participate
- Make space for others to actively participate
- *Listen!*
- Try to have one conversation at a time
- *Come prepared to work and stay focused*
- Respect and support a diverse set of experiences and perspectives, *and moral beliefs*
- *No cell phones or text messaging*
- Freedom to share information, *without attribution*, unless there is a request for privacy

The Public Conversations process, in contrast to Open Space methodology, is intensely facilitated. The facilitator provides a highly structured format, with an emphasis on a series of questions posed to the participants, which are answered in turn, without interruption. The facilitator also intervenes in order to gently but firmly move participants back to adhering to norms, including time constraints, process agreements and a consistent focus on speaking from their own lived experience.

---

<sup>10</sup> The language of instruction at Lebanese American University and the summer institute is English. In addition to me (speaking in English), the other facilitators were a female Arabic speaking Lebanese conflict resolution practitioner and the female non-Lebanese director of the Center for Peace and Justice Education at LAU, who also understands Arabic.

<sup>11</sup> This is a basic list of recommended norms for any PC process.



This more intervention-oriented facilitation serves to create a degree of safety between people who are profoundly conflicted. PCP suggests that

*“Dialogue may be useful in situations where peoples' differences are preventing them from making human connections with one another. It is likely to be especially valuable when relationships among those involved in a conflict are so polarized - so riddled with anger, hurt, blame, and distrust - that engaging in an outcome-oriented process such as mediation, problem-solving, or coalition-building is unthinkable or too risky.”<sup>12</sup>*

As the process designer and facilitator I chose this methodology precisely because of its highly facilitated nature. This served two purposes for the participants. First, it gave them an opportunity to talk about deeply divisive issues that are rarely honestly or constructively discussed. At the conclusion of the process, one woman from south Lebanon said, “This is the first time I have talked about these issues without either screaming or being screamed at.” It is not that people avoid these discussions, but rather that the experience of engaging in these discussion tends to be so destructive and futile. The process is explicitly *not* debate. This gave them a radically new experience of telling and hearing narratives about conflict.

Participants were asked to respond to three questions, one at a time, for up to three minutes each. Each participant thought about the question, and then was offered an opportunity to respond (or pass if they preferred).

*What do you hope will come out of this experience today?*

People spoke about wanting to really learn from each other, to be able to express their views without fear of being hurt, and to learn something about dialogue. One said, “I want to tell you all about what it means to be Palestinian. That is all I care about.”

*What is something about your life experience that will help us understand your views and concerns about conflict in the Middle East, Lebanon, or your community?*

Many participants struggled to remain focused on themselves and their own experiences, rather than making more “debate” oriented comments. People talked about the “problem of our leaders”, one said “people

---

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.publicconversations.org/pcp/page.php?id=423#3>

don't mix", one mentioned that "Islam is misunderstood". Each time I brought each participant back with interventions like, "How does that effect *you personally*." After several rounds, this developed a culture within the group of speaking from the heart about lived experiences. My interventions became fewer and fewer as the norm was embraced more fully.

One participant who struggled intensely with negative interactions throughout the program, feeling ostracized and participating in daily interpersonal conflicts with other participants, spoke briefly but intensely about his experiences "living the war" in Lebanon, "making mistakes". He shared that he "never had a chance to get married, to live a real life". He felt that "none of you will ever, ever understand this or me".

*When you consider your views about conflict in the Middle East, Lebanon, or your community, do you have any uncertainties or mixed feelings about any of the views you hold?*

This question opened a wealth of information. It builds on the notion of what Peter Senge calls "double loop learning", that is, exploring the experiences and data that inform and underlay our conclusions about the world.<sup>13</sup>

One participant shared that he was a devout Muslim, and felt that religion was at the heart of his life and work. On the other hand, he feels deeply conflicted because, while Islam calls for the expansion of *sharia*, Islamic law, he does not want to live in a theocratic society, and resists the creeping imposition of Islamic law in Kuwait, his home. Another spoke of her passion for social change work in Egypt, with the nagging question more and more present for her, "Why should I work for change in a society that doesn't give a damn?"

Following the scripted questions, I invited participants into a more informal, less scripted phase of the dialogue. Participants asked each other questions. They disagreed. They developed earlier themes. They pushed on each other with respect. Two Christian Lebanese engaged each other:

*"You know our community is lying when it says we will welcome Muslims into our neighborhoods."*

*"I disagree. How do you know that?"*

---

<sup>13</sup> Senge, Peter et al, The Fifth Discipline Fieldbook, Doubleday:1994

*“Because my mother and father hate Muslims and will never allow them to live here.”*

*“But there are laws...”*

*“Laws are one thing, people are another. This is what needs to change.”*

Nearly all of the participants spoke about the shared challenge of apathy, of societies that seem to resist engaging with these issues, which marginalize the efforts of indigenous peace builders like them. People spoke with deep sadness about a crisis of faith in their own agency and efficacy.

The disagreements were also very real. Key areas were the future of the political structure of Lebanon, the place of Palestinians in Lebanon, the role of Islam in the Middle East, and gender roles. One anti-sectarian Christian drew a map of Lebanon and asked another more militant Christian to look at the implications of his own reasoning, “Where can you find a place where there really are no Muslims and Christians living together for what you call a ‘Christian community’? For me, we all live together, so we cannot be separate.”

These exchanges exemplified what the Public Conversations Project means when it defines dialogue as: “...any conversation animated by a search for understanding rather than for agreements or solutions.”<sup>14</sup>

### **Narrative Transformation**

Finally, participants were asked to respond to the most unusual question of the day.

*Imagine you have a book of photographs, taken 10 years in the future by a magical camera. Imagine that these photos have been taken in the future you long to see, your vision for the future Middle East, Lebanon or your own community, in 10 years. Take the photo album out, and look at one of the photos. What is in the picture? What do you see in the photograph?*

The images were:

- Graduation at the American University of Kuwait, with a plaque hanging over the podium that reads, “Gender segregation is not

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.publicconversations.org/pcp/page.php?id=423#1>

- good for real education". This quote would be inscribed with the name of the young devoutly Muslim Kuwaiti participant himself.
- A "sea of white", a country not awash in the divisive political colors and flags which now mark the neighborhoods as "belonging" to a sectarian group.
  - "A peaceful river running next to my house in Beirut"
  - "A globe with no borders drawn on it"
  - "A mosque and a church side by side in a peaceful, serene Cairo. I know it's a typical view but this would be different because it would reflect reality, not just be on a postcard." <sup>15</sup>

With the poetic images still "visible" in the room, people were glowing at the conclusion of the dialogue. In the debrief, participants were full of positive energy. Each spoke about a sense of possibility, of a powerfully new way of dealing with the issues they confront all the time. Many spoke about a real interest in having these conversations again, back in their communities. One young woman asked me for a copy of the facilitation packet, so she could go immediately facilitate a dialogue in her community.

## Drawing Lessons

What occurred in these exchanges? Renowned physicist and an intellectual grandfather of dialogue theory and practice David Bohm refers to a transformation through dialogue of "...not only the relationship between people, but even more, the very nature of consciousness in which these relationships arise."<sup>16</sup> I believe the *spirit and structure* of the methodology, along with the openness of the participants and the skill and attention of the facilitators generated this transformation of consciousness as well as of the narratives which articulate this consciousness (about "us" in relation to the "other").

For this sort of Dialogue to occur, Bohm notes that three basic conditions need to be met:<sup>17</sup>

**Participants must suspend their assumptions.** British scholar of informal education Mark K. Smith clarifies that "Suspending an assumption does

---

<sup>15</sup> The image mentioned appears on postcards sold in Cairo.

<sup>16</sup> Bohm, David, *Unfolding Meaning: A weekend of dialogue with David Bohm*, London:Ark, 1987 (Republished 1996 by Routledge), as quoted by Smith, M. K. (2001) 'Dialogue and conversation', *the encyclopaedia of informal education*, [www.infed.org/biblio/b-dialog.htm](http://www.infed.org/biblio/b-dialog.htm), p. 5

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. p. 6

not mean ignoring it, but rather 'holding it in front of us' ready for exploration."

The pursuit of deeper understanding rather than solutions, the consistent focus on *lived experience* rather than on conclusions, and the emphasis on "mixed feelings" all contributed to help participants hold their own assumptions up to the light of the dialogue. This allowed them to clarify and at times shift their own perceptions of themselves and the others in the group.

**Participants must view each other as colleagues or peers.** Bohm argues that dialogue is "essentially a dialogue among equals". The norms of the process and the skillful and balanced work of the facilitators helped balance power and create equity in the room.

**There needs to be a facilitator who 'holds the context' of dialogue.** The facilitators played a very strong role in the creating of safety and the engagement with the central spirit of the dialogue. As participants embraced the process, I and the other facilitators intervened less and less. This is in line with Bohm's notion of "'leading from behind'", facilitation that empowers rather than overpowers.

## CONCLUSION

What are the threads that link these two participatory dialogue initiatives, with different stakeholders, different challenges, and different methodologies? In terms of **design**, the thread is creating an environment in which people can interact in a radically new way, to unlock the potential inherent in interaction. This has to do with time, place participants, facilitators and structure. Open Space and Public Conversations methodologies meet very different needs, as do all of the various methods available to practitioners, and one must be mindful to chose (and develop) methodologies based on the needs and realities of the participants.<sup>18</sup>

In terms of **outcomes**, I believe one way to describe the core of the change is as an *increase in the level of hopefulness* experienced by participants during and after an effective participatory dialogue. This hopefulness is an absolutely essential ingredient for efforts towards social integration. Without hope, creativity, problem solving, democratic engagement, and constructive conflict are impossible. Dialogic

---

<sup>18</sup> See the National Coalition for Dialogue and Deliberation for more on the broad range of methodologies available for dialogue practitioners. <http://thataway.org/>

processes make it possible to enter environments with deep conflict and have a positive (or at least not devastating) experience with people who think very differently. Design can be supportive of this “hope building” phenomenon, but there are other more elusive ingredients that we should continue to investigate.

Freire argues that:

*“Dialogue...requires an intense faith in humankind, faith in their power to make and remake, to create and re-create, faith in their vocation to be more fully human... Faith in people is an a priori requirement for dialogue; “the ‘dialogical man’ believes in others even before he meets them face to face.”<sup>19</sup>*

It may be true that a degree of faith (or hopefulness) is a pre requisite for dialogue. However, in Iraq and Lebanon I believe the coming together of conflict narratives in a dialogic space also helped to *generate* faith and hopefulness for the participants. I observed here and in countless other dialogues in deep conflict environments<sup>20</sup> that hope and faith are necessary and are that dialogue is generative. By this I mean that *dialogue has the ability at times to originate, produce, and create this human phenomenon, through interaction.*

*Necessary but not sufficient*

Dialogue can be an incubator of new narratives, perspectives, fresh ideas and partnerships across violent divides, but peace building also demands sustained, committed and well resourced change-processes. A recent *Economist* article noted that funders, participants and practitioners seem to be taking note of the critical importance of action, long-term commitment and tangible change.

The director in Israel of the Abraham Fund notes that ““Many activists realized that just bringing people together isn’t enough.”” Many projects now address “...some common interest that can be pursued for a long time”, including Arabic lessons for young Jewish schoolchildren, anti-

---

<sup>19</sup> Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, p. 71

<sup>20</sup> I have also used Open Space in Thailand with Burmese ethnic leaders, in New York as a part of a genocide prevention initiative, in East Timor with 250 civil society leaders and the President of the country, among other settings. I have used Public Conversations in Northern Ireland and Iraq, and both models have been used in countless deep conflict settings with powerful outcomes by other facilitators.

discrimination initiatives, legal-advise centers, doctors' training, textbook reviews focused on the conflict narratives, and joint water projects.<sup>21</sup>

This is clearly reminiscent of the notion of *praxis* discussed earlier. Without both action and reflection, efforts to build peace and increase social integration will be weakened.

One of the greatest ongoing challenges to dialogue practitioners is the question of power and "justice". Nearly all dialogue processes take a stand of balance and neutrality, explicitly avoiding advocacy.<sup>22</sup> Freire suggests a more activist stance: "dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world, and those who do not want this naming; or between those who have been denied the right to speak, and those who deny the right."<sup>23</sup>

### *Open Questions*

This helps us clarify some of the open questions for participatory dialogue: What about power and justice? Who gets invited to dialogue with whom? Are "spoilers"<sup>24</sup> at the table? What about the social and political location of the facilitator? How do we generate macro sustainability from the micro shifts that can and do occur in a dialogue?

This last question illuminates the importance of the ongoing conversation between the various actors in a given peace building and integration initiative, those who advocate and those who support dialogic interaction. We in these fields of practice must *ourselves be in dialogue*, with a praxis orientation and a spirit of new narratives.

---

<sup>21</sup> "Still campaigning for co-existence", *The Economist*, September 1<sup>st</sup>-7<sup>th</sup>, 2007, pg. 37

<sup>22</sup> Although certainly most peace building approaches offer many more resources than strictly dialogue processes, see for instance William Ury's ten "Third Side" roles and John Paul Lederach's intervener taxonomy.

<sup>23</sup> Freire, P. (1972) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, p. 61

<sup>24</sup> See Stedman, Stephen John. "Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes." *International Security* 22.2 (1997): 5-53, as referenced in Sofiane Khatib, *Spoiler Management During Algeria's Civil War*", *Stanford Journal of International Affairs*, Volume 6, Issue 1, Winter 2005