We Will Be Tested

As I write this, we are just ten days removed from the events of September 11. It has already become a commonplace to say that the world is different now. By the time you read this, it may be more different still. As I write, we are still reeling, and as a Center we are feeling our way through how we can respond to the tragedy and the events that will follow. The only thing that seems certain is that we must respond. Now, more than ever, our world needs reflection, dialogue, analysis. We began this process on the day after the bombing, by beginning to post reflections on the Web site. This is a practice that we will continue in the weeks and months to come, as events unfold in the United States and across the world. Please visit our site at www.brandeis.edu/ethics for the most recent contributions. In the meantime, I reprint here how the world looked to me on the day after, September 12, 2001:

We are grieving. The tragedy of the events in New York and Washington is testing the limits of our resilience, as we learn the fates of loved ones and strangers, men and women caught in the crossfire of history.

In the weeks and months to come, we will be tested in different ways. As we seek to move forward as individuals, as a nation, as members of a world community, we will find that our deepest values, our deepest convictions will be challenged in ways that we can only begin to imagine. Our health and our spirit, individually and collectively, will depend on how we meet these challenges.

Some of us believe that evil understands only force, that violence must be met with violence, that retribution for horrific crimes must be swift, sure, and forceful. But we are learning that the targets for our guns and our bombs do not stand out against a city skyline, but shrink from the daylight in isolated corners of the world. If we believe that justice requires proportionate punishment, our beliefs will be tested.

Some of us believe in the power and possibility of pacifism, and argue that we can best combat terror and violence through the faith and discipline that comes through holding human life as the highest value. But we are learning that the purveyors of death are ruthless and capable, and we will find that “security” for ourselves and our loved ones is no longer an abstract concept in America. If we believe that nonviolence is not only right but effective, our beliefs will be tested.

Some of us place the highest value on liberty: on freedom of movement, on the right to privacy, on protection from the intrusions of government. But we are learning that the enemies of liberty are unafraid to exploit it, taking advantage of democracy’s openness to engage in secret warfare. If we believe that freedom is the bulwark of our society, our beliefs will be tested.

Some of us believe that security is the foundation of a free society, that maintaining our way of life depends on thinking first about acquiring the firepower to protect ourselves. But we are learning this week that every system is vulnerable, and that the true core of a society is not its infrastructure but the capacity of its people to think first about acquiring the firepower to protect ourselves. But we are learning that a strong defense should take precedence over other priorities, our beliefs will be tested.

Some of us believe that security is the foundation of a free society, that maintaining our way of life depends on thinking first about acquiring the firepower to protect ourselves. But we are learning this week that every system is vulnerable, and that the true core of a society is not its infrastructure but the capacity of its people to think first about acquiring the firepower to protect ourselves. But we are learning that a strong defense should take precedence over other priorities, our beliefs will be tested.

Some of us put our faith in the greatness of America. But we are learning that American power and presence generates fearsome levels of anger in many corners of the world, feelings that we can no longer dismiss as envy or childish resentment. If we believe that American dominance is essential to the future of the world, our beliefs will be tested.

A Sample of Initial Reactions

What does winning a war against terrorism mean? How has hatred of America become a source of meaning for vast numbers whose poverty already amounts to a state of war? Must a massive campaign of unleashed violence become America’s new source of meaning, too? The World Trade Center was a symbol of the social, economic, and political hope Americans treasure, a hope embodied above all in law. To win the struggle against terrorism means inspiring that same hope in the hearts of all who do not have it. How we respond to this catastrophe will define our patriotism, shape the century, and memorialize our beloved dead.

—James Carroll, Center Advisory Board Member (9/15/01)

We must, through dialogue and consensus, build bridges to those whose lives have been...
order, our beliefs will be tested.

Some of us believe that power is the problem, that its superpower status has tempted the United States to exploit the marginalized and the dispossessed around the globe. But we are learning that no recital of past wrongs rings true as justification, when thousands of innocent lives are taken in an instant. If we believe that America is the primary source of the world’s problems, our beliefs will be tested.

These and many of our other beliefs will be tested, to be sure. The challenge is to meet that test through rigorous examination of the moral and political principles we hold dear, with a respectful ear open to the ideas and passionate insights of others.

We would be foolish to pretend that the life-changing events of this month will have no impact on our convictions, and we must embrace and accept the possibility of modifying our beliefs in the face of new circumstances.

Yet it would be equally foolish to throw cherished ideals out the window, just because we were, collectively, unable to prevent a colossal tragedy.

Now, more than ever, we need to consider our actions as individuals and as a nation in the light not just of our immediate feelings of sorrow and rage, but in the light of the whole range of values and ideals that we stand for. Wherever we stand on the spectra of politics and temperament, let us have the courage to ask hard questions of ourselves as we reflect, we converse, and we act.

continued from page 1

Once we succeed in eliminating the organization that was responsible for last Tuesday’s terrorist triumph, it will be a lot easier to secure the cooperation of the other rogue regimes that have sheltered terrorist organizations in the past. Having seen the willingness of the civilized world to pay whatever price in blood and treasure is necessary to remove this scourge from the country from which the planning for the attack emanated, they will be far more likely to crack down on the terrorist groups they have hosted in the past, lest such a fate befall them too. If they remain recalcitrant, we will have no choice but to go after them as well.

–Stephen J. Solarz, Center Advisory Board Member (9/14/01)

When I entered the subway on the afternoon of the attack, I saw an older lady coughing, coughing, and coughing. Polite as I am, I said “Bless you” to her. She liked that. So I said “Bless you” again. Well, she liked that too. I asked her if she was okay. “No, do I look okay?” she replied. “Damn those Arab terrorists . . .” In the subway I sat next to her and made a point of listening to her. Really listening. Although the ride was short, she successfully revealed to me her enormous anger and frustration at “the Arab countries who allow this to happen.” Had she been in President Bush’s shoes, she said, she would have definitely bombed all countries involved in this by now. She blamed the Palestinians, the Arabs, the Muslims, and the Israelis. She claimed that the Israelis should have given the Palestinians what they needed. I just listened the entire time, looked her in the eyes and nodded my head. She felt safe to say anything on her mind. I provided her the most safety and comfort possible. I turned the train in another direction and got ready to leave the subway, I looked at her and asked her where are you from? She was surprised, of course. She asked me whether I spoke “Jewish” or not. “Yes, but my mother language is Arabic” I said. She seemed so confused!!! “You are Israeli, but your mother language is Arabic?” she said, as the train stopped and the doors opened. As I grabbed my black bag, stood up and got ready to leave the subway, I looked at her eyes one last time and said: “Well, it’s complicated. I am an Arab, I am Palestinian, I am Muslim, I am an Israeli, and I agree with you, we live in a messed-up world.”

–Forsan Hussein, 1998 Ethics and Coexistence Student Fellow (9/12/01)
The Center is happy to announce the publication of Working with Integrity: A Guidebook for Peacebuilders Asking Ethical Questions by Cynthia Cohen, Director of the Brandeis Initiative in Intercommunal Coexistence. With funding from the United States Institutes of Peace and the Alan B. Slifka Foundation, Cohen developed the guidebook as a resource for people who promote coexistence and reconciliation in historically divided communities. It is not a training manual designed to impart skills or a textbook intended to teach peacebuilding theory. It is designed instead to engage its users in an approach to ethical inquiry that is useful for the kinds of dilemmas and questions that arise in the work of building peace.

The following is an excerpt from the chapter “When Should We Refrain from Speaking?” For more information on the guidebook visit the Center online at www.brandeis.edu/ethics or contact the Center.

**Identifying the Ethical Issue**

[“Losing My Sense of What is Right and Wrong” is a] story, told by Sanath*, a Sinhalese Sri Lankan peacebuilder. It reveals some of the dilemmas and tensions that emerged when he tried to strengthen tenuous relationships and build trust with Tamil counterparts by temporarily refraining from speaking his mind. His self-awareness, and the candor with which he reveals his inner processes are especially helpful in considering the ethical possibilities and risks inherent in refraining from speaking.

One dilemma I grapple with personally is when to raise issues that might damage a tenuous trust I am developing with someone from the Tamil community. I try to avoid getting into debates, because I know that I’m not that good at it, and I can easily get emotionally caught up in the debate. Also, I know that whatever points are made there don’t matter that much in the end. I’d rather allow what is, in my view, a slightly biased version of the real picture than create a fight or an uproar or risk damaging a relationship with a Tamil colleague. Usually I prefer the other person to have his say rather than have to fight the particular issue. But I also find I use it, in a way, to disarm the other side...

...There was another instance at an international institute when Murali, a Tamil colleague, became really emotional when Gene Sharp, an advocate of non-violence, raised objections to the Tamil strategy that includes the use of violence. I actually sympathize with Gene’s view that after the Tamils resorted to violence many more have suffered or been killed. Before the Tamils took up arms there were periodic riots in which tens, twenties, maybe hundreds were killed. A thousand may have been killed in a major riot. In 1983 that was the biggest one, and according to government figures maybe 400 Tamils were killed, but no one is really sure of the figure. But after they became militant, the repression became massive. Twenty-five percent of the Tamil population have left the country.

I believe Gene Sharp, that maybe if there had been an equivalent kind of commitment to nonviolence the level of destruction of Tamil land, Tamil property, and Tamil lives would be much less. But my Tamil colleague did not see it that way. He made the point that after the Tigers took up arms, the riots against the Tamils stopped. He said that before they took up arms they were getting killed, but after they were not getting killed. But actually the Tamil people are getting killed much more by the State, by the army. He was focusing on civilian against civilian, and that has stopped. But it has been replaced by the army killing civilians. But if I pointed that out, Murali might have gotten heated. So that’s the main reason I didn’t want to state my opinion at that time.

But the second reason is that the Tamil side of the story is not being heard. Five years ago it was being expressed, but it isn’t now. So I’m representing a side that, in effect, has gotten its story out. So why should I try to put spokes into the Tamil story? The largest reason not to state my opinion is that I didn’t want the session to degenerate into squabbling and damage my relationship with Murali.

The question is, though, when do you raise certain issues when they might jeopardize an important interpersonal relationship? My tendency would be to...

*All names are pseudonyms.
Global Partnerships in Education

The Center’s Global Education Partnerships Program is in full swing in 2001. Funded by a grant from the Coca-Cola Foundation, the program links Brandeis students and faculty with education programs in Chelsea, Massachusetts, the Caribbean island nation of Grenada, and Haifa, Israel.

The purpose of the project is to engage teams in the exploration of family, community, and the cultural, aesthetic, historical, and intellectual inheritances of youth as sources of learning. Teams are comprised of community educators, Brandeis faculty, and students. The community-based educators will apply the skills learned to strengthen their communities and enhance the relationships of distinct cultural groups within and between communities.

The program design involves three partnership teams each consisting of one Brandeis faculty member, two Brandeis students, and a member from a partnership organization — a community-based youth education program. The project is composed of three phases: 1) the community-based education and culture institute, 2) travel to partner sites, and 3) the development of group projects for a forthcoming publication.

The Three Teams

**Destination: Chelsea and Revere, Massachusetts**

**Partner Organization:** Roca, Inc., a grassroots community development and leadership training organization

**Participants:**
- Sayra Pinto, Roca
- Keyse Angelo, Roca
- Lisette Olivera, Roca
- Victor Jose Santana, Roca
- Lawrence Neil Bailis, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis
- April Powell-Willingham, Ethics Center, Brandeis
- Natalie Lukashevsky, ‘03
- Mike Feuer, M.A. student, Brandeis

**Destination: Israel**

**Partner Organization:** Center for Jewish Education, University of Haifa, and youth in coexistence programs

**Participants:**
- Sarah Meltzer, University of Haifa
- Sigalit Slubski, ‘01, University of Haifa
- Shifra Schonman, University of Haifa
- Gordie Fellman, Sociology, Brandeis
- Pamela Blau, violinist and Jungian analyst
- Stephanie Gerber, Ph.D. student, Brandeis
- Maisa Khshaibon, ‘03

**Destination: Grenada**

**Organization:** GRENED, a community-based program devoted to youth educational programming

**Participants:**
- Joseph Date, GRENED
- Dessima Williams, Sociology, Brandeis
- Gardie Guiteau, ‘02
- Nicole Murray, ‘02
Highlights from the Community-Based Education and Culture Institute

The 10-day global community-based education and culture institute, held in June 2001, was developed and led by the institute’s Director, Jane Sapp, whose approach to “cultural work” is at the center of the Global Education Partnerships Project. Program Director April Powell-Willingham and Project Coordinator Stephanie Gerber were also instrumental in organizing the institute. Ms. Sapp is a musician and educator who conducts folklore research in the American south and performs and teaches in communities throughout the United States and abroad. Her primary focus is on building communities through cultural expression, creativity, and exchange. Ms. Sapp promotes the discussion of sensitive and important issues among diverse groups by encouraging participants to share their insights though stories, songs, poems, and the visual arts.

“I was born in Augusta, Georgia and grew up during a period of segregation in the South. I’ve just never forgotten segregation; I think that my work around social justice is to make sure that it doesn’t happen again. No one should ever feel that kind of assault on one’s dignity, intelligence, community, and sense of humanity.”

Participants explored “cognitive drama” in a workshop led by Dr. Shifra Schonman of Haifa University.

Joseph “Squares” Date, who leads a steel drum orchestra of sixty young people in Grenada, added Caribbean rhythms and tam-tams to the musical mix.
Moving Pictures: Framing Coexistence

Hosted by the Brandeis Initiative in Intercommunal Coexistence, Moving Pictures: Framing Coexistence, an International Documentary Film Series explored the potential and limitations of documentary-making as a resource for coexistence. A series of six films were presented, from regions including South Africa, Northern Ireland, Sri Lanka, Kosovo, and the Middle East. A session that included background on the conflict, comments from the filmmakers, responses to the documentary, and reflections on efforts towards coexistence and reconciliation in the region presented followed each film.

Students as well as other members of the Brandeis community and local organizations were invited to participate. The sessions helped students realize that documentary-makers relate to their medium in distinct ways: as artists, educators, and coexistence practitioners.

- Lawrence Pitkethly relates to documentary-making as an artist. He uses his return to his native Belfast, his own subjective journey, as a central element of his documentary Belfast My Love.

- John Michalczyk's work emphasizes the educational dimension as he brings teams of American students into various conflict regions: “We’re trying to understand the issues. We never will fully understand because we weren’t there to live out the pain, the tragedy, and sometimes the healing in each area. But what we have done is bring back testimony of what happened.”

- Susan Siegel of the Global Action Project considers documentary-making itself as a coherence intervention. She put cameras into the hands of Palestinian and Israeli youth and encourages them to document their lives, their dialogues, and their visits to each other’s homes. The shaping of the documentary becomes an exercise in coexistence; the result an educational resource.
American Premiere of *Belfast My Love*

**The Overriding Pre-Emptive Visual Authority of Media Images**

Excerpts from Lawrence Pitkethly’s Address

“When you go back to a place that’s important in your life the real question is not if you go back but how you go back... In August 1969, I was a young BBC television reporter who’d grown up in Northern Ireland covering the story for BBC London. Thirty years later I went back to the city to try and understand, as well as assess, what those traumatic events set in motion. The question I asked myself in Belfast was whether I believed the hype and occasional hoopla about transformation? Were the two sides genuinely being reconciled? Or was it possible that at the end of thirty years of so-called coexistence, sectarian animosity between Protestants and Catholics could be re-activated in a new context?

...I can’t help thinking that more might be done in the area of cultural stimulation. A people habituated to conflict could benefit from new paradigms of thought as much as from new houses, otherwise the houses will always remain apart in a divided community... By cultural stimulation I mean a re-imagination of some basic working paradigms of Northern Irish identity, and of the arenas in which this is expressed—or contested.

Unfortunately, the British media still operates pretty much according to parameters established by the war. From the beginning, a few dominant, highly dramatic images of the conflict threaded together dialectically in a sort of rough montage, established a sort of overriding, pre-emptive, visual authority. These sequences began to project a drama of deteriorating community relations and conflict into people’s consciousness—and it depended on what side you were on how you interpreted these images, how they registered polemically... First you had police truncheons beating unarmed Civil Rights demonstrators at Burntullet in ’68. Then in Belfast in August ’69 whole streets were set ablaze and people fled their homes. The next image was the British Army entering Belfast as peacekeepers, as a civilizing force. The final image was Bloody Sunday with the British Army descending into the hell of its historic role in Ireland as a bloody occupying force. With that the signifiers were operating on full pistons and the war was on with a vengeance. Every image since—paramilitary hoods and balaclavas, hunger strikers, the giant graffiti in ghetto areas, bomb blast and funeral—has continued the same narrative. The war in that sense has been one long film from Belfast.

In order to change perceptions you have to alter the movie script, or at least suggest new visuals. We’ve had one image—hand-shakes for the Peace Agreement—followed by endless squabbles. It’s not enough to change the dominant film dialectic. Obviously filmmakers can’t do this in the abstract, but they can engage in the process of re-evaluation...”
# Selected Highlights of Spring and Summer 2001 Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>“Using Film to Foster Coexistence: Educational and Ethical Questions,” panel discussion and screening introducing <em>Moving Pictures: Framing Coexistence, an International Documentary Series</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARCH</td>
<td>“Art and Empowerment In Contemporary South Africa,” by Pamela Allara, Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Called to Service: The Future of Public Life,” featuring members of the Center’s advisory board in conjunction with the board’s second annual meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Israeli Women’s Peace Movement: Making Change at the Radical Edge,” with Marcia Freeman, an Israeli feminist and peace activist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY</td>
<td>“A Call to Conversation,” Brandeis students engage in a series of eleven small-group discussions on majority/minority relations on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUNE</td>
<td>“Cultural Work, Folklore, and Community Knowledge,” presentation and song-writing workshop by Jane Sapp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Cognitive Drama,” theatre workshop by Dr. Shifra Schonmann, Haifa University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Recent Peacebuilding and Reconciliation Work in Sierra Leone, Nigeria, and Rwanda: Challenges and Opportunities,” by Dr. Hizkias Assefa, Coordinator of the African Peacebuilding and Reconciliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JULY</td>
<td>“Aang Serian Peace Village: Preserving and Promoting Maasai Culture,” presentation and slide show by Aang Serian founders, Lesikar Ole Ngila and Yunus Rafiq of Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“From Tippecat to Alumbulic: Traditional Creativity and the Application of Folklore in Coexistence,” by Dr. Simon Lichman of the Centre for Creativity in Education and Cultural Heritage, Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In June, Cynthia Cohen, director of the Brandeis Initiative in Intercommunal Coexistence, presented the Initiative as a model of a multi-faceted approach to coexistence education to the Anti-Bias Education Working Group of the American Jewish Committee in Chicago. April Powell-Willingham and Mark Power Robison attended a conference at the Salzburg Seminar, in Salzburg, Austria. “International Legal Perspectives on Human Rights” brought together legal and human rights professionals from over 35 countries and was cochaired by Justice Richard Goldstone, a Center Advisory Board member. Marci McPhee, assistant director of the Center, also serves as the cochair for the Religious, Pluralism, and Spirituality Committee (RPS) at Brandeis. With RPS, Marci is spearheading an initiative for the University to take a collective campus-wide break to observe an “Hour of Presence” to consider a more mindful, balanced, and healthful approach to time. The event will take place on April 24th, 2002 from 2-3 p.m. Hizkias Assefa, visiting scholar to the Center and coordinator of the African Peacebuilding and Reconciliation Network, held a discussion in June on Recent Peacebuilding and Reconciliation Work in Sierra Leone, Nigeria, and Rwanda. Devika Mahadevan, a 1999 Brandeis Ethics and Coexistence Student Fellow and Hart Fellow through Duke University, received a full scholarship to London School of Economics where she is pursing a master’s degree in Development Studies.

**2001 Ethics and Coexistence Student Fellows**

Student Fellows have returned from their summer internships in Israel, Northern Ireland, South Africa, and Sri Lanka.

**Aliya Caler, ’02**
*U Managing Conflict (UMAC) Women and Peacebuilding Programme, Cape Town, South Africa*
Empowers women from disadvantaged areas as leaders and peacebuilders in their communities

**Maryanne Cullinan, ’02**
*Corrymeela Community, Ballycastle, Northern Ireland*
Committed to reconciliation and the healing of social, religious and political divisions

**Anna Jaffe-Desnick, ’02**
*Gender Advocacy Programme, Cape Town, South Africa*
Works to reduce domestic violence in South Africa by educating women about their rights and increasing access to resources

**Jennifer Lewey, ’02**
*Sewa Lanka Foundation, Colombo, Sri Lanka*
Promotes social mobilization and institutional capacity building in mainly conflict-affected communities

**Yaser Robles, ’03**
*Ikamva Labantu, Cape Town, South Africa*
Supports democracy in post-apartheid South Africa by providing educational and economic resources to community members and townships

**Daniel Weinstein, ’02**
*Gesher, Jerusalem, Israel*
Promotes dialogue between secular and religious Jews through the implementation of educational programs

---

**E-Mail Update from the Field**

“[Teaching] the English classes are great… I now have over twenty students… I had a full house (refugees, community people, and even school children). It was quite a challenge, but it worked out really well …

This Thursday I gave a presentation on coexistence through dialogue and cultural understanding. I felt that it was very appropriate to talk about this issue especially because it is a mixed group. Most of them are refugees from different African countries. [Although they] live in the same shelter, there is no real unity among them. In my coexistence class last semester we learned about the different approaches and definitions of coexistence. Here at the shelter I was able to identify one of those definitions. Eugene Weiner believes that coexistence is to be able to live with each other without having to become friends. This is what was happening with my students. They see each other’s face every day, but don’t know each other’s names. They are coexisting according to Weiner’s definition, but they are hurting themselves.

[On] Thursday they talked about themselves. They had a voice and were listened to. Every time one of them talked, I could see the smiles in the room. There were so many things they didn’t know about each other. They were really surprised. Toward the end of the class I could see them getting closer to each other.

Teaching these people has been one of the best experiences here in South Africa. I could relate to them, particularly because English is my second language and I can understand their struggles. [Also, I’ve] read many books for my classes and I’m so thankful I did because I’m teaching these people what I learned in class. This has been an opportunity that not everyone gets. It feels really good to be able to put in what you’ve learned into practice.”

—Yaser Robles, ’03, South Africa Ethics and Coexistence Student Fellow
preserve the relationship and wait for the opportunity to make the real points. In this case, I did show a video in a later session, which brought out the Muslim issue, and there were other opportunities in some of the sessions we had. I was telling others, but Murali was also present. So I was able to communicate my point of view in a more subtle way. And I know he listens, because we do talk about these issues afterward, and I also listen to what he says.

When Murali talks, I get a sense of how the people in the Northeast feel. They will not grumble if the LTTE kills mayors, because they see these mayors as agents of the army, and the army is occupying them and they are fighting a war. They understand that the mayors are actually there to legitimize the presence of the army. In the same way we will not grumble if the LTTE kills army people because they are fighting a war.

Basically the Tamil logic is very difficult for people who are outside the Northeast, or even foreigners, to accept. So, thanks to Murali, I have a better sense of how people in the Northeast feel. Now Murali did not communicate this directly to me. It happened that there was a third party, a journalist – she was part of the Burgher community, descendants of the Portuguese and the Dutch – and she was raising the question about the mayors. Now maybe because I was there, he was also trusted the journalist because of my presence. Maybe this would have been too intense for us to do one-on-one. The journalist as a third person lessened the emotional intensity of the whole thing.

But I have a problem if I tell this story to people in my office or in my family. They can’t accept the legitimacy of killing elected mayors, and they get upset. They say that I’m supporting the LTTE, which to them is a very bad thing. But then I have to say, “Well, those are the people we are trying to make peace with.” I start losing my sense of what is acceptable, of what is right and what is wrong. That is another type of dilemma I face.

Responses to James Carroll’s Constantine’s Sword: The Church and the Jews: A History is now available. Contact the Center for a free copy.

The Center Welcomes New Staff Member

The Center would like to welcome Lesley Yalen, the new administrative assistant for the Brandeis Initiative in Intercommunal Coexistence. Lesley has worked for the Middle East Conflict Resolution Program at Search for Common Ground in Washington, DC and Gaza City. She is a graduate of Brown University and has received training in peacebuilding and conflict resolution with organizations such as Creative Response to Conflict and the School for International Training.
**Brandeis International Fellows Selected for the 2001-2003 Program in Human Rights, Intervention, and International Law**

The 2001-03 Brandeis International Fellowships in Human Rights, Intervention, and International Law convenes ten scholars, educators, activists, and judges from around the world for a combination of collaborative sessions and individual reflection. Their efforts focus on developing a framework for reflective practice in international courts on issues of human rights and intervention. Participants in the program attend three institutes over eighteen months designed to develop a methodology for orienting new international judges to ideas and responsibilities in these areas. They will also produce projects related to the Fellows program, such as scholarly articles or teaching modules for judges. Their work over the course of the program will pioneer new frameworks for thinking about international intervention and human rights, and new means of preparing jurists for the challenges of this emerging field. Fellows will be at Brandeis for their first Institute from November 11th through the 16th, 2001.

**David Benatar** is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Cape Town, South Africa. Dr. Benatar teaches courses in applied ethics, contemporary moral and political philosophy, critical thinking, bioethics, and philosophy of law. He is the author of *Ethics for Everyday* and numerous articles.

**Brian Concannon Jr.** is a human rights lawyer and activist. Since 1996 he has managed the Bureau des Avocats Internationaux, an office funded by the Haitian government to help the judiciary prosecute human rights violations from Haiti’s 1991-94 dictatorship. Mr. Concannon is currently working on an article entitled “The Bureau des Avocats Internationaux: A Victim-Centered Approach” for the volume *Effective Strategies for Protecting Human Rights*.

**Peter Ford** is British Ambassador to Bahrain. He is also a linguist and a Middle East specialist with extensive experience in the politics and economics of the region. Prior to becoming Ambassador, Mr. Ford served as head of the Near East and North Africa Department in the British Foreign Office, and Senior Advisor to the Foreign Secretary on the Middle East peace process. His other diplomatic posts have included Riyadh, Paris, Cairo, and Beirut.

**David Hawk** is a consultant on human rights and international affairs. He has consulted for organizations such as the Landmine Survivors Network, Fair Labor Association, U.S. Committee for Refugees, and Amnesty International. Mr. Hawk also served as head of education and chief of the Education, Training, and Information Unit for the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights Cambodia Office in Phnom Penh. He is currently researching and writing on the subject of transitional justice in Phnom Penh.

**Naina Kapur** is an attorney and Director of Saskhi, a violence intervention center in New Delhi, India. She is also cochairperson of the Asia-Pacific Advisory Forum on Judicial Education and Equality Issues, an ongoing judge-led effort to mainstream gender equality issues within the judiciary with specific emphasis on violence against women. In addition, she is Legal Counsel for a test case before the Supreme Court of India focused on re-interpreting the existing law on rape.

**Agnieszka Klonowiecka-Milart** is an international judge with the United Nations Mission in Kosovo, serving on the Pristina District Court. She also serves as a District Court Judge in Lublin, Poland. Judge Klonowiecka-Milart began her international judicial experience in 1998 when she was selected by the United Nations as head of the Judicial Revue Team that examined the judiciary system in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Prior to her time on the bench she taught criminal law and procedure in Poland.

**Joseph Marko** is a law professor and director of the Center for South-East European Studies at the University of Graz, in Austria. In addition, he is an international judge and Vice-President of the Constitutional Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina. His main areas of research include international law, comparative constitutional law, and politics in East Central Europe. He has written, coauthored, or edited seventeen books and numerous articles on law and politics.

**Chidi Anselm Odinkalu** serves as Senior Legal Officer for the Africa, Liberty, and Security of Persons Programmes at Interights in London. He has also been a Solicitor and Advocate of the Supreme Court of Nigeria since 1988. An active member of the Executive Boards of several NGOs, he has also served as a Human Rights Advisor for the U.N. Observer Mission in Sierra Leone. Mr. Odinkalu’s most recent book *Building Bridges for Rights: Inter-African Initiatives in the field of Human Rights* follows two monographs on Nigerian legal issues.

**Shiranee Tilakawardane** was the first woman appointed as a Court of Appeal Judge in Sri Lanka. Previously, she was a High Court Judge and an Admiralty Court Judge. Judge Tilakawardane’s efforts are focused on the fields of equality, gender education, and child rights. She has been active in Sakshi of India’s gender workshops for judges, the Asia Pacific Forum for Gender Education for Judges, and serves on the International Panel of Judges for the Child Rights Bureau.

**Silvana Turner** is an investigator and researcher for the Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team, an organization that applies the techniques of forensic anthropology to the investigation of human rights violations. Ms. Turner is also an assistant lecturer at the University of Buenos Aires, Argentina. In addition to participating in investigations in Argentina, she has joined forensic teams working in Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Panama, Guatemala, Honduras, Bosnia, Kosovo, the Philippines, and Ethiopia.
Announcement of the Middle East Youth Leaders Exchange Project

In cooperation with Crossing Borders (Jordan), Givat Haviva (Israel), and the Palestinian House of Friendship (PNA), the Center is implementing the Middle East Youth Leaders Exchange Program. The program is designed to build capacity within a cohort of exemplary youth leaders, enabling them to design and implement cross-border community research projects. With the assistance of the Center for Youth and Communities of the Heller Graduate School, the project will help young professionals working with youth in Palestine, Israel, and Jordan to design community research projects that will enhance communication among young people from the three areas.

The program’s purpose is to demonstrate how youth leaders from regions in conflict can enhance their commitments to and capacities for coexistence through collaboration in community research projects. The training and the projects themselves provide opportunities for the participants to explore both commonalities and differences, and to discuss conflicts productively and with open minds. The community research field draws on ethnographic and journalistic tools such as oral history, photography, video, and the arts to better understand particular issues confronting local communities.

At the heart of this project is the development of a new generation of leadership in the Middle East. The direct beneficiaries of the project—eighteen Israeli, Palestinian, and Jordanian youth leaders—will study together, work together, and develop a lasting network. By working actively together on issues that face youth in Jewish and Arab communities, they will be modeling a 21st century approach to leadership that is regional, rather than national or sectarian. But the project’s scope will go well beyond those participants, as these professionals help develop leadership and coexistence skills among today’s teenagers. As today’s young people become accustomed to looking honestly and deeply together at issues that affect them all, they will lay the groundwork for working productively together on practical solutions to common problems when they are themselves the practitioners and policymakers a decade or two into the 21st century. The project will begin in the fall of 2001 and continue into the summer of 2002.

This program is funded by a grant from the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the U.S. State Department.
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