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ABSTRACT

COMMUNITY ORGANIZING PRACTICE AND NEGOTIATION: SHARED PRINCIPLES AND METHODS

Raquel Gonzalez, M.S.

George Mason University, 2012

Thesis Director: Dr. Solon Simmons

This thesis examines areas of convergence between the principles and methods of community organizing practice and diplomatic negotiations through comparative textual analysis of the literature in both fields, interviews with diplomatic negotiators, and an online survey of community organizers. The data suggests shared theoretical principles and practical methods within the framework of a conflict resolution perspective, with emphasis on strategies, skills, and tactics. I conclude that successful diplomatic negotiation practice requires emphasis long-term relationship building and sustainable outcomes and community organizing achieves this through storytelling. Examining claims that current models of negotiation training are insufficient, I posit that community organizing training on storytelling may benefit negotiators. Further research is needed on the potential impact of community organizing training in narrative and storytelling with diplomatic negotiation training.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

My research stems from a personal experience that presented a question without an answer. In November 2009, I was an observer traveling with the U.S. delegation to the 6th Council Meeting of the ITER project, an international collaboration on “a large-scale scientific experiment that aims to demonstrate that it is possible to produce commercial energy from fusion” (The International ITER Project for Fusion, 2011). Seated around the table were government officials representing seven member countries sharing a common goal of achieving continued funding and measurable progress in the construction and eventual operation of the project. The purpose of the meeting was to ensure all parties could uphold their commitments by reaching agreement on budget and timeline proposals.

As negotiations progressed, I watched obstacles arise between the parties, manifesting from perceived conflicting interests. Some pressured the group to proceed hastily while others appeared to purposefully stall the proceedings. Each delegation expressed concern for retaining political and financial support from home constituencies. ITER is politically controversial, given the large monetary risk for each country if the project timeline is delayed or complex technical components fail to operate. However, if the delegates negotiate successful completion of the project and eventually “demonstrate that it is possible to produce commercial energy from fusion,” the future of energy across
the globe could potentially be transformed with the addition of “an inexhaustible, environmentally benign, and universally available resource” (ITER and Beyond, 2011).

I left this meeting with the distinct sense that my experience on the Obama Presidential campaign the year before and the knowledge and skills gained through my role as a community organizer could also be applied to mitigate conflict in diplomatic negotiations. Essentially a complex question arose: Do the fields of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations share theoretical principles and practical methods? If so, could an integrated process emerge from the two practices within a conflict resolution framework? How might they be combined effectively? To put it plainly, could a diplomatic negotiator secure a more successful agreement by utilizing skills learned through previous experience in community organizing?

My suggestion of applying theories and practices of community organizing to diplomatic negotiations during the ITER Council Meeting was initially met with resistance by experienced negotiators. During the next two years, I heard similar accounts of stalled diplomatic negotiations from other presidential appointees in the Obama Administration who also had previously worked for the 2008 Obama presidential campaign. Consultation with colleagues across the federal government revealed an interest for further exploration in this area. Thus began my research on community organizing practice and negotiation.

I believe there are more similarities between the theory and practice of community organizing and negotiation than many practitioners in both fields realize. Given previous and perhaps understandable skepticism, I expect current negotiators and those without community organizing experience to view my thesis research with suspicion and perhaps be
resistant to my idea. But based on the support I received from former colleagues – from community organizers to individuals currently employed in diplomatic and policy negotiations – I believe it will be possible to reveal narratives linking community organizing skills and principles with diplomatic negotiations. A comprehensive review of negotiation literature from a conflict resolution perspective may also suggest potential areas of convergence in process and objectives between diplomatic negotiations and community organizing. Some additional critical variable indicators to consider when examining relevant data include: Demographics such as the negotiator’s age and gender; issues of culture and identity; and theories on communication.

To ensure this work is accessible to readers from multiple disciplines, I will limit the use of technical terms used by scholars and practitioners of specific fields. When use of such jargon is unavoidable, I will attempt to clearly define or explain such concepts. I realize many people reading this thesis may not be familiar with the academic study and professional practice of Conflict Resolution, Negotiation, or Community Organizing. To facilitate a shared knowledge base among readers, I provide background information on the three fields. While I do not want to digress into a complete deconstruction of the concepts, I will begin with a brief overview of each field and highlight the main theories that influence my research.

It is imperative that readers are aware of and understand the framework through which I view the concepts because it impacts how I interpret data and reach conclusions. This research will examine negotiation and community organizing through the lens of Conflict Resolution. My own orientation to the field becomes an important factor in the way I present
and analyze information. Simply by interacting with the data, any researcher must recognize how one’s “subjective experience creates and reflects the truth of the interaction” (Hocker & Wilmot, 1995).
The Field of Conflict Resolution

Kriesberg (2001) outlined the growth and development of the Conflict resolution field in four phases: “1914-1945, when ideas and actions prepared the way for the emergence of the Conflict resolution field; 1946-1969, a period of early efforts and basic research; 1970-1985, a period of crystallization and expansion; and 1986-present, a time of differentiation and institutionalization” (p. 407). In another account from Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall (2005), Conflict resolution emerged as a distinct field during the nuclear threat of the Cold War in the ‘50s and ‘60s when progressive-thinking experts of various disciplines began to study conflict as a general phenomenon across industries, arenas, and levels of impact.

Initially, given the tense global politics of the time, conflict studies primarily focused on armed violence and war. Even amidst mounting criticism from international relations professionals that the efforts were duplicative, conflict studies attracted a broad range of researchers, resulting in specializations and the development of new theories and methods. By the 8’0s and following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, conflict resolution concepts were being applied with success in real conflicts, the language was being used in global politics, and international organizations focused on peace studies were established to further development of the practice (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2005).
Conflict resolution as a field has always inspired debate and criticism about its validity and effectiveness from experts in other disciplines and between conflict resolution theorist and practitioners of different schools of thought (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2005). Realists tend to view conflict resolution as “soft-headed and unrealistic” (Hough, 2008) because they believe violent conflict is inevitable and should be treated as a rational foreign policy option of last resort to maintain power balance between the great power nations. Neo-Marxists seek an advocacy approach from the Conflict resolution field, claiming it ignores larger structural issues of global economic inequalities, and some critics question the ability of western pedagogy to transcend cultural boundaries for global applicability (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall, 2005).

In response to these criticisms, the field of Conflict resolution remains dynamic both in theory and practice, adapting to address evolving conflicts and involved parties. Increasingly, emphasis has been placed on analysis of cultural and emotional factors in conflict and maximizing participation of those directly affected (Kriesberg, 2001). More and more, successful conflict resolution practice includes looking beyond simply determining the appropriate timing and tactics to de-escalate and resolve conflicts toward achieving durable or sustainable outcomes that reduce the likelihood of reoccurrence (Kriesberg, 2001).

There are many definitions of conflict and with the same terminology being assigned in academia, fieldwork, and policy, it is important to be clear about how I am using it in my research. Some readers may associate the term with armed violence but that is a narrow view of one type of conflict. Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall (2005) characterized the term ‘conflict’ as encompassing “the pursuit of incompatible goals by different groups” (p. 19-20).
ranging from interpersonal interactions to international affairs. I ascribe the meaning of conflict ascribed to a broader application, described by Hocker and Wilmot (2007) as “an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce resources, and interference from others in achieving their goals” (p. 9). Mayer (2000) offered a more general definition of “a belief or understanding that one’s own needs, interests, wants, or values are incompatible with someone else’s” (p. 4).

Furthermore, Mayer (2000) described the traditional paradigm of conflict as “natural, inevitable, necessary, and normal” while some schools view the role of conflict resolution as both “a service to people who need assistance and as a force for social change” (p. 3, p. xi). Progressive practitioners seek to move beyond merely resolving specific disputes. They view each conflict as an opportunity to contribute to an improved general welfare and society. Mayer (2000) outlined the approach by stating, “Although Conflict resolution is not itself a movement for social justice, the values that guide us cannot be separated from the commitment to justice and peace” (p. xii).

Aligned with this social justice perspective, Galtung (1969) suggested that the practice of Conflict resolution should not only successfully resolve conflicts but also foster the positive conditions that enable individuals to realize their objective potential. In an analysis of peacebuilding in post-war reconstruction, Galtung (1969) offered a general definition of peace as the absence of violence (conditions preventing the actualization of what would otherwise objectively have been obtainable), which can be negative or positive. Negative peace is simply the absence of physical violence, while positive peace is interchangeable with social justice and results in the absence of structural violence or
systemic inequalities (Galtung, 1969). Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall (2005) explained this concept of peacebuilding as comprising," the ‘negative’ task of preventing a relapse into overt violence and the ‘positive’ tasks of aiding national recovery and expediting the eventual removal of the underlying causes” (p.187-188).

I have long thought the term conflict resolution is too narrow in focus, because it implies that the practitioner seeks merely to address immediately noticeable issues to end overt conflict behavior — negative peace (Galtung, 1969). My own orientation to conflict resolution supports seeking positive peace by addressing deeper remaining issues, such as inherent institutional inequities, resulting in latent conflict through structural violence (Galtung, 1969). Lederach (2003) pioneered the effort to transform conflict resolution practice beyond seeking settlement toward reconciliation and more holistic outcomes. Through a subdivision known as conflict transformation, Lederach (2003) stated that the goal should be:

…to envision and respond to the ebb and flow of social conflict as life-giving opportunities for creating constructive change processes that reduce violence, increases justice in direct interaction and social structures, and respond to real-life problems in human relationships (p. 14).

A conflict transformation approach requires reflective and adaptive practice that responds to the specific situation and relevant parties. Along with emerging schools focused on humanizing the process, Kriesberg (2001) summed up the evolution of the Conflict resolution field by stating:
All of this is part of viewing conflicts in a long-term perspective, including the avoidance of conflicts becoming intractable, the transformation of protracted conflicts into intractable ones, and the establishment of a stable peace, and perhaps reconciliation, between former adversaries (p. 414).

In the field of conflict analysis and resolution one can approach intervention at various levels. Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall (2005) referred to a Track I approach as occurring at the highest level with the broadest potential impact through diplomatic negotiations, arbitration, and public policy. These typically involve top leaders such as government officials, international organizations and financial institutions. Track II emerged from concerned citizens frustrated with the performance of formal institutions in international peacemaking.

In response, Diamond and McDonald (1996) described a growing “citizen diplomacy movement” (p. 3) of individuals and non-governmental organizations engaged in peacebuilding outreach efforts through people-to-people grassroots methods. Track III emphasizes building social cohesion and common ground through grassroots tactics involving indigenous resources and local actors within the conflict. Track III is described by Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall (2005) as “placing an emphasis on the need to build constituencies and capacities within societies and to learn from domestic cultures how to manage conflicts in a sustained way over time” (p. 28). In many cases, negotiators serve as representatives of one or more constituency groups and provide progress reports or proposed resolutions to the constituency group. In this manner, grassroots efforts can influence
diplomatic negotiations when organizations and individuals build coalitions giving voice to constituent stakeholders.

Within Track I negotiations there is a resolution of highly controversial issues because the outcomes have wider effects in the international community. In most cases, negotiators serve as representatives of one or more constituency groups to whom they must report back on progress or proposed resolutions to the discussions. In this manner, Track II and Track III initiatives can influence negotiation at the Track I level when organizations and individuals build coalitions giving voice to the constituencies represented by negotiators.
Negotiation Pedagogy

Similar to the field of conflict resolution, negotiation has also been studied by scholars and practitioners across a broad spectrum of disciplines for theoretical analysis and real world application at various levels. The result is a rich and diverse field of various conceptions of the purpose, style, and strategies deemed most appropriate or effective to the discipline through which it is examined or utilized (Alfredson, and Cungu, 2008). As such, there are numerous definitions of negotiation. Mayer (2000) defined negotiation as “an interaction in which people try to meet their needs or accomplish their goals by reaching an agreement with others who are trying to get their own needs met” (p. 143). Other definitions focus on the parties’ desire to combine conflicting positions (Kissinger, 1994), or to end social conflict by reconciling incompatible goals (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

Literature on negotiation can be categorized as primarily descriptive or prescriptive in nature (Alfredson & Cungu, 2008). Prescriptive approaches offer practical advice about process, including strategies and tactics for success, while descriptive analyses seek to identify and explain the various components of negotiation circumstances and those forces that determine the course and outcome (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

Historically, research on negotiation has been conducted through controlled laboratory experiments and field observation. Depending on the aspects being analyzed, researchers either simulate negotiations between parties (oftentimes with computer
programs) and track decisions as variables are modified or collect data from negotiation practitioners through interviews, case studies, and questionnaires (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

Negotiations have two dimensions: distributive and integrative. A negotiation is distributive when parties seek to divide a limited resource such as time, money, or land. This perspective can put parties in a structurally adversarial position if the negotiations involve high stakes and poor relationships. In such instances, parties can become preoccupied with retaining or gaining power as they each seek to acquire as much as possible of what is available (Mayer, 2000). Integrative negotiations occur when parties are able to view outcomes which include possible gains for all participants, and they seek to expand the available resources to meet common or complementary needs. Information sharing and free flow of communication are necessary for parties to identify potential areas of convergence. Integrative negotiation is about establishing relationships and genuine partnerships among participants through education, creative joint problem-solving, and an interest-based principled process (Mayer, 2000).

Pruitt & Carnevale (1993) deconstructed negotiation strategies into the following categories: concession making, contending, problem solving, inaction and withdrawal. Each can be used in either distributive or integrative dimensions, in succession, alternating, or even in some cases concurrently. Concession-making requires one to reduce personal goals or offer incentives and typically leads to higher outcomes for negotiators who remain firm in their own demands while accepting concessions from other parties. At a certain point, however, increased pressure can generate resentment and failure to reach agreement. Contending focuses on persuading the other party to concede or trying to resist similar efforts.
by the other party, and tends to result in low joint benefit or no agreement. Problem solving strategies center on identifying and adopting mutually satisfying options through collaborative tactics, including exchanging concessions and addressing underlying concerns. Inaction is essentially doing nothing - or as little as possible - for the purpose of stalling or expressing a loss of interest or dismay. Withdrawal indicates a breakdown of negotiations as one or more parties completely disengages from the process and discontinues negotiations entirely (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

Potential outcomes in negotiation include victory for one party, compromise on one or more major dimensions connecting the parties’ initial offer, a win-win agreement on mutually beneficial terms, or failure to reach agreement (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Only the last outcome does not require joint approval to execute. Parties manage various goals, limits, and demands throughout a cyclical negotiation process of matching, mismatching, and undermatching demands or concessions by other participants in a tit-for-tat strategy (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993).

The traditional negotiation paradigm is rooted in an economic focus that relies on mathematical calculations to maximize potential personal gains (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). To characterize the various strategies employed and demonstrate their effectiveness given particular parameters, studies were conducted through games using computers or third-party intermediaries in which individuals attempted to optimize joint outcomes through independent decisions or moves that interact with those of other participants (Raffia, 2002). The resulting body of knowledge on individual cognitive processes and decision-making is known as Game Theory, referring to a theoretical framework for analyzing strategic
situations such as chess matches, military war games, and financial matters (Greif, 2007). With limited or no personal interaction between negotiation participants, the emphasis is based on formulaic probabilities of outcomes given a range of possible moves anticipated from other participants. This concept has been the prevailing approach to negotiations. Expert advice books offer tips on using algorithmic strategies to calculate ways of getting the most gains with minimal concessions.

However, many scholars critique the standard negotiation paradigm as lacking focus on broader context in which negotiations occur, without consideration of the past history of the issues, relationships between parties, and social norms. Pruitt & Carnevale (1993) claimed the traditional negotiation pedagogy erroneously assumes negotiators are only motivated by self-interest and take no interest in the other’s welfare and “makes the oversimplified assumptions that there are only two negotiating parties and that these parties (even if they are organizations or nations) are unitary intelligences whose aim is to maximize self-interest” (p. xvi).

Through time, research on negotiations has shown that “successful negotiations eventually move toward collaborative or integrative processes” (Holmes 1992; Gulliver 1979, quoted in Wilmot & Hocker, p. 266). When parties enter negotiations with the collective mindset that working together is the best path, they engage in joint decision making. Contrary to the independent or self-interested approach of game theory, joint decisions shift focus from separate interactive actions to group actions, with emphasis placed on the final conclusion or agreement (Raffia, Richardson, & Metcalfe, 2002).
Perhaps the most widely recognized joint decision making approach, principled negotiation or merit-based negotiation, is outlined in Fisher, Ury, and Patton’s (1981) *Getting to Yes*. Addressing procedural aspects of negotiation, Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1981) posited a dichotomy between hard negotiations, that emphasize winning even if it damages the relationship and soft negotiation, in which one or more parties values the relationship more than the outcome and is therefore overly accommodating. Principled negotiation is presented as a new, third approach that changes the game to focus on achieving wise outcomes efficiently and amicably (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1981).

*Getting to Yes* (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1981) presents four core principles: “separate the people from the problem, focus on interests instead of positions, generate a variety of possibilities before deciding what to do, and insist that the result be based on some objective standard” (p. 10-11). This approach favors a collaborative rational analysis that is devoid of emotion and uses objective standards. The goal is to maximize mutual gains through integrative outcomes supported by comprehensive prior research of the potential limits and goals for each party.

The principled negotiation style has been praised for offering an alternative process that mitigates potentially adversarial situations by reframing the discussion so parties view each other as partners solving a puzzle together and encouraging creativity to increase the options for settlement. Hocker and Wilmot (2007) said of the principled negotiation style, “many times you will be able to get destructive negotiation back into a cooperative mode if you remember these basic approaches” (p. 258).
However, there is a growing body of research claiming the principled negotiation approach is inadequate for resolving conflict because it places too large an emphasis on rational negotiation with not enough consideration of genuine rapport building between parties within a conflict and fails to address several crucial elements, including the context within which negotiations occur, historical background and relationships between negotiation parties, and constituents or stakeholders to whom negotiators may be accountable.

Mayer (2000) describes the Principled negotiation style as “naïve” for assuming a focus on positions is synonymous to a distributive approach and is automatically detrimental to progress while a focus on interests will alter the dynamic of negotiations toward a more collaborative environment and integrative process (p. 156). Even more, Mayer (2000) fundamentally challenged the level of differentiation between interests and positions stating: positions and interest themselves are not as different as they might first appear. The difference between positions and interests is usually a difference in depth of analysis and style of presentation. (p. 157)

Kolb and Putnam (1997) suggested that principled negotiation approach is inherently disingenuous and manipulative because it still assumes a competitive system where negotiators are self-interested in personal gain and promotes superficial collaboration to encourage other parties to cooperate or offer concessions. Hocker and Wilmot (2007) argue that negotiators seeking authentic collaboration and joint problem solving for conflict resolution should “focus on relationships, using connectedness, transformation, dialogue, and storytelling” (p. 263-264). My analysis of negotiation begins with this school of thought and is developed further throughout the thesis.
Exploring negotiation as a tool for conflict resolution requires a more comprehensive analysis of factors affecting the process and outcomes. Refocusing negotiations to deemphasize distributive elements can lead to more viable and sustainable outcomes. Healthy negotiations involve collaborative tactics that require a degree of trust between negotiators, such as open information sharing among parties (Hocker & Wilmot, 2007) (Mayer, 2000). Additionally negotiations focused on integrative approaches between parties can prevent escalation of conflicts as improved cooperation continues into future negotiations (Mayer, 2000).

Furthermore, a conflict resolution orientation to negotiation envisions long-term impacts of potential outcomes including the transformative potential of negotiation to create new ways to cooperate, new feelings, and new positive solutions based on “community concerns, cooperativeness, subjectivity, intuition, emotion” (Hocker & Wilmot, 2007, 261). From this perspective, an emphasis on relationships produces more effective and sustainable outcomes, through connectedness, dialogue, and storytelling (Kolb & Putnam, 1997).

Throughout this study, I examine the role of negotiation in international diplomacy because negotiation is a central component of policy formation, diplomatic efforts, and international affairs, among other arenas. According to Alfredson, and Cungu (2008), negotiation skills and principles are essential to “exploring options, finding solutions and securing needed support from relevant parties in order to ensure that planned policies are sustainable” (p. 2).

Growing legitimacy of conceptualizing international negotiations as a system increases pressure for a shift from the traditional bargaining power strategy toward a more
holistic approach that considers the context, negotiator relationships, and external stakeholders (Kremenyuk, 1991). Diamond and McDonald (1996) described the systems approach of diplomacy as an “interactive process…about relationship, communication, connectedness” with diplomacy defined as “our principle means of tackling international problems and stabilizing a world precariously balanced between order and violence” (p. 11).

In this structure those with formalized professional connections, typically in Track 1, have more credibility and direct access to influencing policymaking through a sense of government insularity perpetuated by internalized power politics, manifested in turf wars and intergroup rivalry. Advocating for professionals in each track to respect the value of and learn from other tracks, Diamond and McDonald (1996) stated:

In fact, much relevant expertise about international relations, peace, and conflict resolution resides outside the Track One community, but the boundaries are so tight and so closely guarded that such expertise frequently has no way of getting through to the people who need access to it. (p. 30)

Diamond and McDonald (1996) called for a shift from the traditional paradigm toward a worldview of collaboration among and across the various levels and approaches to international peacemaking efforts, claiming “relationship is indeed the heart of the peacemaking system. Connectedness and interaction are what systems are all about”, both within the system and between parties to diplomatic efforts (p. 7). In formal negotiations between representatives of nations, regardless of the field or scope of intervention, this attention to fostering good will and cultivating relationships is essential. Diamond and
McDonald (1996) maintained through the analysis that “the activity of building personal trust is critical” (p. 29).

Through extended ethnographic interviews with current and former diplomats and individuals or groups engaged in unofficial citizen diplomacy, Diamond and McDonald (1996) gathered data on both the process and substance of peacemaking efforts, including values, personal intentions, and assumptions. Participants were challenged to examine their decisions and thought processes. Most revealed they had not stopped to think much about these aspects of their work (Diamond & McDonald, 1996). It became clear that on the whole diplomats tend to not have formal training in the field, typically relying on trial and error methods to learn what works. Diamond and McDonald (1996) made the following assessment:

Diplomats need increased and improved training in negotiation skills, particularly in multilateral negotiations. At present, most formal negotiators are operating without theoretical or practical training, other than their own experience and intuition. (p. 31)

King, Keohane, and Verba (1994) argued that humans and social interaction are unique and unpredictable. According to this perspective of social science, the insight and knowledge gained through real world experience is far more valuable and effective than what can be learned through generalizations in coursework and simulations of formalized training programs. Mayer (2000) cautioned against theories on negotiation based on generalizations that are too broad and do not account for variations, stating the following:

Any effort to analyze the dynamics of negotiation, or of any complex human interaction, must inevitably run up against the reality that every person, situation, and
system creates its own process. Furthermore, some of the most important occurrences in negotiation are unconscious, unintentional, or instinctive. (p. 167)
Overview of Community Organizing

The field of conflict resolution has striking similarities to community organizing, especially Track III, which as previously stated, encompasses broad grassroots activities such as protests, petitions, and lobbying. My research will specifically focus on community organizing. The formation of community organizing as a field can be difficult to outline because its origins lie throughout Europe and North America in the nineteenth century. The field grew from efforts by churches and working class organizations during social reformation activities to improve education and labor conditions. These movements evolved in the mid-twentieth century as increased focus on democratic ideals in North America generated literature promoted community development and improved quality of life through civic engagement and social services organizations (Smith, 1996).

By the ‘40s, following a world-renown social movement and series of protests in India led by Mahatma Gandhi, divergent conceptions arose surrounding the degree to which resources should be externally allocated or internally generated and local populations should be represented or empowered to represent themselves. Rothman (1974) described three disparate yet overlapping approaches to community organization: locality development, social planning, and social action. Social action became the field of community organizing that exists today and is the basis of this study. Rothman (1974) defined the social action approach:
…presupposes a disadvantaged segment of the population that needs to be organized perhaps in alliance with others, in order to make adequate demands on the larger community for increased resources or treatment more in accordance with social justice or democracy. (p. 24).

Galtung’s (1969) theory of positive peace because as with conflict resolution, the aim is to affect systemic reform of institutionalized inequities to eliminate structural violence. Social justice is the core principle for Galtung’s (1969) theory and for community organizing.

In a radical shift from the welfare system approach of the War on Poverty, Saul Alinsky promoted grassroots mobilization of marginalized populations to self-identify and obtain the resources and services they needed. The goal was to break the cycle of dependency and helplessness perpetuated by social services organizations through a "consumer advocacy" approach of “wrestling services and resources from the outside powers that be” (Obama, 1988, p. 42). The Civil Rights Movement of the ‘60s inspired a generation of activists seeking social reform, crystallizing community organizing into a distinct field. During the next several decades, organizing efforts in Chicago and New York also modeled Alinsky’s approach.

By the ‘80s community organizing became grounded in a philosophy centered on communities of ideas rather than geography. This approach focused on harnessing the social capital of the local people. Influenced by Alinsky’s teachings, Obama (1988) described the following account of organizing low-income communities in Chicago:

In theory, community organizing provides a way to merge various strategies for neighborhood empowerment. Organizing begins with the premise that (1) the
problems facing inner-city communities do not result from a lack of effective solutions, but from a lack of power to implement these solutions; (2) that the only way for communities to build long-term power is by organizing people and money around a common vision; and (3) that a viable organization can only be achieved if a broadly based indigenous leadership and not one or two charismatic leaders can knit together the diverse interests of their local institutions. (p. 41).

One of the most influential forefathers of community organizing as a field, Saul Alinsky, was born in 1909 in Chicago’s west side and split his teen years between divorced parents in Chicago and Los Angeles. He studied archeology at the University of Chicago and enrolled in the graduate school of criminology in 1930, only to leave a year later to work instead at the Clifford R. Shaw Institute of Juvenile Research. In 1939, Alinsky began working to eradicate juvenile crime in a deeply impoverished section of Chicago called the Back of the Yards, made famous from Upton Sinclair’s 1906 novel *The Jungle* (Joravsky, 1988).

Alinsky was inspired by union organizers in the Back of the Yards and his own desire to fight fascism; through this approach he develop a model of organizing based on “local leadership, confrontational tactics, and personalizing the issue” (Joravsky, 1988, p. 10) that gained him national acclaim and inspired similar efforts across the country. In response to the widespread following, Alinsky released *Reveille for Radicals* (1946) and *Rules for Radicals* (1971) and established a training school for organizers, called the Industrial Areas Foundation, to provide a structure and guidance for others seeking to reproduce his model.
Despite the popularity of the model, critics claimed Alinsky relied too heavily on confrontational tactics that achieved only short-lived success in specific settings where religious organizations had a strong influence in poor communities. Rodham (1969) discussed several assessments of Alinsky’s model as too localized and reliant on Alinsky’s charismatic personality as a “master showman” who manipulated people by appealing to their self-interest to incite action (p. 60). Additional critiques of Alinsky’s organizing model accuse him of reinforcing segregation in communities by organizing according to race, creating competition between civic organizations for funding and press coverage, and avoiding underlying structural issues such as racism, political corruption, and civil rights abuses (Joravsky, 1988; p. 11).

Alinsky died at age 63 in 1972, leaving behind a legacy of community organizing that Joravsky (1988) claimed “has become the prototype for groups in poor and working-class black, white-ethnic and Hispanic neighborhoods across the country” (p. 10). Those who worked close with Alinsky spread his teachings to the next generation of organizers, transforming the way political and labor relations was conducted. Following Alinsky’s model, Cesar Chavez and Marshall Ganz achieved success organizing farm workers in California through the ‘70s. Additional organizing efforts in New York and Chicago attributed progress to lessons from Alinsky’s teachings.

Over the years, Alinsky’s model has been modified in various ways and applied to political elections and corporate campaigns for data collection and outreach efforts (Joravsky, 1988). Others built on the Alinsky organizing model by integrating mass-marketing techniques and promoting local leadership development for years after initial contact.
(Joravsky, 1988). Efforts to transform organizing from temporary employment to a respectable career track inspired strategic changes to personnel management. To prevent burn-out and encourage retention, organizations hiring organizers rotated staff through different territories and increased salaries (Joravsky, 1988). Rodham (1969) offered the following analysis of positive and negative aspects of Alinsky’s organizing model:

Alinsky’s prescription for the poor helping themselves was to motivate the powerless to acquire the necessary skills and knowledge to control their own affairs. His belief that the poor can translate apathy into power and then use that power responsibly has, in some cases, proven true. In others the transformation has been dysfunctional either for the community or for the cause of radical change. Often the application of the Alinsky Model in geographically-bound lower class areas assumes an almost bootstrap formula which is too conservative for our present situation. (p. 69)

Few would characterize Alinsky, his methods, or teachings as conservative. In fact, Alinsky sought radical social change and often criticized liberal thinking that led to inaction. Rooted in the ideals of a Democratic society, Alinsky (1971) conceptualized a People’s Organization of the marginalized populations demanding improved quality of life and human dignity. In his model, the “sole reason for [a People’s Organization] coming into being is to wage war against all evils which cause suffering and unhappiness” (p. 132). The organizer was responsible for combating apathy or hopelessness to mobilize marginalized communities. Alinsky’s teachings focused on building a power base through leadership development and leveraging resources. To incite action, “an organizer must stir up
dissatisfaction and discontent; provide a channel into which people can pour their frustrations” (Alinsky, 1971; p. 117).

While I could have selected from other noteworthy community organizers as the basis for my analysis of the field, few organizers have exhibited as clear a conceptualization of the principles and methods on a national level as Alinsky’s prolific writing and training institutions have demonstrated. Seal (2008) summarized the appeal of Alinsky’s work in this sober critique:

Saul Alinsky’s ideas could be seen as controversial, but he was effective and practical as a community activist, and his work and writing deserves to be more widely known among those involved in informal education, community development work and social pedagogy. Not that his principles and rules are unquestionable or right for every situation, but they are a practical toolkit to effect change though leverage in those with power, potentially of great worth to those engaged in community work and education. (Conclusion).

Another notable leader in community organizing, and a student of the Alinsky model, is Marshall Ganz. The majority of Ganz’s organizing experience is in labor unions and political campaigns, which translated into a position as the grassroots strategist for the 2008 Obama presidential campaign.

Ganz’s passion for civil rights grew from his early experiences during his childhood. Immediately after World War II, his family lived in Germany where his father served as a chaplain in the U.S. Army working with Holocaust survivors. He spent the remainder of his childhood in an oil and agriculture town in Southern California before moving Boston to
attend Harvard College in 1960. Ganz took the lessons learned that he from his parents about the dangers of racism, and applied it to his civil rights work. Motivated and inspired by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the work being done by similar activists in the South, Ganz was drawn to participate in the Civil Rights Movement. He volunteered for the Mississippi Summer Project in 1964 and then worked for the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee instead of completing his final year in college (Ganz, 2009).

In 1965 he joined Cesar Chavez in the National Farm Workers Association (later known as the United Farm Workers of America) where he worked for 16 years organizing boycotts, negotiating, and advising on the national executive board. For ten years, between 1981 and 1991, Ganz continued organizing primarily in California for election campaigns, union groups, and community issues. After 26 years of organizing experience, Ganz returned to Harvard College to complete his undergraduate degree and subsequently earn his Masters degree in 1993. While working on his Ph.D. at Harvard, Ganz was asked to teach a course on organizing at the Kennedy School and joined the faculty in 2000 (Ganz, 2009) where he has presented community organizing in a deconstructed model by covering key components of both the process and substance of the work.

For Ganz (2006a) community organizing is primarily about developing leadership, building relationships, and creating a common vision of the future to mobilize communities. Ganz (2006g) described the role of community organizers by stating:

Organizers bring people together, challenging them to act on behalf of their shared values and interests. They develop the relationships, motivate the participation, strategize the pathways, and take the action that enable people to gain new
appreciation of their values, the resources to which they have access, their interests,
and a new capacity to use their resources on behalf of their interests. (par. 1).

Leaders are identified, recruited, and then coached through rigorous training and
incremental increases in responsibility, with obvious accountability to constituents (Ganz,
2006b). Relationships are critical to establish trust and credibility as well as learn the
particular culture of the community, including historical background and subtle political or
socio-economic contexts. Community organizers build relationships through emotional
dialogue and storytelling that ultimately motivate people to action with a compelling
narrative of the future that inspires hope through agency and solidarity (Ganz, 2006d).

Ganz (2009) argues community organizers also need to develop strategic capacity or
the ability to devise a good strategy, which he contends “is a function of who its leaders are”
and the organizational culture they create through decisions on how to structure and operate
the effort (p. 8). This approach requires creative thinking to navigate appropriately, targeting
limited resources, using the most effective tactics, and identifying when to act for the greatest
impact on the desired outcome (Ganz, 2009). Strategic capacity is derived from who the
leaders are (i.e. their social status or networks) and the efforts they make to include
constituents in transparent decision-making.

Critics of my approach may claim that focusing specifically on the Democratic Party
introduces a selection bias that skews the analysis and conclusions of this study. Some may
question why I did not also examine the Republican or third-party campaigns. Although
limited time played a role in my decision to limit the scope of this research, the primary
reason I chose to examine the Obama campaign and not include other political parties is
because no other political campaign used the Alinsky-Ganz organizing model at the scale and effectiveness of the Obama campaign. It is certainly the true that if the selection of Obama’s 2008 Presidential campaign was based on political ideology or the candidate himself, it would pose an inherent bias in the research.

However, for the purposes of this study, I am not concerned with the political ideology or candidate. The focus of the study is instead on the principles and methods of the Alinsky-Ganz community organizing model as applicable to resolving conflict. I use conflict resolution as a lens to examine the skills, tactics, and strategies of the community organizing aspect of the campaign. I focus on the style of community organizing used that was the basic strategy for Obama’s 2008 presidential campaign, because it is a successful large-scale grassroots effort that combined elements of the principles and practice of community organizing as taught by Alinsky and Ganz.

The 2008 Obama presidential campaign is widely recognized for its success in producing unprecedented voter turnout. In a post-election analysis of the 2008 Obama presidential campaign, Alexander (2010) summarized the startling success of the campaign’s organizing strategy to secure nearly 70 million vote, compared to McCain’s 60 million, winning the popular vote 53 percent to 46 percent and 68 percent of electoral college to McCain’s 32 percent (p. 266). To illustrate the success of the campaign strategy further, Alexander (2010) also referenced a Wall Street Journal article which highlighted the campaign’s stunning scope and intensity, stating, “Sen. Obama’s field operations, which have become his campaign’s trademark, are…of a size unprecedented in presidential politics,
stunning even seasoned veterans…” (p. 41-42). In short, one reason I focused on the 2008 Obama presidential campaign is because it was undeniably effective.

There are numerous proposed explanations for the success of the 2008 Obama presidential campaign. Conventional political wisdom attributed the campaign’s success to massive fundraising revenues that offered opportunities for national advertising to disburse political messaging and further entrench candidate name recognition. Silver (January 14, 2009) reviewed voting trends and posited that the ultimate determining factor in the 2008 election was Obama’s strategic identification with and outreach to urban areas, which marked a significant departure not only from his opposition but also from previous presidential candidates’ tendency to tout rural upbringings. Even full-time campaign volunteers, Parlett and Graves (2010), attributed the campaign’s success more to strategic political messaging that celebrated the candidate’s diversity and universal appeal through “the transcendent power of the slogan” (p. 8).

Other political and statistical analysts insist the crux of the campaign success rested on the massive field operation, or “ground game”, which mobilized masses of volunteers to personally contact potential voters. Plouffe (2009) affirmed in an autobiographical account of the campaign that this particular community organizing model was the foundation of the entire operation, and key to its success, when he stated:

Our secret weapon, day in and day out, was our army of volunteers, real people... The bonds of trust between individuals who shared values, goals, or even just living space were far stronger than anything we might hope to have forged through more traditional tactics. (pp. 379-380)
In a discussion on the critical elements of the Obama campaign’s organizational power, Alexander (2010) highlighted the importance of face-to-face contact with voters to foster feelings of connection and sustain volunteer motivation through “not only intensive but also extensive moral commitment and emotional energy” (p. 44). This assumption was universally promoted as valid by members of both major political parties, with Jarmin’s (2008) research quoting one Republican consultant who stated, “One of the keys to Mr. Obama’s success was building an unprecedented ground game…” (as cited in Masket, 2009, p. 1023).

Through a heavily statistical analysis of contributing factors to the campaign’s success, Masket (2009) investigated claims that the ground game impacted voter turnout more than other variables. According to Masket (2009), the Obama campaign “pursued an unusually aggressive field office effort” (p. 1029) with Luo and McIntire (2008) reporting 700 Obama field offices nationwide, compared to McCain’s 400 field offices (as cited in Masket, 2009, p.1026). Masket (2009) initially hypothesized that although the presence of field offices had a measurable impact on voter turnout in closely contested states, Obama likely would have won the election without the field offices because he out-performed Democratic presidential candidate John Kerry’s 2004 voter turnout uniformly across states, whether or not there was substantive field presence (p. 1026).

Testing political campaign research that suggests direct contact can increase voter turnout, Masket (2009) considered additional variables that may have contributed to higher levels of democratic voter turnout in 2008, including: population growth, increased minority participation due to self-identification with the African American candidate, unemployment
rates (p. 1029-1030). Ultimately, Masket (2009) concluded that the presence of field offices is “positively and statistically significant” (p. 1032).

Masket (2009) concluded that the overall success of the 2008 Obama presidential campaign was largely a result of the strategic use of funds to staff field offices in unprecedented numbers, stating:

What this study ultimately suggests is that, in an era when campaigns sink more and more money into television advertisements with less and less to show for it, investing more in shoe and leather may be a wise decision. Not only does it appear to actually move voters, but it also produces a number of positive externalities that we say we want from campaigns... (p. 1037)

While the presence of Obama field offices typically contributed to an increase in Democratic voter turnout, the presence of McCain field offices did not have a similar boosting effect on Republican voter turnout (Masket, 2009). I argue that this is because the Obama campaign used the Alinsky-Ganz organizing style, which no other national campaign has done, including McCain’s 2008 presidential bid.

The campaign model used in the 2008 Obama presidential campaign was markedly different from previous political campaigns because it was, as its core, an effective community organizing structure that deployed mass quantities of people engaged in grassroots efforts to personally contact potential voters. Parlett & Graves (2010) described how in many ways it was more than a political campaign; it was seen by many as “a movement unparalleled for its ubiquitous grass root [sic] or voluntary membership” (p. 7). President of the New Organizing Institute, Exley (October 8, 2008), described how the
philosophy and tactics utilized by the 2008 Obama campaign differed from traditional political campaigns in the following analysis:

Other recent attempts have failed because they were either so "top-down" and/or poorly-managed that they choked volunteer leadership and enthusiasm; or because they were so dogmatically fixated on pure peer-to-peer or "bottom-up" organizing that they rejected basic management, accountability and planning. The architects and builders of the Obama field campaign, on the other hand, have undogmatically mixed timeless traditions and discipline [sic] of good organizing with new technologies of decentralization and self-organization. (par. 2)

I argue that the “timeless traditions and discipline” to which Exley (2008) refers are the community organizing principles and methods of Saul Alinsky and Marshall Ganz as they were combined into one new model of organizing

Reflecting on organizing poor minority populations in Chicago, Obama (1988) criticized Alinsky’s model for focusing too much on tactics, stating, “We tend to think of organizing as a mechanical, instrumental thing," but is it most effective when the focus is on “building a culture [by] building up stories and getting people to reflect on what their lives mean…” (as cited in Alexander, 2010, p. 45).

Alexander (2010) spoke with paid staff and volunteers of the Obama campaign about the community organizing model used, and concluded that within the context of the Obama campaign strategy, “Organizing is not about interests and resources, at least not at first. It’s about ‘sharing your story’ and ‘working together for the common good…Organizing is about building a relationship…’trust, respect, interaction, commonality, getting to know each other
– openness” (p. 48). Campaign staff and volunteers were encouraged to build relationships with one another to increase accountability and personal ownership of the grassroots outreach process to potential voters.

Additionally, interactions with voters were framed as continuous and each contact was considered value-added even if a commitment to the candidate was not immediately expressed. In this way, voters were not viewed as commodities to produce votes for the candidate, but rather treated as partners in a humanized process that emphasized exchanging personal stories designed to build relationships. Alexander (2010) described how one experienced campaign staff member explained the strategy while facilitating a training camp for incoming volunteer leaders:

One-on-one is not just a conversation. It is rooted in a story; it’s not just a task. Make yourself vulnerable. Let yourself be driven by curiosity. Don’t ask ‘what’ questions but get to motivation…Don’t think about extracting resources from people – money, time, whatever. Think about them as another human being. (p. 53)

Similarly, Exley (August 29, 2009) attended a training session led by Ganz who designed the campaign’s grassroots organizing strategy; Exley observed that one of the primary goals of the training was to teach organizers how to tell personal stories about why they feel compelled to action and then teach newly recruited volunteers to construct and share an emotive personal narrative to inspire others to join the cause. To Exley (August 29, 2009), while numerical measurements of votes were valued as indicators of progress toward the end goal, contrary to traditional political campaign strategy, “The story telling exercises are the foundation of the model being used at Camp Obama” (para 26).
The conflict resolution field in general tends to view community organizing negatively as advocating confrontation and manufacturing conflict, which is counterproductive to the peacebuilding goals of de-escalation. For others there is a fear of social unrest associated with the basic concept behind mobilizing and empowering communities. Rodham (1969) plainly identified this sentiment by stating, “Alinsky is viewed as a proponent of a dangerous socio/political philosophy. As a result he has been feared…If the ideals Alinsky espouses were actualized, the result would be social revolution” (p. 74)

However, Alinsky viewed community organizing as a means to address important issues that cause conflict. One must first create conflict to raise issues and establish public discourse before seeking consensus and resolution. Alinsky (1971) believed organizers “must search out controversy and issues, rather than avoid them, for unless there is controversy people are not concerned enough to act” (p. 116-117). Confrontation is sometimes necessary, particularly when dealing with marginalized populations that need to establish legitimacy within the current power structure, to force existing institutions to acknowledge a population’s concerns or demands.

In response to criticisms of this philosophy based on poorly executed attempts to realize the underlying premise, Rodham (1969) quipped, “The problem is not in the model but in those applying it” (p. 58). Ultimately Alinsky appealed to self-interest, and to the human desire to be recognized and treated with dignity in an equitable society. This appeal echoes a foundational theory in the conflict resolution field, which attempts to identify root causes of conflicts and provide a framework for resolution based on the analysis.
Burton’s (1988) theory of basic human needs explored “conditions or opportunities that are essential to the individual if he is to be a functioning and cooperative member of society, conditions that are essential to his development” (p. 38). Examples include rights, independence, participation, and dignity. Burton (1988) outlined the following eight human needs as a basis for the organization and survival of society: ‘consistency of response, stimulation, security, recognition, justice, meaning, rationality, and control” (pp. 47-48). Burton (1988) posited that these needs are identified in relation to the inferior role in a given relationship, which seeks to obtain these needs, while the superior role attempts to retain them in role defense.

Although similar and related, basic human needs remain fairly constant through time, while cultural values morph with societies and may provide the means through which needs are satisfied. Burton (1988) asserted that basic human needs are relevant in all levels of behavioral relationships, whether as individuals or as social groups; in short, they are the core of human interaction.

Burton (1988) suggested that developing a commonly accepted framework for analyzing the root causes of civil unrest allows for better understanding of how to address the sources of conflict, resulting in more effective conflict resolution. Burton (1988) advocated approaching conflict resolution in terms of the fulfillment of basic human needs, because they are “universal in the sense that they are a systemic requirement of the individual and that no society can be harmonious or survive indefinitely unless they are satisfied” (p. 37). Such needs exist independent of social constructs, and for individuals, the fulfillment of basic human needs is so powerful that it takes precedence over social order.
Alinsky’s model aligns with Burton’s theory because, at essence, it was about “fighting feelings of powerlessness inherent in society” (Rodham 1969 p. 59). If society does not allow individuals to secure basic human needs, they will deviate from social norms in order to secure these needs, causing social disruption. Effective conflict prevention and de-escalation requires understanding the role of basic human needs as root causes of conflicts and working to ensure needs are satisfied through positive peace efforts, which is precisely what community organizing aims to do through grassroots empowerment (Burton, 1988) (Galtung, 1969).
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

A review of existing research indicates my approach has not been extensively examined, particularly in academia. Previously, a common analysis of the relationship between levels of peacebuilding intervention explores how Track III uses grassroots activities like community organizing to influence Track I diplomatic negotiations through external social or political pressure. A closely related approach attempts to incorporate the interests and goals of grassroots organizations into substantive negotiation discussions. However, little research has examined the convergence of shared principles and methods of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations.

A detailed analysis of international relations and the ongoing debate over the role of NGOs in conflict resolution or peacebuilding efforts is beyond the scope of my study. However, I will provide a brief overview of the major arguments encountered in my literature review to establish the basis for my founding premise: That NGOs play a vital role in international relations by influencing policy decisions and diplomatic negotiations. I will then build upon developments in the research which demonstrate the need to improve and normalize Track I negotiation training by including best practices from Track III grassroots principles and methods, particularly community organizing.

Independent organizations such as Global Policy Forum monitor and critique the policymaking work of international bodies - including the United Nations (U.N.) and World
Trade Organization – and advocate involvement of NGOs to promote “accountability and citizen participation in decisions on peace and security, social justice and international law” (Global Policy Forum, 2012). By their nature, NGOs do not represent states or nations, and therefore are not bound by allegiances to national agendas and can represent communities of culture as well as geographic areas. Oftentimes NGOs engage in advocacy and community organizing for specific issues across borders with the goal of influencing national and international policymaking on behalf of their constituents.

Global Policy Forum claims that NGOs play a vital role in international peacemaking and development efforts. It advocates for their inclusion in the international community, quoting a former U.N. Secretary-General who referred to NGOs as the “world’s third superpower” (Deen, September 7, 2007). Although NGOs lack formal authority in international relations, these organizations have gained credibility since World War II and have proven effective at marshalling resources to impact policy decisions (Paul, June 2000). This success can be accomplished through coalition building between NGOs with similar missions (Paul, June 2000).

According to Docherty (2004b), negotiators should always consider whether there are interested external parties who are likely to be affected by the outcome of a negotiation and might “use their power to spoil an agreement if they are not included in the negotiation or consulted about the proposed settlement” (p. 866). NGOs can influence diplomatic negotiations through external political pressure. Using community organizing strategies, NGOs can rally constituents and stakeholders for disruptive public demonstrations, protests, and petitions that attract media scrutiny of policy discussions (Paul, June 2000). NGOs can
also internally influence policy decisions by ensuring their concerns are included in discussions. They may advocate for inclusion of certain issues or their own representatives in deliberations to strive for a particular overall settlement to negotiations.

Nevertheless, Track 1 professionals traditionally have more cachet and receive direct access to policymaking through formalized government connections. This creates a sense of government insularity that decreases the likelihood of Track I cooperating with other tracks in a multi-track system of diplomacy. This exclusive subculture is perpetuated within Track I by internalized power politics, manifested in turf wars and intergroup rivalry (Diamond & McDonald, 1996). In an analysis of potential opportunities for integrating conflict resolution practices into formal policymaking, Fuller and Fitzen (2007) also highlighted the resistance of Track 1 professionals to include or embrace the expertise of NGOs in diplomatic efforts.

Even so, the role of NGOs and their expertise in conflict resolution has increasingly become widely accepted as legitimate and valuable in international relations. Although they are still banned from some high-level meetings, NGOs are allowed to attend and monitor U.N. general assembly meetings to keep their constituents informed of the proceedings (Deen, September 12, 2011). The U.N. Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) recognizes the value of NGOs by listing 3,000 NGOs as holding "consultative status" to provide technical expertise in advocacy and grassroots strategies as well as serving as liaisons with local communities affected by U.N. decisions (Deen, September 12, 2011).

Furthermore, a growing trend in research on the relationship between grassroots efforts and international diplomacy is the recognition that these bodies offer legitimate
contributions to negotiations and valuable professional expertise in conflict resolution and community organizing.

Kremenyuk (1991) discussed an emergent systems approach of international negotiation with formalized institutions and procedures for addressing transnational conflicts. Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, and Miall’s (2005) description of a three-track diplomatic intervention model supports a systems approach to international negotiation. Diamond and McDonald (1996) updated the model with a nine-track model in which grassroots activities like community organizing comprise Tracks Two and Six. This model ascribes legitimate diplomatic policy formation abilities to NGOs and activist organizations (Diamond & McDonald, 1996). It marks a sharp departure from traditional perspectives of grassroots efforts as merely advocating to influence international governing bodies.

Similarly, Lenucha, Kothari, and Labonte, (2011) found that the dynamic of international diplomacy has fundamentally shifted, with NGOs exercising a greater authoritative role as a result of their ability to organize and mobilize communities of supportive public constituents. To this end, Lenucha, Kothari, and Labonte (2011) stated, “diplomacy, once consigned to interactions among state officials, has witnessed the dilution of its state-centric origins with the inclusion of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the diplomacy process” (Abstract, para. 1).

Accordingly, Diamond and McDonald (1996) called for a shift from the traditional model of international diplomacy toward one of better collaboration within each track, across the entire system, and between negotiation parties. Through research on seemingly intractable conflicts, Galloway (2011) concluded that a stronger relationship and better
collaboration between all levels of peacebuilding intervention are needed for effective settlement. From a conflict resolution perspective, regardless of the field or scope of intervention, cultivating relationships between the various tracks is essential for effective international diplomatic efforts. Advocating for each track to respect the value of others, to learn from and share best practices, Diamond and McDonald (1996) stated:

In fact, much relevant expertise about international relations, peace, and conflict resolution resides outside the Track One community, but the boundaries are so tight and so closely guarded that such expertise frequently has no way of getting through to the people who need access to it (p. 30).

Beyond the need for improved collaboration between the various levels of the international diplomacy system, the literature review revealed two additional central themes that relate to my thesis. First, conflict resolution professionals claim that diplomatic negotiators lack adequate training for the role. Second, they advocate for improving the current negotiation training by focusing on long-term sustainability of outcomes through relationship building.

Building on forty years of experience in international diplomacy, retired U.S. Ambassador McDonald concluded that Track 1 professionals tend to be poorly trained and, in his view, too arrogant to recognize or admit their shortcomings (personal communication, August 15, 2012). Ambassador McDonald held U.S. State Department assignments in Western Europe and the Middle East, served sixteen years as a representative to the U.N. on economic and social affairs, and is currently Chairman and co-founder of the Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy (Institute for Multi-Track Diplomacy Staff Profiles, 2012).
Supported by extensive interviews with current and former diplomats, Diamond and McDonald (1996) found that diplomats typically rely on trial and error rather than formal training, resulting in the following assessment:

Diplomats need increased and improved training in negotiation skills, particularly in multilateral negotiations. At present, most formal negotiators are operating without theoretical or practical training, other than their own experience and intuition” (p. 31).

In response, McDonald developed the first conflict management course for the National Defense University and provides formal negotiation training for diplomats across the globe (personal communication, August 15, 2012).

Newsom (1984) discussed concerns about attempts by conflict resolution scholars to apply theories and techniques developed in the U.S. to the international arena. Newsom (1984) argued that such approaches to international conflict “would suffer from shock, frustration, and difficulty in understanding what was going on” (p. 35). Newsom (1984) criticized ethnocentric approaches because they do not account for regional and cultural differences including alternative options, views on legal reproach, variations of interactions between individuals and states, bureaucratic obstacles, and assumptions of technical training and experience in conflict resolution versus political status of negotiators. Kremenyuk (1991) further developed this argument, proclaiming that the traditional approach of building bargaining power is outdated and insufficient for addressing the complexity of global problems that impact the international community.

Additionally, the way traditional approach to teaching negotiation models poorly reflects the “everyday experience of negotiation” (Docherty, 2010, p. 488-489). Typically,
simulations and role playing do not account for either the past histories or the future
relationships of negotiation parties. Docherty (2005) argued negotiators must consider
holistically the context within which negotiations occur including external influence
stakeholders or constituents. Parties ascribe different meanings and to various aspects of
negotiation enter negotiations with expectations for when to offer concessions or make
demands (Docherty, 2005).

Honeyman and Cohen (2010) discussed the complexity of negotiations that involve
“many parties, many issues, and many ancillary and even competing processes in addition to
bilateral negotiation, all in an environment of unstable rules, laws, players, and politics” (p.
443). First mentioned by Horst Rittell and Melvin Webber in 1973, these “wicked problems”
require a radically different negotiation approach rooted in conflict resolution principles and
techniques (Honeyman & Cohen, p. 440). Docherty (2010) and colleagues proposed an
updated training model called “Negotiation 2.0” (p. 502) that shifts away from teaching pre-
determined skills and strategies toward developing self- and cultural awareness. Remaining
flexible and adaptive allows negotiators to respond to larger structural contexts (Docherty

Perhaps the most important suggestion for improving traditional negotiation training
is an emphasis on building rapport and fostering long-term relationships. Diamond and
McDonald (1996) concluded that “relationship is indeed the heart of the peacemaking
system. Connectedness and interaction are what systems are all about” (Diamond &
between negotiators “fosters cooperative behavior necessary for efficient negotiated
outcomes” (p. 877) and contributes to an increased “willingness to cooperate, to share crucial information, to make fewer ultimatums and threats, and to a reduction of the risk of impasse” (p. 875). Rapport is established fastest through face-to-face meetings, prior interactions, or similar professional affiliations between negotiators that bolsters mutual trust and promotes cooperation (Nadler, 2004).

According to Lull (1969) political or emotionally-charged statements may entrench parties into hardened positions and create adversarial relationships. Expressing one’s own negative feelings or causing negative feelings in others can impede collaboration. Conversely, positive emotions encourage creative thinking in search of integrative and sustainable outcomes as “negotiators with positive mood report higher enjoyment of their tasks, achieve more optimally integrative outcomes, and use fewer aggressive behaviors” (Shapiro 2004, p.744).

Building on a sophisticated body of research that departs from traditional perspectives, Shapiro (2004) declared ignoring emotion in negotiation is “untenable and often makes things worse” (p. 739). Revealing emotions leaves negotiators open to manipulation. However, smart negotiators are unlikely to use manipulation because the short-term advantage of exploiting emotions is oftentimes outweighed by the risk of breaking down trust and damaging long-term relationships (Shapiro, 2004).
Current State of the Field

In summary, previous research validates the important role of NGOs in international relations and the effectiveness of community organizing tactics for influencing policy formation. Further studies place the field at a state where the system of international negotiations and diplomatic efforts could benefit from collaboration between the various tracks, standardized training focused on cultural and contextual awareness, and emphasis on establishing rapport and long-term relationships for sustainable, integrative outcomes. There is not much published data available on the potential for integrating the effectiveness of community organizing tactics with negotiation training.

My research identifies potential similarities in international negotiations and community organizing that addresses this knowledge gap. I have structured an observational design study to produce suggestive corollary evidence between community organizing skills and successful diplomatic negotiations. Through an analysis of the process and objectives of each field, I will synthesize a descriptive model for shared principles and methods of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations within a conflict resolution framework.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Diamond and McDonald (1996) stated “the very act of analyzing is a factor in the analysis, because the interpreters –the researchers- are themselves part of the system, with their own views and perspectives” (p. 7). Before presenting data or analysis, I must acknowledge theories, methods, and personal experience that influence my research design, data collection, and analysis. Understanding the subjective nature of my orientation to the subject matter provides the reader with a basis for recognizing a degree of uncertainty, or doubt, in the validity of the conclusions (King, Koehane & Verba, 1994).

From the initial design phase of selecting the research topic, I began with what Fitterer (2008) refers to as a dramatic bias or “an emotional and reactionary response to social interactions […] at work covertly and unconsciously skewing the agenda of our practical intelligence” (p. 82). Dramatic bias is an immediate and intuitive reaction developed from personal experiences. It can limit one’s consideration of factors beyond their own interpretation. It is important to consider how my experiences with community organizing, diplomatic negotiations, and conflict resolution might affect objectivity throughout this thesis.

As stated during the introduction, I was a paid employee of the 2008 Obama presidential campaign. I also have additional community organizing experience in prior political campaigns and advocacy efforts. It is no surprise that I believe community
organizing is a worthwhile and effective endeavor. I hold a favorable view of community organizers, simply by professional association. I have previously asserted that community organizing deserves further exploration as a conflict resolution method. I am also inclined to support research arguing for increased inclusion of NGOs in Track I international negotiations within the multi-track system of diplomacy. Lastly, my clear identification with a particular political party introduces the potential for accusations of selection bias or uneven analysis in favor of the Democratic Party and its membership.

I have limited experience with diplomatic negotiations as an observing member of the United States delegation for an international collaboration. I have also participated in numerous simulations of diplomatic negotiations portraying the representative of a country or nation. Through this, I gained insight into the complexities of multi-lateral diplomatic negotiations. Even still, I have never officially negotiated on behalf of a nation or government. As a result, my perception of what is possible or feasible may be different than the experience of official negotiators. Therefore, I will be relying heavily on textual review and personal communication with well-qualified practitioners to develop conclusions based on inference.

As is evident from my degree program, I am a student of conflict analysis and resolution. I mentioned in the introduction my orientation to view the practice as more than merely resolving current disputes between conflict parties. Building on Galtung’s (1969) conception of positive peace, I perceive the ultimate goal for practitioners of also addressing underlying structural issues to transform the conflict and ensure sustainability of settlements (Lederach, 2003).
Lastly, I would be remiss if I failed to mention my own background as a young Latina because it carries certain worldviews about age, gender, or cultural bias. I have developed the assumption that younger people are more likely to perceive great similarities between community organizing and diplomatic negotiations regardless of whether they practice either field. As a woman interested in understanding gender dynamics in social settings, I have studied literature on the role of gender in conflict resolution, including numerous publications specifically focused within the context of negotiation. According to Kolb and Putnam (1997) traditional negotiation strategies reflect a male-gender stereotype of rationality and stoicism but female negotiators are better able to navigate emotions and relationships toward more effective and sustainable outcomes. Avruch (1998) cautioned against misconceptions about culture as static and homogeneous. As an ethnic minority, I expect that other minorities will be more sensitive to cultural nuances in both fields.

To correct for the aforementioned biases, I have attempted to demonstrate objectivity by providing clear and logical explanations for each decision through a transparent process of selection and analysis. When dealing with human subjects in interviews and surveys, to the extent possible, I have allowed informants to speak for themselves with minimal interjection of my own interpretation.

Research Methods

Traditional approaches to research rely primarily on quantitative data to identify correlations and prove causation between variables. Luker (2008) described a stigma of deviating from these “canonical” research methods that remains persistent in academia
In a guide to designing social research, King, Koehane, and Verba (1994) declared “neither quantitative nor qualitative research is superior to each other, regardless of the research problem being addressed” (p. 5-6). As long as researchers apply the rules of scientific method, the product is equally valid regardless if data is quantitative or qualitative. It is the process that matters, not whether data is numerical or in narrative form. According to King, Koehane, & Verba (1994), “differences between quantitative and qualitative traditions are only stylistic and are methodologically and substantively unimportant” (p. 4).

Not all social science research is conducted to prove some theory right or wrong. Some researchers seek merely to understand and chronicle social phenomena. King, Koehane, & Verba (1994) affirmed the importance of descriptive analysis as the first step in understanding any social phenomena by stating, “Often the contribution of a single project will be a descriptive inference” (p. 15). My thesis primarily aims to identify and describe convergence or commonalities between the principles and methods of community organizing and negotiation. My research combines some quantitative data with primarily qualitative data in a mix-methods approach endorsed by Luker (2008).

This research was conducted using an observational study designed to elicit a descriptive model for how community organizers and diplomatic negotiators internalize their roles, measure progress, and define success. I began by first conducting a comparative textual analysis of community organizing and negotiation literature to gain an understanding of the basic theory and methods discussed in academia. Then, I conducted qualitative research through interviews and online surveys and compiled a list of the principles, objectives, stylistic options, and strategic suggestions for each field. My primary interest in using
ethnographic questions was to establish metrics for defining and measuring success in community organizing and diplomatic negotiation based on the perceptions of the practitioners. Lastly, I identified in the data areas of convergence or divergence to produce a descriptive model for any emergent correlations.

Given my own curiosity about the subject, I expect this process reveal new information points which shift my original research direction. King, Koehane, Verba (1994) avowed that researchers may begin collecting data without a completely formulated theory and the theory may change during the course of the study. I attempted to analyze scholarly publications and experiences of practitioners from multiple levels of experience. This intentional breadth of analysis is based on King, Koehane, and Verba’s (1994) assertion that “our data need not all be the same level of analysis [and] our data also need not be ‘symmetric’ (p. 48)

**Operational Definitions**

1. Community organizing is defined by Ganz (2006d) as:

   Enabling people to determine what conditions of life they want to change, and how they want to change them. (p. 1).

2. Diplomatic negotiations is defined by Ramsbotham, Woodhouse, & Miall (2005)

   as:

   Typically occurring at the highest level with the broadest potential impact and involve[ing] top leaders such as government officials, international organizations and financial institutions. (pp. 27-29)
3. International negotiation is defined by Lull (1969) as:

   The process of consideration of an international dispute or situation by peaceful means, other than judicial or arbitral processes, with a view to promoting or reaching among the parties concerned or interested some understanding, amelioration, adjustment, or settlement of the dispute or situation. (p. 5)\(^1\)

4. Methods will be understood for the purposes of this study as:

   The strategies and tactics commonly used or taught as best practices for success within a particular field.

5. Principles will be understood for the purposes of this study as:

   The founding assumptions about people and social interactions, or worldviews, commonly taught as best practices for success within a particular field.

**Target populations**

The use of human subjects for this research was approved by the George Mason University Internal Review Board as exempt from formal review by Human Subject Review Board. The use of human subjects is limited to interviews and an online survey to include the following sample populations:

\(^1\) According to Lull (1969): “This definition suggests the inclusion of all forms of discussion, meeting, conference, mediation, conciliation, good offices, and other direct or indirect liaison among the parties concerned” (p. 5).
Current practitioners of diplomatic negotiations with previous community organizing experience.

Current practitioners of diplomatic negotiations with no previous experience with community organizing.

Current staff of the 2012 Barack Obama presidential campaign with diplomatic negotiations experience.

Current staff of the 2012 Barack Obama presidential campaign with no diplomatic negotiations experience.

Ethical considerations

Many of the human subjects involved in this study are former coworkers. I have previously worked some with on the 2008 Obama Presidential campaign, while others were colleagues from my employment with the federal government. I know almost every interviewee. Given the nature of diplomatic negotiations, the interviewees will be federal government officials of a senior level, much higher than my grade while employed by the federal government. There is no risk of interviewees feeling obligated to participate as a result of my former authority because interviewees are of a much senior level than I was while working with the federal government.

I also know most of the people completing the online survey who are currently deployed across the nation staffing campaign offices or working in other community organizing efforts. There was minimal risk that informants completing the online survey felt obligated to participate as a result of my former authority because most were not in a position
lower than the one I held and some have since been promoted to positions equal to or higher than the one I previously held.

These connections are a key element in gaining access to high level officials with very busy schedules, who might otherwise reject inquires unrelated to their daily professional duties or the mission of the organization they represent. I suspect they met with me or completed the online survey out of professional courtesy or personal interest in my thesis topic, given our existing professional relationships.

In light of minor concerns about confidentiality, the identities of all informants remain confidential in research notes, drafts, and final publications. I use a number system to identify interviewees in all notes, recordings, transcriptions, and analyses. I properly safeguarded email communications, audio files, transcriptions, and notes from unauthorized access through appropriate digital security measures including password protection and storing hardcopies under lock and key. Similarly, any references made by informants during interviews to their person or employer were removed and omitted in the final transcription included in the appendix.
A review of community organizing and negotiation literature reveals numerous similarities between the two fields. One similarity is the need to cultivate capable and effective leadership in the major parties involved in a conflict. In a seminar on community organizing, Ganz (2006b) claimed that the first step toward problem solving is for strong leaders “to engage people with one another to discern their common interests and develop the capacity to act on them” (para. 1). Diplomatic negotiators do this on a daily basis and as such are obviously in positions of political leadership. Docherty (2010) went further with the proposition that negotiators “are in a position of social leadership”, because the work they do to reach agreement in the midst of conflict offers opportunities to either reinforce or challenge existing structures (p. 493). For Docherty, because these leaders can influence policy decisions, they should view every negotiation as an opportunity to work towards Galtung’s (1969) positive peace by challenging existing social injustices.

A shared principle in community organizing and negotiation, and the most critical element in determining success or failure, is developing strong long-term relationships between parties. Literature from both fields urges effective practitioners to spend ample time in the beginning cultivating long-term relationships and nurturing them throughout the entire process. Fisher, Ury, and Patton, (1981) stressed the importance of building and maintaining strong working relationships and a good reputation for smoother future negotiations (p. 152).
According to Ganz (2006e) relationships require mutual commitment to co-create meaning and “learning each other’s ‘stories’ is a critical step in forming, maintaining, and developing relationships” (p. 7). Ganz (2006e) described relationships as open-ended and implying a shared future and past.

Literature for both fields indicates that the most effective way to solidify relationships and build a common vision of the future is through storytelling. Fisher, Ury, and Patton, (1981) called for negotiators to envision what a successful agreement might look like before entering into discussions with other parties to help maintain focus and provide insight into persuasion tactics. To achieve this, Docherty (2010) described the crucial role of narrative and metaphor in negotiation, stating, “in times of crisis or instability, community leaders help people articulate a new vision and move effectively toward making that vision real” (p. 70). To achieve such a vision of the shared future in negotiation, Docherty (2010) argued that parties co-create their reality through a meaning-making process of telling autobiographical stories “that give our lives meaning and share our sense of identity” (p. 24).

In community organizing, Alinsky (1971) challenged organizers to acknowledge the “world as it is” while simultaneously striving for the “world as it should be” (p. 12). Alinsky (1971) further argued that people must first be curious about their situation before they will act toward the vision, and the role of the organizer is to agitate the individual’s complacency by questioning the status quo quo (p. 72). Community organizing relies on a narrative to craft a common hopeful vision of the future and teach people how to exercise agency in the face of uncertainty, because hope inspires creative problem-solving (Tsui, April 1, 2009). According to Ganz (2006d), organizers use dialogue to achieve this vision, with the following:
“Organizers work through ‘dialogues’ in relationships, motivation, strategy and action… so that each contributes to the other” (para. 2). Ganz (2006f) deconstructed the components of a good “personal story” and led training sessions on compelling storytelling for staff during the 2008 Obama presidential campaign. These stories pull together disparate individual accounts to form a shared story and vision of the future based on common interests (Ganz, 2006f).

Furthermore, community organizing and negotiation literature both highlight the principle that relationships are built on mutual trust and respect. In negotiations, progress can be expedited when negotiators value and consider the effects of values, perceptions, concerns, norms of behavior, and mood for each party involved (Fisher, Ury, & Patton, 1981). Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1981) preempted Burton’s (1988) theory of basic human needs when they stated “in some ways people everywhere are similar to one another. We want to be loved, we care about the respect of other people and ourselves, and we do not like to feel taken advantage of” (p. 166). In short, people want to be recognized treated with respect, empowered to make their own decisions about their future, and included in the discussions about potential settlements.

Fisher, Ury, and Patton (1981) further developed the idea of appealing to one’s need to feel respected by emphasizing the importance of recognition in facilitating persuasion, claiming “when the other side feels heard by you, they are more apt to listen to you” (p. 181). Recognition of the individual or social identity of parties can contribute to better relations. According to Alinsky (1971), a common reason for failure in community organizing is that the organizer does not recognize the indigenous leadership of the people and treat them with dignity. Alinsky (1971) stressed the importance of consulting the people and allowing them
to determine the direction of the organization, stating, “when [the organizer] respects the
dignity of the people, they cannot be denied the elementary right to participate fully in the
solutions to their own problems” (p. 123). Fisher, Ury, and Patton, (1981) also spoke of
including negotiation parties in a collaborative problem-solving process, stating “If they are
not involved in the process, they are hardly likely to approve the product” (p. 27). Ganz
(2006a) also highlighted the benefits of including a broader base of constituents, indicating a
shared sense of ownership contributes to more sustainable outcomes.

Community organizing and negotiation literature also share common advice for
effective tactics and strategies to influence the process. In a discussion on community
organizing strategy, Alinsky (1971) advised organizers to use a myriad of tactics called
“mass political jujitsu” to make the enemy live up to its own book of rules (p. 152).
Similarly, Fisher, Ury, and Patton, (1981) asserted that negotiators need to be flexible in
adapting to dynamic contexts, using “negotiation jujitsu” as a way to counter positional
bargaining and refocusing attention on the merits of discussion, or “get parties to play the
game by your rules” (p. 105-112).

For both fields, advanced research on the goals, limits, and capabilities of other
parties may allow for a more advantageous bargaining position in discussions with parties
retaining greater established social, economic, or political will. Sometimes involves
presenting a confidence about one’s absolute power regardless of the relative power to other
parties. In negotiation, Fisher, Ury, and Patton, (1981) said “if you have an extremely
attractive best alternative to a negotiated agreement (BATNA) it is in your best interest to let
the other side know” (p. 104). In a related discussion on alternatives to collaborative efforts,
Alinsky (1971) described power as “not only what you have but what the enemy thinks you have” (p.127). Presenting a confidence in one’s abilities and resources can discourage competitive discussions and encourage collaboration among parties.

In community organizing, where oftentimes the organizer is corralling a marginalized community to rally against a more powerful private organization or civic institution, the use of coercion can seem attractive. Threats made by community organizers to more powerful conflict parties of civil unrest or disruption of services are “usually more terrifying then the thing itself” (Alinsky, 1971, p. 129). However, one must be careful not to appear deceptive or selfish. This may damage trust and can also lead to a deterioration of the relationship.

Alinsky (1971) cautioned that threats must be perceived as plausible or one risks losing credibility in the future. “if you’re ever caught bluffing, forget about ever using threats in the future” (p. 146). Reminding practitioners that joint-decision making through collaboration is most effective in negotiations, Fisher, Ury, and Patton, (1981) advised that threats can harm negotiations by inciting retaliation so “good negotiators rarely resort to threats” (p. 137).

Analysis

A review of literature offering strategic guidance in community organizing and negotiations reveals several areas of convergence between the fields when viewed through a conflict resolution lens. In particular, there is consensus on the importance of relationships building as a foundational activity upon which all else rests. Additionally, strong leadership must recognize and include constituents or stakeholders to establish a sense of accountability and ownership necessary for sustainable outcomes. Similar strategies and tactics are
mentioned for community organizers and negotiators. Lastly, narrative and storytelling play crucial roles in co-creating a common vision of the future around which parties can coalesce.

In sum, according to Fisher, Ury, and Patton, (1981) the ideal approach to negotiation echoes guidance in literature for effective community organizing:

if you understand the other side and they understand you; if emotions are acknowledged and people are treated with respect even when they disagree; if there is clear, two-way communication with good listening; and if people problems are dealt with directly, not by demanding or offering concessions on substance (p. 179).
Data: Interviews

Each interview was scheduled to last between fifteen and thirty minutes and occur face-to-face. However, one interview was conducted by phone and two interviews lasted significantly longer than thirty minutes as the informants offered several allegorical references. After obtaining prior written consent from the informant, audio taping was conducted during the time in which the interview occurred. Interview audio recording files were transcribed by a third-party expert transcriber for more convenient analysis. I then identified and categorized recurrence of particular responses across sample groups to expose common themes and possible areas for integration.

To address concerns of confidentiality in adherence to the stipulations of the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) guidelines for research involving human subjects, I obtained prior written approval from George Mason University before conducting the interviews. Informants were provided with details on the purpose and scope of the research questions in advance of the interview date and given the option to decline audio recording. The digital recording device remained secured in a locked room at my residence and electronic media was password protected on my personal computer (Braunschweiger & Hansen, 2000). Research participants were notified that audio files will be destroyed within four months after transcription, but no later than October 31, 2012. Transcriptions with
personally identifiable information omitted are included in the appendices and will be retained by the researcher in electronic format for one year from the date of the interview.

**Interview Sample Populations**

The purpose of conducting one-on-one interviews was to hear about the informants’ personal experience to learn more about the following topics:

- Definition and understanding of the purpose and objectives of the field of diplomatic negotiations and field of community organizing.
- Founding principles and assumptions of diplomatic negotiations and community organizing.
- Metrics for measuring success in diplomatic negotiations and community organizing.
- Skills needed for effective practitioners in the fields of diplomatic negotiations and community organizing.
- Current duties as related to diplomatic negotiations and community organizing.
- Past experience with diplomatic negotiations and community organizing.

Sample populations were categorized according to the following variables:

- Current diplomatic negotiators holding presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed positions with no previous community organizing experience.²

---

² To increase the likelihood that human research subjects are involved in negotiating at the Track I level, I selected senior level diplomatic negotiators in the U.S. government.
o Current diplomatic negotiators holding presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed positions with previous community organizing experience on the 2008 Barack Obama presidential campaign.³

o Current diplomatic negotiations with holding presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed positions previous community organizing experience other than with the 2008 Barack Obama presidential campaign.

Given my previous professional and personal relationship to many of the participants, the primary recruitment tool for securing interviews with high-level federal employees was an informal email requesting an interview with a summary of my thesis topic and the informed consent form. Specific interview questions were not disclosed until the time of interview.

**Interview questions**

Interviews were designed to elicit personal narratives from the informants’ own experience, with minimal leading or guiding from the researcher. An ethnographic approach encouraged and allowed informants to personally define, measure, and achieve success in community organizing and diplomatic negotiations. Even though, it can be difficult to prevent contamination of data collection. Diamond and McDonald (1996) described the inherent challenge with maintaining objectivity in qualitative research, stating:

³ This category is limited to 3,500 presidentially appointed positions in the U.S. government (O’Keefe, March 8, 2010), with only approximately 1,300 at a seniority level requiring Senate confirmation (White House, n.d.).
Scientists have discovered that the act of watching is itself an intervention in the system that influences the process under study. This is especially true in social systems, where the researchers are related in any number of ways to the people and activities being considered, and where the analysis itself (in this case the act of being interviewed) is an invitation for the actors to step back and consider themselves, something an atom or a molecule in a laboratory test presumably cannot do. (p. 7)

In an effort to minimize the potential for my own perception of the issues to inform or lead the responses, I used an ethnographic approach so informants could ascribe their own meanings and associations within their field. Ethnographic research requires a base assumption of ignorance by the interviewer to extract information from the informants with minimal external influence or pressure.

In a training manual for conducting ethnographic research, the Center for Refugee and Disaster Response (n.d.) cautioned researchers with the following quote from Werner, and Schoepfle (1987): “The formulation of appropriate questions on a given topic is not a trivial matter. In order to obtain a meaningful answer, the ethnographer must first ask a meaningful question” (p. 10). I formulated interviews in a manner that attempts to remove bias or conjecture by asking a series of carefully constructed ethnographic questions, incorporating a blend of descriptive, structural, and contrast questions. Descriptive questions ask the informant to talk about a situation, person, organization, or event so that the interviewer can collect a broad range of data points. Structural questions offer the interviewer examples of how informants organize information in their minds by categories, hierarchies, or other systems. Contrast questions require the informant to compare two or more elements
and highlight similarities and differences, indicating which aspects are important to the
informant. I also used verification questions to restate informants’ responses using their own
terminology, which signifies the importance of the meaning associated with specific words
(Center for Refugee and Disaster Response, n.d.).

**Interview Questions**

1. What is your age, race, and gender?  
2. For the purposes of this study as I have just described it to you, would you consider
   yourself more of a diplomatic negotiator, community organizer, or both?  
3. Can you please provide a brief description of current role in the field and previous
   experience in the field?  
4. How many total years of experience would you say you have in the field?
5. Throughout all that time, how have you acquired the skills to perform well? Did you
   read literature or study it in college? Have you received formal training or
   certification? Did you have a mentor or learn by doing?

---

4 The first question is a basic demographic question designed to provide insight into potential
biases that might arise based on the personal background of the informant, such as gendered
communication styles or ageism. Due to time constraints for the research study and
inaccessibility of the sample population, too few informants are included for any corollary
trends to be verified.

5 Prior to commencing the interview, I provided the informant with an abstract of the topic and answered any
questions the informant might have had about the purpose or scope of the study or interview questions.

6 This question is important to ascertain how the informant views his or her purpose in the current position and
how that perception might be related to previous experience. Every informant was selected because their current
role requires them to officially represent the United States government during negotiations with other countries
or other entities within the United States federal government. However, some informants perceived themselves
differently, and it is their own conceptualization with which I am most interested.

7 A literature review revealed claims that diplomatic negotiators lack formalized training. This questions aims to
reveal the informants’ primary and preferred methods for learning their field.
6. How would you define the purpose, goals, or mission of diplomatic negotiations/community organizing?

7. From your experience, what are the core principles in the field of diplomatic negotiation/community organizing? Meaning how does one have to view the world, or people in general, to perform well in the field?

8. From your experience, what skills are required to practice effective diplomatic negotiation/community organizing?

9. How do you measure success in diplomatic negotiations/community organizing? What are milestones of progress?

10. How do you know when you’ve been successful? What does the end result ideally look like?

Summary of interview data

To increase the likelihood that informants with community organizing experience are familiar with the Alinsky-Ganz model used on the 2008 Obama presidential campaign, all but two (2) informants selected held presidentially appointed positions at the time of the interview. In an effort to obtain fair representation, the sample population includes an equal number of informants with experience in both community organizing and diplomatic negotiations as well as informants with experience in only one of those fields. Similarly, half of the informants are younger than fifty (50) and the other half are older than fifty (50). There are two more men than women informants because both fields of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations tend to be male-dominated professions and it was difficult to locate
women at high enough level of seniority to fall within the parameters of the study. However, there are equal numbers of male and female informants within each profession, so at least representation within the groups is balanced. Lastly, the racial breakdown is less than ideal with four (4) Caucasians, four (4) Hispanics, one (1) African American, and one (1) Asian American.

Table 1
Interviews: Aggregate Demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant #</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Self-identification</th>
<th>Years experience in Diplomatic Negotiations</th>
<th>Years experience in Community Organizing</th>
<th>Trial &amp; Error</th>
<th>Mentor</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Formal Training</th>
<th>College Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Community Organizer</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Diplomatic Negotiator</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>15 combined</td>
<td>15 combined</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Chinese-American</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 combined</td>
<td>30 combined</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Italian-Mexican</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-identification as either community organizer or diplomatic negotiator:

- Five (5) informants described themselves as primarily diplomatic negotiators.
- Five (5) informants described themselves as primarily community organizers.

Overall Age range distribution:

- Five (5) informants were between ages thirty (30) and fifty (50).
- Five (5) informants were between ages fifty (50) and seventy-five (75).
Age distribution for community organizers:

- Of the five (5) self-reported community organizers, two (2) were between ages thirty-five (35) and fifty (50).
- The other three (3) self-reported community organizers were between ages fifty (50) and seventy-five (75).

Age distribution for diplomatic negotiators:

- Of the five (5) self-reported diplomatic negotiators, three (3) were between ages thirty-five (35) and fifty (50).
- The other two (2) self-reported diplomatic negotiators were between ages fifty (50) and seventy-five (75).

Overall gender distribution:

- Six (6) informants were men, with half self-identified as community organizers while the other half self-identified as diplomatic negotiators. Four (4) of the men are younger than fifty (50) and the other two (2) men were older than fifty (50). Two (2) of the men self-identified as Caucasian, and the other four (4) men self-identified as racial minorities.
- Four (4) informants were woman, with half self-identified as community organizers while the other half self-identified as diplomatic negotiators. Three (3) of the women were older than fifty (50) and the other woman is younger than fifty (50). Two (2) of the women self-identified as Caucasian, and the other two (2) women self-identified as racial minorities.
Overall self-reported years of experience in Diplomatic negotiations:

- Five (5) informants reported less than 10 years
- Five (5) informants reported more than 10 years

Overall self-reported years of experience in community organizing:

- Five (5) informants reported less than 10 years
- Five (5) informants reported more than 10 years

Age distribution among self-identified Diplomatic Negotiators:

- Of the five (5) who self-identified as diplomatic negotiators, three (3) are under fifty (50) years and two (2) are over fifty (50) years.
- Of the five (5) who self-identified as community organizers, three (3) are over fifty (50) years and two (2) are under fifty (50) years.

Racial distribution among both fields:

- Of five (5) self-identified diplomatic negotiators, three (3) were self-reported Caucasian and two (2) are self-reported racial minorities.
- Of five (5) self-reported community organizers, three (3) were minority, one (1) is Caucasian, one (1) self-reported multiple ethnicities.
- Four (4) of five (5) who identified as community organizers are racial minorities. The one (1) Caucasian is a member of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community.
• Of informants who identified as diplomatic negotiators, three (3) were Caucasian and two (2) are White Hispanics

Learning styles:
• Eight (8) informants mentioned learn as you go or trial by error; four (4) diplomatic negotiators, four (4) community organizers
• Three (3) of the five (5) community organizers had mentors; diplomatic negotiators don't zero (0)
• Three (3) informants had formal/structured on the job training: two (2) diplomatic negotiators, one (1) community organizer
• Four (4) informants obtained college degrees in related fields: diplomatic negotiators earned degrees in related fields three (3) of five (5); community organizers tended not to one (1) of five (5)

Individual Interviews

For the convenience of the reader a summary of each interview is provided below, highlighting key elements. Complete, unedited, transcriptions are available in the appendix with personal identifying information redacted.

Interview #1

Informant number one is a mature white transgendered woman who works with lesbian, gay, transgendered, and bisexual (LGBT) populations in developing countries, which she described as “diplomatically challenging” (interview, July 19, 2012) because the federal
agency where she works has a public agenda of promoting universal human rights values in countries where LGBT activities are criminalized. Among the core responsibilities of her office is the role of providing “cover” or physical and legal safety through “diplomatic presence” (informant number one, interview, July 19, 2012) of U.S. government officials, while also teaching basic community organizing skills to local LGBT populations through a clear and transparent Democratic process.

In her current role, informant number one serves as a senior level government official involved in international collaborations, although she sees the role as more involved in community organizing. According to informant number one, the mission of community organizing has two main functions: to represent an affinity-based community on a specific issue, or closely-related set of issues, or advocate for a physical community based on a particular geographic location. Informant number one brings 25 years of community organizing experience to the position and has acquired knowledge in the field through mentors and learning “pretty much on the go” (informant number one, interview, July 19, 2012).

According to informant number one, community organizers are motivated by a worldview of respecting the local people and customs and cultures. However, she conceives two types of community organizers: the rare transformational leader who has a particular vision and actively “coheres a bunch of followers around that vision”, and those who impartially facilitate dialogue and create a “deliberative space where a community has the freedom to really articulate what their priorities are, or to weigh out what their priorities are” (informant number one, interview, July 19, 2012).
For informant number one, the end goal is about establishing a sense of resilience within the community through a shared common purpose that is perceived by all as bigger than any one individual. In essence, success is ultimately measured by the quality of dialogue in creating a sustainable process of fair and effective deliberation, which can be identified by the following milestones of progress:

The fact that people are getting together, they are being heard, they’re respecting each other enough to come around some common principles and ideas. I’m there to keep a process healthy and on track, and really as inclusive as possible (informant number one, interview, July 19, 2012).

To achieve this end, informant number one highlights as valuable skills for community organizers the abilities to build consensus, cultivate trust, and persuade groups. Additionally, community organizers need to consider culture and context. Mediation skills can help with defusing conflicts and building social capital, especially when dealing with controversial issues or populations particularly vulnerable to political and legal disenfranchisement.

In contrast, informant number one perceived of diplomatic negotiations as focusing erroneously on a shorter-term vision in order to “prevail” and “get what your country says is what you need” (interview, July 19, 2012). There is an undeniable element of political messaging required to adhere to policies and articulate national interests determined partially by political personalities and partially by incessant power struggles.
Interview #2

Informant number two is a middle-aged Hispanic woman who has ten years of experience conducting diplomatic negotiations on legally binding international agreements with foreign governments to facilitate collaborations in basic science research. Although she obtained an undergraduate and advanced degree in related disciplines and completed some professional training courses, informant number two credits her knowledge of negotiations and skill development to a “sink-or-swim mentality” of learning by doing (interview, July 20, 2012).

Informant number two described the goal of conducting diplomatic negotiations as “trying to get the things that you want” out of interactions with another entity or government while also striving to ensure a “level playing field” by “finding the middle ground where both sides will actually be happy with each other” (interview, July 20, 2012). For her, the desired end result of diplomatic negotiation is obtaining a written, legally binding agreement which all governments involved officially support and enforce in accordance with applicable international laws. To achieve this, negotiators must first accept that they will not get everything they want and should therefore prioritize the most important goals.

Informant number two believes successful negotiators are critical thinking, people-oriented personalities who can read body language in face-to-face meetings to build rapport and create a trusting relationship with their counterparts. Conducting research into the other parties’ background can highlight “what they’re coming to the negotiating table with, what their baggage is” to help one consider limits and be friendly but firm in interactions (informant number two, interview, July 20, 2012).
According to informant number two, negotiation is about joint problem solving with each side offering concessions through compromise and bargaining. Negotiators should approach discussions in a collaborative manner and hold a “view of the world that other people might – or other cultures or other governments may have – ideas or better ideas that you don’t have” (informant number two, interview, July 20, 2012). Negotiators who remain open minded about addressing concerns for all parties through creative solutions will “go further than having a hard line strategy in place” (informant number two, interview, July 20, 2012).

With no experience in community organizing, informant number two initially speculated that major differences between community organizing and diplomatic negotiations include personality traits and mission. Informant number two claimed community organizers must be charismatic leaders who can build trust to get “everybody together to kind of go for a common goal” (interview, July 20, 2012). Community organizers must also accept that it is likely everyone will not be able to get everything they want and open-minded prioritizing is necessary to reach agreements that satisfy most interests. After further consideration though, informant number two indicated she had never thought about her role this way before but stated there may be more similarities than differences between diplomatic negotiations and community organizing, offering the following revelation:

In terms of community organizing, I’m thinking more – maybe it’s just my perception of community organizing – you have a lot of people telling you what they want, and you have to be able to lead them to get them to come up with one idea or one mission. But maybe, now I’m thinking about it, maybe it is the same thing. Because I didn’t
think about me doing the same thing. I have to get the State Department on board.

And the government on board, the scientists. Maybe I do do the same thing.

[Laughter] Now that I’m thinking about it (interview, July 20, 2012).

**Interview #3**

Informant number three is an early career Caucasian man who views his role in diplomatic negotiations as facilitating international science cooperation in energy-related fields to leverage national and foreign resources to accelerate science research through collaborative agreements. With seven years’ experience in international negotiations, informant number three has developed negotiation skills using a philosophy of “learn as you go” that he claims has improved the negotiation team’s methods and inspired other offices to copy the model of his team (interview, July 25, 2012).

According to informant number three, the first requirement for effective negotiations is the view that collaboration is more productive than working independently because it more often results in mutual gains such as shared cost-savings or new discoveries. Additionally, successful negotiators consider the current political agenda, legal parameters, and “relative strengths of each side, and what you have to bring to the table and what the other side has to offer” (informant number three, interview, July 25, 2012). Informant number three believes it is imperative to consult those who are impacted by any potential agreements throughout the negotiation process. Doing so can lead to more sustainable outcomes than simply debriefing them after an agreement is adopted because if there is no support in the community, settlements will fail when parties refuse to cooperate.
Indicators of success in negotiations involve agreement on selecting agenda items and assigning roles and responsibilities. Beyond the immediate context of negotiations, success is also measured by the occurrence of regular meetings between scientists representing all parties. To achieve these milestones, an effective negotiator is skilled in consensus building, has excellent communication skills, appears trustworthy, strives for transparency, and uses a team-oriented approach (informant number three, interview, July 25, 2012).

Even though he has no experience in community organizing, when asked to consider similarities and differences between community organizing and diplomatic negotiations, informant number three suggested that community organizing efforts move at a quicker pace than diplomatic negotiations. One dramatic leader with a personal interest in the issue(s) inspires immediate action through enthusiasm and passion. Meanwhile, diplomatic negotiations typically move at a slower pace and have changing leadership depending on dynamic political climates. Informant number three posited that regardless of stylistic or structural differences in leadership, for both fields, true progress “comes from the people actually doing the work, not the leaders or organizers” (interview, July 25, 2012).

Ultimately, the end goal of any negotiations or community organizing efforts is sustainable outcomes. This is achieved through collaborative thinking and cooperative measures, which informant number three describes in the following analysis:

I think with community organizing, I imagine it to be very, very similar, that it’s basically the same process. You have to have people on board. People have to basically have the same goal that you have. You have to build consensus. You have to
have, get the people actually doing the work to be involved from early on, so they can give their input to the process and so they don’t feel like, later on, they’re stuck with doing something that they don’t want to do. And I think it probably takes the same, you know, has all the same skill sets: teamwork, working together, communication. So I think it’s basically – I think they both mirror each other (interview, July 25, 2012).

Informant number three repeatedly emphasized the importance for both fields to include stakeholders or constituents from the beginning of the process to encourage the ownership and accountability necessary for achieving sustainable outcomes.

Interview #4

Informant number four is a Hispanic man in his forties who represents the United States government in efforts to improve educational attainment levels for the Latino community in America. His office convenes meetings around the country to provide updates on relevant federal policies and programs while also learning about the needs and concerns of the local residents. Specifically stating this work is not diplomatic negotiations, informant number four categorizes his role as both community organizing and “community-to-state” negotiations (interview, July 12, 2012).

Informant number four described community organizing and negotiations as inherently intertwined and inseparable because, “the goal of community organizing, in some sense, is for you to be at the negotiating table” (interview, July 12, 2012). Estimating fifteen-
years of combined experience in both fields, informant number four developed skills through academic concentration, personal experimentation, and mentors.

Informant number four conceptualizes a strategic approach of marshaling financial and social capital to build a power base for establishing legitimacy and authority to enable negotiation from a position of strength. This preparation includes seeking or offering policy recommendations, solidifying support from allies, and researching background contexts, constituents, and interests of the parties. Most importantly, however, is the need for community organizers and negotiators to view the process as an exercise in compromise. This outlook can produce outcomes in which all parties leave “better off than when they came in”, even if it simply results in a better understanding of the underlying concerns or motivations of other parties for use in future discussions (informant number four, interview, July 12, 2012).

Inspired by early exposure to community organizing efforts around immigration legislation, informant number four pursued a career motivated by “working toward a world of social justice” that offers a “public voice and persona” to marginalized populations (interview, July 12, 2012). Nonetheless, informant number four criticized naïve idealism, stating that striving for the ideal world of opportunity and equality requires more than simply providing people with the right information and trusting them then make the best decisions. Additionally, negotiators must have empathy and consider the interests of other parties. Negotiators will be “terrible” if they allow their egos to become inflated behind closed-doors and fail to include their own constituents in the process (informant number four, interview, July 12, 2012).
According to informant number four, success in both fields requires reflective practice and progress is measured by “wins and loses” (interview, July 12, 2012). Therefore, emphasis should be places on strategy, with clear expectations and definitions for the desired outcomes, acceptable alternatives, and failures. Lastly, informant number four claimed current tactics are quickly becoming outdated and “irrelevant” because increasingly in international relations “negotiating is not going to happen between states, per se, or institutions and states, but is going to happen between movements and states” and those with negotiation authority or legitimate leadership will not be easily assigned or determined (interview, July 12, 2012).

Interview #5

Informant number five is an Asian American man nearing retirement who also views community organizing and negotiations as fields so inter-related that they cannot be separated. With approximately thirty combined years’ experience in community organizing and high-level negotiations, informant number two currently leads an office whose mission is to address local workforce issues of access and training for employment by building relationships with faith-based organizations and other community organizations to connect federal support resources.

While informant number five was in seminary school, an adviser referred him to community organizing training to complement his constant struggle for justice and equity in the world. Informant number five received training directly from several of Saul Alinsky’s
deputies working in a Chicago faith-based organization. He still remains close with his mentors forty years later as they now lead various national grassroots organizations.

For informant number five, the bottom line goal in community organizing is to improve the quality of public life. Community organizers must have a long-term vision and strive for the ideal society, which informant number five described as the following:

…people can have healthier, livable communities. It is public life, civic life, whatever you want to say, whatever you call it. Everybody prospers. The goal is to get to a win-win situation that everybody can prosper in their community and their society (informant number five, interview, July 25, 2012).

Similarly, informant number five believes that negotiators should also consider the long-term context of discussions and potential outcomes. Although in his experience, many negotiators fail to do so in practice and risk prematurely returning to the negotiation table over failed solutions. Additionally, critical analysis and honesty impact credibility, which is also crucial to sustainable settlements. Identifying milestones of success in each field revolves around measuring levels of engagement among participants. Recurring meetings and active discussion indicate continued interest in the relationship. Joint-problem solving techniques mark progress toward compromises that maximize mutual gains.

Informant number five ultimately decided that community organizing and diplomatic negotiations are more similar than they are different from one another. The major distinctions are the scope of the issue or solution and the number of involved parties. Practitioners in both fields need to have a basic understanding of conflict management. The best performers develop excellent active listening skills with a feedback loop of restating and asking
questions to clarify areas of potential confusion. Successful community organizers and
negotiators “do their homework” but also remain open to “new learning, new understanding”
(informant number five, interview, July 25, 2012). They recognize personal knowledge gaps
and skill limitations and seek guidance or assistance instead of wasting time and energy
trying to work through problems alone.

Interview #6

Informant number six is a Hispanic male representing the U.S. in international
financial negotiations. He has two and a half years of diplomatic negotiations with an
additional 10 years’ experience in financial negotiations as a lawyer and banker. Noting that
it can be difficult to define diplomatic negotiations broadly, informant number six described
his current position as seeking to “advance and protect the interests of your country”
(personal communication, July 12, 2012). With an Ivy League education in related
disciplines, informant number six described himself as “unapologetically Keynesian” and
supports government spending to stimulate economic growth⁹ (personal communication, July
12, 2012).

Although he has extensive formal education and training in negotiations, informant
number six believes the best way to learn negotiation strategies is to practice in real world
situations. It is equally important to master both the process and substance of negotiations.

⁸ Informant number six did not approve audio recording to avoid cumbersome bureaucratic approval processes. As such, a transcription is not provided in the appendix.
Learning techniques and strategy can influence how negotiations are conducted. While understanding the technical aspects such as legality, economics, and history of parties contributes to the quality of discussion and implementation of potential agreements.

According to informant number six, diplomatic negotiations can be quite transactional. At times negotiators must “play hard ball” to accomplish their goals (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012). Other times, it is wise to work on establishing rapport with other parties to gain information on their goals and limits. Everything is subjective and situational, so negotiators must always consider context.

Informant number six cautions that even while researching the issues and other parties, negotiators should enter discussions with the understanding that it is impossible to have “perfect knowledge” (personal communication, July 12, 2012). He recommends negotiators remain skeptical of other parties and assume they are not being forthcoming. As a result, one should also remain somewhat guarded and not reveal all information upfront. However, it is important to maintain a balance to prevent dissolution of trust and damage relationships. Experience and practice help parties develop an intuition for how to navigate these aspects of negotiation. Negotiators who do their homework to understand the details of negotiations are less likely to be embarrassed by more knowledgeable counterparts, miss opportunities to gain advantage, or require face-saving measures when inadvertently agreeing to detrimental terms.

According to informant number six, negotiators need to be clear about what their bottom-line goal is. They have to be ready to walk away instead of agreeing to terms less appealing than their best alternative. Effective negotiators appear confident and are not easily
intimidated by the status or demands of other parties. They display a “poker face” when bluffing and call others on their bluffs (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012). There is also a fair amount of psychology in diplomatic negotiations. Negotiators perform best when they can read body language, employ strong listening skills, and wonder about other parties “what makes them tick?” to understand the strengths and weaknesses of each side (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012).

Given the contextual dynamic of diplomatic negotiations, informant number six advised that success may center on strengthening relationships in preparation for ongoing discussions, or “feeling like you got the best possible deal for my [sic] side” (personal communication, July 12, 2012). Either way, if negotiators start off discussions “too hard line, or get greedy” they are “probably going nowhere” (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012).

Turning to community organizing, informant number six speculated from observation that the purpose is to work with communities lacking power who need help challenging policies impacting them “because they’re not sure how to do it” (personal communication, July 12, 2012). Organizers empower people to advocate on their own so outcomes can be sustainable. Informant number six perceives these communities as being a “captive audience” or “very receptive” (personal communication, July 12, 2012).

Similar to diplomatic negotiations, informant number six suggested community organizers need to do homework to understand the legal and political aspects, identify problems, and propose solutions. For community organizing, informant number six places a stronger emphasis on building relationships through persuasion in order to win the trust of
the people and get them to "take a leap of faith" (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012). Organizers must “appear to be one of them” and really listen to establish credibility for why “they should follow you” (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012).

Finally, informant number six noted that community organizing is more about building and strengthening the organization long-term than resolving a specific issue in the present. The focus is on “institutional goals” of organizing and empowering the group to learn from mistakes and redouble efforts when they fail or hit obstacles informant number six, personal communication, 2012). Success in community organizing is about “getting the establishment to do whatever it is you want them to do; maybe not all but most important things” (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012).

Interview #7

Informant number seven is a late career Caucasian man who comes to government from private sector with thirty total years of experience negotiating deals, primarily around issues of operational budget and program funding between his organization and government officials, both domestically and internationally. He views negotiation through the lens of the science and technology industry. For him it has been a means to secure resources necessary to accomplish goals related to advancing research and development.

While he did take some training courses in management and negotiation early in his career, he indicated most of his knowledge of conducting diplomatic negotiations has occurred through trial and error, saying “You learn as you go, more or less” (informant
number seven, personal communication, July 30, 2012). He places an emphasis on relationship building and trust as the keys to performing well in negotiations, stating:

> It seems to me one of the things that’s most important in negotiations is what kind of relationship you establish in the discussion with people that you’re negotiating with. If you make that an adversarial relationship, you’re dead. And you’ll probably never get anywhere. If you can manage that relationship so that it is on a friendly basis, you have infinitely better chance of getting something done (informant number seven, personal communication, July 30, 2012).

As such the skills identified as necessary for a negotiator are: articulate communication; strategic timing with raising issues, offering concessions, and making demands; understanding one’s own goals and limits in advance; and “an ability to keep your wits about yourself” (informant number seven, interview, July 30, 2012). Informant number seven defines success in diplomatic negotiations as accomplishing a pre-determined goal, but cautions that it can be slow, iterative process. Negotiations may require continuous meetings, focused on one issue at a time and addressing objections by other parties, until the desired result is achieved. According to informant number seven, “Sometimes you make a little progress, and you go back, and you make a little more. And you finally get there. It can be a very gradual thing” (personal communication, July 30, 2012).

Without personal experience in community organizing, informant number seven speculated that a community organizer must display excellent public speaking and communication skills and have an outgoing and charismatic personality to be able to handle larger groups of people than are typically involved in diplomatic negotiations. The challenge
here is to maintain the support of the community by identifying “what the community is really interested in” and incorporating those elements in the end goal, rather simply “selling it to the community” (informant number seven, personal communication, July 30, 2012).

Acknowledging that compromise is necessary because it is rare for one to get everything they seek, informant number seven describes success in community organizing as getting some or most of the end goal achieved, even if through an alternative option than originally proposed as long as it satisfies the same needs.

Informant number seven surmised that an essential component to community organizing is identifying and including the interests of the affected community for successful implementation to any final resolution. Upon reflection, he decided this is also the case when conducting diplomatic negotiations in his current role, offering the following testimony:

We have some of that, in a sense that our scientific community has to be behind us. If we don’t have them behind us, we aren’t going anywhere…[Laughs]… So they have power to really change what happens here. So you have to watch out, that you see to it that the community stays behind you. And that’s a much broader thing. And that often is an issue of seeing to it that the community is involved in some way. Right? It’s very, very important for them to feel involved in the decision-making process. Just over and over again, that comes through (informant number seven, personal communication, July 30, 2012).

At the conclusion of the interview, informant number seven revealed he had not previously considered himself a diplomatic negotiator, but reflecting on the interview questions shifted his self-perception to realize the majority of his time is spent negotiating.
As a final point, informant number seven reiterated a statement made early in the interview about the importance of relationship building in conducting diplomatic negotiations, both during intra-government preparatory discussions and with foreign governments. He elaborated on the issue with the following statement about his experience entering the Washington, D.C. political and government spheres from a background in private corporations:

…the important thing is to know people. The more people who know you and think of you as being an okay person, the better off you are. [...]What I found, the longer I’ve been here, the more I know more and more people…and it just helps. When I first got here, nobody knew me, and it just was very painful, because they all were suspicious. And that has changed over the three years. It’s much better now. I can go to people and talk to them honestly and not have to worry about it. And that’s a big change. And it was true of – internally and externally (informant number seven, personal communication, July 30, 2012).

Interview #8

Informant number eight is a 42 year old male of mixed ethnic heritage, including Mexican. Even with substantial experience representing a transnational governing body in post-conflict reconstruction, informant number eight identifies more as an international community organizer than a diplomatic negotiator. Informant number eight unintentionally became a practiced community organizer during college when he started mediating violent disputes between local gangs. Later, he entered the realm of international diplomacy by
happenstance when he was recruited to a large international organization by a personal friend. As such, his knowledge and skill base came from immersion and exposure as he observed seasoned practitioners, and his repertoire expanded with each experience.

Working in the field with local communities struggling to rebuild in the wake of violent conflict, informant number eight emphasized the need to assume cultural ignorance as a basis for respecting the indigenous knowledge and leadership. No amount of formalized training at headquarters can fully prepare one for the dynamic social and political sentiments on the ground. Informant number eight criticized diplomatic negotiators for struggling to remain open-minded, resourceful, and adaptive to changing contexts. He claimed community organizers achieve better results because they tailoring strategies and tactics to each situation though a “willingness to listen and understand that the community that you’re there with knows more about what they need” (personal communication, August 3, 2012).

According to informant number eight, both fields require patience, humility, perseverance, and an understanding that the process can take longer and move slower than one might desire. Community organizing requires a more flexible and organic approach that is responsive to the goals of the local people. Diplomatic efforts operate in a more formalized structure so negotiators need to be aware of established protocols, legal guidelines, and policies on limits or minimum demands.

Success in either field is difficult to define for informant number eight. Progress in community organizing can be measured by the process of “showing people how to use what they’ve got to get what they need to get for their own community” (informant number eight, personal communication, August 3, 2012). In diplomatic negotiations oftentimes there is a
mandate to achieve or enforce policies, but “goalposts tend to move” so it can be difficult to measure progress (informant number eight, personal communication, August 3, 2012).

Lastly, informant number eight stressed the importance of diplomatic negotiators and community organizers working on similar peacebuilding issues to collaborate together. Outcomes are more sustainable when practitioners of each field recognize the merits of the other and share best practices. Informant number eight described the ideal team approach to international peace-building and conflict reconstruction involving diplomatic negotiators and community organizers as the following:

When they’re both able to work together and understand each other’s roles, I think you have a more successful operation. But when they’re working in isolation and don’t take the time to understand each other or - at the least, or are in antagonistic relationship, then you’re not going to see much movement. (personal communication, August 3, 2012).

Interview #9

Informant number nine is a mature African American woman with over twenty years combined experience in community organizing and negotiations. She is currently responsible for engaging communities in information exchange sessions regarding U.S. diplomatic efforts. Her office focuses on “pulling people together and making them see a message, put a message out there, and buy into it” (personal communication, August 1, 2012). Informant described herself as mostly self-taught through years of participation in social movements and political campaigns, beginning with the Women’s Rights movement of the ‘70s.
According to informant number nine, the purpose of community organizing is “to influence people, institutions, and ideology, and bring those folks, people, entities to the conclusion you want them to have, whether that’s in public policy or politics” (personal communication, August 1, 2012). She links it to diplomatic negotiations and believes in theory the two fields are complementary. Describing a synergy between the two fields, informant number nine claimed they are “the best tool we have” because “you can make progress, you can resolve issues, and you can give folks a better understanding of how to achieve their aspirations” (personal communication, August 1, 2012).

For informant number nine, both fields require a belief in universal human rights and a compulsion to aid vulnerable populations. She encourages practitioners to put themselves in the place of others and be intentioned about promoting cross-cultural understanding. Even so, informant number nine is clear about the importance of unwavering conviction in these ideals, stating that “we can have strong diplomacy, strong community organizing, across the globe, based on our values and our principles. And we don’t have to sacrifice those in order to be effective in the world” (personal communication, August 1, 2012).

Informant number nine cautioned that dealing with such emotionally and politically charged topics requires a great sense of humor and respect for different cultures. Cultural awareness is particularly essential in diplomatic negotiations. Informant number nine advised that above all else, “you have to be sensitive, and respect each nation and group of citizens, people’s cultures” (informant number nine, personal communication, August 1, 2012).

Informant number nine defines success in both fields with quantitative metrics. Numbers are necessary for measuring progress: “number of students, college students; the
number of thought leaders; and the number of grassroots voters that we literally touch \(^{10}\) (personal communication, August 1, 2012). In community organizing, this can be achieved by outreach to populations that have previously been excluded from discussions. In diplomatic negotiations one can identify progress when there is a positive response from other parties.

**Interview #10\(^{11}\)**

Informant number ten is a mid-career Caucasian woman with decades of experience working on nuclear nonproliferation issues. She holds an advanced degree in international relations and negotiation from an Ivy League university and has between two and three years of experience conducting diplomatic negotiations in the U.S. federal government.

The goal of diplomatic negotiations for informant number ten is partially about representing a national agenda of “put[ting] forward a position that you’re representing” and partially about obtaining concessions from the other side or agreeing on a way of going forward (informant number ten, personal communication, July 12, 2012).

Informant number ten believes it is difficult to produce a universal definition of success in diplomatic negotiations because it depends on context. What may constitute success varies from one situation to the next. However, general signs of progress include reaching previously determined interim standards or goals.

---

\(^{10}\) In this case, a “touch” is a personal contact such as a face-to-face meeting, email, or phone communication.

\(^{11}\) Informant number ten was unable to approve audio recording due to the sensitive nature of the work conducted in the office. As such, a transcription is not provided in the appendix.
Successful negotiators demonstrate effective listening skills and identify from the beginning clear and reasonable expectations about the desired goal. They also understand the limits of what can be offered or demanded by both parties and exhibit courage and tenacity to remain focused on the objective when facing obstacles.

While informant number ten has no community organizing, she speculates it is “very similar” to diplomatic negotiations (personal communication, July 12, 2012). She described both fields as “search[ing] for ways to work together” using persuasion to get “people to get to a place that you want them to get to” (informant number ten, personal communication, July 12, 2012).

Although she identified several commonalities between community organizing and diplomatic negotiations, informant number ten advised me to focus more on individual personalities of negotiators and organizers and place less emphasis on the process. She cautioned that personality traits are oftentimes major contributors of success or failure in diplomatic negotiations and declared “some people are predisposed” to perform well in this type of work, independent of the tactic or strategies used (informant number ten, personal communication, July 2012).

Analysis

In general, informants revealed they had not previously been asked to reflect on the nature of their work in this manner. Several interview informants expressed that the exercise was personally and professionally enlightening. At times, I watched as some informants
formulated conclusions about their accumulated experience to which they appeared, at times, genuinely surprised.

All of the informants identifying as diplomatic negotiators have no community organizing experience. Informants with any experience in community organizing self-identify primarily as community organizers, even if their current position involves diplomatic negotiations and even when the number of years’ experience in negotiations is similar or equal to years of experience in community organizing. This suggests that the experience of being community organizer is incorporated in one’s sense of identity; it becomes who one is, rather than what one does. Multiple informants with experience in community organizing and diplomatic negotiations indicated the two fields are so similar and interconnected that it is difficult to distinguish or separate them. However, a determinant factor may be number of years’ experience in community organizing, because all informants self-identifying as community organizers reported twenty (20) or more years’ experience in community organizing, except one person. It is possible these informants might identify as diplomatic negotiators if they had more years’ experience in diplomatic negotiations than in community organizing.

In general, informants from both fields lacked formalized training, instead developing their expertise primarily through trial and error over the years. This finding is consistent with previous research highlighting a lack of formalized training for diplomatic negotiators.

Although, it was viewed by informants as an asset, and none of them expressed concern about a lack of formalized training or offered any major criticism of the content or availability of formalized training. Diplomatic negotiators were slightly more likely to have
pursued academic studies in related disciplines, while community organizers typically named one or more influential mentors throughout their career as their original source of knowledge on the topic.

For convenient analysis, verbatim responses have been categorized and compared side-by-side in tables below:

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews: Definitions of Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Organizing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Helping them to learn the basic skills of community organizing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Establish a clear and Democratic process, a transparent process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Trying to negotiate with an entity that has more power than you to get to the negotiating table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Try to find a just outcome for all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Figure out what the community is really interested in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Trying to empower a group to get something done and in a sustainable manner so that it benefits their community in a positive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
\textit{Interviews: Purpose of Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose/Mission/Goal</th>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Representing a specific issue, or closely-related set of issues</td>
<td>● Get what your country says is what you need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Advocating for a particular geographic location</td>
<td>● Clear agenda is not to find the common good between you and them; it’s to prevail in what your understanding of national self-interest entails.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Build social capital</td>
<td>● Show them the most powerful, the most organized, the most coordinated, the smartest and the well-resourced as possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Get people to trust one another enough so that they can cohere as a community</td>
<td>● Negotiating from a position of strength and that you’re not there asking and trying to get people to give you stuff from a position of weakness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achieve certain outcomes (for a common goal)</td>
<td>● Find a short-term solution to the table, and stay at the table, while looking at leadership long-term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Serve the community</td>
<td>● Seeking a just society that treats its employees, as well as nations, fair and equitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Build consensus</td>
<td>● Get money for budgets and things like that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Vehicle to give a public voice and a public persona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Organize the resources (e.g. people or money) that we have to give us additional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Getting a strategy, getting policy recommendations, making sure that allies that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are behind us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Establish legitimacy and authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Working toward a world of social justice and opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Improving the quality of public life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Get to a win-win situation so that everybody can prosper in their community and their society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Influence people, institutions, and ideology, and bring those folks, people, entities to the conclusion you want them to have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Universal human rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Capacity building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4  
*Interviews: Principles of Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles/Worldview</th>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic Negotiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● No particular strategic self-interest in the outcomes: just have a stake in the quality of the coherence, the process, the deliberation</td>
<td>● You really have a very big stake in a particular set of outcomes and values</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Focus on long-term relationships</td>
<td>● Relationships are important</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Understand that the process is not always going to move just because you’re there trying to move it</td>
<td>● It can be a very gradual thing; an iterative process of taking one issue on at a time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Requires a flexible approach to grow organically; you don’t want to have too much of the protocols, too much of the formality.</td>
<td>● Understand pre-established structures and protocols within which one must operate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Strive for inclusion, respecting the local people, customs, and cultures</td>
<td>● You’re not negotiating for yourself; you are negotiating for a constituency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Working towards a sustainable future</td>
<td>● Shorter-term vision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Don’t have to sacrifice values and principles in order to be effective</td>
<td>● Don’t have to sacrifice values and principles in order to be effective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Bring people are getting together, they are being heard, they’re respecting each other enough to come around some common principles and ideas</td>
<td>● Prefer team approach over strict hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Motivated by disparities and disequilibrium in power</td>
<td>● View of the world that other people might – or other cultures or other governments may have – ideas or better ideas that you don’t have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Value human rights</td>
<td>● Requires an open mind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Focus on fairness and effectiveness of the process</td>
<td>● Must prioritize demands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● A sense of commitment</td>
<td>● Willing to engage and create a relationship with other parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Foster sense of ownership in the people actually doing the work so they don’t feel like, later on, they’re stuck with doing something that they don’t want to do</td>
<td>● View that collaboration is better than going it alone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Takes a lot more time (than diplomatic negotiations)</td>
<td>● Understand the strengths, goals, and limits of all parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● View the world as it is while striving for the world as it should be</td>
<td>● Be aware of relevant laws and regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Be aware of current political climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Understand entire context/environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Leadership cycles in and out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Negotiations are always a give and take</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● You always gain more about the other party’s perspective than you had before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Strategy part is really important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Multiple dimensions and layers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You have to be willing to compromise on what the community wants, too. It’s not just a question of selling it to the community.

- Advocating for underrepresented or marginalized communities
- Organizing is dirty and gritty, not glamorous.
- You lose more than win, most of the time; you go two steps forward and five steps backwards

- The right people at the table will find the solution
- You always end up having to compromise; very seldom do you get everything you want
- The more people who know you and think of you as being an okay person, the better off you are.
- Dialogue is important to creating shared understanding
- Put yourself in the place of others and promote cross-cultural understanding

Table 5

*Interviews: Skills of Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>Open-minded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Team player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>Communicating very clearly and explaining all the details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking skills</td>
<td>Ability to talk to people in an articulate fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good listening/feedback skills</td>
<td>Good listening skills/feedback skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship-building</td>
<td>Relationship-building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical analysis</td>
<td>Critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict management</td>
<td>Conflict management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You really need to be a mediator</td>
<td>Humble/modest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>Great sense of humor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great sense of humor</td>
<td>People-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charismatic/outgoing</td>
<td>Willing to ask for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to ask for help</td>
<td>Ability to adapt strategy in real time if current action is not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasive</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to adapt strategy in real time if current action is not working</td>
<td>Friendly, but firm rapport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendly</td>
<td>Being critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-minded</td>
<td>Read their body language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to prioritize</td>
<td>Research their background, what they’re coming to the negotiating table with, what their baggage is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation/enthusiasm</td>
<td>Building consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion for justice and equity</td>
<td>Honest/trueful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term vision</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to develop leadership in others</td>
<td>Know and represent your constituency’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to handle large groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perseverance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
principles
● Set clear expectations about what’s a win
● Identify and learn from mistakes
● Ability to help people think through what they’re wrestling with.
● Resourceful
● Ability to keep your wits about yourself
● Understand what you can/not concede
● Ability to put things on the table at the right time
● Re sensitive and respect each nation and group of citizens or cultures
● Ability to negotiate with people from all levels

Table 6
*Interviews: Defining Success in Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Success/End goal</th>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic Negotiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Creating, facilitating, or supporting resilience.</td>
<td>● Agreement that both sides are willing to sign and have their governments back up under a legally binding agreement in international law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Sustainable outcomes (if the community is interested in it, they want to keep it going)</td>
<td>● New discoveries/advancement of the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● When they finally can agree to something that says they’re both winners</td>
<td>● Joint publications.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Bringing in groups that heretofore had really not been included in any of our outreach</td>
<td>● Cost savings attributed to collaboration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● When they finally can agree to something that says they’re both winners.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Accomplish pre-established goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Bringing in groups that heretofore had really not been included in any of our outreach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Enforcement of mandates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7
*Interviews: Indicators of Success in Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of progress/Measuring success</th>
<th>Community organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the dialogue.</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>● People are actually working together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s something bigger than the</td>
<td>● There’s something bigger than the individuals. There’s a sense of common purpose here.</td>
<td>● Both sides are having internal preparation meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>individuals. There’s a sense of</td>
<td>● People are all aligning themselves around a set of issues that they think define them, or define their mission.</td>
<td>● Deciding what topics to talk about, and assigning roles and responsibilities on each side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common purpose here.</td>
<td>● Level of engagement.</td>
<td>● Level of engagement (energy level, as well as level of questioning).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Attendance (people show up to meetings).</td>
<td>● Attendance (people show up to meetings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Number of people and how many times you’ve touched them, and through how many means.</td>
<td>● Continuous meetings until you get to where you want to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Number of media outlets across the country covering our work.</td>
<td>● Positive response from the other side.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General consensus among informants echoed literature emphasizing the importance of relationship building with a long-term vision of achieving sustainable outcomes by including stakeholders or constituents in the process from the beginning. Additionally, informants mentioned similar skill sets required by community organizers and diplomatic negotiators, including: effective listening and communication skills, open-mindedness, trustworthiness, critical analysis, conflict management, and relationship building. Informants also shared some overlapping worldviews or guiding principles of effective practitioners in both fields, namely that teamwork and collaboration are the most effective approaches. Ultimately, a majority of the informants independently concluded that the two fields are more alike than they are different.

Recurrent themes throughout the interviews paralleled literature promoting the need for collaboration and joint-problem solving between parties for successful negotiations.
Those with community organizing experience expressed personal motivations of social justice and equity that carry into their work with diplomatic negotiations. Informants from both fields suggested that in either field, personality traits and political agendas can influence the process and outcomes more than mastery of specific strategies or tactics. Taken as a collective, the informants indicated that the major differences between community organizing and diplomatic negotiations revolve around the scope of issues or settlement and number of participating parties. The areas of greatest divergence are in the initial purpose and the final definition of success. This suggests that while the goal of community organizing and conducting diplomatic negotiations is different, the processes for achieving that goal may be similar in both fields.
Data: Online Survey

Online surveys were created through Surveymonkey.com, a world leading provider of web-based survey solutions. The site uses SSL encryption and multi-machine backup to keep data secure. In accordance with Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) guidelines for ethical considerations of research involving human subjects, the informed consent form was incorporated in the online survey as question number one (Braunschweiger & Hansen, 2000). Informants were asked to indicate their agreement to the terms of the informed consent form by checking the appropriate box at the bottom of the form. Otherwise, survey responses are not linked to informants directly. Participants were not able to view the survey unless they agreed to participate according to the terms outlined in the informed consent form. Participants were not able to view the identities or responses of other participants. Participants were not able to view or change their own responses after submission. I was the only person able to view responses through a password-protected data collection spreadsheet.

Surveys were distributedelectronically using a link sent through a combination of email and Facebook private message. I sent an initial email to fifty (50) people with a link to the survey and a brief outline of the purpose of the study, including an electronic version of the informed consent form. To increase the likelihood that respondents were familiar with the Alinsky-Ganz model of organizing, I selected randomly from current staff members of the
2012 Obama presidential campaign and previous employees of the 2008 Obama presidential campaign across the country. Recipients were blind copied and therefore unable to view who else had received the invitation to participate in the survey. I followed up two weeks after the initial message with a reminder message to the same group of people encouraging those who had not yet completed the survey to consider doing so.

Surveys were designed to take no more than twenty (20) minutes to complete. Surveys consisted of four (4) demographic questions, one (1) question quantifying respondents’ experience in community organizing and diplomatic negotiations, and four (4) primarily open-ended questions about respondents’ perceptions of each field. Questions invited respondents to use their own experience in defining and measuring success in community organizers and diplomatic negotiators. Questions were formulated to encourage a broad range of responses with the goal to elicit personal narratives highlighting the individuals’ experience in community organizing or diplomatic negotiations.

---

12 I used SurveyMonkey certified questions to minimize bias: http://help.surveymonkey.com/app/answers/detail/a_id/5166/session/L2F2LzEvdGltZS8xMzQ3MjkxMTg5L3NhCmV0aXN0LXN0aWxlLXNlc3Mtb3JnLWNvbnRlbnQtc3RhdGVTdWJhbGx5LW1hbmQtd2VuZG9ycw==/.
Online Survey Sample Populations

The purpose of conducting an online survey was to hear about the respondents’ personal experience to learn more about the following topics:

▪ Definition and understanding of the purpose and objectives of the field of community organizing and field of diplomatic negotiations.

▪ Founding principles and assumptions of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations.

▪ Metrics for measuring success in community organizing and diplomatic negotiations.

▪ Skills needed for effective practitioners in the fields of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations.

Sample populations were categorized according to the following variables:

 o Active community organizers currently who are either currently or have been previously employed by the Obama presidential campaign and do not have previous experience with diplomatic negotiations.

 o Active community organizers currently who are either currently or have been previously employed by the Obama presidential campaign and do have diplomatic negotiations.  

---

13 In this case, experience with diplomatic negotiations may refer to participation as either a negotiator or observer – typically as a junior-level presidential appointee in the Obama Administration.
Online Survey Questions\textsuperscript{14}

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)\textsuperscript{15}

3. Please indicate your gender:

   Man

   Woman

   Transgendered

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the
   category which identifies your ethnicity:

   Hispanic or Latino

   Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select
   the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more
   than one:

   American Indian or Alaska Native

   Asian

   Black or African-American

   Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

   White

\textsuperscript{14} (Gonzalez, R., May 11, 2012)
\textsuperscript{15} Questions 2-4 are basic demographic questions designed to provide insight into potential biases that might arise based on the personal background of the respondent such as ageism, gendered communication styles, or trends in cultural conceptions. Due to time constraints for the research study and inaccessibility of the sample population, too few respondents are included for any corollary trends to be verified.
6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

   Community organizing

   Diplomatic negotiation

7. How many years of experience do you have in the following fields\(^\text{16}\)?

   0-1 years
   2-5 years
   6-9 years
   10-15 years
   15-20 years
   More than 20 years

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

   Community organizing

   Diplomatic negotiation

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields

   Community organizing

   Diplomatic negotiation

\(^{16}\text{The range of years yields a degree of uncertainty in the results because it remains unclear whether responses for the first option (0 to 1 year) have and experience or no experience. The question was structured in this manner to limit responses to a more manageable range as well as to produce quantitatively measurable data points.}\)
10. Using your own experience, please describe the types of previous personal or professional experiences that might help someone perform better in the following fields:

- Community organizing
- Diplomatic negotiation

Summary

Out of fifty (50) people originally contacted, thirty-nine (39) respondents started the survey. Of those who started the survey, only twenty-four (24) actually answered all questions for a completion rate of sixty-one and a half percent (61.5%). It is unclear why so many participants exited the survey after agreeing to the terms in the consent form but before answering any questions. I would speculate that informants may have perceived the questions as intrusive or estimated the amount of time to complete the survey to be longer than they could afford to commit.

Among respondents who did complete the entire survey, a majority of those with zero to one (0 to 1) year of diplomatic negotiations did not provide responses to questions about diplomatic negotiations. There is no way to know the rationale for this decision since there were no specific instructions advising respondents to skip questions. Perhaps these respondents would be inclined to perceive previous experience in the field as a benefit to diplomatic negotiators. One could argue that it is a leading question introduces a degree of bias and uncertainty. Even though it is open-ended simply by asking it and listing the two fields next to each other, I am manufacturing an association in the respondents’ mind and increasing the likelihood that respondents will answer in a manner to confirm my hypothesis.

Refer to appendices J-GG for complete responses.
respondents felt unqualified to address the topic, worried about negatively impacting the integrity of my data, or simply did not have time to think about it and only answered questions for which answers came easily to them.

Respondents to the survey are significantly younger than interview informants. All respondents are between ages twenty-six and thirty-seven, except one (1) outlier who is sixty-eight years old. Ages cluster in the mid-twenties with seven (7) people who are either twenty-six or twenty-seven years old and another twelve (12) people between ages twenty-nine and thirty-three.

The older age of interview informants corresponds with the fact that most of them hold presidentially appointed positions required Senate confirmation because such positions require extensive experience. On the contrary, given the young age of survey respondents it appears one can begin practicing community organizing from an early age. This is evidenced by the fact that a majority of respondents with more than five self-reported years of community organizing experience are younger than thirty years of age. What is not clear from this data is whether younger people are more likely to choose community organizing than diplomatic negotiations as a career field.

Analysis

Several respondents submitted identical answers for community organizing and diplomatic and some respondents submitted answers for both fields that were not identical, but quite similar. Overall, the answers submitted by community organizers parallels main themes of

---

19 Refer to Appendix I for aggregated demographic data presented in table format.
the interviews with diplomatic negotiators. Survey respondents generally perceive community organizing to be about empowering marginalized populations to challenge the status quo in hopes of improving the local quality of life. Respondents tended to emphasize relationship building and viewed diplomatic negotiations as requiring compromise rather than using power to impose one’s will through coercive methods. They also indicated that community organizing requires flexibility, empathy, and passion. According to survey respondents, negotiators should be knowledgeable about process and substance and use rational appeals to logic.

For convenient analysis, responses have been categorized and compared side-by-side in tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose/Mission/Goal</th>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating formal neighborhood structure to be activated when certain goals need to be accomplished</td>
<td>• Creating relationships with people that involve strategy, compromise, and logic to avoid war/death</td>
<td>• Bringing countries together to solve their own issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing people together to solve their issues</td>
<td>• Bringing countries together to solve their own issues</td>
<td>• Help nations or other large scale entities identify root causes of conflict between them, propose solutions, and moderate the adoption of the solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help people individually or collectively recognize barriers to their own fulfillment and develop strategies to address</td>
<td>• Help people recognize the value of collaborating and working in tandem with others</td>
<td>• Resolving common problems through dialogue &amp; informed decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help people recognize the value of collaborating and working in tandem with others</td>
<td>• Working with community to improve quality of life for the whole</td>
<td>• Process by which two parties can come to a deal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with community to improve quality of life for the whole</td>
<td>• Bring together the most number of people of eligible voters to exercise their vote in the upcoming elections</td>
<td>• Zero sum game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring together the most number of people of eligible voters to exercise their vote in the upcoming elections</td>
<td>• Organizing community groups to help beautify local communities.</td>
<td>• Working with opposing entities in an effort to achieve a goal that seeks compromise from both parties, often at odds over the subject matter at hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only way to produce lasting change</td>
<td>• Only way to produce lasting change</td>
<td>• Ability to get resolution on a contentious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

*Online Survey: Purpose of Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation*
• Educate, involve and arm individuals with the tools to advocate for change
• Educate citizens on voter rights.
• Support the election of political officials (local, state, and federal officials)
• To gather people in the community and work together to achieve a common goal, often something tangible that will directly benefit that particular community
• Give people the enthusiasm and energy to work together toward the common goal.
• Ability to empower community to effect and impose their collective will on an issue, candidate, or initiative
• Work for change
• Engage in conversation- together
• People with a common interest working together to build power and affect a change within their community
• exerting force over actors that hold power
• Increased community awareness
• To empower people in a community to act in order to change things they find wrong in that community.
• Building a network of people from the community who are invested in improving it either through small or large goals.
• To help a community engage in the issues that affect the community
• To bring people and resources together, who share something in common, in an organized manner, and they work together to achieve a goal
• Political, Community Resources
• Giving people the tools to work together to address common challenges/meet common goals - usually in opposition to some more 'powerful' entity

---

issue by using official channels set up first, second, or third parties
• Facilitate change, movements, needs
• People with different interests working to build a consensus that benefits both sides.
• Courting favor from actors that hold power
• To achieve a mutually desirable outcome with another organization or country
• Building relationships, bridges and compromises to try to resolve points of conflict and work together in a way that benefits both sides.
• Bring peace to nations
• Negotiating terms for conduct or behavior in a way that is respectful to differences in cultural norms and expectations
• Helping powerful individuals or entities to address common challenges or conflicts
Table 9  
*Online Survey: Skills of Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic Negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Build relationships/coalitions**</td>
<td>• Building relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Patience **********21</td>
<td>• Patience ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Read people</td>
<td>• Read people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-reflection</td>
<td>• Self-reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enthusiasm/passion ***</td>
<td>• Enthusiasm/passion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vision*</td>
<td>• Flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interpersonal **</td>
<td>• Practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication ********</td>
<td>• Resourceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge of existing resources/</td>
<td>• Knowledge*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resourceful **</td>
<td>• Insightfulness *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Insightfulness</td>
<td>• Creative*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creative **</td>
<td>• Critical thinking/Analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenacity/perseverance</td>
<td>• Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flexibility/adaptability *</td>
<td>• Diplomacy/political correctness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organization/well organized ****</td>
<td>• Policy expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initiative/Drive</td>
<td>• Psychological techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diplomacy*</td>
<td>• Inner confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding/empathy**</td>
<td>• Negotiating *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Compassion **</td>
<td>• Listening*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Practical</td>
<td>• Knowing desired result in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Honesty</td>
<td>• International relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership **</td>
<td>• Cultural traditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social</td>
<td>• Intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowing issues in advance *</td>
<td>• Well-reasoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discipline *</td>
<td>• Careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Charismatic</td>
<td>• Strategic *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hard-working/determination</td>
<td>• Great communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Savvy</td>
<td>• People skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to get people to work with you and for you*</td>
<td>• Ability to get at the heart of the issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to build consensus</td>
<td>• Build common ground and mutual beneficial situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Familiarity with being inclusive, engaging</td>
<td>• Conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resilience</td>
<td>• Diligent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To limit the range of responses to a more manageable number, responses containing synonyms for a word already listed were combined with the first occurrence of the concept. This process involves some interpretation by the researcher and therefore introduces a degree of uncertainty about the accuracy with which the grouping represents the intent of the respondent.

Some answers were submitted by multiple respondents. In every case, the number of asterisks indicates the number of additional mention of the word that precedes it. For example, “patience” was mentioned as a skill for community organizers 9 times, so there are eight asterisks after the word.
- Understanding of power and strategy for exerting force over actors.
- Persuasion*
- Public speaking/eloquence
- Stamina
- Cultural understanding
- Competency
- Ability to simplify complex processes
- Disciplined
- Ability to sell and convince
- Poise
- Context knowledge
- Perseverance
- Leadership
- Understanding
- Problem solving

Table 10
**Online Survey: Defining Success in Community Organizing and Diplomatic Negotiation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Organizing</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create &amp; sustain structure for community motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Completion of task or considerable movement toward it *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quality of life indicators *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Physical and tangible success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Concrete change within a community (a church built, a ballot measure defeated, a unionization of a steel plant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Issues and actions agreed upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Finding one voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased knowledge of issues and/or development of community action to address subject issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Review post-organizing state of community and if community remains committed and organized after then job is successfully completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reached immediate goals and core infrastructure to meet future goals and trials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Long-term or short-term goals over a select period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working with others within and beyond reach to engage in a united conversation and effort by accomplishing goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set the ultimate goal (winning an election, stopping a store from being built), determine how you would quantify a &quot;win&quot;, create a plan for benchmarks along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diplomatic Negotiations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Avoid war/death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Completion of task or mutual agreement on movement toward shared goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Resolution of common problem through compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Usually not measurable/results seen years later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Whether one achieved a better deal than status quo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- All parties equally satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Better relations and understanding among involved entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Both parties will find some fault with the results- each side gives a little to achieve a better result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reach resolution, without both sides feeling they got screwed over too badly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Can be measured on smaller gains, if necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- May be getting someone to meet with you, but on a larger scale- shifting their minds, getting buy-in, at least engaging in conversation may be enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mutually agreeable solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This is more about end game - did the parties involved come to an agreement? How you get there probably matters less.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positivity, clear vision, clear goals, eagerness to teach/train/develop others, an attitude of service, leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leave a negotiation with a common</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the way that would indicate progress towards that ultimate goal, get to work mobilizing stakeholders to work towards that goal.

- Achieving organizational goals
- Winning an election, changing the tone of a topic
- When the people you have organized are doing it on their own. Also known as "organizing yourself out of a job"
- Building a core group of people who can function with or without financial and institutional resources and attempt to make changes. Achieving your goal is less of an indicator of success as much as your ability to come together and work towards a clear goal. Clear message, goals and leaders are a sign of success as well.
- The community engages in activities to better themselves and their community
- When the organized group achieves goals that benefit the community over a period of time and are sustainable
- Number of people reached and the number of people reached that also reach out to others
- Organizing a diverse group of people with otherwise diverse interests to, for a time, pursue a similar goal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficial previous experiences</th>
<th>Benefit to Community Organizing</th>
<th>Benefit to Diplomatic Negotiators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previously living or working in the area where now organizing</td>
<td>• Previously living or working in the area where now negotiating</td>
<td>• Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background in (Social) Psychology*</td>
<td>• Administrative work</td>
<td>• Administrative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative work</td>
<td>• Database</td>
<td>• Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database</td>
<td>• Logistics</td>
<td>• Logistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>• Campaigning</td>
<td>• Campaigning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaigning</td>
<td>• Advocacy</td>
<td>• Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>• Social work/non-profits ***</td>
<td>• Cultural anthropology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

*Online Survey: Beneficial previous life experiences for Community Organizers and Diplomatic Negotiators*
- Ministry
- Formal training or apprenticeship in community organizing
- Marketing/sales
- Management
- Organization
- Patience dealing with different personality types
- Ability to easily move on from mistakes
- Competing in sports
- Public speaking
- Personal impact/consequences of the issue at hand
- Direct connection with issue/person (candidate)
- Volunteer work
- Voter registration
- Religious activity
- Student and/or local government
- Researching what the community wants/needs before you get started
- Engaging unlikely listeners
- Telemarketer/cold calling
- Being fearless and outgoing
- Relationship building
- Follow-through and follow-up
- Never giving up
- Lawyer (fighting for justice)
- Some sort of intense experience with little sleep and high stress
- Background in game theory, background in theater/literature, robust understanding of history
- Team management,
- Teaching
- Being a parent
- Planning a wedding, founding a club, being disenfranchised
- Customer service
- Willingness to compromise
- Ability to read an opponent’s body language and eyes
- Negotiation skills
- Research opponents
- Model UN
- Debate work
- Law school
- Understand all of the political, financial, and personal forces at play with the issue.
- Having an element of relationship equity to build on is key. If you do not, find a trusted third party who has some between both conflict parties and have that person help set the framework for the negotiation.
- If it is the first negotiation, make sure you leave with mutual trust even if the negotiation fails.
- Fundraising
- Management training
- Being a parent
- Teacher
- Political work/experience
- Experience on a lower level of the particular topic
- Shadowing veteran negotiator
CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION

This thesis has focused on comparing core process elements of community organizing and diplomatic negotiation, such as principles and methods. The data suggests several areas of convergence between community organizing and diplomatic negotiations regarding skill sets and underlying principles or worldviews. However, both fields are complex and there are external factors beyond the control of individuals that can influence the process and outcomes. Particularly with diplomatic negotiations, success or failure does not rely solely on training, strategies, or tactics. One must consider a holistic analysis of the context to include power imbalances, personalities, and international law. Full consideration of these factors is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, to ensure a comprehensive and sound research design, I will provide a short analysis.

Kriesberg (1992) discussed a dichotomous view of the theoretical perspectives on successful international negotiations. Some negotiation scholars emphasize the importance of tactics and believe background factors play only a minor role in affecting negotiation outcomes because even in conditions ripe for settlement, negotiations can be derailed by poor negotiator skill and technique. In contrast, a focus on strategy relies on careful examination of the context in which negotiations occur and prudent timing in offering concessions, making demands, or holding meetings. Kriesberg (1992) explained the role of
historical relationships between parties and additional contextual aspects with the following statement:

Background factors strongly influence whether or not a de-escalation agreement is reached […] noting that sometimes aspects of domestic circumstances, relations between adversaries, and the international context together almost compel agreements (p. 123).

In the international realm, power dynamics between governments play a major role in diplomatic negotiations. According to Docherty (2004b), “power comes in many forms, and the motivation to use different forms of power in any given situation is a complex process of meaning making, not just a rational choice” (p. 864-865). Negotiators can choose whether to exert power over the other, as well as the method and degree to which they do.

Those negotiators who use coercive social power are able to “to protect their interests, assure their own well-being, and shape the world around them to their own benefit” (Docherty, 2004b, p.862). This can be achieved through process power to control behavior such as setting the negotiation agenda or including and excluding parties from discussions (Docherty, 2004b). Social power can be strengthened by a negotiator’s reputation for exerting power and making credible threats (Docherty, 2004b) (Honeyman, 2004). Similar to Alinsky’s (1971) claim that threats are about convincing other parties of one’s capacity to fulfill the threat, appearances matter when it comes to diplomatic negotiations. Korobkin (2004) described traditional international negotiation models as being focused on developing bargaining power based on the ability of a negotiator to project a strong BATNA. Exercising
bargaining power requires patience to wait for the appropriate situation and is “as potentially risky as it is potentially rewarding” (Korobkin, 2004, p. 871).

Negotiators can also choose to develop “power with, rather than power over others” (Docherty, 2004b: p. 864). Using collaborative techniques to seek integrative solutions, parties can maximize mutual gains. Docherty (2004) described the creative power approach as “creating new options, expanding the pie, and crafting a win-win option for resolving a conflict” (p.864).

Contrary to criticisms of community organizing in conflict resolution literature, few of the interview and online survey participants identified confrontation as a purpose or goal of community organizing. Instead, community organizers tended to perceive their field as primarily about collaboration and inclusiveness, while suggesting that diplomatic negotiators are competitive and may sometimes seek to win at the risk of damaging relationships.

Another important factor to consider in negotiations is the individual personality of participants. Multiple interview informants advised that the personality and personal values of a community organizer or diplomatic negotiator may be a stronger determinant factor than strategies or tactics in the overall effectiveness of outcomes. One informant specifically recommended that negotiators should study psychology to perform better (informant number six, personal communication, July 12, 2012).

In a corresponding argument, Lull (1969) identified the personal feelings of Heads of States as one of three main factors impacting the progress of diplomatic negotiations.
Arguing that the characteristics of individuals can positively or adversely affect the course of negotiations, Lull (1969) stated:

personal feelings are of profound importance in international affairs; and since it is the most dramatic, delicate, and tense situations that are most apt to rouse feelings, there are few crucial international issues in which the personal reactions of the responsible officials concerned do not have some bearing on the possibilities and practices of negotiation (p. 150).

In parallel to the systems approach of international negotiations and diplomacy outlined by and Diamond and McDonald (1996), Lull (1969) argued that the international community will develop “a genuine and universal respect” for the adherence to and enforcement of international law and be more inclined to seek peaceful resolution to transnational issues (p. 347). The legitimizing of international law could also contribute to the negation of relative military or financial strength as a determinant in negotiations by providing objective criteria for conducting and evaluating negotiations. Several interview informants validated the importance of considering international law in diplomatic negotiations.

Domestic and external political issues can also affect negotiations “as representatives become increasingly aware of gaining constituency support and, in some countries, of achieving formal ratification of any accord reached in negotiation” (Kriesberg 1992, p. 123). Consistent with a populist approach to international relations, careful consideration of timing when offering concession, making demands, and framing issues contributes to conflict resolution by enabling conflicts to mature or become “ripe” (Kriesberg, 1992, p. 148).
Kriesberg (1992) identified the core skills of successful negotiators as the ability to listen to other parties and understand their underlying interests, critical analysis of the conflict to reveal potential mutual gains, and creative problem solving to develop new options and alternatives that may reinvigorate stalled negotiations. Additionally, experienced negotiators employ the following techniques: establishing good personal relations with other parties, arguing against positions instead of individuals, acknowledging emotions, and taking responsibility for one’s own feelings instead of placing blame on others (123-124).

Increasingly, international conflicts are occurring in volatile political arenas with unstable government representation or even non-state actors. In the wake of civil unrest in several North African countries in 2011, international organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are bolstering relationship building activities with the aim of maintaining the safety, security, and stability of the international community (Aliboni, 2011). To that end, Kriesberg (1992) emphasized the cumulative nature of diplomatic negotiations, stating, “partial settlements form building blocks in the construction of a stable, secure relationship insofar as they foster trust and confidence and create vested interests for further integration” (p. 201).

Considering broader contexts of international negotiations, Kriesberg (1992) argued “the use of particular negotiation tactics does not finally determine the success or failure of negotiations” (p. 147). Even so, skillful use of appropriate tactics can contribute to successful resolution in negotiations even during turbulent contexts (Kriesberg, 1992). Basically, negotiators should remain flexible to manage elements affecting negotiations that are beyond
their control, but they should actively address what they are able to control: their own training and behavior.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

This thesis synthesizes seemingly disparate principles and methods of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations into a descriptive model emphasizing largely unexamined links between the two fields related.

The introduction provided an overview of the most salient theories in conflict resolution, negotiation, and community organizing. First, I supported the position that the field of conflict resolution should extend beyond seeking immediate settlement to also address underlying issues that caused the conflict. Then, I explained that negotiation originates from economic-based mathematical competition and transformed to include more collaborative efforts known as joint problem solving. More recently, emphasis has been placed on broader analysis of the context within which negotiations occur. Finally, I discussed the teachings of two prominent community organizers, Saul Alinsky and Marshal Ganz, whose work served as the model for the 2008 Obama presidential campaign and is largely attributed as the reason the campaign was so successful.

Next, the literature review revealed that there is no precedent for examining the integration of community organizing and negotiation principles and methods in the same manner which I have addressed. Existing scholarly research adheres to the assumption that the purpose and content of these two fields are oftentimes in opposition of one another. My
aim was to highlight potential similarities in the procedural, structural, and cultural aspects of these fields.

Investigations into the relationship between grassroots efforts and negotiations highlight the ability of protests, petitions, and other grassroots to influence the substantive discussions or outcomes of diplomatic negotiations by putting political pressure on negotiators. A major argument emphasizes the importance of including nongovernmental organizations in official international governing entities. Others claim the traditional conception of international negotiations has transformed a multi-level system of intervention in which grassroots organizations play a major role. Diplomatic negotiators are urged to recognize the value and expertise across the various levels and collaborate for more effective settlements.

Related research on negotiation as a conflict resolution tool offers poor assessments of existing training for negotiators, claiming that more emphasis should be placed on full analysis of the context within which discussion occur. This includes consideration of historical background between parties, establishing rapport to build long-term relationships, and striving for sustainable outcomes.

I collected my own data through textual reviews of literature in community organizing and negotiation, interviews with senior-level diplomatic negotiators, and an online survey of community organizers likely to be familiar with the Alinsky-Ganz model. Negotiation literature indicates that integrative approaches are most effective at maximizing mutual gains. Two main commonalities between community organizing and negotiations is the need to developing long-term relationships between parties and an emphasis on achieving
sustainable outcomes. For both fields, creating the narrative of a hopeful future creates a common vision that conflict parties can work together to achieve. Evidence shows the best way to accomplish this is through storytelling and involving constituents in the process.

Interviews with senior-level government officials largely reinforced claims by conflict resolution professionals that negotiation training is insufficient and most practitioners learn through trial and error. Informants also echoed the literature by asserting the most successful negotiators build lasting relationships with their counterparts and engage in collaborative efforts to achieve sustainable outcomes. Additionally, most informants concluded that while the initial purpose of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations may at times be divergent, the processes for achieving the end goal are more similar than they are different.

Finally, community organizers in the field completing the online survey demonstrated a belief that community organizing and diplomatic negotiations share similar procedural and structural elements. Providing feedback on their personal experiences and observations, respondents concluded that the skills required, indicators of success, and goals of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations are quite transferrable from one to the other.

Lastly, I briefly examined factors beyond the control of negotiation participants that might influence the process. Success is not as simple as researching the involved parties and employing collaborative tactics. External factors can complicate proceedings and escalate conflicts rather than contributing to settlement, regardless of the intent or will of negotiators. Some of the most common and influential aspects include but are not limited to: international law, political dynamics, and funding for implementation and enforcement.
Based on existing research and the verification of current experienced practitioners, the case is strong for a shift in the way diplomatic negotiations are conceived and conducted. In a global climate of dynamic conflicts a multi-level approach is necessary to address complex issues of international significance. Negotiators must cultivate lasting relationships and have long-term vision to achieve sustainable outcomes. Community organizing is at its core about relationship-building through storytelling and mobilizing constituents around a common vision of the future. With numerous similarities in the principles and methods, integrating community organizing training with training for negotiators is not only possible, it could produce more effective negotiators.

Limited time and relative inaccessibility of sample populations constrained data collection and rendered my analysis exploratory, instead of predictive or causal. Even so, the data presented here suggests that training models developed by community organizers on relationship building through storytelling could be integrated with training for diplomatic negotiators. Further research is needed to substantiate or invalidate a hypothesis that doing so would improve the ability of negotiators to establish long-term relationships and generate sustainable outcomes.
APPENDIX A

Interview transcription

Informant #1 (transcribed by E. Duffy, July 19, 2012):

Q: Okay. We have...
A: Are you looking primarily at women?
Q: No, I was just finding that as I was asking for – as I was looking around at who I knew, it tended to be white males. [Laughter] I was just trying to get a more diverse set of samples. So I started saying, does anybody know women? Does anybody know minorities? Like, I’m trying to branch out and get a more diverse sample set. That’s what that was. That’s why I was asking specifically.
A: Fair enough. Okay.
Q: To make sure my sample wasn’t all the same, you know?
A: One last question, how long? The whole process?
Q: Just the interview? I just have a few questions, so I think probably 15, 20 minutes.
A: That’s fine.
Q: I don’t want to take too much of your time, I know you’re very busy.
A: Just so I have some sense of what’s in store. Let’s go for it.
Q: Okay, great. So for the purposes of the study the way I’ve described it, would you say that your field experience is more of a negotiator, community organizer or both?
A: Community organizer.
Q: Okay, great. And if you could provide me with a brief description of your current work in the field – what are the types of things you’re responsible for, [the duties?] you do? And then touch a little bit upon previous experience, so I have a sense of the total ...
A: Okay, sure. My current mandate is primarily around organizing and facilitating the organization of LGBT groups in developing countries. This is often done in [very? varying?] repressing environments, so just trying to get any sexual minorities in any context in places where it’s criminalized is a real challenge. So it’s a really diplomatically challenging process. Because we have very strong and well-articulated values around human rights of LGBT people, and we’re supportive of their efforts to get organized, and we help align capacity building for them to do this kind of work. So a lot of our – we do two things, one of which is we give them cover. We give them space to meet that they’re not going to get arrested in, because nobody’s going to do that when it’s a diplomatic – I guess you’d call it diplomatic presence, the fact that embassy and <REDACTED> people are there means we’re going to be left alone. Sort of gives them some cover that way. And secondly, it’s traditional stuff that we’ve always been doing with NGOs and CSOs, and that is helping them to learn the basic skills of community organizing. Articulating a mission, and having a clear vision and learning how to advocate and articulate their priorities and how to coordinate within their organization to establish a clear and Democratic process, a transparent process to report out on the work that they’re doing. All those things that are really essentially to a healthy civil society and community group.
Q: Okay. And how many – if you had to sort of look back – how many years would you say you have experience in that field?
A: I was, before, I was a town and regional planner, so I’ve been working with community groups for 30 years around a whole different set... All different sets of issues. The focus on LGBT has really been just the last three years. But it’s really much of the same. I mean, except that that’s my community, so there’s a direct personal affinity with that, with

---

22 At times when the audio was difficult to understand due to background noise or speech patterns, transcriptionist indicates best attempt to capture the possible language used. This formatting continues for all ten interviews.

23 Any words which might specifically reveal the identify of an informant by name, location, or employer has been omitted.
LGBT people. But prior to that, I was much more of a stand-off facilitator who didn’t have a dog in the fight, but was able to be the impartial person from the outside. So it’s a little different now, because I’m – I mean, the fact that I’m a political appointee because I’m LGBT makes me a role model person. That’s why I said it could skew things, because I’m not the impartial person anymore. The very fact of my presence sends a message about this administration’s priorities.

Q: Okay. If you had to put a number to the amount of years that you would call yourself a community organizer, how many years would you...

A: Twenty-five.

Q: Okay. Thanks. Okay, in terms of your training or any literature, have you read literature specific to community organizing, or have you received any formal training or certification? Or was it sort of on the go, learning as you did it?

A: Pretty much on the go. I think I learned the most in South Africa. They’re just masters of this. And I’ve had some really good mentors. I’ve read a number of books, but none of them have been particularly helpful or relevant to what I do. It’s much more learning from – because everything in community organizing is so context specific that the cultural implications of how you coordinate are so overriding in most cases that it’s... Generalizations written by Western people are hard to make a lot of relevance, to see the value in that.

Q: Okay. How would you define the purpose, goals, or mission of community organizing?

A: The primary mission of community organizing is to represent – there’s two things. They’re either representing a specific issue, or closely-related set of issues. Or they’re advocating for a particular geographic location. The people of a village, or of a neighborhood, and a whole range of disparate issues. But they’re either cohered around one or both of those issues. They’re either geographical or affinity-based. They’re both finding, in both cases finding that representative government is not meeting their needs, or even understanding their needs. In some cases there is no representative government they can appeal to. So they’re basically disenfranchised at some practical level, even if they may be
formally enfranchised. And it’s a way to – it’s motivated by disparities and disequilibriums in power. They just have no other significant voice unless they get together.

Q: Okay. Thank you. What do you think from your experience are the core principles or underlying assumptions that a community organizer has in order to do their job as they’re doing it? How they see the world, do you have to, to be a community organizer?

A: The hardest challenge for a community organizer is to serve the community, to not try to be... There’s two different things that happen here. One of which is a community leader, who has a particular vision and coheres a bunch of followers around that vision, and that’s one kind of community organizer. The other kind is really somebody who is there as a very competent facilitator of dialogue, basically creating a deliberative space where people are comfortable to come together. A process by which people’s voices can be respectfully heard. Basically a referee, if you will, of a deliberative space where a community has the freedom to really articulate what their priorities are, or to weigh out what their priorities are. And to really come up with their lead issues and to constantly update those, and then to coordinate what’s going to happen. So that sort of coordinator/referee role is one role. The other is sort of a transformational leader role, which is far less common and often far more difficult. But they both require very special sets of skills.

Q: And so what – and they’re two sort of different questions, right? The core principle, sort of how you view the world, it sounds like you were sort of talking about one of inclusion, one of respecting the local people and customs and cultures.

A: Right.

Q: And that answers the first question. The next question, tied into that, touches on what you just mentioned, the skill sets that are required to do that. And so...

A: I mean, I fit in both of those categories, and that’s what’s interesting to me. I, for most of my career, have been the facilitator. This is not – I’m an outsider, and intentionally so. I don’t have a particular stake in the issues that are being discussed. All I’m concerned about is the fairness and effectiveness of the process of deliberation. The fact that people are getting together, they are being heard, they’re respecting each other enough to come around some common principles and ideas. I’m there to keep a process healthy and on track, and
really as inclusive as possible. More recently, since I’m kind of a role model, as a LGBT appointee, I’m seen more as a leader. [I’m sort of making that up?]. It’s a harder – as a government employee, that’s a harder track to walk. Because I have to be constantly conscious that I’m not here as <REDACTED>, I’m here as the Obama administration, so what I say really has to be absolutely aligned with what the Obama administration says. It can’t just be what I would like to say. [Laughs] So that’s a discipline in and of itself, but it is a leadership role more than just facilitating deliberation. It’s saying, here’s some values that we think are really important. I’m the sort of embodiment of some of those values, I’m a role model. Let’s have a conversation about that.

Q: So then in terms of skill sets, in order to do some of the things you just talked about, it sounds like it would require communications skills...

A: Well, two different... Yeah, two different skill... A facilitator set of skills really requires the ability to defuse conflicts, to be very persuasive around getting people’s concurrence to a process, to trusting each other. You really need to be a mediator. Your whole purpose there is really to build social capital, to really get people to trust one another enough so that they can cohere as a community, and then through that community, achieve certain outcomes. Although you don’t have a stake in the outcomes. You really just have a stake in the quality of the coherence, the process, the deliberation. ON the other side, in this case on the LGBT side, you really have a very big stake in a particular set of outcomes and a particular perspective and values, and you’re there to say, here’s what we think. Not that you must do this, but to be very clear where you’re coming from. These are America’s values on human rights. We feel strongly about them. We will support you if that’s what you – if your values align with ours. If not, we’re not going to support you. And that’s just a black and white situation.

Q: And in that part of it, is there consideration of what I call the end user? The sort of public or the community, as you’re articulating the message or the goals?

A: Oh, absolutely. I mean, we... It’s a sense of commitment, a belief that everyone has equal human rights is the best outcome for everybody. So the fact that you’re committed to that belief and those sets of values, as universal values – not just as American values, but as
universal values — gives you the authority to be making those kinds of statements no matter where you are. It’s the universality argument. If you don’t believe in that, you basically shouldn’t be there. If you’re just trying to push an American set of values that have universal justification, then you’re being imperialistic and imposing, and that’s not what we want to do either. So the whole thing rests on your persuasiveness and conviction these are universal values, and you therefore have a legitimate voice no matter where you are in advocating for America’s position on these universal values.

Q: Okay. So as you’re doing that, how do you — from your experience — how do you know when you’re being successful? How do you define that? What does that look like? What are the signs of progress? And how do you know when you’ve reached your goal, or is there ever an endpoint?

A: Yeah. The best indicator to me is the quality of the dialogue. If there’s dialogue and deliberation that’s really issues-based and not ad hominem or not about personalities, not about power struggles, but is really grasping at issues that are commonly shared, and issues that really affect the greatest number of people there... In other words, there’s something bigger than the individuals. There’s a sense of common purpose here. That’s the strongest indicator that this is going in the right direction, that people are all aligning themselves around a set of issues that they think define them, or define their mission. And it’s clear that what they’re about is in the common good, that everybody gains from this. This is not about one person’s power agenda, this is about a common set of clearly understood and shared values and needs.

Q: So it sounds like — would you say that the success is in the process, [not?] that there is an actual end goal that you have to check off?

A: Absolutely. Yeah. I’m not responsible for the end goal. I have to just trust the process and see where that takes them. In fact, often the intermediate end goals are pretty disappointing, because governments are very repressive around LGBT human rights. I guess the only variant on that would be the end goal of creating resilience or facilitating or supporting resilience. Because a lot of these community groups, by having a good process of
deliberation and dialogue, become extremely resilient to outside pressure that’s negative. So that’s another sort of – could be seen as an end goal, is that they’re sustainable and resilient.

Q: Okay. [Key words?], [sustainable and resilient?].

A: Mm-hmm.

Q: Okay, well that’s all the main questions I have. Do you have anything else that you want to add for me to consider and think about as I’m comparing and examining between the fields of community organizing and diplomatic negotiations and how they may or may not have similarities and commonalities? Is there anything else you think you’d like to ...

A: I think there’s huge differences. Diplomatic negotiations are trying to achieve a particular set of ends that are in a defined national interest. And that may or may not have [a real?] sensitivity to the interest of those on the other side of the table. You’re there to get what your country says is what you need. You’re there to prevail. And you may have to give and take a little bit, but your clear agenda is not to find the common good between you and them. It’s to prevail in what your understanding of national self-interest entails. And this is where we have a different role, as development experts, to diplomats. And often we push back to the State Department, because they have a shorter-term vision, and a vision that’s really ... There’s no good or bad here, it’s just a different focus. Their focus is on achieving national self-interest, as defined at any given point of time. And that very nature of defining national self-interest is that it’s very temporarily based. It’s very short-term, in most cases. So they’re there to negotiate to achieve that specific list of objectives. Now, we’re in community organizing, as development people, really to forward and further development, as broad as that may be. And that’s in everyone’s mutual interest. We don’t have an overriding agenda. There’s no particular – in its purest forms – no particular strategic self-interest. Now, that you could say gets corrupted. That’s not a fair word. But the very nature of us being a government agency means we have some specific national self-interest implications. And our responsibility, then, is to declare those. To say, we are a <REDACTED> agency, but we are also a tax-payer funded government agency. So here’s what we’re coming into this development process from, and these are what our goals are in this. And as long as we’re clear about that, nobody’s upset, they understand that we’re a bilateral, that we have our own
interest as well. But the whole difference here is that, where we wear it on our sleeve. We make it as clear as we can, and we really are very, very willing to negotiate even on that basis. To say, well, you know, maybe we should reconsider what our national self-interests are, in the context of your development. That’s not where a diplomat comes from.

Q: Okay.
A: Okay?
Q: That’s helpful. Thank you. [Recording ends]
APPENDIX B

Interview transcription

Informant #2 (transcribed by E. Duffy, July 20, 2012):

Q: Okay, so first questions are just quick demographic. Age?
A: Oh, are you going to make me do that? [Laughs]
Q: I know, I’m sorry.
A: Forty.
Q: Thank you. [Laughter] You would never know. Race?
A: Hispanic.
Q: Thank you. And so for the purposes of the study as I described it to you, would you describe yourself as a diplomatic negotiator, community organizer, or both?
A: I would say diplomatic negotiator.
Q: Okay. And can you give me a brief description of your current duties in that field?
A: Yeah, I mean, as the <REDACTED>, my job is to coordinate the <REDACTED> international activities, but also be the facilitator in terms of negotiating international agreements with foreign entities, governments, so forth, to provide a framework for the science to be done by the scientists. And those kinds of legally binding international agreements provide safeguards to intellectual property rights, transfer of equipment, transfer of data, exchange of information, holding meetings. Pretty much provide the framework for the two sides to work together, so that’s my job, to work with the governments and make sure that we’re taken care of. That’s one of the main jobs, in terms of diplomatic negotiations.
Q: And do you have prior negotiation experience as well?
A: Yeah. Well, through other offices that I’ve worked in, same kind of thing.
Q: Okay. If you could think about it, how many years total do you think you would say you have in that field?
A: I’d say 10.
Q: Okay. Thank you. Now, have you had any formal training or received certificates, or have you read any literature pertaining to this, or was your knowledge based more sort of on the go, learn as you do it?
A: I would say both. My degrees help. I majored in Russian language and literature, and government and politics, for my undergrad. And then received a master’s degree in international economic policy. And then from there, working in the <REDACTED>, obviously I learned on the go. Kind of a sink-or-swim mentality of working through the different programs that I’ve been working with and negotiating international agreements. But also there’s been some training opportunities as well. There’s a Foreign Service Institute, and they even have negotiating strategy training that you can take in Arlington. So different kinds of activities like that, to keep it up, but it’s mostly on the job training, and seeing how things work, and reading people.
Q: Okay. How would you define the purpose or the goals or the mission of diplomatic negotiations in general? Not just pertaining to the specific goal.
A: It’s working with another entity or another government and trying to get the things that you want out of those interactions, in terms of protections of, like I said, intellectual property, or the interests of the scientists, making sure that they have all the tools needed to do the science and the mission of the <REDACTED>. But yeah, I mean... Yeah, I would say that would be it. I mean, bottom line is, if you don’t have these tools in place... So you’re trying to get what you want by the same time making sure [it’s a?] level playing field with the other entity. So they obviously have their own negotiating strategies, and you have yours, and you need to kind of find the middle ground where both sides will actually be happy with each other, and giving what each side can possibly give up or negotiate on. So it’s an interesting process.
Q: Okay. What do you think are the core principles, or the founding, underlying assumptions that a diplomatic negotiator would have – sort of, how do you have to see the world? How do you have to see people [in? and?] negotiations in order to do the job?

A: Well, you definitely have to have an open mind. And you can’t be the one to think that you’re always going to get everything that you want. So if you have that open mind and know that you’re not going to get everything you want, but you prioritize and you look to see what are the major things that you’re trying to get out of a negotiation... But for sure you can’t have – you have to have more of an open mind and more of a view of the world that other people might – or other cultures or other governments may have – ideas or better ideas that you don’t have. And so if you have that kind of mentality, I think you’re going to go further than having a hard line strategy in place. Especially in this type of work. Now, maybe it’s different with other kinds of negotiations, but the type of negotiations that I do, having that kind of mentality and prioritizing what you want out of it can be very successful, in terms of negotiating with others.

Q: You mentioned success. How do you actually measure or define success? How do you know when you’re being successful?

A: When you actually get an agreement [laughs] that both sides are willing to sign and have their governments back up under a legally binding agreement in international law. So if they’re... If I get a draft of an agreement and I have our secretary or whoever ready to sign it, and their counterpart willing to agree to those terms, than I find that successful. Because then once they’ve signed the agreement, it provides that framework for my scientists.

Q: Okay. So in order to achieve that success – you kind of touched on it, but I just want to get more specific – what do you think are the skills that are required of a diplomatic negotiator, if you had to pick a few?

A: Okay, so obviously open-minded. I would say friendly but firm, because the best negotiations that I’ve had are usually face-to-face, where you get to know the person that you’re working with. You kind of have to do that. I mean, this kind of job is a very people-oriented kind of job. You have to, in some respects, create some type of relationship with the other party. I’m not saying – you know, just having a rapport with them, where they
feel like they can trust that you’re going to negotiate in... You know, with a level playing field in mind, or whatever. But you have to have that kind of personality, where you’re willing to engage them and create a relationship with them. So in some respects, you kind of need to be a people person, I think. Those, I think, are the best negotiators. But at the same time, you have to be firm in what you cannot go past. You know, you have your boundaries. And like I said, having the open mind and being friendly are obviously – those have been helpful for me. And also being – what’s the word? Not taking... Being critical, but at the same time... I’m trying to think of a good word here. Trying to reach people. You have to kind of read their body language, you kind of need to read what their background, what they’re coming to the negotiating table with, what their baggage is. So reading people is a good quality as well. And just being friendly and nice always goes a long way. [Laughter]

Q: Yeah. Okay. Just two more questions.
A: Sure.

Q: So sort of the same – I don’t want to ask them all again, but to get your perspective, even though it’s not your field, the other side of what I’m looking at, the community organizing. If you can kind of – I don’t’ want to ask them all, but just the same kind of things that I asked you – if you can think of, like, the purpose, the goals, the mission, what are the skill sets? From whatever you know about community organizing, what do you think about that?
A: Well, I think you have to be – the purpose is to organize people that may not be...

Getting people together, you’re going to have a lot more clout and power than you are one at a time. So getting everybody together to kind of go for a common goal of whatever it is going to go a long way. A person who actually does that type of work, I would think, is very charismatic. Because you need people to follow you. You have to be a leader. And you have to make sure that they can trust you. So in a lot of sense, you’re using the same type of skill sets in terms of ... Trusting, charismatic, friendly, but at the same time open-minded, because you’re going to get a lot of people wanting different things. Same kind of things. They’re going to come back to you – everybody can’t be happy, so you have to prioritize what you’re going to want to get out of it. What’s the message to go forward? So being able to organize
that for people is – I think would go a long way. And I guess now that you’re putting it to me, there are a lot of similarities, I think. But the difference between… If you’re just doing diplomatic negotiations, like for an agreement… Or, in community organizing, you only have yourself, or your – not yourself, but your mission – to worry about.

Q: In which?
A: In the diplomatic one. For the community organizing, I think you have a mission, but you have a lot of voices. And if you’re not good enough, if you’re not charismatic enough to kind of bring everybody under one idea, then you’re going to have more problems. So I think it’s a little bit more complicated in some respects, I think.

Q: That’s an interesting point. So I just want to clarify, make sure I understand that. As a diplomatic negotiator, when you’re going in to get an agreement, there are presumably people that will benefit or not benefit from the agreement.

A: Yeah.

Q: Is that a consideration in the negotiations? How does that play into it? At all?
A: I guess… No, you’re right. Obviously you have, I guess, your constituents. You’re trying to – you have people that want different things. The State Department might want something. Your scientists might want something else. So in that respect, I can see how that can be… You have to kind of [meld?] everybody to where you say you prioritize what you’re going to get out of it, and what you’re willing to give up and what you’re not. In terms of community organizing, I’m thinking more – maybe it’s just my perception of community organizing – you have a lot of people telling you what they want, and you have to be able to lead them to get them to come up with one idea or one mission. But maybe, now I’m thinking about it, maybe it is the same thing. Because I didn’t think about me doing the same thing. I have to get the State Department on board. And the government on board, the scientists. Maybe I do do the same thing. [Laughter] Now that I’m thinking about it.

Q: Okay. [Laughter]
A: Cut! [Laughter]
Q: No, no, no. This is like the best part. I’m like, yes, she basically said exactly what...
A: Yeah, wait a minute, maybe I do do the same thing. I didn’t think about it that way. It just doesn’t seem like it. Okay. All right, so there you go.

Q: This is perfect. This is what I want to hear without me telling the person that that’s ...

A: Oh, so you got me.

Q: I got you.

A: I’m like, oh, wait a minute, I do have to make sure. But I’m not as charismatic as a community organizer.

Q: Whatever, yes you are. [Laughter] Okay. So that’s my last formal question. Is there anything else that you want to add, that you feel like it’s important for the research to consider?

A: Let me think. I think it’s very interesting research, because I hadn’t thought about it that way. Hmm. No, I think – I mean, you’ve pretty much covered it all. This is going to be interesting. I’d like to be able to read it when you’re done, because it might help me in terms of – you know, I haven’t been asked these kinds of questions, where you actually have to think about what you’re doing and what... You just kind of do it, you know? And you don’t really think about what is it that you’re doing, or how is it that you’re using different skill sets to get it done. So no, I think that’s about it.

Q: Great. Thank you.

[Recording ends]
APPENDIX C
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Informant #3 (transcribed by E. Duffy, July 25, 2012):

Q: So, first question is just a demographic question. What’s your age?
A: Thirty-four.

A: Caucasian.

Q: You say it like I should just know. [Laughter] [Some just say?], like, duh. Okay. And you already answered this, but for the audio, for the purposes of this study, would you describe yourself as a diplomatic negotiator, community organizer, or both?
A: Diplomatic negotiator.

Q: Can you give me a brief description of your current work in the field? Sort of what your duties and responsibilities are?
A: My responsibilities are to facilitate international science cooperation in <REDACTED>-related fields. And I do this by basically enabling U.S. scientists to work with foreign scientists at their facilities and vice versa. And the whole purpose is to leverage our facilities’ expertise and resources and to leverage [foreign?], the same things in the foreign counterparts, to advance science faster than without collaborating. And I do this by negotiating international agreements, and by facilitating or by coordinating and assembling working groups. We have one with Russia and one with the European Union. And I also facilitate this by helping to organize meetings between <REDACTED> officials and foreign officials. And also I do this by coordinating the <REDACTED>, and also other offices that in <REDACTED> involvement in international meetings such as joint commission
meetings, which happen annually between us and other countries as a result of the signing of S&T agreements with other countries.

Q: S&T standing for?
A: Science and technology. And those agreements are signed by the State Department. And so basically the State Department will have an agreement, an S&T agreement, with another country. And basically in the agreement it said that both sides were going to meet every year or every two years. And so what the State Department then does is get interagency participation, so I help to coordinate our participation in those meetings.

Q: Okay. And do you have previous experience as a diplomatic negotiator prior to this?
A: Um... I don’t know, I guess it matters how you define ‘diplomatic negotiator’. I mean, not in the government sense...

Q: How would you define it?
A: But I have negotiated collaborations with foreign counterparts. For example, I had a Fulbright fellowship in Sweden, and for that, [you?] basically have to talk to a scientist abroad and kind of negotiate what you’re going to do together [in science?], you know, what your project’s going to be.

Q: Okay.
A: And similarly for Copenhagen, I did the same. And in Japan.

Q: Okay. So then if you had to sum up the total amount of time in your life that you’ve been working on international collaborations like that, how many years would you say you’ve been doing it?
A: Okay, let’s see. It would be from... I started... So about seven years or so.

Q: And so when you [went on?] the process of learning or as you’re working on building those skills of yours, do you read literature? Have you received formal training or certification? Is it sort of learn as you go? Do you have a mentor?
A: Learn as you go.

Q: Learn as you go, okay.

A: Yeah. Yeah, and [...] actually interesting. It’s learn as you go, and we’ve basically improved our methods by doing that. We found out what works. And actually another office,
like <REDACTED>, they liked how we did our Russia working group, and they want to copy that model.

Q: That’s interesting. Okay.

A: But yes, for me it’s learn as you go.

Q: Okay. And you touched upon this question already in passing, but the concept of, how do you define what a diplomatic negotiator is? What do they do? What’s the purpose, what’s the goal, what’s the mission of engaging diplomatic negotiations? What would you say? I know you kind of talked about what your role is, but sort of in general, how would you define that?

A: I would define diplomatic negotiations as negotiation at a government level what each side is planning on doing, collaboratively, with their foreign counterparts.

Q: Okay. And so what do you think are the core principles or underlying assumptions that a negotiator has to bring to the table about how you see the world? How you see the people on the other side? How you frame things?

A: Well, I think there’s a few things. One is that it’s necessary to have the view that working together is going to be better than going it alone. That’s first of all. You have to first have a good mindset that it’s worthwhile doing international collaborations. It’s also worthwhile understanding the relative strengths of each side, and what you have to bring to the table and what the other side has to offer. It’s also necessary to know what the framework is that you’re working around. For example, legally, what can you do or can’t do? So you have to know about the agreements that are in place. It’s also necessary to know – if you’re working in government – what the administration’s views are, who they want to work with and who they don’t want to work with, and what kind of topics are okay to work with.

Q: So you mean, like, political?

A: Right, right. The political atmosphere. And it’s also necessary to understand if you’re negotiating on behalf of an agency, as in my case, or an office, it’s necessary to know what the scientists and the programs beneath you on the org chart, what they want to do. Because if you go to negotiate and you don’t have the support from the agency program that you’re negotiating with that actually controls the budget... They have to be on board also. And the
scientists have to be on board, because they have to actually want to work together. You can’t just tell scientists, okay, you and you are going to work together and something’s going to happen. Because if they don’t want to, nothing’s going to happen. [Laughter] So it’s necessary to understand how the whole environment that you’re working in, the entire, everything.

Q: The whole context, right? And it has to be voluntary. Okay
A: Right. And other people have to be on board. Other people have to see this as being beneficial.

Q: These other people. And so when you say other people, I kind of call them end users. They could also be called constituents or stakeholders. That’s what you’re referring to? Is that what you mean?
A: Yeah.

Q: Okay, great. And so to accomplish some of the goals and be thinking about some of the principles and the assumptions that we just talked about, what do you think are the most important skill sets that a negotiator needs in order to do this job? Like – well, I don’t want to offer too many, but problem solving, or communication. What are the things you have to be good at?
A: I think that ... Let’s see. I think you have to be good at building consensus so that you can get the people on board who would actually be doing the work. I think it’s also necessary to be trustworthy, so that... Let’s say there’s some scientists who want to work together. They have to trust that when you go into the negotiations, that you’re not going to put them on the line to be responsible for something that they don’t want to be responsible for. So for example, when I go into negotiations to talk about what the <REDACTED> is going to collaborate with some foreign country, and I speak on behalf of one of our office – like <REDACTED>, or one of the others – they trust that I’m not going to commit them to funding some project that they don’t want to fund. So there’s trust. You have to be trustworthy. You have to be able to build consensus.

Q: Wait, sorry. How do you know what the scientists want? How do you go about making sure that that’s...
A: I ask them.
Q: Okay. So you have to have communications with them as well.
A: Yeah. So then – yeah, communications skills is very important. You’re able to very clearly define what’s happening and what this collaboration would look like, so that everyone’s one the same page. So everyone understands what it’s about, what the purpose is, who’s spearheading this effort. So it’s about communicating very clearly and explaining all the details.
Q: Okay. Anything else?
A: Um… It’s also necessary… I’ve found that another skill is having the mindset that we’re all here working together, like as in a team, instead of trying to go it alone.
Q: When you say that, do you mean with the negotiators from the other country, the other organization as well, or within, between…
A: Both, both.
Q: …negotiators and the scientists? What do you mean?
A: Both. In both cases. So on our side, I can just imagine someone who was only interested in advancing their own career and who was kind of more like going out as a loner. That could cause a lot of trouble. Versus someone who wanted to work with everyone, to find out what everyone was actually interested in doing, to make sure everyone was on board.
Q: Okay.
A: So I guess like a team player sort of thing. That’s the skill.
Q: Got it. All right. So then how do you measure success? What are the metrics that you know that you’re heading in the right direction? And then how do you know when you’ve actually reached – is there an end goal? And what is that? And how do you know when you’re there?
A: Mm-hmm. So the end goal is to advance science. So you would know that you did that if, for example, an important, useful joint publication came out. For example, we had a view. There was the recent collaboration in China at Daya Bay, and that’s the neutrino oscillation angle that was discovered recently, and that basically has to do with the
switching from one flavor of neutrino to another. And that was a collaboration where our [hydrophasic?] program collaborated with the Chinese Academy of Sciences at the Daya Bay nuclear reactor. So that came out with a discovery, and that discovery, it costed [sic] us some money, but it costed [sic] us a lot less money than if we went alone and tried to find this out all on our own. So that was a good thing. Another good thing is the discovery, the recent discovery of the heaviest element. I think it’s like number 117, and that was a U.S.-Russian experiment. So basically the outcome that you want is a big discovery, big advancement, and that’s when you know you did things right. And what was the other part of that question?

Q: What are some of the mile-markers along when you’re getting to the end goal, before you get to the end goal, that you know you’re heading in the right direction, you know you’re doing well?

A: You know you’re heading in the right direction if people are actually working together. If the scientists are actually working together. And... Yeah.

Q: Okay. And so part of this also is about community organizing, and I’m trying to get also a sense of what the negotiators think about...

A: And both sides are having meetings, also. That last question.

Q: Okay.

A: So they’re having meetings, things are going on. Like for example, when we negotiating agreements between like the Department of Energy and a foreign ministry, and you know things are going well if you have meetings and both sides agree on the same topic areas, the same areas that they want to explore collaboration. So basically it kind of starts with topics, topics that both sides are interested in. And then it goes to projects later on. So a milestone can be just deciding what topics to talk about, and assigning roles and responsibilities on each side. Like both sides usually designate a person to be in charge of coordinating on each side, who’s not as high-level as the people who signed the agreement – you know, they usually delegate it to someone else. So that’s another milestone.
Q: And when you said that they’re having meetings, both sides are having meetings, do you mean internally they’re having their own working group meetings to prepare for the next big negotiating meeting? Or do you mean...
A: Yeah. That plus meetings between the two foreign, the foreign people.
Q: The negotiators, the scientists, or both?
A: The negotiators. Yeah.
Q: Okay. Okay.
A: Okay, sorry.
Q: No, that’s okay. I appreciate the extra piece, thank you. And so now I’m going to ask you just sort of in general, having not done community organizing, what your sort of perspective is looking out on to it, what that is. So I don’t want to ask every question over again, but sort of big-picture, overall, the purpose, the goal, the skills required? And sort of the success and end result? If you can just think for a minute and give me your perspective of what you think that is, looking at it sort of as an outsider. [?].
A: Okay. So I think with community organizing, I imagine it to be very, very similar, that it’s basically the same process. You have to have people on board. People have to basically have the same goal that you have. You have to build consensus. You have to have, get the people actually doing the work to be involved from early on, so they can give their input to the process and so they don’t feel like, later on, they’re stuck with doing something that they don’t want to do. And I think it probably takes the same, you know, has all the same skill sets: teamwork, working together, communication. So I think it’s basically – I think they both mirror each other.
Q: Awesome. Thank you. That’s helpful. Okay, so that’s the last formal question that I have. Is there anything else that you want to add that you think would be helpful for me to consider, from your experience, or something you’ve heard or read? Or anything related to the overall topic?
A: Well, I was just thinking now that, I think with community organizing, I usually think about it as there being this one dramatic leader, leading the way. Because I think you need a lot of motivation to start some sort of community activity, and I think it probably arises by
someone who’s really motivated and really draws people together, versus... Government negotiations happen at a different pace. Maybe slower. I don’t know. But there’s not one person in government who’s like, we’ve got to do this. We’ve got to fight to get this agreement going. [Laughter] You don’t really have the same sort of personal interests and this kind of, like, enthusiasm and passion that I would imagine would be really helpful for community organizing. So I guess that’s a difference. In the government we all kind of work together and we’re sort of like, okay, this is our job, let’s get it done. And we all work together, and there’s no one leader. We’re all kind of working together.

Q: And the leaders – I guess not in every case, but I know probably in this case, the leaders who would be pushing something kind of cycle in and out anyway, right?

A: Are you talking about community organizing?

Q: No, I’m talking about in diplomatic negotiating.

A: Oh, right, right, right. So in government. Yeah. People are cycling in and out. Right, who leads one effort one time might change to someone else a little bit later on.

Q: [It’s a long?] process?

A: But things... But because [we have?] the scientists working together, hopefully things can keep on going. It’s the same thing with community organizing. I guess even if you were to lose your passionate leader, then hopefully things could still move forward. Yeah.

Q: So it could be self-sustaining?

A: Yeah.

Q: Perfect. Thank you. Anything else?

A: I guess the self-sustaining, that’s kind of an important topic. Because the same thing with government, diplomatic negotiations, if you don’t have scientists who are interested, it won’t be self-sustaining. It’s really that, it comes from the people actually doing the work, not the leaders or organizers. It’s the same thing with community organizing. If the community is interested in it, they want to keep it going, then it will, regardless of who’s leading it, I guess. As long as things are kind of organized in the right way.

Q: And that sounds like it touches back to something you said earlier, where you were saying how the diplomatic negotiators have to be considered trustworthy by the scientists and
not get them into an agreement that they aren’t confident in, or they’re not willing to commit to that. Because if they’re not, they’re going to find some way to not do it, or to sort of slack on it. So what you’re saying now about making sure that they’re, I guess, involved in the process and consulted about the implementation before the agreement’s actually completed can make it be self-sustaining.

A: Right. Right.

Q: Thank you. Just making sure I understand.

A: Yeah. That’s a huge thing, that’s really important.

Q: Great. Okay. That’s it?

A: Yeah.

Q: Thank you.

A: Yeah.

[Recording ends]
Informant #4 (transcribed by E. Duffy, July 12, 2012):

Q: So the first question is [about? sort of?] demographic. What’s your age?
A: 42.
Q: I won’t tell anybody.
A: [Laughs] No, I don’t care.
Q: Race and gender?
A: Male, Mexican.
Q: Okay. So for the purpose of the study as I’ve described it to you, in your current field, what would you consider yourself to be more of? More of a diplomatic negotiator, community organizer, or both?
A: I would definitely say both.
Q: Okay. Can you give me a brief description of your current work and your role now?
A: Sure, sure. So I’m the <REDACTED> of the <REDACTED>. And part of our role is to engage community leaders across the country, to inform them – well, to learn from them what are things that they feel the government should, the federal government should stop doing, should start doing, and should continue doing that increase the educational [attainment?] of Latino students. So this, these suggestions and these informing of leaders of federal programs and policies, that’s a big – the role that we play is we try to inform the leaders of the federal program [and? of?] policies to be able to get their input and recommendations on how we could better improve those programs and policies. And then also to get those leaders who are practitioners in the field from across the country to provide that input directly to the policymakers here in Washington, D.C. So a big role that we play is
being able to do a power [map?] of the country. So we identify who are the key players in the different areas of education in the Latino community. Provide them with as much information as what we’re doing on the federal side, so they could get an idea of what the policy issues are, and then we connect them with the decision makers here in the federal government so they could influence policy. So for us, a lot of it is, we use the principles of community organizing to identify those folks, provide them that information. And then we also employ negotiation strategies to be able to have those individuals sit down not just with the president and the secretary, but also with assistant secretaries, which are those individuals that are actually making those policy decisions on an ongoing basis.

Q: Okay. And what ... You’ve done work in community organizations or [?] negotiations before this as well?
A: Mm-hmm.

Q: How many years would you say both – in diplomatic negotiations?
A: In diplomatic negotiations? Like, state-to-state? No.
Q: Okay.
A: But in community ... But community-to-state-bureaucracies, yes. So I’ve done that for about 10 years. One of the big... So two big areas that I’ve been involved in, that have to do with community organizing and negotiations, are around education and immigration. So the most recent one was that I participated in a community hunger strike in Chicago, where we held the city of Chicago accountable for not providing educational opportunities for Latino students. Which resulted in a huge community organizing effort, and mobilized tens of thousands of individuals and leaders to hold the mayor of Chicago accountable for not building a college-prep school in the Latino community. The end result of that was that the Little Village community in Chicago was able to get a $70 million high school built, a college prep – four, actually, four college prep high schools built. And through a pretty long negotiation process with the city of Chicago, that was able to come to bear and to include some of the latest educational design principles at that time. So that was one of the, that was the most recent piece that I was directly involved in organizing, and the negotiating process. And then actually ended up being a principal of the school.
Q: Wow.
A: Yeah. So that’s the most recent one.
Q: So in total number of years – you say 10 years for both, or 10 years for...
A: No, that one was about a five-year process.
Q: Okay. So if you had to sum up your whole experience, though, would you say that you’ve done negotiations for 10 years [?] five, or is it ...
A: Well, I wouldn’t actually even separate them that much, right?
Q: Oh, okay.
A: Because the goal of community organizing, in some sense, is for you to be at the negotiating table. Right?
Q: Okay.
A: So the community organizing obviously takes a lot more time. And the negotiation process could also be protracted, but most of the time they ... If you’re successful, you’re at the negotiating piece. I’ve been in community organizing efforts that we never got to that piece, because we wouldn’t have the power to get to the negotiating table. But the successful ones, and the ones that have had the biggest impact, in my opinion, it was a pretty long organizing campaign, and then followed by a negotiation period that followed after that.
Q: Okay. So then for you, they’re the same. You don’t separate them out.
A: Yeah.
Q: Then thinking of it in that way, total number of years’ experience in that field?
A: About 15 years.
Q: Okay. That’s helpful, I’m glad you made that distinction. Because that’s important.
A: So my second one was in immigration when I was doing community organizing around immigrant rights, starting in 1996, when the current immigration law passed, IIRIRA passed, which allowed for police enforcements to basically ask individuals for their immigration documentations. And so what ended up happening, in the suburbs of Chicago, there were several police departments that were stopping people that they suspected of being in the country unlawfully and asking them for their immigration papers. And what ended up happening was that many individuals were stopped. Those that happened to not have any
immigration papers for them to prove their status with them, the police officers either
impounded their cars or incarcerated these individuals, and only let them out if families were
able to provide hundreds of dollars for their release. And so I was part of an effort to get the
Department of Justice to investigate and seize this practice in the township of Cicero, Illinois.

Q: Wow.
A: A suburb of Chicago. So that was another effort where it was a pretty long campaign
to first get these individuals to share their story without fear of being deported, and then to
get enough of them to share their story to the Department of Justice officials. Although they
were afraid that sharing the story to the federal government was a big risk to them, because
that was the entity that might deport them. Right?

Q: Right.
A: So there was a huge negotiating process, both – mainly with the community, to get
them to feel safe that they could share this information, and that them coming forward was
not going to lead to their possible deportation. So, but the end result was that the Department
of Justice was able to force the township of Cicero to first acknowledge that they were doing
that, and to put systems in place that would allow community members to monitor what was
going on. And more importantly, I think, for members of that community to feel secure that
they could go to the Department of Justice and other civil rights organizations to denounce
the practice.

Q: That’s interesting, wow. So it sounds like there’s a lot of trust that has to be built up.
A: [It’s all?] [?] [trust? interest?]. mm-hmm.

Q: Okay. So you’ve been doing this for a long time. How did you learn? Have you read
literature? Have you had formal training or certification? Was it sort of something, you had a
mentor, you learned it on the go? How do you get to be good at it?
A: So, all of those things. So I did a lot of studying about it when I was in college. I had
some amazing mentors who basically taught me examples of how it’s done in our
community. I also went at it on my own and experienced a lot of early failures in how to do
it. But I think to me, probably the biggest impression that came to my mind was as a kid,
when I was in Chicago, one of the first memories I have as a child was seeing a human rights
march going through my neighborhood, led by a leader whose name is Rudy Lozano, who was an immigrant rights advocate. And during that time when I was in Chicago, the ICE was doing a lot of raids, deportation raids in immigrant communities. And there was a big wave of fear going on in those communities. And what – and I was undocumented myself, so as a kid, I knew that that was something that was very... That was always something hiding. And that was something that was always possible, right, that me or my family – one day I could come home from school and my family wouldn’t be there, or one day I could get picked up myself, and I wouldn’t be able to go home. But the fact that this individual organized, and was... And created an organization of individuals that denounced that practice and demanded that that stop. And that there were thousands of individuals that took to the street, to basically show that as a community we were not afraid, that we were going to fight back, and that we were going to resist that practice. That, for, me was a very telling moment where it was for the first time I realized that you don’t have to be afraid, you don’t have to live in the shadows, that you could actually be out in the street and you could actually fight for your self-dignity. And that was something that – I think that’s probably the earliest memory I have, of having a public, of being able to have a public voice. Even though, you know, even though for many reasons you are, you tend to have – because you’re undocumented – to try to be a non-public, to be as private and basically almost clandestine, right?

Q: Yes. Yes.

A: As possible. So that’s a huge difference, right? So community organizing, specifically for me as an immigrant, and as an undocumented immigrant, was the vehicle to give me a public voice and a public persona without having to be afraid of my immigration status.

Q: That’s funny you said that, because when I was in Europe – I almost did my thesis on immigration issues in the Mediterranean, actually. And there’s a government entity over there called Frontex that basically... Hold on.

[First recording ends][Second recording begins]

Q: ...so we’re going to pick back up where we left off. Okay. So you touched on some of this already, but more directly, I’ll ask you. How would you define, from your experience,

---

24 Here, the conversation turned into a personal discussion about my Masters Degree program and the selection of my thesis topic. I chose to temporarily stop the audio recording because the aside is irrelevant to the study.
what is the purpose or the goal or the mission of doing community organizing or negotiations like that? And if you can separate them – but you can’t – but ...

A: Yeah. Well, I think in a way you can. So I think community organizing, from my point of view, is... The purpose of it, and the way it’s usually used, implemented, is when you’re trying to negotiate with an entity that has more power than you, right? And usually we talk about institutional power that has to do with organized money, organized resources, has information that the other side doesn’t have. So part of the reason a community that is disenfranchised or doesn’t have that institutional power, the only way they could get to the negotiating table is by community organizing.

Q: Okay. So for you, the reason why they’re related – and you sort of mix them up and intertwine them – is because you have to ... The end goal of community organizing is to get to the negotiating table, so you need to organize before you can get to the table.

A: Exactly.

Q: Okay. Trying to make sure I understand the relationship, from your perspective.

A: Right. Right. And obviously, you know, certain interests need community organizing to be able to go to the negotiating table to make sure you get what you want. And I’m sure – it’s all situational, right? So as an individual, some people, some interests don’t need community organizing to go to the negotiating table, but most of the time, whenever you know that you have to be able to get something from somebody else, the smart thing to do is to embark on a community organizing strategy before that so you can go to the negotiating table from a position of power.

Q: Okay.

A: And again, and because – just thinking about the Latino community or the immigrant community, very often community organizing is used to be able to organize the resources that we have to give us additional power. And most of the time, that resource is people. Sometimes it has to do with money. And also sometimes it also has to do with getting a strategy, getting policy recommendations, making sure that we have our allies that are behind us. But that’s kind of in-line with people. So when we go to the negotiating table with the other party, the other interests, they see us as the most – at the most powerful position that we
could possibly be at that point in time, so that that other entity is able to see... The goal of you is to show them the most powerful, the most organized, the most coordinated, the smartest and the well-resourced as possible, so when you negotiate, you’re negotiating from a position of strength and that you’re not there asking and trying to get people to give you stuff from a position of weakness. Right? Because nine times out of 10, the reason you’re at the negotiating table is because people don’t want to give you something.

Q: So it’s sort of a way to build legitimacy?
A: Well, the way I see it is it’s a way to build authority. Right?
Q: Okay.
A: So the way I see it is, I always feel... And you know, it could be moral authority, or it could be other types of authority, but you want to be able to be at the table where your position needs to be taken seriously.
Q: Got it.
A: And you could have a legitimate concern, but may not have any authority around it.
Q: Okay. Now what about the negotiation aspect of it? What about when you’re at the negotiation table? Or even for negotiations that don’t require community organizing, where it’s more formalized?
A: Yeah. Yeah, yeah.
Q: What about that? What would you say would be the purpose, the goal, or the mission of those types of negotiations?
A: So I think with those types of negotiations, right, negotiations are always a give and take. And then obviously I think a purpose – from my point of view – is that the purpose of those negotiations is for people to come to an agreement where both parties are able to leave a negotiation table being better off [than?] when they come in. Right? And I don’t necessarily think ... I’ve never really necessarily felt that it’s been, I won something and I lose something. Because I don’t think I’ve ever been in those type of negotiations. The negotiations that I’ve been in is, I’ve either received more than I … I’ve always left with more than what [I got in?]. But more importantly, I think that you’re always – to me – you always gain more about the other party’s perspective than you had before. And you... In my
opinion, most of the time you could only gain that perspective through the negotiation process. Right? Because you could get a lot of – I mean, before you go to a negotiation stage, you get as much background on what their positions are and what their interests are, and who they’re beholden to, and all of that stuff. And theoretically, you could come up with an argument and what their issues are. But until you actually get to the negotiation table, you get a more clear picture of what those interests are based on what they’re willing to give and what they’re not willing to give. Because those things become a lot more clear. Because oftentimes, you’re surprised. That the thing you think is the one thing they’re not going to give you, is sometimes the thing they give you right away, and then they refuse to budge on something else. Where you’re like, wait a minute. [Laughter] That’s the easy one. What are you talking about?


A:  But again, you really never know what those things are, even if you do all the research beforehand, until you get to negotiation. So you win something, but you also, I think, get a better perspective of what the other party’s interests are. And to me, I’ve always wondered if there was a way to get to that without going through the negotiations, because then you’re able to get a better perspective on things. But I don’t really think you can. Right? But I don’t know. That’s a question I’ve always had. Maybe somebody has an answer to it. But yeah, so those are the two things that I think you get out of. You get more out of it, and then you get a better appreciation of what the other party’s interests are and concerns are and values are, and all of that stuff.

Q:  Okay. So [we?] kind of touched on this a little too, but I’ll ask it again more directly. So what do you think are the core principles, or, like, the underlying assumptions that one has to have about the world and how it works and your role in the world in order to do the work of a negotiator and of a community organizer? How do you have to see the world? How do you have to see people?

A:  Yeah.

Q:  How do you have to approach things?

A:  Yeah, yeah, yeah. So I ... Well, that’s kind of your worldview on things, right?
Q: Yeah.
A: So I think that part of what... So there is the world as it is, and the world as it should be, right?
Q: Mm-hmm.
A: And I think that you should always have a vision of what the world as it should be. And I think that most of the community organizers that I’ve worked with, and the school of community organizing that I belong to, is that...
Q: What school is that?
A: Well, you are working toward a world of social justice, right?
Q: Okay.
A: That you want to make sure that people have opportunities. That the work that you’re doing, that you’re going to be able to sustain. You’re working towards a sustainable future. That you want to make sure that you’re eradicating the –isms that plague and, I think, undercut our human dignity. I mean, those are the – that’s kind of the world as it should be, and I think that it’s very important to understand whether, what those values are. And I think that’s the worldview that I have, and I think that’s the worldview that a lot of people who get into community organizing... At the same time, you also need to be very clear about the world as it is, and how the power dynamics play out. What are people’s interests? That I think the mistake – I know I made this mistake, but I think the mistake that most community organizers make in the beginning is that they think that if you provide people with the right information, that they’re going to make decisions based on the right information. Right? If only people knew the research, people are going to change X and Y. And that doesn’t happen.
Q: And so what about –

[Second recording ends]²⁵ [Third recording begins]

Q: [?], I’m going to have two more quick ones that are very, almost the same. And then just for negotiations as well, what would you say are the sort of way that you have to see the world? Is it different, or is it the same?

²⁵ At this point, the interview was momentarily interrupted by a person unrelated to the interview or research study approaching to speak briefly with the informant.
A: No, I think it’s a little different. I mean, I think that – to be honest I think that the way that you need to see the world from a negotiation standpoint of view, you kind of need to see the world from the other person’s point of view. I think this is where empathy is pretty important, because you will be a terrible negotiator if you’re only thinking of your own interests. You have to think of the other person’s interests. But at the same time, one of the things that – again, this is something that’s rare, right – is you also always have to be mindful that you’re not... Is [allowing? aligning?] your ego. You’re not negotiating for yourself. And that you are negotiating for a constituency, whatever that constituency is. And so you almost have to make sure that those demands or that those principles that your constituency hold dear, that those are not compromised. Right?


A: And the difficulty about negotiations is that, because they’re based ... They’re usually done in a room with a small number of people, and they’re done in closed doors. It’s very easy – and good negotiators do this – it’s very easy to play up people’s ego, because then people are able... People are sometimes forced to make concessions based on their ego versus based on the constituencies.

Q: Yep.

A: And so as a negotiator, you need to make sure your ego issues are straight. And you also need to make sure that you are able to channel and communicate and know your constituency’s principles, because that’s basically what guides where you draw the line and what you’re willing to do and not do.

Q: Okay. And then just quickly, how do you measure success along the way? And what are the skills that you need to get there, to get success?

A: Sure. Yeah, sure. So obviously, I mean, the measuring of the success is pretty simple. It’s all about wins and losses. So you have to be able to be very clear up front with yourself and your constituency what’s a win. And the reason why that’s super, super important is because many people sacrifice a lot when they do community organizing. That they need to know and feel when there is a win, so that’s something that’s really important. The other piece that’s also really important is that people need to be... [Electronic noise.] Oh, so that’s
how it sounds. [Laughter] I just got it today. People need to be very intentional about recognizing those wins. And then also analyzing and being very honest when you lose. Right? Because obviously whenever you lose, you need to be very honest about it so people can know what mistakes were made so then you could correct those mistakes. And chances are you’re going to have to try it again, right? And you’re very aware that that’s what you need to do, and you try to negotiate again at some point in the future. But the measure of success is very simple, right? Wins and losses. And then also people need to be very well aware and understand what they need to do whenever they lose. And then they also need to know that when they’ve won, people need to feel good about those wins.

Q: Okay. That’s pretty much all the questions I have.
A: That’s it?
Q: [?] that you think it’s important for me to consider?
A: I mean, I think – I think that the strategy part is really important, in terms of being able to think about the strategy. And the thing that I would ask people to deemphasize is the tactics, especially around community organizing. The thing that I think is basically going to – well, not only will, but has revolutionized this whole area is the whole, like, social media, the Arab Spring, all of that stuff. Where now negotiation – I mean, you know, things are almost determined before you even go to the negotiating table, in a respect, because things happen so fast and things are out in public. So again, I’m just thinking about the big movements that are happening right now that ... The question wasn’t if Mubarak was going to leave, the question is, when is he going to leave?
Q: [laughs] Right.
A: And how powerful the military’s going to take its role. And all of this was happening in a broad arena, right?
Q: Yeah.
A: So I think... So the question for me is, for considering is, how is this going to continually play out in international relations where the negotiating is not going to happen between states, per se, or institutions and states, but is going to happen between movements and states? That hardly... I mean, that’s a new field, right? So that’s why I’m saying that the
tactics right now are almost irrelevant, because they’re almost so 20th century that the strategies are actually right now really, really important. Because they’re all about movements, right? And very few people right now actually are experts in movements. But that’s really what I think the next thing is, that people really need to consider movements. Which is a little bit different than community organizing, right?

Q: Yeah. Yeah.

A: So, to me, how does it go from community organizing to movements to negotiating? Right? Because that’s ... So one of the challenges that movements – again, we’ve seen this. One of the challenges that movements have is around leadership. [Laughs] Right? So who’s going to do the negotiating? Right? Where again, when you have, for example, the PLO negotiating around the Middle East, it was very clear who was negotiating. Now, with movements, that’s not very clear. So that’s something that I think is ... To me, that’s the interesting part of what we’re experiencing right now.

Q: That is interesting. And that’s definitely something to keep a look at. Thank you. That’s going to be helpful for me to [think about?]. That’s it. I appreciate it.

A: Cool. And what...

[Third recording ends]26
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26 The formal interview ends here so audio recorded was terminated. Additional conversation was unrelated to the interview or research study and was therefore unrecorded.
APPENDIX E

Interview transcription

Informant #5 (transcribed by E. Duffy, July 25, 2012), Part 1:

Q: The first question’s just a demographic question, your age, race and gender.
A: Age, race and gender. Sixty-two, Chinese American, male.
Q: Thank you. And then for the purposes of this study, as I sort of described it to you already, would you call yourself currently more of a diplomatic negotiator, community organizer, or sort of both?
A: Sort of both.
Q: Okay. Can you give me a brief description of currently what your sort of roles and responsibilities are as related to this too?
A: My work in reaching out to faith-based, [work of justice?] centers, workers’ advocacy groups, community organizing groups, is to build relationships between these organizations and various <REDACTED> agencies. So again, organizing around particular issues, like [wage theft?], [misclassification?], health and safety issues. So again, working with a number of [worker centers?] around organizing our folks and their folks in working on common issues. Part of it is also negotiating what we can work on, what we can’t work on, because you can imagine that advocacy groups have a lot of demands. We can’t meet all the demands, because it’s beyond our legislative jurisdiction, but at least we try to negotiate what we can do and then what else I can do on behalf of the <REDACTED> to reach out to other agencies, other entities. So again, yeah. This is organizing, finding common ground, what we can organize together, and then also negotiating around [the hurdles?] of that organizing group.
Q: And in terms of previous experience in either field, how much would you say you have – how many, like, years would you say experience you had in community organizing, and in the negotiation side of it?
A: Probably 30. Thirty-plus years.
Q: And do you put them together in that time, or would you separate them out and say 15 of each, or ...
A: No, I would say... Because most of my organizing work was negotiating, too.
Because as we [?] involved in bringing on new groups, but then also negotiating between new groups and existing groups. Negotiation between public officials and community-based groups, faith-based groups. So again, couldn’t separate. They were really interrelated. They were central to the whole process.
Q: Okay. Now, throughout that time, how do you learn how to do it? Did you have any formal training or certification? Did you have a mentor? Did you read literature from previous people? How do you go about learning these things?
A: Well, by chance, when I was going to graduate school in the early ‘70s, I was – [?] find seminary life was, seminary studies was not to my liking. And so I was in Chicago, and one of my faculty advisors said, you know what? I think you should go to organizing training. So he got me hooked up with a group called the Jesuit Agency for Organizing. Tom [Gaudet?], one of Saul Alinsky’s deputies. And so I ended up working with the director, Father John [Balmer? Belmont?], who is now the director of [Peco?] National Network. It’s a small world. And so I the extraordinary starting experience of working with [COUP?], Community of United People, on the West Side of Chicago, on Roosevelt Avenue, in 1972. I got to work with John [Belmont?] and Tom [Gaudet?], Greg [Galluzzo?], who’s the head of [?], now retired, was one of the fellow Jesuit organizers. And so it was a great starting experience to learn how to organize in Chicago. And so from that, then I went to work with the staff at the National Welfare [Rights?] Organization on the North Side of Chicago, and got [?] [up?] [TWO?]. And so that was – so I got formal training, on-the-job training, organizing in the [housing projects?], the [Jane Addams?] housing project on the West
Side of Chicago. And then also working with all the Welfare Rights Organization. So that kind of was my platform for the five years I was in Chicago.

Q: Wow. That’s amazing experience. I’m like... [Laughs]

A: Yeah, I know. I know. I know, it’s great. And John and Greg, everybody, we all laugh. We’ve known each other 50 years.

Q: Wow.

A: Forty years. Forty years. [Let me think about the?] date. It’s 40 years. We’ve known each other for 40 years.

Q: This is me hoping that 40 years from now, I’ll be like, yeah, I totally knew those people, we used to work together. And we’ll be big shots like you.

A: Yeah.

Q: That’s awesome, okay.

A: Yeah. [Tony?] is my mentor.

Q: So okay, so then from your experience, how would you define what is the sort of purpose or the goal or the mission of community organizing, and then of the negotiation side as well? [And do you think they’re the same?] [If they’re the same, they’re different, separate them?].

A: No, I think the bottom line is, again, it’s improving the quality of public life. As, again, that all citizens, all residents and neighbors, whatever the language people want to use, improve the quality of life. And that people can have healthier, livable communities. It is public life, civic life, whatever you want to say, whatever you call it. Everybody prospers. The goal is to get to a win-win situation that everybody can prosper in their community and their society. So that’s organizing, and the hope is, whatever the negotiation is, is the same outcome.

Q: Okay. What do you think are the core principles or underlying assumptions that a person has to have when they’re doing either community organizing or diplomatic negotiations? When you’re looking... How do you have to see the world, how do you have to see people and society? Just...
A: Yeah. I think, one, that the world’s not vanilla flavor. Two things I look for, in terms of leadership – and I mean this is part of the organizing and people at the negotiating table – have to have a passion for justice and equity. And they’ve got to have a vision that’s long term. Because I think if we keep looking at short-term goals, we lose sight of the larger goal. And they’ve got to have passion for justice, because really in the end, organizing and negotiation, again, it’s to try to find a just outcome for all. I think it’s just, again, looking at [it?] piecemeal is not... Is organizing, but in the most narrowest term. So every time I was invited by a group, faith-based, community-based group to help organize, whether it’s public housing residents, persons on public assistance, I’ve even organized suburbanites. It’s crazy. [Laughs] And faith-based groups around particular issues. Again, it was always, okay, who’s going to step up to the plate? Who’s really passionate about this? Who’s going to ... This is not going to, we’re not going... For example, [?] public housing [tenant group?], and the city was [trying to?] evict them from their, because the land had become valuable, and [sitting?], and rich for – you know, high-end development. The residents came to me, they said. <REDACTED>, we want to fight this. I just said to them first, you’re going to have to do the heavy lifting. I’ll help you. But you’ve got to do the work. And this is going to at least take three years, and I can’t guarantee you you’ll win this. Because nobody wants you here. And when they all said yes we will, and two and a half years later, they won their case. They took it to [HUD?]. And they tore down the [?] housing and built a new Hope Six project. And so – and as we look back at that, [it says?], you did it. You were passionate about it, you were committed, you were willing to put in the hard work, and you knew it was going to take a long time. Because you thought this was going to do it in 30 days, and I said I wasn’t going to work with you. [Laughter]

Q: Okay. And that, just to be clear, to make sure I understood the things that you just described, in terms of justice, having a vision of the world that’s long-term visions and passion for social justice, essentially. And looking at equity and things like that. That’s only for community organizing, or you think that’s also necessary for a negotiation side?

A: I think the negotiator too. I think it’s negotiating. Because again, the negotiator, just not only wants an outcome that’s short-term, because if it’s a short-term solution, then they’ll
be back at the table quickly. So always the negotiator, I mean, he or she has to find a short-term solution to get them to the table, and keep them at the table, but the hope is that he or she is looking with the leadership long-term. Because I think when people are fixed on the short-term, the negotiator is responsible, again, to present the long-term hope that’s envisioned by both parties. It’s not his or her vision, it’s really the parties’ . Because whatever disagreement they have, in the end, they both want a just agreement to the just outcome. Otherwise they wouldn’t be at the table.

Q: Okay. You kind of touched on this a little bit, but it’s also a little bit different. What do you think are the skills that are required in order to practice effectively as a community organizer and as a negotiator?

A: Good listening skills, number one. That’s a good... I mean, good feedback skills. Good listening leads to good feedback, because you’ve got to feedback to people what they’re saying, and an ability to ask clarifying questions to help people think through what they’re wrestling with. And also a person who’s also willing to ask for help. Because I think whether... I would say whether I was organizing or a negotiator, I didn’t have all the answers. So like I’ll go back to the public housing tenant group. I said, I don’t know everything. I said, I can never be in your shoes, [what it’s?] like to live in public housing. So I took them to Cabrini Green, I called Cabrini Green. I knew they had a tenant association in Chicago. I said, hey, can we come up and spend a couple days with you? Our tenant association is trying to do a Hope Six project. You guys did it. You know, as a peer-to-peer learning. I said, help me, help the group. And then I also, again, called all the housing organizers, [?], okay, what’d you do on this? What should I do? How do I negotiate with HUD on this? How do we negotiate with the city on this? So what are some other options? So I think a good negotiator does his or her homework, but he or she is open – and then this is organizer, too – open to new learnings, new understanding. Doesn’t always have all the answers, because if the organizer thinks he or she has all the answers, they don’t last very long. Because they become too arrogant. They’re arrogant enough as a group. [Laughs] They think they know everything. [Laughter] You can always tell a new organizer. [Laughter]

Q: So true.
A: Okay. Tell me what to do. Okay, go get burned. Okay. [Laughs] So yeah, I think that – yeah. I think first, good listener. And again, a critical analysis skill, which is the questioning and which is the feedback. You’ve got to be able to think critically. And you’ve got to be resourceful, which is really the third part. You’ve got to be able to ask for help. And so I was always asking for help. Because I may know the principles, but I didn’t know the issue. That’s part of the homework. That’s the research piece. So we’d tell the group that they had [?], they had to do research, but the organizer or negotiator needs to be doing research too. Because if they don’t understand the issue, [and this falls to mention?], and they show it at the table and don’t admit it, that impacts their credibility. And so I’d rather say, I don’t know, I’ll get back to you. It’s more truthful than you fake it and say, well, we just... I just heard a situation where somebody faked the answer and got caught. Her credibility went down huge-wise. She gave the wrong answer because she didn’t know the answer. Yeah.

Q: Okay. And then is there anything – so those sound like they’re... Just to make sure I understand, it sounds like you’re saying that those are skills that are necessary for both. Are there any that are necessary for one and not the other?

A: Well, I [forgot?]... Don’t forget, I want to include conflict management. One needs to know how to deal with conflict management. That’s organizing and negotiating. That’s an interesting question. Organizing. You know, let me ask a clarifying question here. For the negotiator, are you looking in terms of national, in terms of between nations, or a negotiation in a group?

Q: Let’s think about it both ways.

A: Okay.

Q: Because if you think that there’s a big difference between the two, then most of what I’m trying to do here is understand how you perceive it. So if you think that for one of those answers, there are differences, and for the other answer it’s not differences, answer however you want.

A: Yeah. I was just trying to think, what the first one jumped at me again. I think in terms of international diplomacy, you’ve got a broader impact. Because you’re not just
impacting the immediate community. I think for most organizing – again, there’s national organizing, but most organizing is local. You know? It really just impacts the local community. I think if you’re trying to negotiate, again, like Kofi Annan’s trying to negotiate with Syria to try to get rid of ... You’ve got to think about how the Russians [are going to react?]. You have to think about how the U.S. [is going to impact?]. So there’s multiple implications, how different parties... [And that’s probably all the negotiating party?]. because you’ve got to negotiate with all those parties. But it’s not like organizing, you have multiple partners to negotiate with, but I think the implications at that level of negotiation has some – has more dimensions and more layers. When you think about outcomes. So in doing our homework... What was the last campaign I was involved in? Okay, so when I was [Lord? Lorre?] [Valley?], we weren’t going to [?] a housing trust fund for Kentuckians. And so you’re trying – so I chaired the board of the [Metro Housing Coalition?], so we were working with all the housing advocates three years ago to try to get this Kentucky state legislature to [approve?] the $20 million housing trust fund. So again, the [impact? implication?] affects all Kentuckians who qualify for affordable housing, and impacted developers, housing developers, for-profit, non-profit. It affected local municipal, again, because they had to come up with some of the money to match. So again, you think about all that, but you know, I think that’s more manageable than trying to negotiate between nations.

Q: So the scale’s larger.

A: The scale’s larger.

Q: But with the scale being larger, does that require a different skill set, or a different...

A: A sort of – yeah, that’s what I’m trying to ... See, digging down deep to think about that, I don’t think so. Because I was thinking, okay, Kofi Annan as being at the U.N. when he was. You [have to?] master – not only territories, you have the cultures, and you have to negotiate systems that are all over the map. But then you do that at a local neighborhood level too. And so that’s what I’m thinking. When I’m thinking about it, no. I don’t think it’s that much different. Going to eastern Kentucky to work with housing development group, man, I was fearful for my life, because they were about as racist as they could be. But you know, we were trying to work on the same principles. [We’re about housing, my friends?],
we’re on the same ground. You know? I mean, I had an Obama sticker on the back of my car when I was going around to work with these housing... [laughs] Someone would say, hey you! [Checking?] [of the day in?], you know, someone said something to me not so kindly, I just kind of locked my door. [laughs] Stayed in my hotel room. But when I met with the group the next day, I mean, I was meeting with some [rural? real?] Kentuckian folks, and I was trying to help them to think about participating. Again, it was city versus rural mentality. You’re from Louisville, you don’t understand our culture. I says, but I understand housing. That’s what we’re trying to talk about, is housing issues. You’re trying to provide affordable housing for your neighbors. Yeah, you know. So we talked organizers. [He said?], well, you know, our folks have to come from what? I said, where’s the inclusion of low-income folks? [She said?] [you’re?] all the housing developers. How about the ... Well, they live all over. [There were about?] two counties. I just, okay, that’s [different? difficult?] organizing, trying to get people from two counties to come together for a night meeting. [Little tough?]. But how do we do that differently? So it was – so I had to step back and say, you’re right. I come from the urban organizing [people?]. I can get people from across the city for a night meeting. You’ve got two counties.

Q: Yeah.

A: And so you got four-hour drives. And I remember talking to [an I.F.?] organizer in California when I was doing an evaluation of the organizers, several years ago, for [a funder?]. I talked to the Northern California organizer. He says... I said, what’s the biggest challenge for you of being an organizer? And he says, getting out people. [We generally want to work on?] local issue, but we’re being pressed to work on state-wide issues, and they were being pressed to work on national issues. I’m wasting my leaders, because they’re frustrated because they have to spend so much time going to Sacramento. And I’ve got to [bus some of them?] to D.C., because [I.F.?] wants them in D.C. And so I have to choose what is most... And you know what it comes down to, most of them? They’d rather work local issues, even though [it has?] national implications. So the minefield of organizing, you know, and negotiation, I think, are similar. You’ve just got a lot of challenges, and the question is how then... So obviously, again, being resourceful, is the organizer... You know,
Again, making clear what the issues are. Making sure what are the limits of your organizing capacity. So you just got me thinking. Gosh, it’s nice to reflect. I don’t think about these things like this. [Laughter] Yeah.

Q: I hear that a lot. People are like, man, no one’s ever asked me about that before. I never had to think about this in that way.

A: Yeah. Yeah. Because most of my organizing has been at the ... I mean, you know, is more at the city level and state level. But then I was on the board for the [Center for Community Change?] for six years, and we did a lot of national organizing around affordable housing trust funds and immigration reform. And so again... But I didn’t see anything different. It was, again, just more travel, further distance, trying to bring people over the challenge of raising more money. And so in a way, I think ... Now, here’s a [point maybe?]. Well, that’s not really true. [See, every time I think?], I say, uh-huh, no, it’s not. [Laughter] When you bring people on an international level, obviously you’re still bringing them across a distance. They may be from two countries. But [it wasn’t?] different than across two cities, two states, across the U.S. It’s always – I really can’t see a difference. [Laughter]

Q: You’re going over it and over it.

A: The more I think about it...

Q: You’re like, wait a second.

A: Yeah, wait a second. Yeah. Yeah. I think the only difference is language, and the framework. I mean, again... I’ve said this before. Whether you’re a neighborhood leader, state leader, faith-based leader, a national leader, I mean, again, you ... One, you have self interest. Two, again, you’ve got to know your people. And third, you’ve got to be able to know how far you can go. An organizer needs to know that of the leadership team that they’re working with, whether it’s a labor table, international table, you know, or a baseball strike. You’ve just got to know how far people will go, and what’s the breaking point? At least for... Our negotiation with the city went two years for the public housing residents to finally get the city to give up ownership of the property and deed it over to the city. I mean, it was [one land mine?], one [sense? set?] [of?] [?] by the city, da, da, da, da. And so we
didn’t – I lost my job because of that, because the city cut a deal. Because I was asked to organize because [I’m?] working for a quasi-city organization, for housing development. And so I wasn’t being paid by the city, I was being paid by a foundation, but yet the board was – two-thirds of the board was selected by the mayor. And so we were going against the mayor.

Q: Oh, that’s a conflict of interest. Jeez.

A: I know. I know. And when he found out – even though the deputy mayor had been at the table for a year, I mean, the fact is that when the mayor found out, I had to meet with him, and he just royally chewed me out. He said, what the hell do you think you’re doing? And so I just said, this is my job. And so anyway, I didn’t get to finish up the project. But the other organizer I worked with, [when I was?] sent in exile to Louisville, finished the job. But I kept in touch. So you just – so I would think, again, this... I can’t really think of a difference, you know? It’s just, I think, you’ve just got to know your leadership team [from? on?] both sides. And I think when you’re a negotiator, organizer, if they’re the right people at the table, they will find the solution, which is usually a compromise. It’s never going to be their first ask. It’s usually their second, if not their third, ask that gets met.

Q: Why do you think so?

A: Because if they got their first ask, that means somebody loses. Because the other person, the other group’s first ask will not get met. Because usually the first ask of both sides is either/or. And so you’re going to – so yeah.

Q: Okay. I think that that touches on the next question that I was going to ask. Or it might be making assumptions, [but we’ll see?]. How do you measure success? What are milestones? How do you know when you’re heading in the right direction in community organizing, and in negotiations? And then how do you know when you’ve reached success? What does that look like?

A: Well, I think they reach success when they finally can agree to something that says they’re both winners. They can walk away from the table – and the organizing also – and so as you know... In organizing... I just went to the Washington [?] Network meeting, and of course they had [city?] council members sitting there [in?] front and asking them standard
questions. Will you do this for us? Yes or no? And they always have to answer yes, or otherwise they get booted off the stage. But, but, but... And let’s just say this. None of the city councils [lose faith?]. Even though they may not buy it, but they can still walk away. It’s like – okay, I don’t like Romney. I hate Romney. But the fact he went to NAACP was a very organized [tactic?]. In a sense, I’m going to go there, but at least I showed up. Whereas Bush W. didn’t show up. So it was a win/win. The NAACP got, demonstrated the power to have Romney there, and then they could act how they want. But it was, hey, you know, they asked their “enemy” to the table. Romney showed up, took it all, and then he was [crowing?] on Fox News how he was well-received. [Laughter] I know. But they both walked away with gracefulness. For the public perception, they received each other. So in the same way, I think you could [tell? talk?] body language. So when [they’re?] organizing, I could tell – how can I tell? I can tell by the energy level around the table. I could tell by people asking more questions. I could tell by the level of engagement. I think when I see eyes dropping and people also leaving the meeting – and I have seen that – it’s just like, okay, they’re not happy. And so again, but I keep on pulling them back at the table, [whether?] organizing or all that, because I think most of the time I’ve done my homework, to keep pressing questions, to keep them at the table to ask questions of each other, or to ask of them. And so I think the level of engagement’s really a critical measurement of whether one is “successful” and engaging in the organizing [work? world?] or the negotiation. The fact that they will show up for a follow-up meeting also shows a level of engagement. [Attendance?] is as much an indicator as well as energy level, as well as level of questioning. And I think all of that are ingredients to a successful compromise. Again, I say the word compromise in a positive sense. And so that’s what it will take. And I think, again, it’s when you see the parties dropping off any of those levels, then you’re at a dead end. You’ve got to start all over. And the question is whether that same team of leaders will come back to the table, or if you have a new group to start all over at zero. And so that’s what I measure. So every time – I mean, it’s like every neighborhood group’s asked me, we want to organize X, Y, Z. [I’ve stopped?] [?] [questions?]. Are you willing to go organize, recruit all the people to go to the meeting? Are you willing to show up for meetings? Are you willing to lead? Are you willing to raise
money? And I hear, yes, yes, yes, and yes. And each succeeding meeting, same question, more excitement. More organizational stuff, more engagement. And so for the organizing, yes. And so translate that to a negotiating team meeting, most of my negotiation, like on behalf of the city, I went no more than two, no less than two, no more than two meetings. Usually by the third meeting we were able to negotiate to a successful resolution. And we had some tough territorial issues. But again, I kept going back to both sides in between the meetings and working them. And just, again, what’s your limit? What’s your backup? What are you willing to live with, and what can you not live with? And so trying to figure that out, and not put – I didn’t negotiate apart from the two groups, but I kept hearing the other side formulating their questions, going back to the other side, and simply reframe it to them trying to figure out where they’re going to come from. And then when we got back to the table, then I could reframe from the last meeting. Say, okay, at the last meeting, you said this. At the last meeting, you said this. This is what you want, this is what you want. And let me try it this route, in terms of listening to each of you. Can you – what about this resolution, Z? You know? What do you think? And basically again they started... My challenge as the negotiator was to get [the?], push them back, why not? So what’s your option? What will you offer as a counteroffer to that? So again, keep them [critically?] engaged. And again, if the negotiator can’t ask the right critical questions, then they’re not doing his or her... They’re expecting them to come just cross the table and shake hands, and come to a resolution on their own. No, that’s why you’re there, as a negotiator. Because if they could have worked it out between themselves, they would have done it. So a negotiator plays a viable role. Because first of all, he or she’s been invited to do that role. But the same thing for the organizer. The organizer does... There are a lot of people who start things because they think it’s the right thing to do, but they haven’t been invited. They’ll have less success. Some of them do it on pure charisma, as you know. There are charismatic people who will organize things and get followers. But the question is, are they [developing?] leaders? Everybody does... And usually when that charismatic leader leaves or dies or do something, the organization collapses. And so part of the organizing and the negotiating is, again, developing... Well, let’s just say this. On the negotiating, you do have leaders. Because the parties know who
they want to speak for them. But at the neighborhood level, you’ve just got a lot of folks who
don’t understand or don’t know how to do it. So some of them may be leaders, some of them
may be workers. And that’s what you have to discern over the next six months, year, two
years, three years. Somebody asked me that the other day. It was interesting, about [\?].

Because going back to Indianapolis – again, I don’t pat myself on the back. So I helped assist
with the organizing of about [15? 50?] different groups, and they’re all standing [20?] years
later. And so ...

Q: Wow. That’s sustainability. [Laughs]
A: Yeah. Well, and they asked me, what do you [attribute it to?]? And I says, [find?
fine?] leaders. You know? And again, it’s the negotiating team. I think this is the same thing
you look for in organizing, in the negotiating team, is you look for who is the leader among
the leaders? Because if you’ve persuaded him or her, then the rest of the folks... See, I’m
always trying to read the team. And so it’s a good... I always used to ... Because the reason I
used ... Because when I started organizing in Chicago, I did public housing tenants at the
[McDill?] [School?] [on?] [West Roosevelt?]. It was torn down, [?] years ago, North
Chicago. And the mayor... But you know, you’ve heard... People say people [of low
income?] can’t organize. Well, I worked with the public housing, and [?] [fires?], you know,
they can organize as well as anybody else. It’s just a mentality that some people just think
poor people can’t organize. And so I mean, doing the one-on-one, going through the 300
tenants, as I was talking to each of them. [What’s the question?] is, organizers, after I said
I’m so-and-so, your folks here invited me, I’m just doing one-on-ones. I says, who else
should I talk to? And after making 100 one-on-ones, I kept hearing this name Robbie.
Robbie, Robbie. So I finally said, I got to talk to Robbie. I said, Robbie, the [hometown?]
tenant association invited me to help work with all of you and to organize. I think you’re
their leader. [She?] says, what, me? I says, yeah. Says, I’m not a leader. I says, you don’t
have a title, but you know what? I’ve talked to 100 families. Every one has said if they’ve got
an issue or a problem, they come to you. I said, they trust you. And so Robbie became the
president. She became the leader. And they followed. And so it was just... And so I think in
terms of the negotiating table, you’re always looking at, again, who’s the one who needs to
say yes? Because the rest will follow, because - if they trust that person. So yeah. So you know, I think you know from your own [organizing?]. I mean, it’s not just a skill. It’s kind of an art as well as a skill. [You always sort of know the job?]. I’ve run into lots of [?]. And I’ve made a lot of mistakes, so [hear me out?], I didn’t, [did not succeed?] at everything. [?] learning curve.

Q: So what – that makes me think of another question. What do you think contributes to failure? I heard you say a couple of things, like if the negotiators walk in and sort of expect that people are going to come to an agreement pretty quickly.

A: Yeah.

Q: And it’s really – we touched on success, and you’ve got me thinking, well, what then are some clear things that a person can do – both in negotiations... Or think, or how they can approach things, in negotiations and in community organizing that is like, you’re not going to, this isn’t going to go anywhere?

A: Wrong people at the table. Both in organizing... Again, a lot of people talk the talk. And so I would hope – again, I think the difference in a negotiation is that the leaders, who they represent, whether it’s a country or a labor union, they pick their leader. But for a neighborhood organizing, you don’t know. And so I used to... I had tons of people in [my organizer’s?] [?] say, <REDACTED>, help me start this organization, because I want to start... And soon – and I could eventually tell they were only out for themselves. They were trying to really promote themselves. And I knew that would be a disaster for building anything sustainable. And again – and the rule of organizing is... I would say that to some folks, you need to broaden your leadership base, because – in the hope of, in a gentle way, a diplomatic way of trying to bring out other leaders that would counter this charismatic, or this self-interested... Sometimes I couldn’t do it, and I had to let the group decide to do it. And if they couldn’t do it, then I couldn’t do anything about it.

Q: Right.

A: And so I think that’s the challenge of organizing versus negotiating, because you’ve got the leaders at the table. Whereas you have to build and develop that leadership, and there
are a lot of people who just come for a selfish purpose. I always had all these, I’m the mayor of this neighborhood. Okay, but nobody else thinks that. You know?

Q: Right.
A: [Laughs] You know? Or you’re a political campaign. I mean, you know, I’ll take charge of them. They couldn’t organize [out of a bag?]. [Laughter] And the issue was how to gently move them out. And [it was interesting?] that this guy was asking me, he says, what did you do to help sustain these groups? I says, you know, the founding leader is sometimes good at founding and organizing, but they couldn’t take it to the next step. Part of my job as organizer was to help the leadership recognize that, and to help that person gently be removed out of leadership. Because some people make themselves president for life, and after a few years they become so ineffective, but they hang on to it, because whatever its worth is to their ego, whatever. But they destroy the organization in the process. And so that’s a – organizing, you’ve got to constantly do leadership development. Negotiating team’s short-term, you know? At least a negotiator, I think it’s usually around a particular issue, and it’s short-term. Organizer, you’ve got to look at long-term, because you’re talking about sustainability. And in a way, a negotiation...

Q: Wait, when you say that, the negotiations being short-term, are you thinking about a specific type of negotiations, or all negotiations?
A: Well, say, maybe just... Yeah. I think of negotiators like when you go the negotiation [board?] you ... That’s... A labor dispute. [They go to?] the National Labor Relations Board and say, we need ... Or again, I think of countries. So again, all the countries have asked Kofi, hey, you know, the guy will talk to you. They’re trying to [settle? sell?]... The killings in Syria are now. They’re not thinking about the future of Syria, 20 years from now.

Q: Okay.
A: I think in community organizing, even though you’re thinking short-term, how to start the organization, you’re trying to think about the long-term, the welfare of this community. And so I think both things... But the negotiation is usually once you’re done with that task, you’re done. He or she doesn’t stay on for the next negotiation. You bring in another negotiator. Maybe that same person. So I think like even a labor strike, you’re settling the
strike, but you’re not [thinking?] about the welfare and the health of the labor union or the industry that’s at the heart of the dispute. You’re just thinking about settling that immediate strike. Whereas I think an organizer is always thinking about, how do I build this organization three years from now? Five years from now? Ten years from now? Because you’ve got to constantly think about leadership development, leadership development, leadership development. Whereas, as a negotiator, you’re not thinking about leadership development, you’re just thinking about how to end this strike or how to end this impasse. Make sense?

Q: Okay.
A: So the context is different, in terms of the framework in which you’re trying to organize and negotiate. The skills are the same. But the negotiator sees him/herself maybe there 90 days, a year, maybe two years [or months? as much?]. Organizers are trying to think... [In your office?], organizers, you’re [supposed?] to think yourself out of a job, but I haven’t seen an organization that ever thought an organizer out of a job. [Laughs] You know? Organizer says, I’ve still got to pay my bills. [Laughter] [But good organizers?] [all want?] growth. They just recruit more organizers. But so there’s a career path for the organizer too. Self-interest of the organizer is you build a strong organization, but also because your [self-interest?] is tied to the wellbeing of that... The welfare of those countries are tied to that negotiator. But he or she can separate themselves after the issue. It’s settled one way or another, good or bad. So their wellbeing is not tied. [?] for organizers, you know? So maybe – but that’s organizing from a community organizing perspective, or a faith-based. Political organizing is campaign-to-campaign. But it’s also career-driven too, because you want to do well, because the DNC is not going to invite you back to do another campaign if you do lousy. [Laughs] But that’s true with negotiators. If you suck at negotiating, no one’s going to invite you to negotiate.

Q: Yeah.
A: But I think the organizer, at least from the grassroots-side, obviously sees a long-term, perhaps, relationship. Whereas a negotiator for, again, between countries or [?], don’t see a long-term.
Q: Okay.
A: That just came to me.
Q: No, it’s good. Thank you.
A: Because I’m still trying to go back to one of your questions, what differentiates, is there any differentiation? That’s one of the few differentiations.
Q: Okay. An important one. I’ll make sure I have that down here. So ...
A: See, now you’ve got me going back... [Laughter] Which I do. Which I’ve been known to do after [?] is over. This job’s... Yeah, I’ve been asked to join a few organizing groups.
Q: I bet, the experience you have. Jeez.
A: Yeah.
Q: Well, that’s the end of the formal questions that I have.
A: Okay.
Q: If there’s anything that you want to add that you think that I should consider that I didn’t ask about, feel free to just tell me.
A: Well, I think a good question, in terms of the organizing... Okay, apart from the principle, what drives them in this business, in this work?
Q: Okay. Like the person?
A: Yeah. Because you’ll find, I think, a common theme: justice. I wouldn’t be surprised if you hear the word justice a lot. I want to work for a just society, work for a just ... I mean, [that’s not working?] just for higher income for, you know, baseball players. I would assume a labor organizer, you know, higher paid, but that they think all workers be paid a just wage. A just society that treats its employees, as well as nations, fair, equitable. [It says here?] [I'm interested?], what drives [?] I’d be curious. And so that’s more personal, but I think you might see how it translates, transfers into their organizing or negotiating skills.
Q: You’re right. You’re right. And you know what? I was trying to get at that by asking about how they learned what they’re doing. Kind of, I guess making an assumption that if they had read specific literature or learned from certain people, that they would sort of take
that on as part of the way that they view it and part of their passion, but that’s not necessarily true.

A: Yeah. No. Because I took that question as a skills-training question, not a question of values.

Q: You’re right. You’re right.

A: So what are the values behind the skills training?

Q: You’re right. Okay. That’s good, thank you.

A: You’re welcome.

Q: I can be sure that I’m being more clear and specific about these things.

A: Yeah, because part of my training with Tom [Gaudet?], because he always – we spent, when I started with him, he pushed us like hell on the skills training. You know what I mean? We had to keep doing it. I mean, he was my first trainer, and the only trainer, my mentor. And I respected him highly. Every Friday night, we would have a staff meeting at 6:00, starting Friday night, and go till 6:00 Saturday morning.

Q: No way.

A: Yes.

Q: All night?

A: All nighter. [And?] go back to work. And so as the rookie on the team – I think he was testing the tenacity. This is what he ... So my job in Westside Chicago, 2:00 in the morning, was to find beer. Because he would drink it. [Laughter] So I said, hey Tom, it’s 2:00 in the morning. I think every bar is closed. He said, it’s not my problem. Your problem.

Q: No way.

A: So I’d be... I finally found, you know, a bar that I’d buy two cases for the staff, the 12 of us. [?] [wanted?] to drink beer, he just [piling?] [?]. He’d be [grilling?] you on some questions, reflecting, how did you do this? Why’d you do this? But so ... But part of it, also, you complement that, because he was working with the Jesuits. The Jesuits, they’re one of the strongest organizations. John [Bauman?]’s the Jesuit priest. Greg [?] was a Jesuit priest. So two of the four national... You’ll find a lot of the organizers, old-timer organizers, came out of ... They were either clergy, Catholic or Protestant. But it was interesting. Then we
would spend a week at Notre Dame campus, and we’d be talking to a group of both philosophical and religious. And he just wanted to complement in terms of [our?] values. He’s like, why are you doing this? So that’s why I come back to that question. So why are you doing this? To do good? Then get the hell out of here. That’s what he would say. [Laughter] Said, doing good is not going to get you very far. [He was just this Marine?]. He’s just – I think, Greg and I, we laugh, we look back at that, 40 years ago. Laugh. But he says, look at where we are 40 years [later?]. We’re still doing it because we love it. Different context [from?] John [Bauman?], you know, and we just said, it was that kind of training. But it was that training underscored by all the values that we had to examine. Because we saw a lot of organizers drop off. Because again, it wasn’t self-fulfilling. But it wasn’t self-fulfilling because it was – their values were driven differently. You know? They thought it was going to be glamorous. Well, organizing is not glamorous. It’s dirty. It’s gritty. And you lose more than win, most of the time. I just said that to a group last week[end?]. In organizing, you go two steps forward and five steps backwards. You know? But that’s – you take that as the long view. You come back to the long view. You have to keep the long view, because if you only look six months, a year, and your people get deflated because you don’t help them see the long view, you’ll lose all sense of hope. And people won’t come back to the meeting if they keep [failing and losing?]. So you’ve got to win a few battles, too. But ...

45:06 mark

Part 2:
A:...I think it’s probably an organizing tactic, but as well as, again, what’s the value that drives organizing? And so that’s really important. I think the [?] value drives negotiation. Because then you settle for... If your values aren’t a just society or a just outcome, then you’ll settle for the less-than outcome. And so I wasn’t satisfied with just a streetlight.

45:27 mark
Part 3:

A: You know? For a neighborhood – for a traffic light – that that’s all you’re thinking? I mean, fine, go ahead. You guys can do that. [Laughter] But the question is what you want for your community. What do you want to see? What do you want to see for your children? What do you want to see for your grandchildren? What is it, those values you instill? And that’s really the passion that comes in, and you see people, yeah, this is what I want to do. So I think a lot – that’s why I think all of the organizers’ training, at least in the faith-based and community-based, do a lot of values reflection. Because they want to know. That’s where they weed out the ones... And you don’t always know. At least, that’s a good indicator of whether somebody really will make it to the first couple years of organizing.

Q: And then – I’m sorry, one more question, because you just made me think about it. Earlier you had mentioned one-on-ones. Can you talk a little bit about that? Because I haven’t heard that in any previous interviews.

A: Oh. Wow.

Q: And so I just wanted to see what that meant for you and how you use that.

A: Well, in terms of the self-interest, the one-on-one used by most of the faith... So faith-based groups [relational building?], but [Pico?] [Camilio?], National People’s Action, DART – Direct Action Research Training – have all used the one-on-one language. And basically it says that for the ... So you come in as the organizer [on the staff now?], and I will say to you, you need to do 600 one-on-ones in the next three months. That means you will do 600 30-minute conversations with people. And that will be the first set of interviews. But that’s to build relationships. Basically to go out there and do door-knocking. So I had 2,000 units in [Jade?] [House?]. I did that all in about eight months. So I just went, hi, I’m [REDACTED] I’m from [Community of United People?]. We’re just trying to meet folks. I’m working with leader so-and-so, to give me credentials. Because the first time I went in there, the gang stopped me, saying, what the hell are you doing here in this African-American neighborhood? [You look? You’re?] Chinese, you don’t belong here. [Laughter] Had to go back to the president [?] and say, hey John, can you tell these folks to back off? And they got the word, they said, okay, you’re okay. So but again, but see, that was part of
the credentialing. And part of the credentialing, in terms of establishing credibility, is first of all meet people face-to-face, not on the phone. Again, the social network is great, but it’s a tool that compliments the face-to-face. And so on this job, I say this to my colleagues, with the [worker centers?] you’ve got to have face-to-face meetings with[out?] the Department <REDACTED> folks. Get to meet them personally. Get [and make them tick?]. I said, that’s going to be more important than [establishing?] a relationship with me, because that’s long-term. They’re the career staff. So I taught them to do one-on-ones. So I’ve been promoting one-on-ones in this whole building. And so basically it’s the least – [?] is just to meet face-to-face. With three basic questions: Who are you? Who am I? Where’s... Well, [at least?] in a neighborhood, how long have you lived here? What are you involved in the neighborhood? What issues do you ... So I can do that in 30 minutes. We train new organizers. And we train leaders. So it’s just not organizers. These are leaders doing this. So then the second set, once having the development – you lose 30 percent of those. Thirty to 40 percent of those folks will not welcome you back. But the majority of folks, when you come back, hey, I was here last month. I’ve just come back. May I have another 30 minutes of your time? You keep doing that, and what you’re doing is, one, establishing a relationship. You’re at least establishing trust and credibility, because they’re letting you back in their house a second time. But you’re also listening to issues. So by the third meeting, you – when I send out the leadership team. So you know, usually when a [treasurer?] asks me, we want to work with our neighborhood, we want to help organize our neighborhood, I say, okay. I need [depending on the size?], 10 teams of two to go out door-to-door for the next three months, do these 30 minutes. You know. And again, when they come back, then it’s, okay, let’s reflect on what you’d hear. Da, da, da, da. X, Y, Z. [?] Tears down some assumptions. So some groups say, well, our neighborhood’s transient. [?] Wow, we found almost two-thirds of the people have been living here 10 years are more. I said, it’s because you don’t live here. You made that assumption because you drive [to church?]. These folks have been around. And then they said, there is no resources. Wow, there are like two dozen agencies in there. Again, the fact is they went out and asked, who do you work with? Oh, I work with this youth agency, or I work with this. So they ... They’re gathering information about what
resources. Also learning about what the issues of that particular person they interview. And so taking that information out, first they’re establishing relationship. Two, they’re developing a directory of resources that exist, but they’re not [aware of?]. Third, they’re also identifying issues that people care about, passionate about. And then the organizing job that the leadership team has said, [Al?], that listening session... The first listening session is then to discern what are the number-one two or three issues? So usually when I do that for [?], okay – [?] [*60s stuff?], but I’d say, okay, how... So I’d talk to the leadership, our visitation teams. Okay, in your one-to-ones, how many said housing? How many said schools? How many said [alleys?]? How many said da, da, da? So what we try to do is do an analysis, then. Say, okay, of the 200 houses we hit, the 200 people we talked to, a third of them said there’s no after-school program. Number-two issue may be boarded-up housing. Third may be the issue of public safety. People are fearful for their safety because the crime is high. So that discernment, then, say, go back to the group. That’s when the teams look at me. We need you to go back for a second visit. No, no. Now you’re going back to visit – this is what we heard in our visits, and you said the top three issues. And they should... [?] They would have recorded what they said. So, okay, so they said, Raquel, you said when I visited you last month that boarded-up housing across the street is, it’s an issue of safety and fear and costs us property value. And so we heard that from 60 other of your neighbors. We’re going to have a meeting about how to address that issue. And we’re going back to those folks and everybody else we talked to. Are you willing to work on this issue? And so again, some would say yeah, some no. But maybe a dozen people out of that 60 will [?], but that’s where we start. So oaky. And that becomes our leadership. Now of that, we try to discern who’s the leader among leaders, but again, we’re helping them develop the skills. Helping them to identify, okay, you say board-up buildings are [an issue?], but then we have to continue to then ... In the research, what is it about boarded-up homes that you’re concerned about? What’s really an issue that we can work on? Because just saying, we want to get rid of all boarded-up houses, okay, that’s an issue. The question is, but what’s really doable?

Q: Right.
A: And so again, da, da, da, da. But part of that leadership team then goes back and visits, and part of the staff goes back and visits. So coming back to your question on one-on-ones, that’s what the one-on-one does. It just gets your foot into the door of a community you don’t know and starts building relationships. And the credibility is built on winning an issue. So [?] going knock door-to-door. Because I can go back – neighborhood leaders will tell me... People always tell me, okay, [?] for [a lot?] of neighborhood. So I said, what are the top 10 killers of organizing? No follow up. I said, I don’t want to hear that. I said, because how many of you said you were going to do something, you didn’t do it? And let’s talk about how many ways you screwed it up. I said, you do that enough, why should anybody show up for your meeting? Why should anybody want to talk to you? Why should anybody trust you? I said, your one-to-ones is a [real step?] to go back to try to reestablish your credibility, or start building credibility. Because I ... I mean, I used to have people laughing a lot, but I knew I was hitting a raw never because I would say... I would go, my top 10 list... I says, you know what kills neighborhood organizations? Again, no follow up. No leadership. Boring meetings. [Laughter] No food at meetings. [Laughter] That’s right. No time frame. I said, no meeting should go more than an hour and a half, two hours. Because after 9:00, people are looking at their watches, especially if it’s a night meeting. They’ve got plans, or they’ve got American Idol, they’ve got the wife... [Laughter] You know? That’s what I said to the guy. I says, you’re asking people to come for a two-hour, they want to make sure it’s productive, and they want to make sure it’s useful, and they want to get something out of it. And if you don’t do that for them the first time, they may still come back a second time. You do that a second time, you’ve lost them. Because they’re saying, you guys are talkers and do nothing. And so that’s the way I ... I just said, don’t do that. And so I think part of the test of this leadership team is they’ve got to produce a result. So obviously we sort of – [?] negotiation, because I got a negotiation. Everybody wants to ... No, we need to get rid of all 50 boarded-up homes, <REDACTED>. I says, you know what? That’ll take years. Let’s talk about a small step, because what you have to demonstrate to your neighbors is that you can do this. And so let’s take the three boarded-up homes on X Street. Let’s just say to this city and negotiate with the city, okay, [to board them up?]... And again, let’s go after the owners of
those to fix it up. Or at least board it up nicely so it’s not an eyesore to the neighborhood. I said, if we can do that, that will say something to the rest of the neighborhood, that you can produce.

Q: Right.

A: Then we can start tackling the next five, the next 10. Then let’s talk to the housing developer and see if we can restore some of those houses and bring them back on the market and rehab them and put them on sale and sell them to your neighbors. So you’ve got to take those baby steps. But again, short-term, long-term vision for the health of the organization. But at the same time, you’re bringing leadership. And so part of the one-on-one is, okay, I’ll go back. Okay Raquel, the boarded homes [w asn’t?] your issue. You were talking about safety, crime. So we’re ready to start another group to work on the issue of public safety. So we’re going to set up a meeting to talk to the police about how we can maybe do something to address it. So will you come to that meeting? So again, you won’t work on this, but will you work on this issue? So you have to be multiple-issue-based. But again, you’ve got to keep on thinking about how to engage as many people... Because if you become a single-issue organization, when that issue gets resolved, you’re done.

Q: And then it’s short-term, like you described, in negotiation?

A: That’s right.

Q: You mentioned negotiations as you were talking about the one-on-ones and it got me thinking, have you ever used one-on-one negotiations, or have you seen other people do it? And in this one, I’d be particularly interested to see what you think about that in relation to specifically diplomatic negotiations?

A: I haven’t seen any other... I haven’t been in the presence... I’ve heard Labor negotiations. And so... And I’ve seen community groups negotiate with the city on major issues, I’ve sat in on. But again, I think the negotiator has done his or her homework by talking to the various parties and done the one-on-ones. That’s all it is.

Q: The negotiator does one-on-ones...

A: With the opposing...

Q: With the other...
A: Yeah, with both. With all the parties. So...
Q: What if there’s not a third party person there? Like, what if...
A: See then, but you still have to do your homework of, okay, so let’s take one of the [worst-cases ever?]. I can’t imagine Kofi Annan trying to negotiate with Syria. Negotiation.
Q: Okay.
A: Before he gets to the table, he’s talking to them individually. And he’s trying to find out, again, what makes them tick? What drives them? What will they accept as their first stance and their second stance? What they’re willing to give up. So that’s the one-on-one to me. So even though there’s one party... But you know, my sense is he’s also probably talking to the rebels and what they’re willing... Because this is what I think about the one-on-ones. The U.S. government in Afghanistan and Iraq went to the local tribe’s leader to negotiate. And what they did, they had to go to their village. They had to use a translator. But they asked them – they got to know them. They said, I’m just not a U.S. – I’m an ambassador for the U.S. So it says, [?] one-on-ones. Because they were trying to find out how they could win over the local tribe leaders. But they did that not by offering gifts. They asked them, what is it they want? And they may want a school. They may want a water system. They may have wanted cash. But they wanted something. But they had to ask that question and not assume.
But they only know what they – they can only negotiate what they know they want, not assume. The old negotiating way, we’re coming in, this is what we’re going to do for you, like it or leave it. The United States has had to learn that the hard way. And so has – and the faith-based groups, the community-based groups. The city would come in and say, we’re going to do this for you. And so I think every group in here, the secretary’s saying, we need to go out and talk to workers, ask them how can we help them, and not assume that we know how to help them. I said, oh jeez. Not rocket science. You know? [Laughter] And so – yeah. But unfortunately for many of our career staff, they think they know best. And so they’re going out and telling groups... And I’m having to help retrain our field staff to say, I want you to go out and do one-on-ones. I just want you to go meet these workers. These workers don’t trust you. You represent the government, and sometimes you represent the worst of government, because in the past administration, you were anti-worker. So why should they
trust you? So what you need to do is start first of all by developing a personal relationship. Of course the feedback, pushback I get from career staff: I don’t have time for this, and this is not my job. And then I said, this is your job. Because if you want to be successful in what you’re doing and be effective in what you’re doing, these folks who you consider the enemy will become your ally. Because they will help you report violations. They will help you report bad employers. They will make your job easier. But you have to trust them, and they have to trust you. And you’ll do that not - by working in partnership with them. So that’s a hard sell, because they’re just waiting for us to leave. [Laughs] Saying, I’ll go back to my own way, and you can just stay out of my way. Because I’ve had that a lot of times. People say, you know, I’ll still be here 10 years from now, and you’ll be long gone. I’m not going to change. And so it’s trying to get those folks out of the way. But unfortunately these are staff and you can’t just get rid of them. I’d like to see them get fired, some of them. [Laughter] But you know...

Q: I know exactly what you mean.
A: <REDACTED> assistant secretary, so I’ve been meeting with their 16 regional offices, so they put their administrator... So I was doing this. [?] but building relationships with workers, worker centers and worker groups. I said, okay, you’ve got to go out. First of all, you have to get out of your office. Pick up the phone. Call and say, I’d like to come over, wherever you’ll meet. And for day laborers, it may be a parking lot. It’s Home Depot. For restaurant workers, it may be some restaurant. I said, wherever that – you need to meet them where they’re at. Because that says you respect them.

Q: Right.
A: And so you’ve got to get out to these [?]. [And then this hand goes up?]. Regional administrator for <REDACTED>[?] Denver. He’s been there, deputy chief, [?] [27 years?]. [Laughter] So his question, okay, help me. I don’t understand. What is a community group? I looked at [that?] [?], oh shit. [Laughter] I said, we’ve got a lot of work to do.

Q: You’ve got to start from the basics, start all over from scratch.
A: Yeah. So I mean, some places we’re doing well. Some places there’s great resistance. And so I mean... So anyway, but I guess my point is that’s the purpose of one-on-ones.
Q: Got it.
A: Again, if you don’t have any relationship, you’ve got to build those. And so you know, you could pick up the phone, talk to some folks, you have a relationship with them. And if you ask them to do them, nine out of 10 times, they’ll say yes. There’s a relationship. They trust you. And it’s not rocket science. So I think when you’re at the negotiating table, you have to have both sides trust you. Because if they don’t trust you, they’re not going to be at the table. And so that’s why they picked – that’s why they get to chose who they want to be the ... They may think he or she is going to be favorable, but the point is that they trust you to come up with a fair solution. Organizers, I mean, usually it’s by word of mouth. But again, most people call me because they’ll say, so and so said you did this with them. We’d like you to come out and work with us. I said, okay. But I said, I know you don’t know me, I have to prove myself, and I expect you to hold me accountable because I’m going to hold you accountable. So let’s be upfront. That’s one of my rules of organizing. You tell me what’s on your mind. I’ll tell you what’s on my mind. I’ll be blunt. Because we’ve got to work together. And so we’re not going to play games.
Q: All right. Cool.
A: So yeah, so yeah, so I don’t know if I messed up the...
Q: No. No. You’re good. That’s – I’ll turn it off now.

[Recording ends]
APPENDIX F

Interview transcription

Informant #7 (transcribed by E. Duffy, July 30, 2012):

Q: Okay, so the first question’s just a quick demographic question. Age, race, and gender?
A: Age, 73. Male, obviously.

Q: So for the purposes of the study, the way that I described it to you, would you say that your experience is more of a diplomatic negotiator, community organizer or both?
A: More on the diplomatic side, because I mean, [what do I do?] in this job? [Laughs] Besides negotiate with Congress and OMB? [Laughs]

Q: Well actually, that’s the next question, is if you can describe to me quickly what your current duties are in the field, related to diplomatic negotiations.
A: Well, my duties are to run this organization, but the biggest issue is always budget and issues of approval of actions we want to take. And those things require either OMB approval or approval within the department, or even on the Hill. And so those things all require us to negotiate and get people behind us and for us.

Q: And internationally as well?
A: Internationally, yes, of course <REDACTED> is a very big part of the negotiations for me, but also China. We have a lot of negotiations with China, and Russia, and India. In fact this afternoon, I’m going back to talk to India. So there’s all those things. And we gradually work them out. [Laughs]

Q: Okay. And prior to this position, you had similar negotiation experience?
A: Some. I was in a company, right? So, corporations are quite different. Again, you’re looking up above you to get money for budgets and things like that, and you also negotiate,
once in a while, negotiating deals and ... But I was not a businessperson per se, I was running a research organization, so I wasn’t trying to sell. [Laughs]

Q: Okay. So then how many years total in your life would you say you think you have had some sort of negotiation role?

A: Well, to take away the <REDACTED> years, which were eight years – I wasn’t negotiating much then – but I was 35 at [?] and out of those, I would say 25, probably, were when I was at a high enough level of management that I had to worry about negotiating deals.

Q: Okay. And with this too? So almost 30? Or is that...

A: Here’s only three years. And there was 28 years or somewhere in there. About 30 years, all total.

Q: Okay. And throughout the process, how have you learned how to do it? Have you read literature about it? Have you received formal training? Did you have a mentor? Was it kind of just learn as you go?

A: Well, let’s see. You learn as you go, more or less, but also a place like <REDACTED> had a lot of training courses for their management. They had ... Part of those training courses were to learn to negotiate and how to handle negotiations.

Q: Okay. Okay, so based on your experience, how would you define... What do you think is the purpose or the goal or the mission of conducting diplomatic negotiations?

A: Well, I mean, let’s see. Diplomatic negotiations, you always want something. Right? Whether you want to build something together and you’re trying to negotiate a deal where you build things together, or whether you want to talk about arms control, you know, you’re trying to negotiate a deal where they won’t build a nuclear weapon, like with Iran. And those kinds of things. So diplomatic negotiations always involve you wanting something, or somebody else wanting something from you [laughs] that you’re [least? at least?] willing to talk about giving to them, arranging something with them.

Q: Okay. And so what do you think are the core principles or underlying assumptions of diplomatic negotiations? Like, how does one view the world? How does one view other
people? How do you have to sort of approach things philosophically as a diplomatic negotiator?

A: That’s a good question. It seems to me one of the things that’s most important in negotiations is what kind of relationship you establish in the discussion with people that you’re negotiating with. If you make that an adversarial relationship, you’re dead. And you’ll probably never get anywhere. If you can manage that relationship so that it is on a friendly basis, you have infinitely better chance of getting something done.

Q: Okay. So then sort of going along those lines, what do you think are the skills that are required to be an effective diplomatic negotiator? How do you sort of get to that?

A: There’s several things that’s very, very important. It is sort of an ability to talk to people in an articulate fashion. It’s an ability to keep your wits about yourself, so that you don’t go off and do something that’s going to lead you to real problems. Those, in some sense, are the really important things. That you have to understand what you’re going to put on the table and make sure that you handle that. Put things on the table at the right time, so to speak. Understand what you’re willing to concede, what you’re not willing to concede.

Q: Okay. And then how do you measure success in diplomatic negotiations? What are some milestones that you know you’re heading in the right direction, you’re making progress? How do you measure that for yourself?

A: Well, usually you have some goal. And so the issue is really to establish that goal, and to accomplish that goal in the negotiation. Whether it’s a budget issue or an agreement, you want to figure out some kind of, enable some kind of agreement that allows you to go forward with some joint program or something. And you need to figure out a way to make that happen.

Q: So that’s sort of like the end result, that’s how you know you’ve reached success. But along the way, how do you know that you’re heading in that direction? That it looks like it’s going to happen?

A: Well, sometimes it’s very interesting. Sometimes you make a little progress, and you go back, and you make a little more. And you finally get there. It can be a very gradual thing sometimes where you keep finding ways to accommodate to some of the objections that
people have and come up with an answer. And so it’s that kind of thing. It’s very much an iterative process of taking one issue on at a time.

Q: So then you’d say having more meetings, continued meetings is a sign of progress?
A: You usually end up having continuous meetings until you get to where you want to be.

Q: Okay. So now comes the hard part. I’m going to ask you to speak on your perceptions of community organizing, even though you don’t have experience in it.
A: What?

Q: I’m going to ask you to speak on your perceptions of community organizing, without experience, just by what you know from the outside.
A: On community things?

Q: Mm-hmm. On the community organizing aspect. So can you tell me from your perspective, sort of as an outsider looking in, what do you think are the skill sets that are that are probably required – wait. What do you think is the purpose, the goal, or the mission of community organizing?
A: Well, in community things, it strikes me that you often have to handle larger groups of people. I would’ve thought; I don’t know much about the community business.

Q: That’s fine.
A: But generally speaking, you have to maintain a community behind you, a larger community behind you. We have some of that, in a sense that our scientific community has to be behind us. If we don’t have them behind us, we aren’t going anywhere, because they’ll go the Hill and... [Laughs] So they have power to really change what happens here. So you have to watch out, that you see to it that the community stays behind you. And that’s a much broader thing. And that often is an issue of seeing to it that the community is involved in some way. Right? It’s very, very important for them to feel involved in the decision-making process. Just over and over again, that comes through. Every time we turn around, you really have to be able to make that happen. So that...

Q: Okay. So you’d say the purpose then is to make sure that the community is involved in the process? Or is that how you go about doing it?
A: That’s part of what – that’s how you go about doing it. [You’ve got to tell me what you want?], but you also have to very much figure out what the community is really interested in [the community?], because it may not be what you think it is. And sometimes you can be wrong on that, right? And you have to adjust, because in the end, you have to be willing to compromise on what the community wants, too. It’s not just a question of selling it to the community.

Q: Okay. SO then in order to do that, what do you think are the skills that are probably needed for someone who’s trying to organize the community?

A: See, there I think it’s much more your speaking skills and your communication skills, I think, play a bigger role in that situation than they do... And your charisma, that kind of thing, whether you’re outgoing. And that all plays a much bigger role than in that kind of arena than what you see when you’re doing negotiation in small bodies of people, groups of people.

Q: Okay. And then how would you think that one might measure success in community organizing, in terms of ... You already said the end goal would be to organize a broader group of people and make sure they’re feeling included. How do you feel like you can tell when they’re being successful in that?

A: Well, you do have an end goal. You may not get that goal. Like if you get something, you get an alternative that effectively does what you want to get done, then you’ve been successful. Right? You don’t always get the goal that you started out with, but you may end up with something that is just as good or satisfies a vast majority of what you wanted. There’s all kinds, there’s all levels at which you can declare success or failure, depending on how you look at it. If you really get nothing of what you want, obviously you’ve failed. If you get most of what you want, then it’s okay.

Q: So it sounds like you’re talking about compromise, maybe?

A: Pardon?

Q: It sounds like you’re talking about compromise. Does that sound right?
A: Yeah. You can’t – you always end up having compromise, though, at least it seems to me. Very seldom do you just get everything you want. I mean, especially in the political [world?]. [Laughs] Very seldom do you get what you want.

Q: There are people who try.

A: Oh yeah.

Q: So that’s kind of why I’m asking, because there’s some people, that’s their perspective, is I’m here to get what I want, and I won’t settle for less. And there’s people who are more like you, that are like, well, you’re not going to get everything you want, so you have to kind of... So that’s important for me to know how you perceive it. Because if you come on... That changes the way that you approach it.

A: I think if you asked Obama if he’s gotten what he wants, he would say, not really. [Laughter]

Q: Not everything. Probably the bigger things. Okay. Well, that’s all the formal questions that I have. Is there anything that you think that I should be considering or that you want me to know that I haven’t asked you about?

A: Let me think about that for a minute. It’s interesting, because I never – I don’t think of myself as a negotiator, but when I sit here and talk about all these things, I realize that most of the time I spend doing that. [Laughs] Trying to negotiate deals.

Q: Yeah, definitely. [Laughter] You were like the first person I thought of when I was like, who can I talk to about this?

A: But ... What I find around this town is the important thing is to know people. The more people who know you and think of you as being an okay person, the better off you are. And that – Washington politics is full of that, right? And you really... What I found, the longer I’ve been here, the more I know more and more people, and it just helps. When I first got here, nobody knew me, and it just was very painful, because they all were suspicious. And that has changed over the three years. It’s much better now. I can go to people and talk to them honestly and not have to worry about it. And that’s a big change. And it was true of – internally and externally. Not just outside. Not just the outside world. You could – well, I was that way too. I didn’t know people, and I didn’t know who I could trust and who I didn’t
trust, and that took a while. But that’s the hardest thing, is when you go into a completely new situation. You need to figure out who’s who and what’s what. That’s very, very important.

Q: All right. That’s great. Thank you.
A: All right?
Q: Yeah.
[Recording ends]
APPENDIX G

Interview transcription
Informant #8 (transcribed by E. Duffy, August 3, 2012):

Q: Okay. So the first question is just a basic demographic question. What’s your age, ethnicity, and gender?
A: Age is 42. Gender is male. Ethnicity, I am mixed. I guess the best, easiest breakdown is English and Sicilian on my mother’s side, and Chicano on my father’s side. [Mexican-American?].

Q: Okay. Thank you. So for the purposes of the study the way that I described it to you, and if you had a chance to read through the abstract, would you consider yourself more of a diplomatic negotiator, a community organizer, or both?
A: At this stage, I would consider myself more of a community organizer that has had experience in the international realm.

Q: Okay. And can you give me a brief description of your current work in the field?
A: Okay. I mean, it’s not paid work, but the current area that I’m working on is [with?] a delegation, preparing for a delegation [?] to I guess bear witness to the [gang?] [?] that are going on over there, and see how sustainable it is and if there’s anything that people from this delegation – it’s mainly a grassroots, people from grassroots organizations working in the Latino community here in the United States that have experience with gang violence. In particular these, the two gangs that are down there in the El Salvador community. So we’re going down there to check that out. That’ll be a one-week process. And then we’re going to try to come up with some [work?] [that?] we can follow up with up here. What had lead to that is it’s just – [?] started on March 8 or 9 in El Salvador, and part of the reason this kind of delegation was formed is, as I said, it’s made up of people who’ve been doing this work in
the El Salvadoran community in the United States for a long time, but with different actors. And it involves [?] themselves, contacted us separately, and then we kind of figured out that we were all talking – not necessarily me, but people in the delegation were talking to similar people down there, so we decided it seemed natural to kind of make this whole sort of delegation so that everyone was on the same page and kind of working off the same information and [?] the same [?], I guess. So that’s the [triumph?]. It’s not – I guess it’s not necessarily field work, per se, since we’ve not been in the field yet. The physical field of El Salvador. But in terms of people who’ve done that – who are doing that sort of stuff here in the States, that’s where it’s at. If that makes any sense.

Q: Okay. No, that makes sense. That’s good, thank you. And then, so in your past experience, you have experience in both fields, then? In both community organizing and sort of like more international collaborations?

A: Yeah, well, I spent from ’97 till November of this past year, I’ve been primarily working both.

[They discuss the car alarm in the background.]

Q: Okay, it’s done.

A: So, back to the question. Right, so from roughly ’97 to November last year, I was with <REDACTED> From 2000 till November, I was primarily working with [?] in several different capacities there. So I wouldn’t, by any means was I anywhere near high-level diplomatic status. Within <REDACTED> line of work, I don’t even know if I was [?] [I felt?] so much of a diplomat so much as, you know, a <REDACTED> peacekeeping staffer. In that regard I worked in East Timor during the transitional period, 2000 to 2002. And there I primarily filled the role of a civil servant for the transitional government at a period where <REDACTED> was administering East Timor, when it was still a territory of Indonesia but not, but following the 1999 referendum. So in that regard, I worked in the capital and in one of the outlying districts, which was actually an enclave that was located on the [westernmost?] side. Worked... And then finished up my time there working for the office of local government development, which basically coordinated the different activities with the 13 districts of the country. So it was a different kind of <REDACTED> position. We were
acting as civil servants for the Timorese government, and as such – and in many cases responded to East Timorese citizens who were ministers or directors within that program. So that was an interesting period [in terms of just?] negotiations and diplomacy and all that, due to varying capacities to the people you were working with, and the nature of trying to determine ways forward for the Timorese government, for a transitional government that didn’t have the legitimacy of having been elected yet. So having to kind of balance the necessity to lay the foundation for a future Timorese state with the respect for the fact that many of the people you’re working with... The people you’re working with on the Timorese side had not yet been approved by their peers. There had been no democratic process as of that point. So you had to be careful that you weren’t subject to biases or kind of developing policy that was going to favor certain groups over others based on who you were working with. So you had to be really conscious of who you were working with, that not all [?] Timorese, I think which was a very tricky part. I had a conversation last night with a colleague that, we worked together in the Sudan, but he was in East Timor several years after I was. But you had to be very careful and not have the attitude that all the Timorese were the same, and understand that there were different tribal and regional and political alliances amongst them, and that that was something you needed to keep in mind when you were helping with policy development, so that you weren’t setting the stage for one group to be in a more powerful position than another or that sort of thing. So that was an interesting experience in terms of that. [In the vein?] of being [diplomatic negotiations?]. I actually – interesting, I guess I never thought of it that way, but that’s kind of what it was.

Q: Yeah. Yeah. I would say it is. That’s so interesting. So wait, so let me ask you a question, then. In learning how to do that, did you have formal training? Have you had certification? Have you gone through – did you have a mentor? Did you read literature? Was it just sort of learn as you go? How do you even get good at that?

A: Well, I’ll be honest. I am a very accidental international development person. I’m from a small town in Colorado, and in the area I grew up, you were big time if you made it to California.

Q: Okay.
A: I made it to California to go to university. And really thought that that’s where the story was going to end, I think at that time. I got involved in community work because at the time I had gone to school, there was a study that came out about more black men in prison than in college. And, but the situation for Latino men, it wasn’t too much different. And having been of the Chicano, [?] I grew up with, [and played?] [?] with and all that from my hometown, I was the only one that – me and my brother were the only ones that actually graduated on time. And [?] as he grew up [?]. So I was drawn to community work, and specifically working with violence prevention amongst youth, the whole gang situation. And [they were doing that stuff?], I found myself in D.C. working with the community there, and then had a friend that lived in <REDACTED> and worked at <REDACTED>. One day at work [?]. A lot of the work I was doing in the community was volunteer, I wasn’t getting paid. [?] [short?] this kid was going to fight another kid. I just was like, you guys want to fight, go kill each other [off this property?] and da, da, da, da. [?] and somebody stepped in. [That was a conflict?]. Next day I called my friend who lived in New York and had a roommate who worked in <REDACTED>, and they arranged for me to come up and take a [?] exam to join <REDACTED>. So I drove up, joined <REDACTED>, and it was a temporary [?] position for the general assembly. That was the first salaried position I’d ever had, and I joined <REDACTED> just because I needed a job. [Laughs] And wanted to – but once in <REDACTED>, and actually immediately for the first [?], [I immediately looked at?] [these? things?] [very bad?] in the community than what I had done. And that was the basis for hiring me. And [?] what they hired me to do. I was a clerk and a secretary for about two and a half years, before I got a [break?] to go to East Timor. And then once in East Timor... I actually went there to do help desk, I was a help desk guy. [Said just do it?] [?] [worked out?]. I ended up working in an IT unit that was replacing computers for the Y2K stuff back in 2000. And the secretariat ... I kind of rose. They kept me in the ranks because I knew how to deal with different people and communities and different conflicts, I guess you could say. I was able to [read?] <REDACTED> and how it worked. And had the benefit of working in a high-profile project in the secretariat, which was replacing all the old computers and bringing in new ones in a very kind of territorial and diplomatic phase where you’ve got
six, eight languages at <REDACTED>, which basically represents sort of six different areas of the world and [?] groups and that. So you had to be – I learned sort of the diplomatic portion in the actual secretariat, dealing with the Chinese [floor?] and the Arabic [floor?] and the French [floor?] and the English [floor?], and who got what, and how it was going to break down and why it needed to go a certain way and what the protocols were. So it was a really funny kind of way of being introduced to the diplomatic world. But in <REDACTED>, even in the secretariat, that was, diplomacy [wasn’t trained?]. I was ... It wasn’t anything that was taught. There was no lessons. But it was, at that level I was a very low-level guy, so you just kind of learned it from picking it up [from folks?]. [?] organizing background and had worked in my [own? old?] community, which is, I guess [?]
[committee? community?] in this country, so I had experience working with them, my community, and then also working with law authority, law enforcement, [recount votes? councils?], state governments, lobbying in D.C. and that sort of thing. So, but it was all very much a grassroots background, and then working in the secretariat, I had to learn how to negotiate just working in that building, which on one level is kind of a typical large bureaucracy, but on another level is not, because of the nature of having 192 member states represent your boss. You know, 192 bosses with varying degrees of [influence?] and how that played out and how things got done, in the building and in resolutions and in the security council. So that was the building, and I was kind of a [?] to learn that. And then once I was in the field, East Timor at that time was – I’d say <REDACTED>, I mean, obviously Indonesia was very concerned [they’re?] [still?] on the scene, although not large numbers [they have an?] involved diplomatic corps there. The Australians [?] [probably back?]. So you had different people who had interests in kind of asserting their influence over East Timor and making sure that they [authorized?] [?] at <REDACTED>. So that was an interesting thing to just [be a part of?]. Please, if I’m kind of getting off-track or whatever, just bring me back.

Q: [Laughs] I mean, this is really interesting stuff, so part of my problem is I want to have the answers to these questions but I also just want to hear about people’s experience because it’s so cool. I mean, this is like...
A: But I mean... Let me try to get back. So in general, in diplomacy, I didn’t necessarily, I was never really, I was never schooled in being a diplomat or international negotiations, all that. I came up doing grassroots stuff and learning how to do, get in the middle of a couple of guys that were going to fight. We did stuff on the street. We heard this and that was going down, somebody called somebody. We divided it up. You go talk to these guys, I’ll talk to these guys. You know, the kind of street level stuff that was good for learning how to negotiate and kind of the delicacy of it, because a lot of times, with guys that are aggravated, loaded, [laughs] loaded meaning, you know...

Q: Yeah.
A: ...both under the influence and carrying anything from knives to guns to God-knows-what. You know? And having to work through a mediation or work through a conference with them, try to bring it to a good end. So that was my background in terms of that stuff. Once I got on the ground, that stuff, my backing in that, community organizing, just understanding how communities work, and also in terms of mediation between gangs and all that, that helped me out a lot. I think that... In fact, I always felt like it [did me more justice?] than other folks who had kind of more of the traditional IR route, you know, in undergrad or masters programs that had read all the books and all that, but hadn’t necessarily been face to face with a guy who wanted to kill a guy in the other [room?].

Q: Right. Right, right. Okay.
A: And they’d been trained more in kind of, you have these different groups, they’re not near each other, and we set up the protocols and we’re working with them from a distance. By the time they actually get face to face, everything – a lot of stuff’s already been worked out, and they’ve kind of orchestrated, and now it’s fine-tuning the details and so forth. They weren’t necessarily the active [combatant?], they were more the leaders, the leadership. So yeah, I had a different schooling. [Laughs]

Q: Okay. Got it. Got it. And then you know what, I’m finding...
A: So, short story long.
Q: I’m finding that that tends to be the answer for everybody, so it’s interesting.
A: On that?
Q: I mean, not the exact same story, but the story that it’s more that people sort of just learned it as they went along and followed what their interests were, rather than anyone having, like, this is what they want to do, and so they get a degree in it, and they get certifications in it. It sounds like most of the people that I’ve been talking to didn’t get formal training so much as they just started doing it and learned it along the way. So it’s becoming – it’s interesting for me to find out that so many people, that’s the way they do it. I think we’re lead to believe that that’s not the way that it happens, so it’s interesting to hear this.

A: Well, I think – just on that point, I think it’s... I think now you’re seeing more of a formalized, like... I think the conflict mediation and that part of it, you’re seeing more formal education than that was before. I think it was more on the diplomatic front. And a lot of the people who end up... And also the way that humanitarians and peacekeeping has shaped up since the fall of the Berlin Wall, you’ve got a lot of people that weren’t initially meaning to necessarily get into that area. Maybe [?] [?] humanitarian background or whatever. And then suddenly found – regular day to day, due course of the job – you had to pick up these other skills. You had to be able to negotiate with village chiefs and elders, and be able to read situations that people hadn’t prepared you for. If you weren’t able to do it, then you weren’t able to actually do the other stuff, which was probably the stuff that brought you there, you know? I think that the knowledge of that amongst humanitarians, more so, I think the diplomatic community always kind of understood that. But humanitarians recognized it, and then I think that also had a large influence on the diplomats as well. You had to have a little bit of everything, you know, in order to get the work done at the field level. Which is always a bit of a clash between the field and the HQ [whether?] [?], and people who’ve never been in the field.

Q: Yep. [Laughs] Familiar with that. Okay, so I have four more questions, but I think that hopefully they’ll go quickly. I don’t want to keep you, and you said you had to get out of there.

A: I’m good. Yeah, I’m fine.
Q: Okay. The next question is, how would you, based on your experience, define what is the purpose, or the mission, or the goal, of diplomatic negotiations and of community organizing?
A: I mean, a combined goal? Or separately?
Q: No, separately. Unless for you they go hand in hand, but I’m asking separately.
A: I mean, to me, when I think of diplomatic negotiations, I think of – and it just may be because of where I worked in <REDACTED> – but I kind of think of the higher-level, and I’ll go back... I was in Sudan most recently, so I [tend to have?] the first thing that pops into my mind, but anytime they needed any sort of discussion between the north and south, it was [?] [Addis Ababa?] and the head of <REDACTED>, [Mbeki?] and all the big men in Africa showed up, from the diplomatic corps, U.S., and they would try to sit everybody down at the table. So that sort of thing, that’s kind of more along the lines of what I think of as diplomatic negotiations. As well as even on the ground itself, a lot of times. I worked on elections, and having to get people to realize that there are certain steps that need to take place, so operationally your [downfall?] in the elections were more operational folks, but you deal with the politics issues, so you’re dealing with the host government and their local electoral body, and they don’t necessarily understand why – or they’re not wanting to be part of a process, or they don’t understand it, whatever. It helps a lot to get the embassies and the different foreign service folks involved. From whatever – whether it’s [Brits?] or wherever. You know, to put their influence on folks [?] and understanding that this operation needs to go a certain way because that’s the way the operation goes. You know? But so I guess high-level to me means you’re involved with the diplomatic corps.
Q: Okay.
A: Not necessarily that you’re off in [East?] [?], [?] and all that. But it could be on the ground, letting the police commission know that the 10 vehicles that had just been given to him were not given to him, they were given so they can patrol the town, patrol the capital. And the British government sends their attaché to meet with the commissioner and say, you’re scheduled to get another 10 vehicles next year, but this is contingent on you
understanding that this is not for you and your three wives and cousins [laughter] to [travel around?] in style.

Q: Right.

A: So that – I think that’s kind of the diplomatic portion of it, when it’s coming down between [?] and that. And then the community organizing piece, I mean, I think that’s when you get – to me, obviously, again, my biases are [there?] on the two levels, [?] <REDACTED> and then street-level organizing and community [effects?] [toward?] violence. Community organizing, I think, is more ... I mean, that’s it. If you’re a true community organizer, in my mind, you’re not going in there to... If you want to work with the community, you need to put your ... Kind of need to put yourself down a bit. I don’t mean put yourself down – you need to humble yourself a bit to understand that if you’re not from that community and already have the [mandate?] of that community, you know, you’re coming in to work with the community. You need to be willing to actually work with them and see what it is that they want done and how best to [translate that?] and they could, as much as possible, be part of building it so that it’s as sustainable as possible. The most sustainable project or process, what have you, which isn’t always – which is, I think, a lot more difficult in many ways than it is in a diplomatic context, where there’s already structures and understanding and protocols. And you’re dealing with people that are – even if they don’t have the most power, one country against another – there is an understanding and there’s a respect for how things should work out based on what agreement is reached or whatnot. A lot of times in community organizing, you’re dealing with – and again, this is really the bias I’m coming from – but dealing with communities that don’t really have anyone, aren’t represented, don’t have advocates, don’t always necessarily know the best way to do that. And are trying to do that, in an arena where the people they are trying to have hear them or work with are not really what you wanted to negotiate or [you want to?] [?]. [Laughs] So sometimes it’s a little trickier, because they may already have... I think a lot of times a community is... Again, I’m biased because of the communities I worked with, because dealing with communities that don’t have so much power and don’t necessarily understand the dynamics and are feeling very much powerless in the face of a city or a state
or a federal government, or a large bureaucracy with tons of money and lots of lobbyists. And it’s a – it’s a lot more patience and it’s a lot of capacity-building, but it’s also a lot of willingness to listen and understand that the community that you’re there with knows more about what they need. They might not know the best way to translate and get it there. Almost like you’re there as a translator, in a sense, and then if they already know what they want to say and what they want to do, then you’re there to empower that process. So I think that that’s kind of the – that’s kind of the bigger difference between the diplomatic negotiations and the community organizing side, where community organizing you’re trying to empower a group to get something done and in a sustainable manner so that it benefits their community in a positive way. Whereas in diplomatic negotiations, a lot of times it’s groups that have a level of power, whether it’s sovereign or not, and their negotiations are based on that. So I don’t know if that makes sense either, but...

Q: No, it does. It does. If I’m not saying much, it’s because I try to limit my responses so that I don’t influence what you say, because I don’t want to lead you. I want to hear what you really think.
A: Yeah.
Q: So usually I’ll turn off the recorder at the end and then give you some feedback based on what I’ve heard from other people as well, but right now I just want to hear whatever you have to say.
A: Okay.
Q: So that’s why I’m not saying a whole lot. Okay, so what – you kind of answered that one already. Here goes one: what do you think are the skills that are required to be an effective diplomatic negotiator? And then the skills that are required to be an effective community organizer? Are they similar? Are they different? How does that look?

[The interviewee asks Raquel to hold while he talks a phone call.]

[First recording ends]
[Second recording begins]

Q: I was saying, what do you think are the skills that are required to be an effective diplomatic negotiator? And what do you think are the skills that are required to be an effective community organizer? I mean, you kind of touched on it, but I just wanted to ask it more directly.

A: Yeah. I think for both, I think patience. [Laughs] I think you definitely have to be patient. And understand that the process is not always going to move just because you’re there trying to move it. And the patience to, if it’s not moving, have the patience and then the perseverance to try to figure out what it is that needs to happen to help get that process rolling. And also the humility to know [?] when ... Not just to know when there’s a process that’s not moving, and either to back off or try to find a different, focus on another issue or what have you, but also just kind of, when you’re dealing with different nations, countries, what have you, to do it in a manner that’s... I’d say respectful. I don’t know. [?] As far as the diplomatic side, I think the added issues of having to understand how the protocol is for the side that you’re representing, and what the chain of command is and how that works. And who gets the first [line?] if they... I mean, really it sounds funny, but you have to understand all that stuff, how you dress, how you approach folks. And you have to have a keen understanding of what your side is trying to get out of the process and what your parameters are in terms of where you’re negotiating and what you can’t do and where you can’t overstep. And you need to have – it’s helpful to have very clear communication on [lines?] on your side, so you know exactly what you’re meant to be doing. And how things roll. What kind of cover you have if things aren’t going the right way, and you know... I think it gets a bit more technical in that aspect, and formal, than on the community organizing side. Which, in that regard, on the community organizing side, I think it’s almost the opposite. You don’t want to have too much of the protocols, too much of the formality. Because you need it to be a bit more organic, you need to be a lot more flexible in that regard. And they’re still – [?] systems and kind of protocols that you’re going to have to figure out, but a lot of them, they’re going to more of an informal nature. Like, of the [four?] old ladies who sit at that table, who’s the one that – you know, who’s the head woman? You know? That sort of thing.
They’re not ... A lot of times, you’re going to have to work on some things that aren’t going to be up front, because I think a lot of community organizing, you work in communities that are – especially if you’re not from that community – they are wary at the very least, and distrustful on the other end of the spectrum. So while the same protocols and formalities are there, they’re more informal and traditional. And you have to be willing to kind of think outside of your cultural domain and what you know, what you were raised to be, and you need to ... Again, this is now my ...

[Dogs bark]

Q: So you were saying you have to step outside of your cultural domain and be aware of the other cultures?
A: I think one of the problems sometimes with community organizing is people come in with their own understanding of, about how things work. And a lot of that’s based on who they are, their background culturally, ethnically, or religiously, what have you. A lot of times you have to willing to work past that, or not even work past it, just be open that there’s a different way fashion, and need to be willing to try to find out how that works, and the community you’re trying to work with. Because I think that’s kind of key thing, and I’ve seen that backfire with a lot of people, particularly in the field, in international development, just coming fresh in, they’ve never been in the ... Out of their country... Not that they’ve never been out, but they’ve never worked in the field like this before. And suddenly they’re trying to apply these methodologies that they learned, or they’re coming at it from very much their own cultural context. And they’re not patient, and they’re not open enough to see where it’s working and where it’s not, and they get kind of frustrated. [In an altercation with the other people at the bar?] that are like, these people don’t know anything, they’re stupid. [Laughs] You know? It’s just, it does – again, that’s probably my own bias from having worked overseas and ... In the evening when I want to relax, the last thing I want to do is sit next to some guy who’s having a hard time with his project complaining about what idiots the Timorese are when I’m having a completely
different experience and I think the Timorese are doing quite well with what they want to do. But *you have to know how to?* work with the Timorese actually to get something done. This guy just doesn’t see how, doesn’t understand how no matter how much he talks to them, they don’t understand him, and probably doesn’t realize that maybe if he had learned a little bit of their *words? work?* or didn’t talk so fast, or whatever, just—he was a little bit more respectful to that funny little guy, that funny little guy is actually the one that everyone else listens to, and he just thinks he’s some funny little guy.

**Q:** Right.

**A:** You know? With feathers on his head. [Laughter]

**Q:** I know exactly what you mean. I mean, not about the feathers on the head, but the whole rest of it.

**A:** But you know what I mean? I think that’s—that’s what I mean by the cultural context. Sometimes people come in and they’re all gung-ho, but they don’t realize that yeah, the theories and all that shit’s all good, but you’ve got to try to put yourself in those people’s positions. And part of doing that is also kind of letting go of what made you who you are. Even though at the same time what made you who you are is why you’re there in the first place. I think people have a hard time reconciling that. And it doesn’t mean that you’re compromising who you are, it just means that you’re opening yourself up to a greater understanding of what is going to help your project move in that area. And if you’re not able to do that, you may get the project moving, but you may get it done very grudgingly and in a manner that, as soon as you’re gone, people are going to just trash it because they weren’t into it, or you do it in a manner that opens yourself up and you might find out that this wonderful project *that you’re there to?* implement actually needs to change, and that if you change it based on the input from the old guy with the feathers on his head, that that project’s going to work.

**Q:** Yeah.

**A:** And I think that’s—that’s kind of a difference between the diplomatic side and the community organizing. Community organizing, you have to be a lot more organic and flexible and open to new things, whereas the diplomatic—it’s not necessarily you don’t have
to be that way. I think what you need on both sides crosses over, but the fundamental
difference is that you have to be much more organic and flexible and open on the community
organizing side. And that the diplomatic side, you have to understand the protocols, the
formalities and what they mean and why they need to be done and what your position is,
what the other side’s position is. And what is the limit for your side, and as best as you can,
understand the limits for their side and try to get as close to that limit that benefits you.
[Laughs] Or [you decide?] or whatever. You know? So it’s a lot more formal and it’s a lot
more technical in that regard.

Q: Okay. Last question: How do you define success, and how do you know that you’re
heading in that right direction and that you’re making progress in both fields? Both
diplomatic negotiations and community organizing?

A: That’s a tough one. It’s really hard.

Q: I know. [Laughs]

A: At <REDACTED>, a lot of times, when I’ve been with <REDACTED>, we’re
working towards the [?]. I’ve worked a lot of elections. And with the elections – and one
thing I appreciate about elections is it was easy. You knew when you got the job done,
because the day after the election, it was over. And people were either saying it was free, fair,
and transparent, or they were saying that the [?] was burning the ballot boxes outside [in
Gambia?]. Either way, you had a pretty immediate response [into?] how successful it was.
But that’s not generally the case, I think, in a lot of international stuff. And the mandate can
be tricky, because when they’re set up... A lot of times I think in international diplomacy the
goalposts tend to move, because that’s the nature of diplomacy and in a changing world,
what was the initial goal might move because people in Libya started rebelling against
Kaddafi, and suddenly the oil in the [?] [mountains?] [in?] [southern?] [?] [doesn’t seem?]
as valuable as all that oil sitting there already processed and ready to go in Tripoli. You
know? And you can put the money more into that, then, so suddenly you’re, if you’re on the
ground in the Sudan, you’re like, wait a minute. What about... They’re like, hold tight,
because right now we’re focusing on that. And that has nothing to do with where you are
right now, other than the fact that it’s affecting the way [?]. You know? And that might be a
bit of a cynical response because I just went through the whole experience of the Sudan, but so it’s difficult. And the goalposts move. I think that generally people have some [parameter?] [on them?] [their mandate?] that that they’re working toward, and that is [?] have a reasonable idea of when you reach the end. [It isn’t only based on?] [?]. I can’t really speak to much else. But fortunately we had mandates, and that’s what we worked for. I guess for me personally, [each?] [?] [in Sierra Leone?] are ... I was saying before... Five countries I’ve worked in. Sierra Leone is one I kind of look back and say, we came in, place was a mess. When I was in East Timor, everyone thought Sierra Leone was hell on earth, which it was. And two years later when I was there for the local government elections, an election that nobody really cared about because everyone was watching [?] [the night before?], being able to [set up a process?] that was legitimate was a success. But people there [?] [work for?] [?]. I guess that’s a lot of institutional success. I don’t know want me to kind of try to define it as personal success in diplomacy, but...

Q: No, that’s fine. That’s fine.
A: Yeah. But I mean, on that side, I ... In my experience it’s always been [?] mandates [?] something. There’s a certain degree of [flexibility?], and that is generally determined by the [?] international community in regard to regional actors, international actors, [?] countries. And then the people on the ground. Are they happy? Is it free? Did they actually have an election? [?] Did the war actually stop? Or are armed militias still rampaging around the country raping women and [?] they can get their hands on while negotiations have stalled [?]? So that’s kind of that side. On the community organizing side, it’s a tough one too. I think for me, that one’s [?] [sustainability?]. It’s really kind of [?] [?] the most elusive thing. You need to have something sustainable, but sometimes the sustainability isn’t necessarily the program, but the process that you got people engaged in. And the ... You’ve shown people that working together and working in a particular fashion, they can achieve... Part of the particular program that you’re working on lasts a year, five years, 10 years or forever after your tenure there, I think a lot of the success in community organizing is in the process itself. Because the nature, for me, the nature of community organizing is it’s kind of
the capacity... I don’t want to say capacity building, because I feel like that’s such a – it indicates that people had no capacity.

Q: Right.

A: But it’s, in terms of showing people how to use what they’ve got to get what they need to get for their own community. And that’s what I mean a lot of times [with process?], because [it?] can be more valuable than the actual outcome. And I think community organizing, that also – just because it’s more flexible and more organic, that ... It changes as well. [?] change the community. But I think that’s a big part of it, because you’re doing what you can [?] represent themselves [for the next time around?], or if not, then at least they’re a lot stronger in doing it.

Q: Okay. Great. Well, thank you. That’s the last of my formal questions. Is there anything else that you want me to think about, or that I didn’t ask about you think is important for me to consider?

A: I don’t know. [You got me in a couple good rambles?] there, [?] a lot more than you needed to hear.

Q: [Laughs] More is better.

A: [Laughs] Yeah. I don’t know. I guess for me I’d like to see – if there’s anything, I’d like to see how, that you kind of deal with, that [?], that would be an understanding of what is involved with the other and why it matters that they understand it and how they complement each other. I’ve been on projects that – the last project I was on was I wouldn’t say a grassroots community project, because we were working with the ministry of the interior, but we were working with the local governments. With the state governors and the local governments, local state governments in South Sudan. And we [?] this wonderful kind of conflict [mitigation?] and stabilization process working toward [the plan?] that engaged big governments, security committees, civil society, and all that. It was really kind of a very much organic kind of grassroots government program that you don’t generally see, especially on behalf of the U.S. government. And due to an administrative and kind of bureaucratic thing between folks that were running the project in the government, the U.S. government, and the company that they had contracted out to, the project ended on a bit of a sour note
because they brought... The people on the ground, diplomatically, liked the project and ... [?] the U.S. government liked it, but it didn’t translate into an actual continuity because of ... I guess that’s not necessarily a diplomatic thing. That was more of an administrative thing, a bureaucratic thing [?]. But [a lot of times?] [it’s the same effect?]. Sometimes are kicking off on the ground that are very successful, and the diplomatic community is so busy [looking?] at the higher-ups, how things are working there, that they don’t see [?] the smaller stuff, [?] whatever the goal or the outcome is [?] the outcome. And vice versa. I think a lot of times on the community organizing side, people have such a preconceived notion about what diplomats are and how they live their life, and you know, big chauffer-driven cars and nice homes and maids and whatnot, and they’re not really doing the work, we’re really doing the work. And when it actually is something that should be worked a lot more in tandem. And when you do have – and I’ve been in places where I think you see that working well, because you’ve got diplomatic [?] in the community organizing side. And in this case, I’m speaking more like NGOs and whatnot, internationally. But they’re working hand in hand. And I guess the same could be said in this country too, when you’re looking at situations where community organizations understand how local governments or state governments are working and are working well with their representatives to move something forward. You do have occasions for that. I think that’s when – when they’re both able to work together and understand each other’s roles, I think you have a more successful operation. But when they’re working in isolation and don’t take the time to understand each other or - at the least, or are in antagonistic relationship, then you’re not going to see much movement.

Q: Okay.

[Second recording ends.]
Q: Okay. So the first question is just a basic demographic question. I’m going to ask you for your age, your ethnicity/race, and gender.
Q: And for the purposes of the study, the way that I described it to you when I went over the abstract, would you say that your field of expertise is more of a diplomatic negotiator, community organizer, or both?
A: Community organizer.
Q: Okay. And can you give me a brief description of your current work, if it’s in that field, or if not...
A: Sure. Sure. My portfolio here at the <REDACTED> is the domestic landscape. So what I’m charged with doing is going all across America, educating the American public about the foreign policy priorities of this president and the initiatives of <REDACTED>. In that capacity, I speak at schools, church groups, think tanks, rural affairs councils. And while it’s not community organizing per se, it is really mobilizing America about the messaging and the work we’re doing overseas and beyond.
Q: Okay. Do you have previous experience in either field before this?
A: Yes. Yes. I worked as a public affairs specialist for a number of years. My last private sector gig, I did a lot of third-party validation and organizing for the corporations who I was representing. So if you had a corporation that was trying to organize a specific project, or trying to influence, [grasp?] top stakeholders, then my job was to make sure that I pulled the appropriate groups together, talked to them about what this company’s initiative or project
was, and then worked to get their buy-in and to organize their community. I’ll give you a good example. One of my clients was <REDACTED>. And they were interested in building a third nuclear reactor on the Eastern shore. They already have two down there. But the resistance from advocates that were against this, we had to combat that. Because in essence, there were two reactors there already, they employed people. That, I mean, literally changed the dynamics of a community. And so that was my charge. Let folks know that this was, yes, more of the same nuclear energy, which is something in America that we’re a little frightened of.

Q: Mm-hmm.

A: However, 80 percent of France runs on nuclear energy. And so my job was to stitch together a coalition, mobilize and organize them, for public hearings that we had. To get them organize to go to Congress, [so that was great?]. So one of my clients was the <REDACTED> campaign. And my job was mobilizing, specifically the African American community, women, and the base of the <REDACTED> Party. So that was great.

Q: Okay. So if you had to think in terms of numbers, how many years of experience would you say you’ve had in community organizing?

A: In this work? Twenty.

Q: Okay.


Q: And in all that time, how did you learn how to do it or get good at it? Did you get any formal training or certification? Did you study that in your college years? Did you have a mentor that showed you? Did you kind of just pick it up along the way? Did you personally read literature that you were interested in? How did that come to be?

A: It came to be because I am – I’ve always been inquisitive. My mom used to say I was just plain nosy. But I’ve always – I have a love of seeing if I can convince someone to come my way. I love doing it, it’s a big challenge. So I didn’t really learn it in school, but I’ve always been a person of the people, and I love making a point and saying, this is how we get here, this is what we have to offer. So I almost learned it by happenstance. And the work that I’ve been involved in over the years. I was a part of the women’s movement since the ‘70s.
And more specifically I was very involved in the domestic violence movement. And so that is a recipe for organizing, a recipe for trying to move an agenda that would benefit a group of people. And then I continued that work when I started doing political work. I was a field organizer.

Q: Okay. And so we’ve been talking about community organizing a lot, but let me get from you how you define – what would you say is the purpose or the goal or the mission of community organizing?

A: I think that the purpose of community organizing is to influence people, institutions, and ideology, and bring those folks, people, entities to the conclusion you want them to have, whether that’s in public policy or politics. It could be economic development. It could be any number of things. But that’s, to me, the bulwark of pulling people together and making them see a message, put a message out there, and buy into it.

Q: And so working at the <REDACTED>, there’s a lot of diplomatic efforts that are occurring as well. Can you give me, from your experience, either having done it or working very closely [with those who do it?], what you think the purpose, mission, or goal of diplomatic negotiations is?

A: Oh, gosh, I think it is the best tool we have, that I believe can change the paradigm about going to war. <REDACTED> is the United States’ number one diplomat. I’ve watched and learned from <REDACTED> that you can make progress, you can resolve issues, and you can give folks a better understanding of how to achieve their aspirations through protest, through conversations. And for getting to know other cultures. There’s a really interesting campaign that <REDACTED> here run. It’s called the <REDACTED>. These are two <REDACTED>. One is the outreach engagement to Muslim communities around the world, on a people-to-people level, not on government-to-government, and the other is <REDACTED> that was appointed who monitors and combats anti-Semitism. I traveled with them to Eastern Europe last year. And they were unveiling their <REDACTED>, where they were asking others to do something... They were asking people to do something that puts you in the place of others. So if you are a Muslim, you might volunteer at a synagogue. If you are Jewish, you may want to do something in the African
American community. But put yourself in the place of others and volunteer the time to foster understanding and to promote cross-cultural understanding. So now ... I mean, just seeing them going and talking to people who are Eastern European, where they all look the same, but the differences are profound. So I’ve seen that in action. I’ve also traveled to Africa as part of the <REDACTED> delegation. I’ve seen <REDACTED>, do <REDACTED> bilateral and multilateral meetings. I had no business in those meetings, but <REDACTED> was so generous of spirit that <REDACTED> allowed me to be in those meetings. And one of the things I can remember quite vividly, last year we were in Africa, and the goal of this particular meeting – it was a meeting of the African Union – was to press upon the African leaders that it was time for ... I don’t want to call him a clown. Who was the guy that – it wasn’t Mubarak. Libya. To get the Libyan dictator out of that...

Q: Kaddafi.
A: Yeah. I’m sorry.
Q: [Laughing] No, it’s okay, it’s okay.
A: <REDACTED> goal was to convince these African leaders to put together a strong resolution to encourage Yasser Arafat to leave office. That was a very difficult challenge, because he was asking other dictators to make a decision to ask one of their peeps to leave office, when they were going to faced with the same kind of uprising.

[Someone enters the office and they speak.]
A: So that was always the challenge, which to me was hard. Now, <REDACTED> did get a resolution out of them, but it didn’t have the same – the teeth in it, that he had wanted. Because guess what has happened after Arafat? More dictators, and with the uprisings in the Middle East. So that was interesting, to see that dance that he had with the president of South Africa, the president of Tanzania. And these guys have been in office forever. That was the hardest thing for them to do, to put teeth in the resolution. Got it a little stronger than they were trying to originally do, but it was never to the point that we wanted. So that was interesting.
Q: Great experiences.
A: Yeah.
Q: I love being able to hear what people have been up to. [The other person leaves.]

Q: So what do you think are the core principles or underlying assumptions, or sort of worldviews, that a person has to have in order to effectively – both at community organizing, and think about it also at negotiations.

A: [?]. That we can have strong diplomacy, strong community organizing, across the globe, based on our values and our principles. And we don’t have to sacrifice those in order to be effective in the world. That’s what I think is the underlying premise of both of those pieces. You know, you believe in universal human rights, whether you’re a community organizer or whether you’re a diplomat. Especially if you’re American, you believe we can move an agenda, but we have to look out for people’s human rights. We have to look out for the most vulnerable, who are our children and our women, but you don’t have to sacrifice your principles and values as an American.

Q: Okay. And so I feel like this next question you kind of touched on, but I’m going to ask a little bit more directly. What do you think are the skills that are required to be a really good community organizer, and to be a good diplomatic negotiator?

A: I think, number one, you have to have a great sense of humor. Because the daily pushback that you get could make you a little cranky. And so you just have to say, this is for a larger good. This is not really about me. And so I think that’s the best tool that one can initially use when coming into a new environment. And you also have to have an understanding that the biggest challenge you probably will have will be the cultural challenge. And then you get into all the other challenges. But you have to be sensitive, and respect each nation and group of citizens, people’s cultures. Because the last thing... If you go in right off the bat and you’re offensive because you don’t understand the culture, you’re not going to get one piece organized, nor one diplomatic victory. So that to me is basic to it all.

Q: So something – you’ve got to do a little bit of research as well.

A: You have to. You really do.
Q: Okay. And so from your experience, how do you measure success? How do you realize that you’re heading in the right direction?

A: Well, actually, I hate the word metrics, but we measure it by the number of students, college students; the number of [thought?] leaders; and the number of grassroots votes that we literally touch. For instance, we have a tool here called the<REDACTED>, where we invite college students in to be briefed by our senior-level officials. This is a new initiative that we created. We’ve only had four <REDACTED>, but we’ve talked to 2,100 students and have communicated with, I think, 15 schools.

Q: Wow.

A: So I mean, we literally look at numbers. And when I go out to speak, I always get feedback on how many people were there. Because that’s – you don’t know otherwise, so you have to count raw numbers and people and how many times you’ve touched them, and through how many means. So we use old-fashioned platforms as well as social medial platforms to reach out and touch. And I think we just do it by numbers. And also part of what my focus is, is how many media outlets across the country are we actually talking to and putting up the word about what we’re doing? So if you look at the top 25 media markets, how many times are we in those newspapers, on those radios, or on those public affairs shows? And because literally, it’s a headcount.

Q: Okay. And what about for any diplomatic negotiation efforts that you have been party to, whether that was just observing, or whether you had to be a part of them. [Think about that?], how would you say that you know there’s progress in that arena?

A: Well, I think you know progress when you look at whatever the diplomatic issue or question is, what has been the response? From the other side, for lack of a better thing. It was great diplomacy that was deployed in Haiti after the earthquake, in working with the government, where all of their institutions had been wiped out. But you still had people left – the president, the whatever, but their schools were crumbled, whatever. And beyond the humanitarian aid, you look at what is the government doing to rebuild houses? Or to build new houses? So you measure that. You measure it by saying, the rubble – there were tons of rubble that had to be moved before one bit of construction could occur. So you literally – we
measured the rubble in tons. Because you have to explain to donors what you’ve used that money to do, especially when they look at Haiti and it still looks the same. So you have to say, look, before the earthquake, this was almost a fourth-world country. And then the rubble. So it almost took a year to make a dent in the rubble. And you have to keep messaging people. You have to keep making visits over and over again that is showing [I’m?] down there talking, it’s progress. And I found one of the biggest diplomatic challenges I wasn’t a part of, but I witnessed from my perch here, is when Aristide wanted to go back. And Duvalier wanted to go back. And people saying, what’s America going to do about this? Well, guess what? Aristide had a visa and a passport to go back to Haiti. We didn’t want him to, but guess what? He could go back. So for our best diplomatic efforts, we couldn’t really interfere in what the people in the government of Haiti wanted. We didn’t want Duvalier to go back, but that wasn’t our call. So we could only do so much, and then we have to sit there and do our best diplomatic efforts to say why this probably isn’t good, but it was their call. So it’s a balance.

Q: Okay. And so we know how we’re making progress, but what’s the end goal for both of the fields? For community organizing, what would you say is the end goal? What do you consider final success?

A: What would I consider... Well, from my perspective or a global perspective? I’m not sure. Because my success...

Q: Your perspective. If you want to take that personally or if you want to take that how you view it objectively – like, broader – that’s up to you.

A: Okay. Well, I want to do both of them.

Q: Okay.

A: My personal success is measured by the commitment that I personally made to the secretary <REDACTED> to do the four or five things that I think I’ve accomplished. The biggest one, to me, was opening up the <REDACTED> and bringing in groups that heretofore had really not been included in any of our outreach. We were bringing in diaspora groups that had never been in here before.

Q: Wow.
A: I did the very first African – focus on sub-Saharan Africa for African Americans in the diaspora. We did that last year, and we had 500 African Americans who knew about the <REDACTED>, some of them had worked with <REDACTED>, but they hadn’t really been over here. And so we did high-level briefings. The secretary came down and talked about her vision. We had <REDACTED> from the <REDACTED>. We had someone who was doing stuff in China. It was an amazing thing. They also opened this place up to our HBCU students, students from historically black colleges and universities. They’d never been invited in here before. So I feel proud of the fact that the two or three or four things that I committed to do, that maybe were a little different for the <REDACTED>, that I’ve actually accomplished. And I think I’ve done, not me, just my staff and everybody who supports me, we’ve created some wonderful signature programs that – we have Conversations with America, which is a web-based program where we sit around a round table and talk about issues with a senior level official and an international NGO partner. So I’ve been able to accomplish opening up the <REDACTED>, in my little way, to communities and people which has never been in here before. I remember I did one on the Western Hemisphere that I think was the very first time the <REDACTED> had literally sent out blast emails to folks in that diaspora. And there was a buzz all around the city. Well, at that time, there were a lot of hard-liners who were saying, we’re going to go to the <REDACTED> we’re going to bust this up, we’re going to hold up signs. And so I’m telling you, I’ve never seen so many Secret Service people lined around a room, waiting for someone to ... And guess what? Everybody was scared except <REDACTED>. Because guess what? These were people who are so anxious because they had never been here before, they didn’t know that we weren’t going to come down here and say, the U.S. government is perfect. We were going to talk about the issues. We were going to lay them out. And so that was really, I think, the seminal moment for me to say, yeah, you’re doing the right thing. So from a global perspective, I think the mere fact that this secretary <REDACTED> has gone places –<REDACTED>– that maybe no secretary <REDACTED> has been in years. A: But for <REDACTED> to have such a high level way <REDACTED> looks at diplomacy. And what I love about <REDACTED> takes no prisoners. <REDACTED> will
stand in their faces. I have seen <REDACTED>, in Africa, on what <REDACTED> calls a [townnterview?]. So those are big town halls where there are also interview pieces of it. So last year, the year before, <REDACTED> went to Africa. And somebody asked <REDACTED> what <REDACTED> thought of something. <REDACTED> goes, I’m <REDACTED>. Why are[n’t?] you asking me? And they misspoke. They were asking <REDACTED> – they wanted to ask <REDACTED> about President <REDACTED>. But they asked <REDACTED> what did President <REDACTED> think? And <REDACTED> was like, excuse me? I mean, I saw <REDACTED> do the [colored-girl neck?], right? [Laughter] But that to me <REDACTED>, right on. I’ve seen pictures of <REDACTED> standing with Melanne Verveer, who is <REDACTED> women’s empowerment person, in [Cote d’Ivoire?], saying to the dictators, you use rape as a weapon of war, you will get no aid. Come on. To me, that’s hard diplomacy. But <REDACTED> couples that with what <REDACTED> calls smart power, where <REDACTED> looks at <REDACTED> toolbox and says, what tool do I need here? Is it an economic tool? A diplomatic tool? Cultural? Do I need to turn this over to Gates at the War Department? You know? It’s like <REDACTED> saying, you can do things, and you can look at your toolbox and there are solutions in there. You’ve got to figure out which is the right one to use. So globally, that’s been an inspiration. And I hope that in my small way, I’ve been able to open this <REDACTED> world up to people who just haven’t ever been included.

Q: That’s really interesting. One of the things that inspired me to even look at this as a topic, and one of the things that I’m hoping will come out of it, is the sort of idea of inclusion of what I consider the end user, or the constituent, the stakeholder.

A: Absolutely.

Q: People who really kind of pay their taxes so we can do these things, and the ones that we’re supposed to be serving. You know what I mean?

A: I do.

Q: So that they’re actually involved and have a say, but also are able to understand better what’s happening.

A: Exactly.
Q: And so it’s exciting for me to hear that that’s something that you’ve been focusing on and that you’re interested in. Because it’s one of the things that I was trying to get to happen over in the <REDACTED>, because <REDACTED> don’t know how to talk to people.
A: Not at all.
Q: They’re just not really good at it. [Laughs]
Q: And it was just like, you know, if people understood what you guys are doing, you might get a little bit more support.
A: It’d be amazing. But they can’t speak the same language, or they don’t. And their comfort zone is not [there?].
Q: No, definitely not.
A: So it’s been an interesting, interesting tenure. It’s been good.
Q: This is exciting. Well, that was the last of my formal questions. Do you have anything that you think I should consider or that I didn’t ask you about you were kind of surprised I didn’t ask you about you want me to ...
A: Explore a little?
Q: Yeah.
A: Well, I think the unsaid thing, always, is the way I’ve seen the secretary really focus in on protecting the vulnerable: women and girls. And how <REDACTED> has placed a major effort on the inclusion and the empowerment of women and girls. And <REDACTED> been doing this since <REDACTED> days before <REDACTED> was <REDACTED>, and that <REDACTED> carried this tradition on. And I think that’d be a major piece of <REDACTED> legacy, is what <REDACTED> has done to build up the institutions and everything that focus on women and girls. Because I believe maybe as much as <REDACTED> does that when you have 50 percent of the population not participating, not a part of it, you cannot have a strong family, strong neighborhood, community, or world. You just can’t. And to me – I’ve been very involved in the women’s movement, domestic violence movement, all that stuff. But to see <REDACTED> do it, and <REDACTED>
such a big figure that <REDACTED> can get the world to pay attention. It’s pretty neat. But you’ve asked about all that, so that’s all cool.

Q: It’s great to hear about it, though, from someone who’s in the mix. You know?
Q: Well, that was...

[Recording ends]27

---

27 The formal interview ends here so audio recorded was terminated. Additional conversation was unrelated to the interview or research study and was therefore unrecorded.
APPENDIX I

Table 12
*Online Survey: Aggregate Gender Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgendered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13
*Online Survey: Aggregate Ethnicity Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
*Online Survey: Aggregate Race Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African-American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15
**Online Survey: Aggregate Years’ Experience in Community Organizing Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years experience in community organizing</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16
**Online Survey: Aggregate Years’ Experience in Diplomatic Negotiations Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years experience in diplomatic negotiations</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-9 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17
*Online Survey: Demographics at a Glance*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Latino or Hispanic</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Years experience in community organizing</th>
<th>Years experience in diplomatic negotiations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#01</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#03</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#05</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#06</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>15-20</td>
<td>10 to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>10 to 15</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6 to 9</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF AM</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>2 to 5</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Online survey respondent #1

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)
1976

3. Please indicate your gender
Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.
Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.
White

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:
Community Organizing - creating a formal neighborhood structure that can be activated when a certain goal needs to be accomplished
Diplomatic Negotiation - creating relationships with people that move strategy, compromise, negotiation to avoid war or violence

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?
0-1 years 2-4 years 6-9 years 10-16 years 16-25 years more than 25 years
Community Organizing X
Diplomatic Negotiation X
If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first:

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):
Community Organizing - ability to build relationships with people who have alternate views, patience, enthusiasm, for causes, skill in "reading" people and constantly self-reflex on your approach, attempt to understand inner-workings of community, class, country
Diplomatic Negotiation - ability to build relationships with people who have alternate views, patience, enthusiasm for causes, ability to "read" people and constantly self-reflex on your approach, attempt to understand inner-workings of community, class, country

APPENDIX K

Online survey respondent #3

View Summary
Browse Responses
Filter Responses
Cross-tab Responses
Download Responses
Share Responses

2. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1970)

1970

3. Please indicate your gender

females

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Black or African American

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing - Time spent gathering political support, volunteers and donations for various political campaigns.
Diplomatic Negotiations - Negotiations with congressional staffing and federal agencies regarding the release of scientific materials.

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

0-1 years 2-4 years 5-9 years 10-15 years 16-20 years more than 20 years

Community Organizing X
Diplomatic Negotiations X

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first: Community Organizing

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community Organizing - Palomos, Tactically, Advocate
Diplomatic Negotiations - Mediate, Advocate

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successfull performance in each of the following fields.

www.surveymonkey.com/s/SurveyResponsesDetail.aspx?sm=34b4697%26by=960c24161b40148...
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Online survey respondent #5

2. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)

[Year]

3. Please indicate your gender

[Male/Female]  

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

[Hispanic or Latino]  

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

[White]  

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing: Bringing people with common interests to work together to help bring about change.

Diplomatic Negotiation: Resolving disputes between nations.

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Experience (years)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic Negotiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have experience in one field, please indicate which code(s):

[ ]  

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community Organizing: patience, communication, building, listening skills, openness, advancement.

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.

Community Organizing: Did your (s) issues get passed/defeated? Did candidate get elected? Agenda advancement to the degree you were hoping.

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1971)
1977

3. Please indicate your gender
Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.
Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following tasks:
Commonwealth Teamwork DRIVER
Diplomatic negotiation -driving leadership together

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?
0-1 years 2-6 years 6-10 years 10-15 years 16-20 years more than 20 years
Community organizing x
Diplomatic negotiations x
If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first: community organizing

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following tasks (leave blank if you do not know):
Community organizing -communication, strategic, research, leadership
Diplomatic negotiation -communication, strategic, research, leadership

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:
Community organizing - group discussions, developed common understanding
Diplomatic negotiation - diverse discussions, identified aligned issues
APPENDIX N

Online survey respondent #7
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Online survey respondent #10

2. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)
1982

3. Please indicate your gender

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Black or African American

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following tasks:

Community organizing - working with community members to build community

Diplomatic negotiation - bringing countries together to peacefully solve their own issues

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

0-1 years 2-5 years 6-9 years 10-15 years 16-20 years more than 20 years

Community organizing X

Diplomatic negotiations X

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first: community organizing

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (please blank if you do not know):

Community/Organizing - patience, insightfulness, and a creative-thinking individual

Diplomatic negotiation - knowledge, patience, insightfulness, and a creative individual

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:

Community/Organizing - completion of task or considerable movement toward intended task

Diplomatic Negotiation - completion of task or mutual agreement or movement toward a shared goal

www.surveymonkey.com/s/5y55QzWcN5KL
Online survey respondent #13

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)

1985

3. Please indicate your gender

Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

White

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following tasks:

Community organizing: To help initiate, facilitate, and mobilize community members in order to identify and meet their needs and develop strategies for addressing these needs. To help people recognize the value of organizing and take action.

Diplomatic negotiation: To help resolve conflicts or achieve agreements involving the interests of different parties. To help people work together. To find a solution.

7. How many years experience do you have in the follow fields?

Community organizing

X

Diplomatic Negotiations

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first. No experience in diplomatic negotiations

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community organizing: Vision, absolute!...not a skill, but will learn it quickly without commitment to a clearly defined vision. Interpersonal skills, communication skills a must. Timeliness, Creativity, Flexibility, Knowledge of leading community protests and other movements with similar or complementary goals. Networking skills. Resources.
APPENDIX Q

Online survey respondent #15

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1970)

1970

3. Please indicate your gender

Male

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

White

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing: Building and strengthening community capacity for the whole
Diplomatic Negotiation: Resolving a common problem through dialogue and informed decision-making

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

0-1 years 2-4 years 5-8 years 10-15 years 16-24 years more than 25 years
Community Organizing X
Diplomatic Negotiation X

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (more blank if you do not know):

Community Organizing: Organization, initiative, diplomacy
Diplomatic Negotiation: Critical thinking, compromise, diplomacy

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:

Community Organizing: Tangible improvement in quality of life for the community
Diplomatic Negotiation: Resolution of a common problem through compromise
Online survey respondent #17

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1970)

1970

3. Please indicate your gender

Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basis racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Black or African-American

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing - To bring together the most powerful ideas toservice the role in the upcoming elections. Also, organizing community groups to help build coalitions.

Diplomatic Negotiation - Some pet - private / foreign in the near future negotiating the treatment of American citizens in prisons abroad.

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

6-10 years 11-15 years 16-24 years more than 24 years

Community Organizing

Diplomacy Negotiation

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first: Community Organizing

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community Organizing - Understanding, patience, resourcefulness, practical.

Diplomacy Negotiation - Flexible, practical, accountable, patient.

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performances in each of the following fields.

www.surveymonkey.com/s/KeySurveyResponsesDetail.aspx?sm=9xKBFZ7%2FMyPRQZC%39%EA1N1zntru... 1/2
2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)
1981

3. Please indicate your gender
Male

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.
NOT MEXICAN OR LATINO

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.
African

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:
Community Organizing — only way to produce lasting change
Diplomatic Negotiation — process by which two parties can come to an agreement

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):
Community Organizing — passion, nuance, empathy, drive
Diplomatic Negotiation — policy expertise, psychological techniques, inner confidence

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:
Community Organizing — concrete change within a community; a church built, a vacant lot landscaped, a school on a city block
APPENDIX T

Online survey respondent #19

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1970)

1974

3. Please indicate your gender

Male

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

mixed origin

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

White

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing - educate, motive and arm individuals with issues to advocate for change
Diplomatic Negotiation - zero sum game

7. How many years experience do you have in the below fields?

0-1 years
5-6 years
8-9 years
11-12 years
16+ years
more than 21 years

Community Organizing
Diplomatic Negotiation

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community Organizing - leadership, social, communication, knowing issues in advance
Diplomatic Negotiation - negotiating, listening, knowing desired result in advance

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:

Community Organizing - issues and actions agreed upon, timing one voice
Diplomatic Negotiation - all parties equally satisfied
Online survey respondent #20

2. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year, for example, 1976)
1982

3. Please indicate your gender
Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.
Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.
Black or African American

6. Using your own experiences, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:
Diplomatic Negotiation

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?
- 0-1 years
- 2-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- More than 20 years
- Community Organizing
- Diplomatic Negotiation

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):
Community Organizing - Interpersonal skills, knowledge base of the issues, persuasion
Diplomatic Negotiation - International relations, cultural traditions, patience

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.
Community Organizing - Increased knowledge of issues and/or development of community action leadership skills
APPENDIX V

Online survey respondent #21

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1970)

1990

3. Please indicate your gender

Male

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Mexican/Cuban/Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

White

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following tasks:

Community Organizing — To gather people in the community and work together to achieve a common goal, often something tangible that will directly benefit that particular community.
Diplomatic Negotiation — To work with opposing entities in an effort to achieve a goal that may require compromise from both parties, often involving issues of the subject matter at hand

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

0-1 years 2-5 years 6-15 years 16-25 years More than 25 years

Community Organizing X
Diplomatic Negotiation X

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which went first.

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following tasks (please state if you do not know):

Community Organizing — Well-organized, disciplined, charismatic, hard-working, savvy
Diplomatic Negotiation — Intelligent, analytical, well-seasoned, careful, strategic

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following tasks:

www.surveymonkey.com/s/MySurveyResponseDetail.aspx?sn=6DHF%26ByPRDc%261NDWlt.do... 1/2
Online survey respondent #22

2. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year, for example, 1976)

1976

3. Please indicate your gender

Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Black or African American

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following tasks:

Community organizing · Charitable communication · Crime prevention · Media relations · Political education · Public relations · Resource development · Substantive communication · Community organizing · Change management · Crime prevention · Media relations · Political education · Public relations · Resource development · Substantive communication

7. How many years experience do you have in the follow fields?

Community Organizing

Diplomatic Negotiations

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which one first: Diplomatic Negotiations

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community organizing · Charitable communication · Crime prevention · Media relations · Political education · Public relations · Resource development · Substantive communication

Diplomatic Negotiation · Great Communication, good people skills, the ability to get to the heart of the issue, build common ground and mutual beneficial situations, and strong political insight.

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure success:
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Online survey respondent #24

2. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1972)
19__

3. Please indicate your gender

Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the category with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

White

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing - Work face-to-face, engage in conversation - together
Diplomatic Negotiation - Facilitate change, movements, and needs

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

6-10 years 6-10 years 10-16 years 16-24 years more than 24 years

Community Organizing X
Diplomatic Negotiation X

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first:

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields:

Community Organizing - Familiarity with being directive, engaging, and having a clear goal of what needs to be accomplished. Must also be well-disciplined.
Diplomatic Negotiation - Negotiation, strategic conversations, diligent, disciplined

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.

Community Organizing - Long-term and short-term goals over a selected period of time, working with others within and recommendations generated are in written form only. Your administration role.
APPENDIX Y

Online survey respondent #26

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year, for example, 1976)

3. Please indicate your gender

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

5. The categories below are designed to identify your racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, and mission of the following fields:

7. How many years experience do you have in the follow fields?

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (please list even if you do not know):

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.
APPENDIX Z

Online survey respondent #28

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4 digit birth year; for example, 1970)
1993

3. Please indicate your gender
Male

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.
NATIVE AMERICAN OR INDIAN

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purposes, goals, or mission of the following fields:
Community Organizing - exerting force over actors that hold power
Diplomatic Negotiation - crafting favor from actors that hold power

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?
0-1 years 5-6 years 6-8 years 10-14 years 15-20 years more than 20 years
Community Organizing X Diplomatic Negotiation X

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):
Community Organizing - understanding of power and strategy for exerting force over actors, understanding of motivation for building a coalition of activists

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.
Community Organizing - achieving organizational goals
Online survey respondent #30

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)

3. Please indicate your gender

Male

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Write

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing - To achieve a desired goal through increased community awareness

Diplomatic Negotiation - To achieve a mutually desirable outcome with another organization or country

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years more than 20 years

Community Organizing

Diplomatic Negotiation

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first: Organizing

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community Organizing - organization, ability to sell and convince, public speaking

Diplomatic Negotiation - knowledge on the topic, ability to sell and convince

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.

Community Organizing - winning an election, changing the tone of a topic

Diplomatic Negotiation - a mutually agreeable solution
APPENDIX BB

Online survey respondent #31

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1970)

1961

3. Please indicate your gender

Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Black or African-American

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

Community Organizing – To empower people in a community to act in order to change things they find wrong in the community. So it's about a leader who can change things for the better or holding elected officials accountable to folks around a common cause.

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields. (if you don't know, leave blank.)

Community Organizing – Communication skills, stamina, being organized, passion, patience

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.

Community Organizing – When the people you have organized are doing it on their own, also known as 'organizing yourself out of a job.'
2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year, for example, 1976)

1985

3. Please indicate your gender

female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

African American

5. The categories below are designed to identify your racial category. Please select the category with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Asian

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following tasks:

Community organizing - building a network of people from the community who are invested in improving it either through small or large goals. Also community can be understood as a neighborhood, town or city or a school, etc.

Diplomatic - building relationships, bridges and compromises to try to resolve points of conflict and work together in a way that benefits all sides.

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

0-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years 16-20 years more than 20 years

Community organizing 

Diplomatic negotiations X

If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first:

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following tasks (leave blank if you do not know):

Community organizing - communication & negotiation, patience, perseverance, MacQueen patterns, leadership

Diplomatic negotiation - force, political correctness, cultural knowledge, patience, perseverance, leadership

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you distress or measure successful partnerships in each of the following tasks:
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Online survey respondent #34

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1975)
1975

3. Please indicate your gender
Male

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.
Not Hispanic Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.
Black or African American

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:
Diplomatic Negotiation - helping one to nations

7. How many years experience do you have in the follow fields?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Organizing</th>
<th>Diplomatic Negotiation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (please state if you do not know):
Community Organizing - patience, understanding
Diplomatic Negotiation - patience, understanding

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:
Community Organizing - The community engages in activities to better themselves and their community
APPENDIX EE

Online survey respondent #36

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1976)

1981

3. Please indicate your gender

Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

Black or African American

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following tactics:

Community organizing - mobilizing and empowering members and making them full participants in an organized manner, and helping them to achieve a goal
Diplomatic negotiation - negotiating terms for conduct behavior in a way that respects cultural differences in cultural norms and expectations

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

6-1 years 2-4 years 6-8 years 10-15 years 16-20 years more than 20 years
Community Organizing X
Diplomatic Negotiations X
If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which was first: community organizing

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner in the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):

Community organizing - patience, diplomacy, cultural understanding / competence, strong communication skills

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:

Community organizing - when the organized group achieves goals that benefit the community over a period of time
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Online survey respondent #37

2. In what year were you born? (enter 4-digit birth year; for example, 1979)
1962

3. Please indicate your gender
Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following fields:

7. How many years experience do you have in the following fields?

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields:

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields:

10. If you have experience in both fields, please indicate which came first:
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Online survey respondent #38

2. In what year were you born? (Enter 4-digit birth year, for example, 1976)
1982

3. Please indicate your gender
Female

4. The categories below are designed to identify your ethnicity. Please select the category which identifies your ethnicity.
Not Hispanic or Latino

5. The categories below are designed to identify your basic racial category. Please select the categories with which you most closely identify yourself. You may choose more than one.
White

6. Using your own experience, please provide a brief description of the purpose, goals, or mission of the following entities:
Diplomatic Negotiation - helping poverty-stricken entities to address common challenges or conflicts

7. How many years experience do you have in the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Level</th>
<th>0-1 years</th>
<th>1-2 years</th>
<th>2-3 years</th>
<th>3-5 years</th>
<th>5-10 years</th>
<th>10-15 years</th>
<th>15-20 years</th>
<th>More than 20 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Organizing</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic Negotiation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Using your own experience, please list the skills required for a practitioner of the following fields (leave blank if you do not know):
Diplomatic Negotiation - listening, creative problem solving

9. Using your own experience, please describe how you define or measure successful performance in each of the following fields.
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