

THE PROJECT ON JUSTICE
IN TIMES OF TRANSITION

PUTTING EXPERIENCE TO WORK FOR PEACE

**The New Political Architecture:
A Workshop for Leaders from
Northern Ireland,
The Republic of Ireland and Great Britain**

July 19-24, 1998
Cambridge, Massachusetts

[Background](#)

[Workshop Objectives and Achievements](#)

[The Participants](#)

[The Case Study Method](#)

[The Curriculum](#)

[Special Events and Informal Activities](#)

[Media Coverage](#)

[Participant Evaluations](#)

[Proposed Follow-up Activities](#)

The Project on Justice in Times of Transition of the Foundation for a Civil Society and the Executive Seminar Program of the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University co-sponsored a week-long workshop in Cambridge, Massachusetts for a group of political leaders from Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland and Great Britain. This off-the-record workshop -- **the first of its kind since the May 1998 referenda** -- provided a unique opportunity for 35 leaders from a wide range of major political parties, including newly elected members of the new Northern Ireland Assembly, to come together in a neutral environment to analyze and develop strategies to address the critical challenges facing them and the new Assembly.

By employing case studies and allowing time for informal activities, this timely program gave the participants a chance to learn how other societies have dealt with problems comparable to those currently existing in Northern Ireland, and to strengthen personal relationships in order to foster dialogue and a greater understanding of different viewpoints.

The workshop was a follow-on to the successful first joint initiative of The Project and the Kennedy School on Northern Ireland, Managing Change in a Diverse Society, held at Harvard University in 1996. In the 1998 workshop, both the organizers and several of the participants who attended the 1996 program were struck by the tremendous optimism among the group as well as the relative ease with which the participants were able to confront difficult issues.

The political diversity among those attending the 1998 workshop, which included members of the anti-agreement Democratic Unionist Party as well as members of all parties involved in the peace talks, was considered an across-the-board endorsement of the importance of dialogue, though not the peace agreement itself. The wide range of viewpoints made for lively and provocative discussions, in which participants consistently responded to the professors, speakers and each other frankly and enthusiastically while recognizing the sensitivity of many of the topics, such as parades and political violence.

Many of the participants credited the excellence of the Harvard faculty and the diversity and quality of the participants with the success of the discussions. At the end of the week, many of the participants left the workshop with a better understanding of each others' political views and the situation in Northern Ireland, as well as a stronger commitment to a more inclusive political process.

Background

Embroided in talks for over 21 months, political leaders in the region finally reached an agreement in April 1998 on a new government for Northern Ireland. After 26 years of recurrent violence, this historic peace accord, popularly known as the Good Friday Agreement because of the timing of the breakthrough, proposed to reinstate self-rule to Northern Ireland by creating new power-sharing institutions, including:

- **A Northern Ireland Assembly**, which will be composed of elected members from Northern Ireland and serve as the legislative body governing the province;
- **A North-South Ministerial Council**, which will facilitate joint policy-making between ministers of the Republic of Ireland and members of the Northern Ireland Assembly; and
- **A British-Irish Council**, which will convene representatives of the British and Irish governments, devolved institutions in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales,

the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands to cooperate on matters of mutual interest.

The Good Friday Agreement was overwhelmingly, though not unanimously, approved in May by referenda in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Elections were held in June, and as a result, 108 representatives from a range of political parties in Northern Ireland, including those who opposed the Agreement, made up the new Assembly.

"We have come here and as you can see we do represent a broad spectrum of opinion within the north of Ireland, and a lot of us are political enemies. But I do think we have come away from this week with a deeper understanding of each other and we have forged friendships with people and seen people on a personal level. And I think that is a very, very important step forward on the road to reconciliation, on the road to peace and on the road to justice in our society."

-- Dara O'Hagan, Sinn Fein, Northern Ireland

To many, this momentous political development marshaled in a new era of optimism in Northern Ireland. However, many obstacles lie ahead. Police reform, prisoners, and parades are particularly contentious issues subject to discussion and debate as the Assembly convenes within a new political framework. Based on the success of the 1996 joint Northern Ireland initiative of The Project and the Kennedy School, Managing Change in a Diverse Society, leaders from Northern Ireland, Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland specifically requested that The Project organize this workshop to help tackle some of the difficult issues related to peacebuilding in this new political environment.

Workshop Objectives and Achievements

With the new peace accord, many believe the genuine prospect for the consolidation of peace in Northern Ireland now exists. Yet, institutional and psychological change must occur in order for peace to take root, and such change will require extended and concerted effort on the part of leaders across the political spectrum, and the development of appropriate strategies. To help promote such change, The Project maintains the following overarching goals for its initiatives in Northern Ireland:

- To provide an opportunity for a broad representation of leaders from Northern Ireland, and, as appropriate, from Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland, to spend a concentrated amount of time together focusing on issues related to the consolidation of peace;
- To provide these leaders with information about possible solutions to some of the challenges facing Northern Ireland by exposing them to examples from other societies in the world;
- To encourage the continuing development of informal ties among the participants, which can contribute to the growth of trust that is essential for political and social cooperation; and

- To draw all sides farther into the peace process to reinforce the value of negotiation rather than violence, and increase their confidence in the ongoing nonviolent diplomatic and reconciliation processes.

The 1998 workshop was a success in that it provided a neutral space in which participants could study issues related to peace-building in other parts of the world. The diverse group of political leaders, representing a wide spectrum of viewpoints, spent four full days at the Kennedy School discussing case studies presented by Harvard University faculty members. (See below for a description of the participant composition and an explanation of the case study method.) The program, held off-the-record to encourage open and frank dialogue, focused on three areas critical to the consolidation of peace in Northern Ireland:

- creating credible, effective and trustworthy institutions of justice;
- the challenge of leadership in times of rapid change; and
- economic development.

While each of these subjects has its own particular complications in the Northern Ireland context, there are other countries that have encountered similar challenges and identified solutions and strategies to address these challenges. By examining analogous case studies set in countries other than Northern Ireland on relevant themes such as prisoners, police and parades, the participants were able to step back and look at their own problems more objectively and constructively, and to learn about solutions that could be applied to Northern Ireland.

Furthermore, the organizers encouraged informal interaction by planning a day on Martha's Vineyard as well as several evenings for socializing, networking, and strengthening friendships. **The participants were able to create personal linkages that they would never have been able to envision in their own political environments.**

It was noted that while the participants appreciated the exercise of examining other countries and found it useful, this year they were more open to talking about Northern Ireland both in the classroom and informally. Unlike in the 1996 workshop, the group found it much easier to confront the uncertainties of Northern Ireland directly and to engage in dialogue across ideological lines. The participants openly debated the thorny issues they are currently facing in Northern Ireland much earlier in the week this year and with more objectivity, decorum, and an eye towards the future. Instead of dwelling on how to settle the past, the focus was on, "Where do we go from here?" Many participants attributed this to the new optimism ushered in by the peace accord as well as to the enabling environment provided by the Kennedy School and The Project.

The Participants

The group of 35 participants comprised mid- and senior-level politicians representing 16 parties -- those for and those against the May referendum. Of the diverse group of participants, 27 were from Northern Ireland, five from the Republic of Ireland and three from Great Britain. (Please see list of participants on page 10.) Moreover, 13 of the participants are elected members of the Assembly, six others were candidates for the Assembly, and three are elected members of the Republic of Ireland's parliament. The composition was diverse in terms of gender and age as well, as approximately one-fifth of the participants were under 30 years old and women made up approximately one-fourth of the group.

As with all of The Project's initiatives, every possible effort was made to ensure participant diversity. To obtain the mix of participants that was needed to yield lively and thought-provoking discussion and debate during the Kennedy School program, The Project worked with the leadership of various political parties in Northern Ireland and Advisory Board member Paul Arthur to identify the most appropriate representatives from each major party. Both those who participated in the successful 1996 program and those who heard about it lobbied for The Project to organize additional programs for new and "veteran" participants. As it was not feasible to conduct more than one workshop during the summer of 1998, it was agreed that a mix of a few previous participants along with individuals who had not taken part in the 1996 program would be ideal for the 1998 workshop.

Three participants from the 1996 program returned to take part in the workshop. Only one invited party, the United Kingdom Unionist Party (UKUP), did not send representatives. Due to miscommunication among UKUP party members, their representatives withdrew at the last minute. The workshop organizers received a formal letter of apology from UKUP party leader Robert McCartney.

"It was great to see most of the parties in Northern Ireland here, the parties in the Republic, and the political parties in Britain. We have all gone through a conditioning process. There is more work to be done, but I think we are listening a lot more to each other and we are beginning to empathize with each other."

-- Joe Byrne, *Social Democratic and Labour Party, Northern Ireland*

The Case Study Method

The Kennedy School's innovative "case study method" challenged the participants to examine how certain complex subjects have been addressed in various countries and to consider ways in which they might be approached in Northern Ireland.

The Kennedy School faculty defines a case study as a written description of a problem or situation without analysis or conclusion. To sharpen problem solving skills and improve the ability to think and reason analytically, the case study method puts participants in the role of decision-maker by giving them the opportunity to discern central from peripheral facts, identify key alternatives, and formulate policy recommendations. Throughout the workshop, the faculty encouraged the group to assert and support their ideas, to listen to others and evaluate their positions, to keep an open mind and be willing to change it with new insights or evidence, and, ultimately, to make well-informed decisions. The discussions were moderated in an effort to avoid addressing Northern Ireland specifically so that the participants could respond mindfully and objectively; thus, the responsibility of drawing parallels and applying the strategies employed in various models to Northern Ireland was left entirely to the participants. Several of the case studies were developed specifically for this workshop by Professor Philip Heymann in consultation with colleagues at Harvard. A member of the Harvard Law School and Kennedy School faculty, Professor Heymann served as faculty chair for the workshop. He has had extensive experience in the U.S. Department of State and the U.S. Department of Justice, and in countries such as El Salvador, Russia, and South Africa on issues related to police reform and court systems.

The Curriculum

The curriculum for the July 1998 program drew heavily on analogous case studies set in countries other than Northern Ireland and focused on three broad topics: creating credible, effective and trustworthy institutions of justice; the challenge of leadership in times of rapid change; and economic development.

Creating credible, effective and trustworthy institutions of justice

Among the preconditions to political development and economic growth are safety and security. Therefore, strategies for addressing such issues as parades, police reform, majority/minority rights, political violence, and the release and incorporation of political prisoners into society are both essential and urgent in creating a climate in which peace will endure.

"I want to pay tribute to the faculty of Harvard and to the Foundation for a Civil Society for putting together this excellent program which is encouraging people like us not to be narrow minded and to recognize that there is much to be learned from stepping out of your own shoes and into someone else's to examine the difficulties and challenges faced in other areas."

-- Gary McMichael, *Ulster Democratic Party, Northern Ireland*

Professor Philip Heymann facilitated a discussion on **parades and political demonstrations** in apartheid South Africa, encouraging the participants to consider a) how marches relate to history and identity; b) the role of the police and the community in avoiding violence; and c) the right to march and the circumstances (if any) under which marches should be banned. As the workshop fell in the middle of a tense marching season in Northern Ireland, this topic was particularly incendiary and the participants had difficulty keeping the focus on South Africa. Professor Heymann steered the discussion back to the case study to illustrate how perceptions (in this case, how the communities and demonstrators perceive the police, and vice versa) often dictate action. This example showed the participants that communities with a long history of distrusting the police eventually began to react differently to police attempts at crowd management under a new legal framework. The participants also discussed the need for third party monitors as well as cooperation between the community and the police to help avert or manage violence as a rival faction demonstrates.

To address the issue of **police reform**, Peter Zimmerman, Senior Associate Dean for Executive Education and Program Development at the Kennedy School, presented a case study of a Houston, Texas policewoman's use of deadly force. The case described a patrolwoman who used her weapon in self-defense, fatally wounding a suspect. This act was considered heroic both by the community and the men in her police department. The group engaged in a provocative discussion on the appropriate use of firearms and whether the shooting in this case merited such applause. Professor Zimmerman then focused on the influence of organizational culture and how it guides behavior and performance within police departments.

Professor Philip Heymann continued the theme of policing by engaging the participants in a discussion on **developing legitimacy for law enforcement** in South Africa. The group addressed improving police-community relations, ensuring police accountability, dealing effectively with crime, and managing the process of institutional change. Professor Heymann concentrated on police restructuring during the transition in South Africa and, specifically, how a police force that had enforced apartheid could gain

acceptance in all law-abiding sectors of the community. In response, the participants suggested: creating a civilian police force, establishing review boards for discipline, designing new training curricula, diversifying the command structure and ensuring that new recruits represent minority groups, addressing paramilitarism, and strengthening community leadership to promote acceptability in the community.

On the topic of **majority and minority rights**, Harvard Law Professor Lani Guinier challenged the participants to rethink the meaning of democracy and to reflect on various voting methods used in the United States and around the world. She encouraged the group to question the fairness of proportional representation and majority rule, and to consider the nature and importance of democratic participation beyond the process of voting.

Further examination of majority and minority rights was presented by Dean Zimmerman with a case involving alleged systematic and long-standing discrimination against racial minorities by the United States Department of Agriculture. The case described how African-American farmers in the United States formed an alliance to lobby for a **managerial commitment to civil rights**. The participants analyzed ways in which social and professional expectations -- based on perceived or assumed group characteristics -- lead to discrimination, and how effective leadership can challenge these assumptions and generate a respect for diversity among the workforce.

Professor Philip Heymann introduced the issue of political violence with a case study on terrorism and the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. He asked the participants to analyze the effects of political violence on the peace process by putting themselves in the key policy-making role of advisor to Prime Minister of Israel Shimon Peres in the aftermath of the assassination of former Prime Minister Yitzak Rabin. Professor Heymann set up a scenario in which the advisor had the opportunity to assassinate a Hamas terrorist/Palestinian hero who has been making the bombs that have killed many Israelis. After much debate, the participants collectively engaged in a cost-benefit analysis of the use of political violence in this particular scenario. They dissected the decision-making processes that lead to and perpetuate terrorist activity and then talked about ways in which societies and political leaders can emerge from a history of dangerous conflict.

Professor Heymann brought the focus back to South Africa with a case study on **negotiating the release of political prisoners**. The participants discussed the concept of amnesty for political prisoners and its degree of importance in relation to the peace process in South Africa. The participants were encouraged to look at the costs of releasing prisoners and, in particular, the risk of more violence by and against those who were released. The participants examined specific examples of contentious prisoner releases in South Africa and discussed ways in which former prisoners can be reintegrated into the community and how to engender a respect for the rule of law.

The challenge of leadership in times of rapid change

As political leaders edge toward a new and uncertain order in Northern Ireland, they face intense personal pressures. Maintaining credibility and support is difficult when introducing new possibilities or when new political realities alter or make obsolete traditional structures of authority. A new understanding of the leaders' role, as well as ideas for coping with the stresses and challenges of change, will be critical to their success.

In one of the most thought-provoking classes of the workshop, Marty Linsky, Lecturer in Public Policy at the Kennedy School, addressed the myriad **challenges to effective leadership** by encouraging the class to analyze the broader context of authority

relationships. Drawing a distinction between authority and leadership, Mr. Linsky described authority as the power to influence or command behavior, and leadership as requiring confidence and the learned skills of observance and interpretation in order to manage successfully. He encouraged the group to take a critical look at a) how people respond to authority by analyzing the repercussions of the abuse of power and b) why those in a position of non-authority are sometimes able to meet the expectations of a community or constituency better than those who have taken or been given authority.

"Some of the leadership strategies can be applied to my new position with the party immediately upon my return."

--Richard Good, Alliance Party, Northern Ireland

During this class session, Mr. Linsky took advantage of a serendipitous opportunity to use the participants themselves as a case study on leadership. Though the classes were closed to the media, the organizers allowed a few exceptions *as permitted by the participants*. As the second session of the class on leadership began, a journalist from the Boston Globe asked to observe part of the discussion. When the Harvard faculty made a unilateral decision to allow the journalist to sit in briefly, the participants protested since they had not been consulted. Mr. Linsky then presented the request to the participants and left the center of the lecture hall. A heated debate among the participants on whether or not to allow a media presence ensued.

During the course of the debate, one participant took it upon himself to preside over the discussion. While the participant in charge instilled some order in the discussion, the majority of the participants eventually objected to his self-selected authority and chose another moderator. After much back and forth, the participants finally decided to allow the journalist to observe during the first 10 minutes of class. This captivating exercise allowed the participants to see not only how they respond to authority, but also to analyze why they had the overwhelming need to look to authority to moderate the discussion and lead the group to a decision.

Mr. Linsky concluded the session on leadership with the following suggestions: effective leadership depends upon the ability to be objective (what Mr. Linsky refers to as "ruling from the balcony"), to surround yourself with allies and confidantes, to listen to yourself and look behind other people's words, to confront hard realities, and to make a distinction between the role and self.

Economic development

Regional growth strategies, job creation, foreign direct investment, business location decisions, and the role of political leadership as well as public services (such as education and tax policy) are crucial in creating the climate for economic growth and achieving success in the global marketplace. In what the participants deemed the most useful and practical segment of the workshop, the faculty and several guest speakers addressed strategies for local and regional economic development.

Debora Spar, Associate Professor of Business, Government and Competition at Harvard Business School, captivated and energized the group with a presentation on economic investment, a topic the participants considered extremely important to strengthening peace. She first presented the case of Intel's Costa Rican plant site to illustrate what political leaders need to learn and think about to **promote economic development and**

attract high technology investment. The participants analyzed Intel's site selection process and Costa Rica's well-developed investment strategy targeting the technology industry. Professor Spar and the participants teased out some of the most important factors for attracting investment, such as political stability and predictability, a commitment to economic openness, and an educated and highly skilled workforce.

Professor Spar then introduced the case of Gerber Products Company investing in Poland in 1991. To establish a base for European operations and get a head start on emerging markets in Eastern and Central Europe, Gerber sought to acquire one of Poland's largest food processing plants. Yet Poland's political instability at the time prompted Gerber to take a closer look at the **costs and benefits of investment in an uncertain environment.** Professor Spar's method was to let the class steer the discussion, but she also encouraged them to put forth options for Gerber. The participants reviewed extensively the opportunities and risks related to the Gerber case, from the perspective of both the investors and the country in which a business is planning to invest, and then focused on what drives industries to invest in developing countries in general.

"...we go back to Northern Ireland with a much clearer view of where all the various parties stand on crucial issues. The sessions on industrial investment will certainly be used in our party's formulation of policy on this crucial issue."

-- Jim Wells, Democratic Unionist Party, Northern Ireland

Dean Zimmerman then addressed regional economic development with a case study on the Institute of Industrial Promotion of Andalusia (IPIA). IPIA was tasked in the 1970s with **promoting private sector development** in Andalusia through the coordination of regional economic policy. Dean Zimmerman urged the class to draw lessons from the development of the Macael marble industry and consider ways in which the lessons are applicable to various underdeveloped sectors of Northern Ireland, such as tourism and agriculture.

To complement the case studies on economic development, the Harvard faculty invited four businessmen to give a **practical assessment of investment in Northern Ireland.** The panelists addressed the possible obstacles to foreign investment and what leaders should do to provide a business-friendly political environment. The panel was composed of John Cullinane, president of The Cullinane Group, Inc. and founder of Cullinet Software, Inc.; Louis L. Davis, Founder and President of Entre International, Inc.; Thomas DiBenedetto, Managing Director of Caucus Fund, L.L.C.; and Ira Jackson, Executive Vice President of BankBoston Corporation. The participants also attended a thought-provoking luncheon address on economic development in Northern Ireland by Jim Lyons, Senior Trial Partner at Rothberger, Johnson and Lyons LLP and Special Advisor to the President and Secretary of State for Economic Initiatives in Ireland.

Special Events and Informal Activities

The group was given a number of opportunities to socialize throughout the week to encourage the development of informal ties and camaraderie among the participants. To welcome the participants, the Kennedy School organized an opening reception and dinner in the penthouse of the Littauer Building. The participants also had a chance to relax and interact with each other in a purely social setting at a cocktail reception at the home of Bill and Sally Fay Cottingham in Cambridge. On another evening, the organizers

gave the participants a guided tour of historic Boston, which was followed by an informal dinner at the famous "No Name Restaurant".

Midweek, the participants spent a memorable day on the island of Martha's Vineyard, during which the group engaged in a vibrant luncheon discussion on civil rights led by Charles William Maynes, President of the Eurasia Foundation, and Sheldon Hackney, Professor at and former President of the University of Pennsylvania. The discussion was held at the home of Frank Loy, then-Chairman of The Foundation for a Civil Society and recently appointed Under Secretary of State for Global Affairs. After an afternoon of shopping, sightseeing and swimming, the participants enjoyed an evening with notables such as Art Buchwald, Walter Cronkite, Mike Nichols, Diane Sawyer, and Mike Wallace at an informal reception and dinner hosted by Rose and William Styron and Nancy and Miles Rubin. One participant commented that the day provided a wonderful opportunity to "relax, reflect, and build social connections." The day of casual and informal activity on the Vineyard visibly increased the level of rapport among the participants in the in-class discussions that followed.

Later in the week, the participants attended a cocktail reception at the Mercury Gallery with distinguished Boston business and political leaders, such as Ambassador Ray Flynn, former Boston Mayor, and Cathy O'Toole, former Boston Secretary of Public Safety and member of the Patton Commission on Policing. Following the reception, the American Ireland Fund (AIF) hosted a dinner at the Ritz Carlton Hotel at which Kingsley Aikins, AIF Executive Director, gave a keynote speech on the challenges of organizational and political fundraising. The week concluded with a reception and dinner hosted by the Kennedy School at which the participants were presented with certificates for their participation.

Media Coverage

The workshop discussions were officially closed to the press in order to provide a forum in which the participants could speak openly. However, in response to numerous media inquiries, the organizers and participants agreed to allow a Boston Globe journalist to sit in briefly on a few workshop discussions to observe the structure of the classes.

At the end of the week, a press briefing was held, in which a representative of each political party had the choice to participate. Members of two Unionist parties, the Democratic Unionist Party and the Ulster Unionist Party, chose not to sit at the press table with Republican party representatives and asked for a separate forum, a request that could not be accommodated by the organizers. The discord at the press conference illustrated that despite the recent progress made in Northern Ireland and the new optimism and openness seen among the workshop participants, the road to reconciliation and the consolidation of peace in Northern Ireland is indeed a long one. Articles on the news conference and the workshop's proceedings appeared in The Irish Times and The Boston Globe.

"We don't have an opportunity in Northern Ireland to socialize. We do still live in highly segregated areas. One of the precious things that happened here is that we have that safe space provided for us that enables us to have that learning in a much more trusting environment."

-- *Monica McWilliams, Northern Ireland Women's Coalition, Northern Ireland*

Participants' Evaluations

Questionnaires about the effectiveness of the program and possible follow-up activity were distributed to participants at the last session. All participants, with the exception of one, ranked the program as excellent or above average, and the majority of the participants stated that the program exceeded their expectations. All participants found the program to be useful and several highlighted the sessions on economic development and leadership as being particularly helpful.

In regard to the content of the case studies, the participants suggested putting more emphasis on economics, leadership, and future problems. Almost all participants suggested that the organizers reduce the volume of reading materials or, alternatively, give the participants more time to read and prepare for classes. While most of the participants thought the program was relevant and well balanced, some believed that a few of the case studies were inapplicable to Northern Ireland.

The participants commented that the day on Martha's Vineyard was by all accounts interesting, enjoyable, and relaxing, and it provided an excellent opportunity to socialize and get to know each other better on a personal level.

"[The workshop] forced me to consider the other person's point of view on its merits and with less emphasis on preconceived ideas."

-- *Austin Currie, Fine Gael, Republic of Ireland*

Some of the participants noted that the program did significantly change their perceptions of the situation and/or the politicians in Northern Ireland, Great Britain and/or the Republic of Ireland, and most commented that it enhanced their understanding of each others' points of view. Many of the participants felt that the workshop strengthened their commitment to a more inclusive political process, and the majority of the participants planned to maintain contact with people from other parties, noting the importance of forging political and personal relationships. Practically all participants responded with enthusiasm about the opportunity to build new networks and relay the knowledge gained at the workshop to their party colleagues. Furthermore, the participants said they would use the strategies learned through case studies, though they were not specific about how. The majority of the participants are eager to participate in follow-up activities sponsored by The Project and the Kennedy School.

Proposed Follow-up Activities

At the end of the workshop, virtually all of the participants expressed a desire for follow-up programming, though few had specific suggestions about structure or content. A significant reason for this is the newness of the Assembly and the need for political leaders to grow into their new roles and identify key issues. The participants did, however, offer a few general suggestions for follow-up work, which include:

- Organizing a conference that would provide an opportunity for a mid-term evaluation of the Assembly;
- Continuing programming on political structures, institutions, and leadership for political leaders in Northern Ireland, the Republic of Ireland and Great Britain to engage in dialogue with those from other countries who have faced similar challenges;

- Coordinating issue-specific meetings to continue the discussion on prisoners, marches, and economic issues.

The Project is currently exploring the appropriateness and feasibility of these and other possibilities for developing various follow-up programs. On the community level, The Project and the Northern Ireland Voluntary Trust (NIVT) have already co-sponsored two programs in 1998 for community leaders and in February 1999 are co-sponsoring another program that will address issues of concern to a range of individuals and groups who can be considered victims of the Troubles in Northern Ireland. Furthermore, community and political leaders alike in Northern Ireland have noted the distance between these groups and indicated their receptivity to initiatives that would begin to bridge the gap.

The Project is currently exploring the appropriateness and feasibility of these and other possibilities for developing various follow-up programs. On the community level, The Project and the Northern Ireland Voluntary Trust (NIVT) have already co-sponsored two programs in 1998 for community leaders and in February 1999 are co-sponsoring another program that will address issues of concern to a range of individuals and groups who can be considered victims of the Troubles in Northern Ireland. Furthermore, community and political leaders alike in Northern Ireland have noted the distance between these groups and indicated their receptivity to initiatives that would begin to bridge the gap. The Project is holding discussions with various community and political leaders about organizing a program to address this need, possibly around some of the topics specifically related to the newly-mandated Civic Forum.

Additionally, it is hoped that the participants in this workshop will carry through on their stated desires to conduct their own follow-up work by:

- Applying the insights they have gained at the workshop by developing and implementing plans for leaders in Northern Ireland (and from Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland) to work together to address obstacles to peace-building and reconciliation;
- Strengthening the personal connections formed during the workshop and building new networks; and
- Relaying the knowledge gained at the workshop to their party colleagues.

In order to ascertain the application of such plans and strategies, The Project will maintain contact with program participants and others in Northern Ireland.

The Project is aware that there are many individuals and organizations working toward peace and reconciliation in Northern Ireland. Throughout The Project's work in Northern Ireland, Project staff have heard repeatedly that its unique methodology is needed and effective, and have been urged to extend its efforts. Accordingly, The Project will continue its Northern Ireland programming and tailor its initiatives based on the changing needs and concerns of future participants.

Acknowledgements

Many people contributed to the success of this workshop. Among those instrumental in designing the program were Paul Arthur, James Cooney, Philip Heymann, Wendy Luers, Timothy Phillips, and Peter Zimmerman. Lesley Theall, Jennifer Gala and other members of the Kennedy School staff made every effort to ensure that the workshop ran seamlessly. Special thanks also go to Kingsley Aikins, Bill and Sally Fay Cottingham, Miranda Daniloff, Amnon Goldman, Maurice Hayes, Adrienne Kaufmann, Frank and Dale Loy, Claire Storrent, Rose and William Styron, and Nick Contos. The workshop was made possible by generous financial support from the American Ireland Fund, the Compton Foundation, John Cullinane, Miles and Nancy Rubin, and a donor who wishes to remain anonymous. Financial assistance for The Project's general development work in 1998 was provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

This report was prepared by Eva Canoutas.