

**Esalen Russian-American
Partnership Project
(ERAPP)**

Co-Sponsored with

TRACK TWO: An Institute for Citizen Diplomacy

**Esalen Institute
Big Sur, California**

October 3-8, 2010

An Introduction

There are now two great nations in the world which, starting from different points, seem to be advancing toward the same goal: the Russians and the Anglo-Americans... Their point of departure is different and their paths diverse; nevertheless, each seems called by some secret desire of Providence one day to hold in its hands the destinies of half the world.

-- ALEXIS DE TOCQUEVILLE, *Democracy in America*, 1835

When Esalen Institute Esalen established its Soviet-American Center in 1980 (now TRACK TWO) the relationship between the two superpowers was the primary nexus of global affairs. With the peaceful conclusion of the Cold War, people worldwide hoped that the conflict between the U.S. and Russia might be sublimated to form a powerful new partnership, and that the hard-won lessons of the Cold War might pave the way for a more peaceful world. This dream, however, has not yet been realized. As Michael Murphy (Founder and Chairman Emeritus of Esalen Institute) said in his opening remarks at the conference, the U.S.-Russian relationship has become “the world’s laziest asset.”

In their invitation letter to the participants of Esalen Russian-American Partnership Project, Michael Murphy, Dulce Murphy (Founder and Executive Director TRACK TWO), and Jay Ogilvy, (conference facilitator) summarized the purpose of the conference:

The rationale for this initiative is based on two facts: first, that relations between Russia and America have deteriorated markedly in recent years; and second, that this deterioration has happened, paradoxically, at a time of unprecedented opportunity for Russian-American collaborations. In undertaking this project, we will build upon the past successes of Russian-American activities sponsored by Esalen Institute and TRACK TWO, formerly The Russian-American Center. But we will do so while recognizing that when it comes to our main mission, the cementing of Russian-American relations, we must acknowledge: mission not accomplished.

Rather than stemming the flow of ideas with a detailed agenda (or, as Ogilvy described it, sentencing the group to a “death march of PowerPoint presentations,”) the structure of the conference was open and simple: it would begin with two relatively structured sessions:

- an international affairs-oriented exploration of the end of the Cold War from an American perspective, led by Jack Matlock (p.4)
- an introduction to the cultural gulf between Russia and America for a more domestic and Russian perspective, led by Vladimir Pozner (p.6)

From these two sessions and a discussion of the nature of citizen diplomacy (p.9), a set of topics emerged that became the foci for the remaining sessions of the conference:

- Investigating the Nature of Media (p.10)
- Rethinking Science and the Environment (p.12)
- Examining the Idea of a Citizens Youth Council (p.14)
- Considering the Essence of Culture (p.15)
- Understanding Business and the Arts (p.17)
- Exploring U.S.-Russian Relations with respect to Space (p.17)

At the conclusion of these sessions the conference participants identified a number of programmatic ideas and potential avenues for action. These ideas (along with those that arose throughout the week) are cataloged in **Appendix A.** (p.21) of this document.

Conference Facilitator:

Jay Ogilvy, co-founder of Global Business Network, former Dean of the Presidio School of Management, Chair of Esalen CTR's Global Potentials program

Andrei Falaleyev—Russian/English interpreter

Bram Briggance—recorder, note-taker

Conference Participants:

Gennady Alferenko, founder of the Foundation for Social Innovation, international business strategist

Marc S. Allen, Assistant Associate Administrator for Strategy, Policy, and International within NASA's Science Mission Directorate, research astronomer and solar physicist

Alexander (Sasha) Bouis, mechanical engineer, software developer, yacht captain

Antonina (Nina) Bouis, Vice President of the Andrei Sakharov Foundation, international consultant, Russian translator

Jean-Claude Bouis, writer, editor, photographer, journalist

Tara Chaille, education expert, chef, champion athlete

Viktor Erofeyev, internationally acclaimed writer, television host, Board Member of TRACK TWO

Mark Garber, Executive Director for Fleming Family & Partners, physician, entrepreneur, natural resources expert

Lizbeth Hasse, international lawyer, negotiator and mediator, Board Member of TRACK TWO

Nicolas V. Iljine, Vice President of International Development for GCAM Group New York, public relations expert, author

J. Mitchell Johnson, Manager of J. Mitchell Johnson Productions, Inc./Abamedia, LLP, filmmaker, visual artist, Board Member of TRACK TWO

Davlat Khudonazarov, filmmaker, politician, human rights activist

Mary Ellen Klee, Arica teacher, acupuncturist, Esalen Board Member
Alexandra (Sasha) Kapitsa, business consultant, international volunteer
Nikolai Kovarsky, Co-Chair of the Club 2015, international strategist
Anya Kucharev, university instructor, author, translator
Jack F. Matlock, Jr., Former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, author
John A. (Mac) McQuown, co-founder of KMV, co-founder and Director of Dimensional Fund Advisors, Board Member of TRACK TWO
Dulce W. Murphy, President and Executive Director of TRACK TWO: An Institute for Citizen Diplomacy
Michael Murphy, co-founder and Chairman of the Esalen Institute, author
MacKenzie (Mac) Murphy, student of sustainable business practices, Esselen Indians expert
Alexei Novikov, General Director of Standard & Poor's EA-Ratings, finance expert
Vladimir Pozner, political commentator, journalist, author, Board Member of TRACK TWO
Jonathan Sanders, international reporter, telecommunications innovator, university instructor
Tatyana Sanikovich, Human Resources Manager for the Esalen Institute
Stephan A. Schwartz, Editor of The Schwartz Report, Senior Samueli Fellow for the Brain, Mind and Healing of the Samueli Institute, researcher, columnist, author, Board Member of TRACK TWO
Ksenia Semenova, New York editor, Snob Magazine
Cynthia Stone, international business developer, finance and public affairs expert
Gordon Wheeler, President of the Esalen Institute, psychologist, author, publisher
Sam Yau, Chair of the Esalen Board, business leader and strategist

Monday, October 4

First Morning Session

Re-examining the Lessons of the Cold War

A presentation and discussion led by Jack Matlock

Matlock began his presentation by voicing his concerns about the direction of both U.S. and world foreign policy. In essence, he stated that our current leaders had failed to capitalize upon what Soviet and U.S. leaders had achieved through the peaceful end of the Cold War. Much of our current international policy, including U.S. foreign policy, is based on distorted perspectives of Cold War history. To help frame the week's discussions, Matlock named four widely held myths about the end of the Cold War, and then explicated three "seismic events" that he claims were truly responsible for fundamentally transforming the nature of U.S.-Soviet relations and the geopolitical face of the globe.

In brief, Matlock stated four misperceptions regarding the Cold War: 1) the Cold War ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union; 2) the Cold War ended due to economic and military pressure by the U.S.; 3) the U.S. “won” the Cold War; and 4) Ronald Reagan is the figure most responsible for the transformation of the Soviet Union and U.S.-Soviet relations.

Rather than clinging to these myths, Matlock stated that world leaders should focus on the three seminal historical developments that reshaped the trajectory of history. By understanding the nature of these events, he said, one can have a clear sense of the transmutation of U.S.-Soviet relations, and the effect this change had on the calculus of geopolitics. The first “seismic event” was the “end of the Cold War.” Matlock somewhat emblematically places the date of this event on December 7, 1988; this is the date on which Mikhail Gorbachev, when addressing the General Assembly of the United Nations, declared that class warfare would no longer be the centerpiece of Soviet international policy. As evidence that America’s relationship with the Soviets had ceased to be adversarial long before the collapse of the Soviet Union, Matlock shared a number of illuminating anecdotes. In one story Matlock shared that when Secretary of State Jim Baker wanted relief from stressful foreign negotiations, he would ask his staff to “schedule a meeting with Eduard,” referring to Soviet Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze. In another, he recounted an instance in which Secretary of State George Schultz once stated frankly to Mr. Shevardnadze, “Eduard, I will never ask you to do anything that is not in the best interest of your country.”

The second “seismic event” explained by Matlock was the loss of total control of the Soviet Union by the Communist Party. According to Matlock, Gorbachev, in order to circumvent resistance to his desired policies, used his influence as General Secretary to convince the party caucuses to submit to competitive elections. This move, coupled with the fact that majority votes were required to hold office and that voters could choose “none of the above,” eased the iron grip of the Communist Party over all Soviet affairs, and fostered a climate in which internal reform was possible.

The final “seismic event,” Matlock argued, was the breakup of the Soviet Union. The fact that the Cold War itself was long over was evidenced by the fact that the U.S. was fearful about the breakup of central authority. According to Matlock, this concern was due to both the potential creation of 12 additional nuclear states, and genuine concern for the Soviet people. He stated, “We [the U.S. leadership] trusted Gorbachev and the direction he was moving for the welfare of people.” Indicative of this attitude, in his widely criticized 1991 address in Kiev President George H. W. Bush implored his Ukrainian audience to not confuse “freedom” with “independence.”

In his concluding remarks, Matlock shared four observations: 1) the Cold War is not “back”—that current U.S.-Russian relations are based on natural international competition rather than existential struggle; 2) the U.S. is not the sole superpower—that while still the most powerful nation, in some ways America’s loss of its role as “necessary protector” has caused its influence to wane; 3) echoing Gorbachev Matlock called for a “new new thinking” to shape U.S.-Russian relations; and 4) in broad terms, U.S. and Russian interests are similar, including wrestling with such common foes as terrorism, climate change and the decentralization of political authority.

Matlock’s remarks spawned an intense conversation that traversed a wide range of topics. After a brief group discussion of the causes and effects of Khrushchev’s western territorial expansion, Viktor Erofeyev speculated on the critical role of individual

personalities in the unfolding of history. This idea that the mentality and temperament of individual leaders has a profound affect on world affairs became a motif throughout the morning's discussion, including exploring the differences between Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders, and casting Ronald Reagan in a much more positive light for many of the ERAPP participants.

Nick Iljine, Nina Bouis, and others explored a number of topics regarding Russia's relationship with Western Europe including the apparently unforgiving treatment it receives by the European Court of Human Rights, paths to closer relations, and the future of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, whose traditional role was encapsulated by Matlock as "to keep the U.S. in, the Russians out, and the Germans down."

Other subjects addressed before the session was adjourned included the threat posed by nuclear weapons and ballistic weapons and their proliferation, the increasing role of money and corporate power (including the potential development of "corporate states"), and the need to abjure "lecturing" and "patronizing" in international relations.

Toward the end of the session Stephan Schwartz asked, "What forces kept American (and Russian) foreign policy establishment from extracting so little wisdom from the end of the Cold War?" This question led to some brief exchanges about international relations regarding China, India, and Afghanistan, and helped set the table for subsequent conference discussions.

Monday, October 4

Afternoon Session

Understanding Russian Culture

A presentation and discussion led by Vladimir Pozner

Vladimir Pozner's presentation offered ERAPP participants the opportunity to understand some of the fundamental cultural differences between Russia and the United States. Only by understanding these differences, Pozner stated, can we establish new and effective partnerships between these two peoples. Pozner opened his remarks by explaining that he was not speaking to the group as a Russian, nor as an American, nor as a Frenchman (Pozner is a citizen of these three nations), but would endeavor to provide an objective portrayal of the current cultural landscape of Russia.

Pozner contextualized the current Russian-American relationship in terms of the history of TRACK TWO. TRACK TWO, he reminded us, was created in order to bring the peoples of the Soviet Union and America together in order to avoid war. However, in the wake of the end of the Cold War, Pozner observed that there is a paucity of exchanges between the two nations, and that a deep mistrust of America has increased among the Russian people. Pozner speculated that the reason the two nations have not been able to capitalize on successfully ending of the Cold War are that 1) the threat of war kept our attention focused to a degree that we have not maintained since, and 2) that the success of

U.S.-Soviet relations was largely dependent on the strong and competent leadership of Mikhail Gorbachev, and that there is no current equivalent of Gorbachev to serve that role today. To emphasize the cardinal importance of Gorbachev, Pozner asked the group to recall that Gorbachev's election over Viktor Grishin was decided by a single vote, and to imagine the ways in which history might have been vastly different.

While Pozner echoed Jack Matlock's assertion that Russian and American international interests are closely aligned (including climate change, terrorism, and disintegration of government authority) he emphatically warned the group not to conflate common interests with common culture. "Not only are Russia and America not the same fundamentally," he said, "in fact, no two countries are more different!"

Pozner offered three factors that have shaped Russian culture in unique ways. First, Pozner explained, the influence of the Russian Orthodox Church continues to imbue all Russian culture. Pozner postulates that much of Russia's current reactionary tendencies, notions of Russian exceptionalism, anti-Western attitudes, and chauvinism can be traced to the Orthodox Church. The Russians' deep identification with the Church, Pozner says, continues to be used by Russian leaders for political purposes.

A second factor that has shaped the culture of Russia in a way that makes it different from the West is a "slave mentality." Until the middle of the 19th Century most Russians were serfs. Pozner argues that this history of serfdom, which inherently places severe limits on autonomy, has impeded a natural sense of responsibility, including civic responsibilities, within the Russian culture. Third, the lack of a democratic tradition serves as a barrier to the sort of grassroots social and political reform one might expect in other countries.

These historical drivers—the Russian Orthodox Church, serfdom, and a lack of democratic traditions—collectively have helped create a cotemporary Russian culture that, in the face of the collapse of the Soviet Union, could be described as somewhat despondent. In addition, Pozner describes a Russian population that is suffering from the "phantom pain" of the loss of the stature and stability afforded to it by its place at the center of the U.S.S.R. Currency fluctuation, high unemployment, and broad economic transformation have created economic dislocation. Coupled with these material challenges is the implosion of the socialist idealism that lay at the center of their aspirations for almost a century, which adds to a broad sense of disillusionment. According to Pozner, these social and psychological conditions have ruptured communal connections and aspirations, and have created a pronounced materialistic and individual-focused populace.

This malaise, which presents challenges to engaging the current generation of Russians in new partnerships, is compounded by new Anti-American feelings. Pozner states that unlike the Cold War, when Anti-Americanism was a position of the state with little grassroots support, the current negativity toward the U.S. is widespread. There is resentment regarding the rise in materialistic tendencies, the disappointment of not receiving the sort of aid and attention they expected after the breakup of the Soviet Union (a sort of "Marshall Plan"), and a perceived lack of respect exemplified by U.S. foreign policy in the Balkans and elsewhere. Pozner also asserts that U.S.-Russian relations may be complicated by the fact that the current U.S. President, Barak Obama, is of African descent, given some of Russia traditional attitudes regarding race.

In his concluding remarks Pozner stated, "no one knows where Russia is going." He reminded us, however, of the enormous potential and importance of a healthy U.S.-Russian relationship.

Pozner's presentation laid the groundwork for a wide-ranging discussion. Among the topics raised were speculations about how Americans and American culture would fare under an analysis similar to one Pozner provided of Russia. For example, Mac McQuown asked whether the U.S. could be said to have clear internal social and political priorities. Pozner stated that at least regarding international affairs, compared to Russia, the U.S. has stable geopolitical objectives. Pozner also described a substantial disconnect between the Russian people and their government that creates a political atmosphere very different from the one in the U.S. Later in the discussion, Ksenia Semenova echoed Pozner's descriptions of current Russian culture and their incompatibility with American attitudes and behaviors, which she described as Americans being much more idealistic.

Nina Bouis suggested that we perhaps temper any impatience we might have regarding materialistic tendencies of modern Russia, recalling that the current "me generation" is undoubtedly born from such a long period of material deprivation; perhaps this generation has "given up the *idea* for *Ikea*," she said. Some of the causes that helped create this Russian "me generation" were examined in the conversation that followed, including the lack of economic security, the psychological toll from the inability of men to continue their traditional roles as breadwinners, and a shrinkage of the radius of social concern from the greater community to oneself or one's family.

Nic Iljine asked Pozner about the extent to which Russian political leaders want to protect the interests of economically powerful citizens. In the conversation that followed, Pozner spoke of the complicated ways in which political and economic power are both intertwined yet distinct. To provide a window of understanding regarding the uniquely Russian relation between the political and economic realms, Pozner reminded the group that when Peter the Great sent out his governors, he essentially ordered them, "to find their own money."

Censorship was a topic of great interest to the participants. Pozner shared some insightful experiences he had with U.S. media magnate and political consultant Roger Ailes, and the similarities between the profit-driven self-censorship of American and Russian journalism. He also stated that in Russia, there is an inverse relationship between the amount of "freedom" a journalist is granted and the size of her audience. Viktor Erofeyev added his perspectives regarding the differences between working in European versus American media, and Michael Murphy spoke about the ways in which Esalen had to struggle against "paradigm wars" once key members of American media turned against the Institute.

One very hopeful note regarding the internal cultural challenges impeding Russia's progress was that 14% of Russians today travel abroad. Many participants believed that this would have positive effects in Russia, including connecting the Russian populace with global concerns, ameliorating mistrust of other peoples, and fostering the eventual establishment of an independent judiciary.

Monday, October 4 Evening Session

Charting a Course for the Conference

Discussion led by Jay Ogilvy

By Monday evening, in the wake of the rich presentations of Jack Matlock and Vladimir Pozner, the conference participants had already been grappling with a wide range of issues. In order to help focus the group's energies and to help establish a foundation for concrete action, Jay Ogilvy offered the 25 principles of Citizen Diplomacy as a framework. These principles were articulated at Esalen in 2006 at a conference that was a 25th reunion and celebration of TRACK TWO. [See **Appendix B.** on p.22 for more information.] Among the principles specifically discussed were the following:

1. Dream the dream, even if it is "impossible." You must have an overarching goal, but no cherished outcome.
2. You can do things that governments can't. It's important not to give power away to the leaders as if they know what they're doing.
11. Work from a non-adversarial place. This means:
 - 1) Never stimulate factionalism.
 - 2) Conduct bi-national or multi-national, not unilateral planning of projects.
 - 3) Take a stand, grind an axe, and you will be ground down.
 - 4) Don't do it *for* them lest you end up doing it *to* them.
 - 5) Instead of facing each other, sit shoulder to shoulder and face "the problem" together.
 - 6) Always speak from equality.
 - 7) You cannot condescend.
6. Diversity, too, is essential. Don't be afraid to gather people who don't like one another.
5. Network. Find allies. Develop personal connections, and trust. We all have friends in curious places. Respect the importance of community. Collegiality is crucial.
7. Get good people together. A small group can make a difference. Make sure you have expert facilitation.
8. Become engaged, and then see the possibilities. Of course you want to conduct a needs assessment in advance. Do your homework. But don't imagine that you can complete a strategic plan and come in with the right answers before you hit the ground. If you know too much, you may come to believe that you can't do what you can. Adopt beginner's mind. Some call it 'the dumb act.'

This last principle calling for the adoption of beginner’s mind became the springboard for the group to identify a fresh set of working guidelines to help shape the specific outcomes of the conference. Vladimir Pozner propelled this conversation by imploring the group not to underestimate the value of human-to-human contact. Familiarity, he stated, erodes hatred and is essential for partnership and trust.

Gennady Alferenko emphasized the cardinal importance of creating opportunities for leaders and future leaders to have direct experiences with other cultures and ways of life. Alferenko had identified Boris Yeltsin as the likely successor to Gorbachev, and was instrumental in helping facilitate his Esalen-sponsored first trip to the United States. Reflecting on this visit, he shared a fascinating (and humorous) story to illustrate this point: Yeltsin, while in Texas, had a series of experiences in large grocery stores that spurred a profound reorientation in his thinking regarding market economics. Invoking Tolstoy’s difficulties finishing *Anna Karenina*, Alferenko told us that Yeltsin’s experiences in U.S. grocery stores helped cause him to lose “the energy of delusion” that had previously been shaping some of his beliefs—Yeltsin’s experience shopping for onions is the “ultimate example of citizen diplomacy,” he said. Alferenko also posited that resources will not be the limiting factor in the success of the ERAPP group’s new ventures; rather success or failure will rest on creating visions that will inspire others to participate.

Mark Garber observed that one serious obstacle to creating meaningful projects that would attract excitement and attention of U.S. and Russian audiences was the fact that Russia is no longer on America’s radar screen. Likewise, he said, to the extent that America receives coverage in Russia, it is only in connection with its European policy.

Ogilvy, following the train of thought of Alferenko, and in an attempt to address Garber’s concerns, invoked Citizen Diplomacy Principle 19: “When you do exchanges, pick topics that both sides are good at: e.g., movies, environmental issues, astronauts and cosmonauts.” This triggered a consideration of a handful of specific ideas, and set the table for the next two days of focused, topic-specific discussions.

Tuesday, October 5

First Morning Session

Investigating the Nature of Media

A discussion led by Jean-Claude Bouis, Jonathon Sanders, Alexei Novikov, Viktor Erofeyev, Stephan Schwartz, and Mitchell Johnson

After some brief remarks about his direct experiences with the editorial policies of the *New York Times*, Jean-Claude Bouis opened the group’s discussion regarding media with a pair of challenges: First, he charged the group with identifying and clarifying its purpose; without such clarification, he stated, no media strategies will succeed, and TRACK TWO would not be able to help Russia and America capitalize on their previous successes.

Second, Bouis helped establish a practical context for the session by asking, somewhat rhetorically, “When will it be safe for me to invest in Russian companies?”

Nick Iljine advised the group of the critical importance of engaging with media partners, and specifically suggested the New York Times as a promising target. He offered a concrete suggestion—an essay contest about global concerns for the young people in Russia and America as a way to select participants in a youth conference, perhaps to be held at Esalen. Jonathan Sanders proposed that Iljine’s essay idea could be expanded to a multi-media format that would include videos and other modes of expression.

After some discussion of how the group might excite the passions of younger audiences, Alexei Novikov raised some troubling issues regarding the limited impact that current media has in Russia. He asserted that issues of censorship are in many ways less confounding than the “one-dimensional approach” that international coverage receives in Russia. Compounding this lack of breadth in foreign coverage, Novikov said, was a “preaching” tone that imbued much of current mainstream Russian media. American participants also lamented an archetypal approach to news stories about Russia in the U.S. in which current events are reported in a way that reinforces expectations and stereotypes. One participant, recalling the insights of Esalen regular Betty-Sue Flowers, stated that it is important to be aware not only of the stories we are writing, but the stories we are writing *from*.

Victor Erofeyev suggested that any discussion of media is premature unless it has first wrestled with the question “What is a human being?” For Russians, he stated, this means grappling with the tensions between the “archaic” and categorical” mind. Just as the U.S. developed from a shift in values, Erofeyev postulated, and because personhood is constituted by values, the conference ought to examine who the modern Russian person *is*, and the values that determine his personhood. Erofeyev’s ruminations on the nature of personhood also gave him occasion to introduce a theme to which he would return throughout the conference—the nature of evil.

Our facilitator, Jay Ogilvy, suggested Maslow’s hierarchy of needs as a way to frame the group’s discussion of its intended audience. “The higher we go up the hierarchy the more narrow the audience” he explained. He suggested we need to be aware of the trade-offs between broad appeal (“swing,” as Ogilvy called it) and the sophistication of the message the group wishes to convey. Ogilvy also stated that we can see our baser human tendencies reflected in the selection of stories that “pick a fight” in order to capture the attention of their audience.

Stephan Schwartz posited that there are two forces shaping our current U.S. media: technology and content. Technology, he said, is allowing information to be transmitted in ever-smaller packets of information. The trends in content include both increased corporate ownership and control of media outlets, and the “rise of the sensoid.” In contrast to data, which are pieces of information, sensoids, Swartz explained, are units of information whose purpose and value are to provoke an emotional response. Schwartz cautioned the group that it understand these trends if it is to navigate the current media landscape effectively. Also, Schwartz thought that, unlike during Soviet times when the dominant flow of information

within TRACK TWO was from the U.S to Russia, its current work should have a more balanced exchange of information between the two nations.

As a rich example of the potential power of popular media, Vladimir Pozner shared a story about a conversation he once had with Agnes Nixon, a pioneer in the creation of American daytime television. She reminded Pozner that despite the fact that soap operas are often an object of ridicule, they were an effective vehicle for spawning important social discussions, and were often the first popular medium to present depictions of such charged topics as interracial marriage and abortion. Pozner also offered that some of the power of television may be derived from the simultaneity of the audience's experience.

Mitchell Johnson saw the essence of the work of TRACK TWO as addressing issues of "human potential." "If what we are trying to communicate doesn't have to do with that then I think we are on the wrong track." Specifically, Johnson saw great potential in the group participating in a nascent PBS project called "Building the City of the Future." A sort of "Esalen Room" could be included in this virtual city as a place to help foster the actualization of human potential.

Nick Iljine concluded the session by reminding the participants of the criticality of choosing the right audience. Without targeting the right group, he stated, we will be unable to generate meaningful change.

Tuesday, October 5

Second Morning Session

Rethinking Science and the Environment

A presentation and discussion lead by Mac McQuown and Lizbeth Hasse

Lizbeth Hasse opened the session on science and the environment by noting how the continued destruction of the earth's ecosystems has enormous potential for uniting the people of the world. "What could be more *shared* than the burning of our habitat?" The environment, Hasse says, speaks directly to issues of human essence, common human experience and shared responsibility. She also proposed environmental issues as a fecund place to capture the attention of audiences of various sizes, and to move them both intellectually and emotionally to become "people of action." The Presidio School of Management, Hasse added, offers one effective model of how to gear learning toward producing action and tangible outcomes.

Following Hasse's general trajectory, Mac McQuown believes that fostering sustainability for the Earth's inhabitants is the cardinal problem of our time. "It dwarfs all other concerns." In order to introduce the topic of environmental sustainability, McQuown invited the room to follow his own learning curve about the topic. The "organic" farm on which he was raised informed his interest in sustainable practices. He described an agricultural life where little garbage was produced and none collected, and where crop

rotation and diversification, the seamless incorporation of animal labor and products into agricultural production, and composting and other “green” practices were second nature. This almost unconscious affinity with nature was enhanced, he explained, by his experiences as an engineer in the U.S. Navy, and by the immense impressions left on him by the night sky. He spoke of a deep connection with his “rust bucket,” and a deep connectivity with the stars “that didn’t even know I was there.”

After a period of “dormancy” during business school and a career in finance, his passion for nature and science were renewed and are now largely directed toward his work with the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, the largest Earth and ocean science research institution in the world.

Informed by his involvement with Scripps, McQuown offered the group a handful of images from oceanic research that could serve as the basis for a potent environmental message. These included:

- the incredible diversity of life in the oceans (e.g., one liter of ocean water 50 miles from shore contains the same gene count as the human genome)
- that almost all of the world’s fishing stocks are at or below reproductive levels
- that whales (as the “trees of the ocean”) play a vital role in storing carbon and their endangerment has far-reaching repercussions
- that the current levels of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere are at their highest concentration in history, and that the dramatic rise in these levels corresponds with the advent of the industrial age

McQuown concluded his remarks by stating that he has a diminishing interest in Russian politics and finds current American politics “appalling.” Politics and economics operate under the implicit assumption that world around them is stable, and therefore what is not directly in their natural purview is “exogenous.” For this reason he believes we need to find new channels to promote reform. McQuown suggested that leveraging our tremendous technological development, and fostering “better manners” are two promising paths to addressing our environmental concerns regarding the atmosphere and our food supply. The environment, McQuown stated, “is undoubtedly our most important common denominator of our two cultures.”

Jay Ogilvy began the discussion portion of the session by cautioning the room to remember the failures of the environmental movement in the 70s and 80s, which he summarized as “one big guilt trip.” Illustrating the need for a positive message, Ogilvy recalls a passage from the book *Breakthrough: From the Death of Environmentalism to the Politics of Possibility* by Michael Shellenberger and Ted Nordhaus in which the authors ask, “Where would the civil rights movement be today if Martin Luther King had given his ‘I Have a Nightmare’ speech?”

In response to Ogilvy’s charge to the group to generate positive messages, Mac Murphy presented a long and impressive list of potential partnerships and projects that could be championed by Esalen. Included in his list were such things as green agricultural exchanges; scientific studies; solar, wind hydroelectric and geothermal explorations; seed saving; runoff control; and inner-city garden projects. Murphy also suggested that we shift our consciousness away from emphasizing the negative and toward what is hopeful.

As participants began to explore possibilities for compelling projects, many in the room identified some inherent challenges in creating an effective environmental message for a Russian audience. Nina Bouis shared that Russians do have a real notion of “green space” and care very much about it. Ksenia Semenova shared some the culture shock she experienced regarding environmental practices in moving to New York. When Sasha Kapitsa asked about the number of recycling plants there are in Russia, Nikolai Kovarsky informed the group that there are only 25 in total.

Mary Ellen Klee suggested that targeting the younger generation might offer the best hope for engendering a new environmental consciousness in Russia, and the world. “If the environment is our number one problem...engaging the youth is a no-brainer.”

Viktor Erofeyev added a layer of complication to the discussion by asserting that for some in Russia, people themselves are considered garbage. To make this point, he shared the story of a community where a copper foundry was located; its population’s life expectancy was 30 years, and there was very little vegetation in the area.

Vladimir Pozner and Kovarsky sounded more optimistic notes. Pozner pointed out that America’s attitude toward litter, for example, has changed tremendously in a rather short time, and that changes in the driving habits of Muscovites imply a great deal of elasticity in their habits. Kovarsky confirmed the remarkable transformation regarding the mores of Moscow drivers and reported that these new patterns of behavior are spreading quickly throughout the nation.

Some of the parting shots made as the conversation wound down included Jonathan Sanders reminding the group that the “race for resources” will influence the direction of any ecological discussion, and McQuown suggesting that government channels may no longer be the most fruitful places to have environmental discussions.

Tuesday, October 5

Afternoon Session

Examining the Idea of a Citizens’ Youth Council

Discussion led by Mac Murphy, Sasha Bouis, Sasha Kapitsa, Ksenia Semenova, Tatyana Sanikovich, Tara Chaille

Mac Murphy, Sasha Bouis, Sasha Kapitsa, Ksenia Semenova, Tatyana Sanikovich, Tara Chaille provided “youthful perspectives” regarding the state of American and Russian affairs, and offered some guidance regarding programmatic possibilities that would speak to the interests and ideals of young Russians and Americans.

These members of the “next generation” of TRACK TWO began their brief presentation by outlining their ideas for a “Citizens’ Youth Council.” This council would act as a sort of steering committee to help develop a portfolio of youth-oriented projects and programs to advance the mission of TRACK TWO. The Council would be populated by young adults from Russia and the U.S., and advised by a team of experienced TRACK TWO

leaders, or “Golden Council,” to serve as “guard dogs” for the Youth Council and provide guidance, as well as technical and monetary support.

The following are the content areas and sample projects suggested for the Citizens’ Youth Council by the presenters: **Values**—e.g., making connections, facilitating “meet-ups,” and sponsoring speakers and workshops; **Science and Climate**—e.g., green housing, sustainability projects, alternative energy programs; **Business**—e.g., internships, work exchanges, and creating social networks for young professionals; **Arts and Culture**—e.g., “Up with People” programs, student exchanges, artist exchanges, school sponsorships, a “Story Corps” program. [See **Appendix A.** on p. 21 for a list of these and other programs.]

Following the group’s considerations of the proposed topics and projects, there was a discussion of the fundamental differences between the cultures of American and Russian young. The most pronounced of these differences centered around idealism and optimism. Semenova spoke about the ways in which a “slave mentality” prohibits young Russians from making their own possibilities. “They aren’t aware they can make decisions,” she said. Sanikovich spoke about her skepticism about inciting action among Russian youth. Comparing U.S. culture to her native land of Belarus, “Americans dream big!” she said. Kapitsa was also somewhat dubious about engaging Russian youth, wondering what the group would identify as the things it would like the Russian young people to share in such exchanges.

Jean-Claude Bouis maintained that such skepticism was healthy and would serve to inform the work of the Youth Council in positive ways. Davlat Khudonazarov, echoing Bouis, spoke of the importance of incorporating the negative part of experience in our work and thinking, and agreed that all future work of TRACK TWO should be sensitive to the differences in the audiences it seeks to reach. Capturing the admiring spirit of the “golden” generation in the room, Khudonazarov concluded he would like to put the young presenters in a pressure cooker and let them “simmer in their own juices” and see what wonderful things they would produce.

Wednesday, October 6

First Morning Session

Considering the Essence of Culture

A presentation by Davlat Khudonazarov with commentary by Viktor Erofeyev

Davlat Khudonazarov introduced the broad topic of culture by giving the group some insight into the particular culture of his upbringing, and the lessons it may have to offer the work of TRACK TWO. As Khudonazarov said, he would speak “not so much about myself, but about my culture.”

Khudonazarov was born in Khorugh, Tajikistan, “the rooftop of the world.” Despite its proximity to China, India, Afghanistan and other neighboring lands, Khudonazarov describes his homeland as a place that operated in almost total isolation from other cultures. Instead, Khudonazarov describes the evolution of his native culture as a vertical one, much like an archeological site where civilizations grow out of the ones beneath.

Comparing his culture to the native peoples of North America, Khudonazarov portrayed his Tajikistan as imbued with a deep connection to nature. Every village had trees or rocks that served as oracles, he said, and spiritual journeys to sacred natural places were common. This connection with nature was evidenced in a story Khudonazarov shared from his youth. When he and the boys of his village went swimming in the nearby river, “we would ask the spirit [of the river] for permission—say a little prayer—before we would enter the water.”

Given that Tajikistan became a “pivotal point in the international game” in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, Khudonazarov explained how a series of invasions and occupations, including a decade of genocide committed by Afghanis, brought the essence of Tajik culture into sharp relief. Paraphrasing the 11th Century Persian philosopher and poet Nāsir Khusraw who was once a refugee in Tajikistan, Khudonazarov stated that the fundamental wisdom of his native culture is: “You do not have to defend your faith. Faith does not require a defense because it resides inside of you—in your mind, your heart, and in your love.” Khudonazarov shared that he grew up within a strong ethos that instructed one to never say anything negative about another culture. “You don’t need to create your enemies,” Khudonazarov said.

Khudonazarov concluded his remarks with some observations about the power of the medium for which he is most famous, cinema. “Good movies,” he said, “destroy barriers between people, both racial and religious.” He also warned of the deleterious effects that inferior films have on the image of the cultures they depicted, explicitly lamenting the association of the U.S. with Hollywood “junk.” Concluding, Khudonazarov submitted that much of the fear regarding technology is unfounded. “Technology,” he posited, “cannot destroy culture; it can only enhance what is already there.”

At the conclusion of Khudonazarov’s rich and often lyrical presentation, Jay Ogilvy remarked, “One does not ask questions of a poem.” However, Viktor Erofejev, offered a series of observations that questioned some of Khudonazarov’s fundamental assumptions. Describing Khudonazarov as a “profound artist” and a man with a “saintly” disposition, Erofejev questioned whether the universal application of Khudonazarov’s principle that one shouldn’t criticize other cultures is not folly. “Sometimes one has to fight back and oppose evil.” Erofejev continued by vividly portraying a great number of atrocities committed by humans, and asking, “What motivates evil?” Erofejev wondered aloud, “Could it not be that evil comes from within?”

As a gentle rebuttal to Erofejev’s challenges, Khudonazarov conceded that if one were to name all the atrocities committed by humans the list would be endless. Ultimately, however, he concludes that if one were to perform a detailed investigation of evil that “there would be no light at the end of this tunnel.” Rather, Khudonazarov stated, “God is your conscience pulsating in you...A man who kills can be said to have no faith.”

Wednesday, October 6

Second Morning Session

Understanding Business and the Arts

Discussion led by Nicolas Iljine, Gennady Alferenko, Cynthia Stone

Nick Iljine launched the session on arts and business by stating, “Culture is the cohesive fabric of human beings...humans need culture like a plant needs water.” Offering some insights from his extensive experience as a liaison between the worlds of art and business, Iljine described the nature of sponsorship as being inextricable from the sponsors’ interest in building an image. Social responsibility, he told the group, is often the result of successful marketing. In addition to these broad observations, Iljine provided a list of specific ideas and anecdotes to help spark the group’s imagination. Chief among these examples was a Kandinsky prize for young Russian artists, which Iljine thought might be a natural partner for Esalen.

Michael Murphy summarized that what Iljine had presented as a promising “Medici Model” for Esalen to pursue. Additionally Murphy spoke about the ways in which art stimulates the brain. Recalling for the group that in Esalen’s earlier days art and therapy were equally prominent areas of interest, he wondered if there might not be potential for Esalen to rekindle some of its emphasis on the arts.

Gennady stated that in Russia there is currently a disconnect between the tremendous quantities of money being generated by Russian businesses and the opportunities to foster opportunities within the arts. The arts, Alferenko explained, are critical to one’s own identification with his or her culture, and to the identity that nations and cultures have for foreigners. The strong association of Mozart with Austria, and the indelible marks of Tolstoy and Tchaikovsky on the image and understanding of Russia worldwide were offered as examples. “Money,” Alferenko stated, “is not the problem” if one is able to unite people’s passions in a common vision. “Unite people and the money will come.”

Alferenko concluded his remarks by offering to use his extensive contacts within Russia to advance the causes of TRACK TWO. Nikolai Kovarsky offered to reach out to government contacts on TRACK TWO’s behalf as well.

Shifting the topic from art and art sponsorship to business, Cynthia Stone informed the group that there are structural as well as psychological barriers to investments that make the current climate not very welcoming to newcomers contemplating investments or start-up operations in Russia. “The tyranny of internal risk officers” is the phrase Stone used to capture the reluctance of some foreign companies to enter the Russian market or expand their existing operations. In some instances, Stone added, Russia’s overly negative imagine among top executives at U.S. headquarters has meant that worthwhile projects proposed by local managers heading their company’s Russia business have been stymied. She stated that, for the most part, foreign investors in Russia can be divided into two categories: short-term investors whose goal is to “get in and get out” at the right time to maximize their financial return; and “long haul” investors with substantial local operations and a long-term commitment to the market. Stone noted that many U.S.-based multinationals have learned

how to quickly adapt to rapidly changing policies, tax laws and red tape and have maintained healthy and profitable businesses in Russia through the economic ups and downs of the last two decades.

In order to elucidate the ways in which the current Russian economy lacks an “infrastructure” conducive to foreign investment, Stone closed her presentation by listing six specific barriers that inhibit business market investments:

1. A lack of capital flow (“Money doesn’t go in and out easily.”)
2. A stable legal/judicial system (“The rules are not stable enough to reduce the risk enough to make investment appealing.”)
3. Tax code (though improving, it often prohibits a reasonable profit)
4. Transparency (this needs to improve to attract foreign capital)
5. Hiring practices (“Is it easy to hire and fire?”)
6. Expanding “public sphere” (the encroachment on the private holdings of small companies driven by plutocrats to preserve the status quo)

One of the final comments of the session came from Alexei Novikov. Illustrating the importance of familiarity and understanding to facilitating fruitful economic investment and exchanges. He told the story of the precipitous drop in tourism and hotel revenue in 1987 in Moscow after a major earthquake in Armenia. Novikov got the biggest laugh of the day when he exclaimed, “Do you know how far Armenia is from Moscow?!” The fact that Armenia and Moscow, though thousands of miles apart, were considered to be the same place (the Soviet Union) testifies, Novikov said, to the importance of details and information to organized investment.

Wednesday, October 6

Afternoon Session

Exploring U.S.-Russian Relations regarding Space

A presentation and discussion led by Marc Allen

Marc Allen opened his presentation about where the U.S. space program is today, and the relations between NASA and the Russian space program with a caveat. “I’m speaking to you as a citizen,” he said, not as a representative of NASA or the U.S. government in any capacity. He then introduced his talk as a good news/bad news story, but one in which he foresaw a positive trajectory for U.S./Russian partnership in space.

Allen told the group that NASA’s work falls into three main areas: aeronautics, human space flight, and science programs. Allen began by addressing human space flight, which he described as illustrious and best known by the general public. What is not well known, he said, is that President John F. Kennedy extended an invitation to the Soviet Union to work jointly on the Apollo space program (the program to achieve human flight to the moon) shortly before his death. After Kennedy’s death, the program became a sort of “shrine” to the president, he explained, and the U.S. no longer pursued a partnership with

the Soviets. At its height in 1965, the Apollo program consumed 4% of the U.S federal budget, but declined steadily after, with Apollo 17 in 1972 being the last lunar landing.

Regarding human flight partnerships, Allen informed the group that there have been great successes. He specifically named the Apollo-Soyuz program in which Soviet and American space craft docked in space. However, as is often the case, further cooperative missions were waylaid due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and other political considerations. More recently, Americans and Russians have worked very successfully on the Shuttle-Mir test docking programs, and on the international space station.

Regarding future human space flight, Allen said there are only three realistic near-term destinations: the moon, close asteroids, and free space. In sum, based on past successes and the current situation, he would give the American-Russian partnership an “A” grade.

The Russian-U.S. partnership regarding science programs has been more challenging, Allen said. To understand the context in which space science partnerships are made, he shared NASA’s five principals, adopted in 1959, which guide all cooperative projects with other nations:

1. The designation of a central agency for all negotiations and to manage the partnership.
2. Agreement on specific projects (rather than generalized programs)
3. Acceptance of financial responsibility by each country for its aspects of the project (no exchange of funds)
4. Projects are to be selected based on mutual scientific interests (vs. diplomatic or other considerations)
5. General publication of all results

In the 1980s, the USSR had three major space science projects—an X-ray/gamma ray observatory, an optical ultraviolet telescope, and a space radio interferometer (a radio dish). The Soviets and the Americans signed agreements to cooperate on two of these three (the X-ray/gamma-ray observatory, and the radio observatory). Severe budget cuts and financial instability crippled progress on these projects within the Soviet Union, ultimately compromising the missions and damaging the working relationship between NASA and the Soviet/Russian space program. Because of the challenges that arose from these fiscal difficulties, coupled with communication problems, Allen assigned the grade of “C-/D+” to the Russian-American space science partnership. However, regarding the good cooperative work being done on recent and forthcoming Mars missions, he said “so far, so good” and estimated that an A- would be a fair grade.

Allen concluded his remarks by briefly discussing Earth science. Unfortunately, he stated, “there isn’t really much” to report. Because of the dearth of joint activity, he said the appropriate Earth science grade for the U.S.-Russian partnership would be “Incomplete.” Earth Science, he concluded, offered a promising opportunity for the peoples of Russia and the U.S. to work together on a host of critically important issues.

Stephan Schwartz asked whether any joint projects were underway regarding climate change; “None that I know of,” Allen replied. Viktor Erofeyev inquired about the level of personal trust between the scientists of the two countries; Allen reported that the trust between the people is good, “money is the problem.” Jay Ogilvy inquired about stylistic differences between the cultures regarding design, which sparked a brief exchange regarding differences in Russian and American approaches to design problems.

Other insights shared by Allen included the fact that President Obama has proposed restoring NASA funding to its early 2000s level, after drastic cuts of 30-40% during the Bush years. He also noted the Globe School Program, a worldwide Earth science program, as a potentially promising model for future TRACK TWO initiatives.

As the hour grew late the conversation took an “idiosyncratic” turn, to quote Michael Murphy. Speculations regarding UFOs, government cover-ups, and physics-defying space flight provided a nice segue to more informal exchanges among the participants over wine.

Appendix A.

Focus Areas and Action Items

Media/Communication

- US/ Russian television leaders conference
- Coffee shop kiosks
- School Skype programs (new “pen pals”)
- Russian web portal to help optimize meaningful searches/exchanges
- Team (7-10 persons) to research Russian Internet Space to understand Russian society
- Independent film project to promote better cultural understanding of US/Russia
- Small TV show to present the issues discussed at Esalen
- Partnership with PBS “city of the future project”

Science, Sustainability, Technology

- Oceanography event (Scripps)
- Green agricultural practices exchange (ancient practices/traditions)
- Urban garden programs
- Waste removal (garbage) project
- State park-to-park partnerships
- Alternative energy exchange for Russia/US youth
- Environmental impact progress

Business

- Green technology workforce pipeline program (Globe Schools as model?)
- Partnership with American Chamber of Commerce in Russia for resource development
- “next generation” of US/Russian business leaders exchange
- Russia/US municipal partnerships to address common problems and best practices
- International internships/work studies
- Business marketing partnerships to advance better Russian/US understanding (“Medici” model for cultural advancement)

Arts and Culture

- CTR slot for Young Citizen Forum
- Russian/American Artist-in-residence program
- Partnership with Kandinsky Prize program to recognize up-and coming artists
- Program to produce training opportunities in the arts for disadvantaged Russian/American youth (Gennady)
- Use mass media (e.g., soap operas) to promote progressive ideas and understanding

- New “Up With People”
- US/Russia Story Corps activities
- “Essay contest” (multimedia) to win participation at a US/Russian youth conference
- Get V. Pozner/others on an “NPR tour” to call for new US/Russia perspectives

Appendix B.

25 Principles from 25 Years of Citizen Diplomacy*

Compiled by Jay Ogilvy

***Printed in Friends of Esalen Newsletter**

Citizen diplomacy complements the formal diplomacy of government officials. It builds trust and mutual understanding based on face-to-face relationships among citizens of different cultures, regions, and religions. Humanity gets a chance to speak when ideology is put on hold by creative human contact.

Esalen’s Soviet-American Exchange Program played an important role in bringing an end to the Cold War. By nurturing a network of deep human relationships, by holding annual conferences and other meetings that built upon those relationships, by creating and maintaining The Loutchkov Library of Psychological Literature at Moscow State University, and by hosting Boris Yeltsin’s first visit to the United States, we created a crucial communications backchannel that served the needs of the 1980s and 1990s.

Supplementing official summitry, groups of different professionals, from psychologists to astronauts, have been meeting for years in what has become known as track two diplomacy. By letting the commonality of their professional—and human—interests speak louder than the differences between their nations and cultures, these individuals have spanned the globe with bonds of growing friendship and mutual understanding. This diplomacy flies beneath the radar of official treaties, age-old enmities, hardened ideologies, and partisan politics. When people with similar interests can talk face-to-face about the things that interest them, “Faces of the Enemy”—the title of a book and video born of track two diplomacy—are replaced by human faces and real communication.

There is impressive evidence that Esalen’s track two work contributed significantly to the transformation of the Soviet Union and Russia’s relationship with the U.S. Now, relations between Islam and the West are strained. Libya is finally coming in from the cold. The American relationship with Europe has been frayed by disagreements over Iraq. Indeed, we in the US may be more in need of building friendship and understanding through citizen diplomacy than at any time in the past century.

Must a “clash of civilizations” replace the Cold War? How will Russians and Americans relate to a new Europe? How will humanity fare in a world where China assumes a more prominent role? Is there a role for track two diplomacy in the long-simmering antipathy between Hindus and Muslims in India and Pakistan? What about the deadlock between Israelis and Palestinians?

The so-called “wars” we are asked to fight may be un-winnable without new thinking and new practices like citizen diplomacy. We are not fighting along established geo-political battle lines. We are struggling for hearts and minds, commitment, understanding, and intelligence. There are plenty of opportunities for inter-cultural jiu-jitsu—highly focused, citizen-led efforts that fly below the radar of official, high level diplomacy.

Rooted in the context of Esalen’s explorations of human potential, Esalen’s Center for Theory and Research along with TRACK TWO: An Institute for Citizen Diplomacy (a successor to the Esalen Soviet-American Exchange program and The Russian-American Center) will continue to give voice to the growing constituency of individuals who feel disheartened and powerless vis-à-vis governments that don’t get it. Citizen diplomacy involves non-governmental individuals and groups that aim to fill the moral and intellectual voids of official peacemaking leadership. Track two diplomacy’s major goal is to re-humanize relations that are dysfunctional. It works to make relationships better.

In April 2006, Esalen Institute and TRACK TWO sponsored a 25th reunion of the many pioneers who then chronicled the principles they have distilled from their work with Russia and the former Soviet Union. These principles, they believe, can be applied to today’s and tomorrow’s vexed relationships: with Islam, with Iran and with China over the longer term.

John Marks led off. Jim Garrison added more. Jim Hickman added still more when his turn came. With the precedent set, others—Joe Montville, Cynthia Lazeroff, Fran Macy, Harriett Crosby, Benina Berger-Gould, Tom Greening, Stephan Schwartz, Bob Fuller, Rusty Schweickart, Anya Kucharev, Liz Hasse, Lisa Goldman, and, of course, Dulce and Michael Murphy contributed additional principles.

More than twenty others contributed to the conversation during the week, including five guests from Russia: Sergei Kapitsa, Viktor Erofeyev, Valentin Kamanev, Tanya Kamaneva, and Tankred Golenpolsky. Jay Ogilvy—the meeting’s facilitator—took notes and wrote up the results as follows:

Right Aspiration

1. Dream the dream, even if it is “impossible.” You must have an overarching goal, but no cherished outcome.
2. You can do things that governments can’t. It’s important not to give power away to the leaders as if they know what they’re doing.
3. Know that everyone wants something greater to emerge.
4. Believe your instincts, *not* your government, or your media, or your conditioning.

Right Gathering

5. Network. Find allies. Develop personal connections, and *trust*. We all have friends in curious places. Respect the importance of community. Collegiality is crucial.

6. Diversity, too, is essential. Don't be afraid to gather people who don't like one another.
7. Get good people together. A small group *can* make a difference. Make sure you have expert facilitation.

Right Engagement

8. Become engaged, and *then* see the possibilities. Of course you want to conduct a needs assessment in advance. Do your homework. But don't imagine that you can complete a strategic plan and come in with the right answers before you hit the ground. If you know too much, you may come to believe that you can't do what you can. Adopt beginner's mind. Some call it 'the dumb act.'
9. Be prepared to be surprised by what you find after you hit the ground. This means:
 - 1) Listen carefully. Listen to what *wants* to happen. Listen for a conspiracy of opportunities.
 - 2) Tolerate ambiguity. Don't jump to conclusions too quickly.
 - 3) Unexpected benefits are as important as the expected.
 - 4) Aim for a right relationship between surrender and action.
10. It is important to create a *safe space*.
11. Work from a non-adversarial place. This means:
 - 1) Never stimulate factionalism.
 - 2) Conduct bi-national or multi-national, not unilateral planning of projects.
 - 3) Take a stand, grind an axe, and you will be ground down.
 - 4) Don't do it *for* them lest you end up doing it *to* them.
 - 5) Instead of facing each other, sit shoulder to shoulder and face "the problem" together.
 - 6) Always speak from equality.
 - 7) You cannot condescend.
12. *Practice empathy*. In whatever way possible, become the other. When we humanize the other, we humanize ourselves. (Consider that the CIA hired émigrés, people who *hated* the USSR, to interpret signals from the USSR.)
13. *Woody Allen principle: Show up*. And keep showing up. Perseverance furthers. The antidote to the biggest force is gentle contact. Large institutions are like inertial masses resting on frictionless surfaces. Lean against them long enough and they will move. Hurl yourself against them expecting immediate results and you will only bloody yourself.
14. Always ask: *Who is doing this?* The internal work you do on yourself prepares for the external work you do in the world. Beware of ego. You must be willing to be anonymous.
15. Engaging in this work is an adventure. Enjoying it is a matter of attitude.

Maxims, Tradecraft

16. Find the acupuncture points. Look for the best leverage points. Look for where self-interest aligns with common interest. Make 'em an offer they can't refuse.
17. *Think out of the box!* Exercise creativity on-the-spot and in real time.

18. *Conduct a two-pronged approach*: e.g., exchanges can be a cover for the political work.
19. When you do exchanges, pick topics that both sides are good at: e.g., movies, environmental issues, astronauts and cosmonauts.
20. Look for metaphors and symbols of transformation, e.g. kids from the United States and the former USSR risking their lives with one another to reach the summit of the then Soviet Union's highest mountain prior to our nations' leaders engaging in "summitry."
21. Be a catalyst for others. Give away all that you have so that others may spread the work. Remember Lao Tzu: *That leader is worst whom the people fear; that leader is better whom the people revere; but that leader is best of whom they say after he or she is gone, we did this ourselves.*

Admonitions

22. In all things, practice *care*, both *Sorge* in the sense Heidegger meant it: *Giving a damn!* but also *care* in a less Teutonic, warmer way, e.g. always observing the birthdays of our far-flung friends.
23. Success brings its challenges. Beware of grandiosity when playing on a very big stage.
24. You are almost bound to fail from time to time, but failure is an essential part of success. Look at how venture capitalists and headhunters in the 1990s looked for leaders who had already had at least one failure. Your failures can be turned into later successes through learning.
25. Meta-rule: you can't know *which* of the above principles will best apply in each new situation.