



ISSN : 1875-4120
Issue : (Provisional)
Published : April 2023

This article will be published in a future issue of TDM (2023). Check website for final publication date for correct reference.

This article may not be the final version and should be considered as a draft article.

Terms & Conditions

Registered TDM users are authorised to download and print one copy of the articles in the TDM Website for personal, non-commercial use provided all printouts clearly include the name of the author and of TDM. The work so downloaded must not be modified. **Copies downloaded must not be further circulated.** Each individual wishing to download a copy must first register with the website.

All other use including copying, distribution, retransmission or modification of the information or materials contained herein without the express written consent of TDM is strictly prohibited. Should the user contravene these conditions TDM reserve the right to send a bill for the unauthorised use to the person or persons engaging in such unauthorised use. The bill will charge to the unauthorised user a sum which takes into account the copyright fee and administrative costs of identifying and pursuing the unauthorised user.

For more information about the Terms & Conditions visit www.transnational-dispute-management.com

© Copyright TDM 2023
TDM Cover v2.7

Transnational Dispute Management

www.transnational-dispute-management.com

Young-OGEMID Author Interview #4: Professor Noam Ebner and Professor Jennifer Reynolds (March 2023)

About TDM

TDM (Transnational Dispute Management): Focusing on recent developments in the area of Investment arbitration and Dispute Management, regulation, treaties, judicial and arbitral cases, voluntary guidelines, tax and contracting.

Visit www.transnational-dispute-management.com for full Terms & Conditions and subscription rates.

Open to all to read and to contribute

TDM has become the hub of a global professional and academic network. Therefore we invite all those with an interest in Investment arbitration and Dispute Management to contribute. We are looking mainly for short comments on recent developments of broad interest. We would like where possible for such comments to be backed-up by provision of in-depth notes and articles (which we will be published in our 'knowledge bank') and primary legal and regulatory materials.

If you would like to participate in this global network please contact us at info@transnational-dispute-management.com: we are ready to publish relevant and quality contributions with name, photo, and brief biographical description - but we will also accept anonymous ones where there is a good reason. We do not expect contributors to produce long academic articles (though we publish a select number of academic studies either as an advance version or an TDM-focused republication), but rather concise comments from the author's professional 'workshop'.

TDM is linked to **OGEMID**, the principal internet information & discussion forum in the area of oil, gas, energy, mining, infrastructure and investment disputes founded by Professor Thomas Wälde.

Young-OGEMID Author Interview #4: *Professor Noam Ebner and Professor Jennifer Reynolds (March 2023)*

Star Wars and Conflict Resolution: There are Alternatives to Fighting,
www.starwarsconflictresolution.com

Moderator: Professor S.I. Strong

Professor Strong began the fourth Young-OGEMID Author Interview by introducing **Prof. Noam Ebner** and **Prof. Jennifer Reynolds**, editors of *Star Wars and Conflict Resolution: There Are Alternatives to Fighting* (DRI Press, 2022).

Noam Ebner is a professor of negotiation and conflict resolution in Creighton University's Department of Interdisciplinary Studies. Previously, Noam taught for over a decade at universities around the world, including in Israel, Turkey, Costa Rica, and elsewhere. He holds an LLB and LLM from Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

Jennifer Reynolds teaches civil procedure, conflict of laws, negotiation, and mediation. Her research interests include dispute systems design, plea bargaining and specialty courts, and cultural influences and implications of alternative processes. She holds a bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago, a master's degree from the University of Texas and a JD from Harvard University.

Professor Jennifer Reynolds introduced the book and its purpose and described it as a kind of sampler of conflict-related topics (not a textbook), consisting of eighteen chapters written by more than two dozen conflict resolution experts with connections to both academia and practice. We loosely organized these chapters into a section on “conflict” and another section on “conflict resolution.” Within these two sections, our authors have written on a variety of topics, using *Star Wars* as both a subject of analysis as well as a lens through which to consider conflict theory:

- **Part One: Conflict.** Topics include conceptions of power; fighting styles; the ethics of first strike; unconscious bias; role of emotions in conflict; interests and values; conflict escalation; and neurochemistry.
- **Part Two: Conflict Resolution.** Topics include conflict styles; interest-based negotiation; mediation; arbitration; empathy; mind tricks and manipulation; gender and negotiation; negotiator satisfaction and subjective value; and the science of meetings.

Our goal is to improve general conflict literacy, defined as the ability (1) to understand and analyze conflict and negotiation and (2) to take constructive steps toward more effective management, resolution, and decision-making. Our target audience is *Star Wars* fans, not law students or lawyers or conflict resolution professionals (though we welcome those readers as well!). We want to reach people who wouldn't necessarily think themselves to be interested in a more academic treatment of conflict, conflict resolution, and negotiation—but who

would pick up a book to read more about how these topics relate to something they are interested in, namely *Star Wars*.

With all this in mind, the purpose of our book is twofold: first, to convey ideas and methods relevant to conflict and conflict resolution through examples from the *Star Wars* saga; and second, to understand the *Star Wars* story better as a result of using these methods. By understanding more about how and why conflict unfolds in *Star Wars*, we get insight into areas of tension or concern that have particular salience in a particular cultural moment. We've presented on this book and related topics numerous times over the past year—most recently at the Emerald City Comic Con in Seattle—and it's been amazing and gratifying to see how much people really want to talk about how conflict works and what we can do about it.

We're excited to have this week with you. Please send us any questions and thoughts on anything related to conflict and *Star Wars*, including the possibilities and limits of popular culture as a vehicle for education and communication about conflict and conflict resolution.



Dr. Eva Litina posted the first question and was “wondering about the inception of this book: how did you decide to work on ways to use popular culture as a means of education about conflict and conflict resolution? And what difficulties did you face while working on this project?”

Professor Ebner replied:

I'll break my answer into two, relating to your two questions.

Pop-culture for teaching conflict resolution

Well, like many teachers and practitioners of conflict resolution topics, we've often heard (and said) "This isn't just for work, everybody needs to know some of this". And, like many others, we've done our share of public-oriented educational projects focusing on people outside of our classrooms. However, even these well-intended efforts are just a drop in the bucket, or in the ocean. So, thinking strategically: how to design projects for educating the public at scale?

We both use pop-culture clips and movies to provide motivational/educational moments in our classrooms, so we are well-familiar with their ability to make people enjoy learning. Jen has also written more substantively about popular culture as a mirror and a forecaster of societal trends and how this relates to conflict and alternative dispute resolution. We discovered that we both had a long-standing plan to write about *Star Wars* and conflict resolution because it is such a natural fit - and also, because we both grew up loving the movies. When we sat down to put the pieces together, we realized that we were on to something much bigger - the solution to the original large-scale challenge.

There is no shortage of courses on conflict and ADR, although their cost is certainly an obstacle. There is no shortage of books on negotiation or conflict or freely accessible videos on YouTube. And still, most people will never touch any of those. So, the issue seems to be less about strict access and more about opportunity, motivation, and communication mode.

On the other hand, millions of people will enthusiastically consume their favorite pop-culture phenomenon, including peripheral material related to the phenomenon. Perhaps even hundreds of millions in some cases, as with Star Wars, Star Trek, Game of Thrones, etc. Any popular movie, TV show or ongoing saga/franchise offers such ready-made audiences. Our challenge became figuring out a way to tap into them. What channel could connect us to fan audiences, building on their motivation, receptiveness, and ongoing engagement with whatever show they like... and convey lessons about conflict resolution?

To hitch the wagon of conflict resolution to the engine provided by pop-culture, we decided to begin with a book (the medium we're most skilled at, given our own background) and with Star Wars (given our love of the movies and the almost-embarrassing depth of our knowledge of the material). We plan to work with other media and other series and movies, but this was the perfect starting place for us.

One important decision we made right at the start was not to write the book ourselves, but instead to invite colleagues from around the conflict field, writ as broadly as you can imagine, to propose topics and participate in the project as authors. One reason we chose this path of an edited collection was considering that as our audience is unprecedentedly diverse (just about anybody in the world who can read and knows what a lightsaber is) multiple voices and perspectives would allow better connections to form.

Challenges

This leads me to your question on "what challenges did you face?" through a preliminary reflection on the challenge we *didn't* face: *participation*. We were overwhelmed by the number of people - some close friends and colleagues, others strangers from across diverse fields, including some we'd never heard of - proposing conflict-themed chapters covering every corner of the Star Wars movies. Beyond this circle, the overwhelmingly positive support we encountered from others across the field quickly showed us we wouldn't face any internal challenges along the lines of "this isn't serious" or "stop distracting us with frivolous things". People get why this work is deadly serious, and important - its novel vehicle notwithstanding.

So, what challenges did we face? I'll share three, and perhaps Jen will chime in to remind me of others (perhaps my memory is too rosy):

One challenge was finding a publisher. We faced a double challenge on this front: Our timing of the project, the culmination of our Call for Papers etc. led us to begin seeking publishers in April 2020. Not the best time for... well, anything. The second challenge was our book's special nature: it isn't an academic or typical trade book on negotiation appealing to the publishers who put out most of the work in our field... and on the other hand, it isn't a typical light fan-service publication. We needed a

publisher who would really get what we were trying to do and support it in the right way. The process of figuring this all was slowed by the pandemic's impact on the publishing industry and finally led us to DRI Press, the boutique dispute resolution publishing arm of the Dispute Resolution Institute at Mitchell-Hamline School of Law, which turned out to be the perfect match.

A second challenge was choosing which of the proposals to include in the book! Honestly, I think this was the toughest challenge. Just about every proposal we received - and these numbered over 70 - could have been developed into a good solid chapter. We needed to choose 15-20 of them that would fit together into a first book that delivered a certain degree of coverage to a broad introduction to conflict and its resolution, as Jen explained in her introductory email. It painful to leave so many proposals out! Thankfully, we already knew back then that we wanted to produce more than one book. Indeed, a second volume is currently in formation, and it won't be the last.

A third challenge was finding the right tone. Writing a law review or a social science article and writing a chapter for a general audience are two completely different ventures; it's amazing they share a verb. The process of figuring out the right balance of smart, witty, sharp, readable, and accessible in delivering both solid conflict content and solid Star Wars insights was long, arduous, and fascinating. We learned so much along the way about our own writing and working with others on their own. We learned about readability and enjoyability from asking people to weigh in who are not only our colleagues or students (including, by the way, our teenage children). I look forward to taking on this challenge again in future volumes and to doing an even better job at delivering a book that any fan of a movie or series, from any background, can pick up, enjoy, and walk away from more conflict-fluent than before.



Shreya Jain followed up and asked:

Thanks for your insightful presentation and congratulations on publishing the book!

1. While working on this book, did you follow any defined rules on what was Star Wars 'canon'?
2. What kind of issues do you intend to cover in volume two of this book? Also, did you end up leaving out any issues because you felt they are more appropriate to be examined by another pop culture lens?

Professor Reynolds replied:

Thank you so much for these questions, Shreya!

Regarding the canon – when we were working on this book, we decided to limit the source material to the 11 *Star Wars* movies (original trilogy, prequel trilogy, sequel trilogy, *Rogue One*, and *Solo*) because we wanted to be sure that the examples were as familiar to as large a readership as possible. Although other canon material (*The Clone Wars* etc.) is chockfull of great examples to use and scenes to dissect, we didn't

want the book to get too specialized. That said, some of our authors occasionally cite to canon (and non-canon) outside the movies. (We are using the Disney rules about what counts as canon and non-canon.)

Regarding volume two – we are in the process of deciding what to include right now! Our deadline for proposals was March 1 and we are going through those proposals at this time. The idea is for the second book to be organized around the different trilogies, so we still have a movie focus in mind. That said, a number of proposals take *Rogue One* as their subject and a fair few are interested in the *Kenobi* television series, so we'll have to think about what that means for our structure.

At this point, I don't think we have identified anything that we consider more appropriate for a different pop culture lens, as we are very focused on *Star Wars*. But it is true that there is considerable overlap with other pop culture lenses, and this overlap is useful in developing conflict literacy. At the Emerald City Comic Con earlier this month, an audience member asked about the ways in which rebellions can overcome oppressive regimes (which is the whole plot of *Star Wars*) and we started talking about how overreach by the Empire contributed to the rebellion/backlash that eventually coalesced into organized resistance (the Alliance, and later the Resistance). During this discussion, we compared this dynamic to what happens in the Harry Potter story, where Voldemort's violent, oppressive actions end up creating the conditions for his destruction. It's good to be able to explore these topics through different narratives; and even though these particular narratives are fictional, they provide us with a common (and maybe more comfortable?) framework for thinking through what we see (or don't see) in real-life conflicts.



Victoria Barausova asked “You mentioned that you intend to organise the second book around different trilogies - could you also share a little bit more about the themes in conflict resolution that you are planning to cover with the help of those films?”

Professor Ebner:

Thanks for this question, which opens a window to share an element of these books that has been most interesting (and challenging) to work with.

If we were designing a textbook for academic courses or a tradebook for popular reading on negotiation or conflict resolution, we'd naturally begin with deciding the table of contents, deciding key themes, breaking them down into sub-topics, and so on.

Working with a diverse cast of authors and aiming at a very broad general audience has flipped this process on its head. In our current process, our first question is "what conflict themes do authors see as particularly interesting in *Star Wars*?". Once we receive proposals, we ask "would this interest *Star Wars* fans?" and "is this likely to increase their conflict literacy?" At a later stage, we ask questions such as "of all the pieces that meet these criteria and are of high quality, which would fit together best in

a book?". It is really at that later stage that we start pulling things together thematically, and as we do, we might notice areas that are over- or under- covered.

This approach (itself a work in progress, we've just begun working on the second book!) is reader-centric rather than discipline-centric. For academics, this is a very unnatural approach to take, and we feel some of that strangeness throughout the process. Not "what do we need to cover?" but rather "how can we do the best for our readers with many of these wonderful ideas we've been handed?"

This is a long prelude to the honest answer: *we simply don't know yet which conflict themes the second book will cover*. But I can share thematic description mapping out many of the proposals we've received:

Some of the proposals offered to apply a key model or framework developed in a book to analyze characters or storylines. For example:

- Applying Salacuse's *Real Leaders Negotiate* to explain dynamics in the prequel trilogy.
- Applying William Ury's *The Third Side* to the relationship between Kylo Ren and Rey in the sequel movies
- Demonstrating Afzalur Rahim's five conflict modes model through characters and interactions in the original trilogy

Others take broad bodies of research on specific topics in negotiation and conflict - such as goal-selection or deception, - and bringing what we know about these issues to life via the movies.

Still others use overarching storylines in each trilogy to discuss big-picture topics that might be the overarching storylines of the conflict resolution field: neutrality (and the Jedi role in bringing peace and justice), worldviews (Jedi and our-world neutrals weighing in on what the nature of conflict is and what we aim to do about it), power (sometimes one party - a disputant, or the Rebel Alliance- is simply outclassed in terms of power. What then?), and more.

As we work through the different jigsaw puzzles of each possible form the book could take, I'm sure more explicit conflict themes will emerge. But we're in early days right now.

We've been very excited to discover that occasionally authors suggest exploring topics in relation to Star Wars that are underexplored or undiscussed in the conflict literature. We've seen some examples in our first book. For example, how can conflict escalation be conducted constructively? Rey and Kylo Ren figured this out; perhaps so can we. Or, when should you be the one to initiate a conflict? Most of the conflict literature would say "Well, never!" but Han Solo may or may not have been right to shoot first in the cantina on Mos Eisley). We've already tentatively identified others in the recent harvest of proposals, but we'll wait to clarify their authors' intentions before sharing them.

No matter what themes eventually make it into the book, the important thing is that each will provide any reader a new pathway for considering a conflict issue, how it played out in Star Wars, and how it relates to their own life.

I hope this was an informative non-answer!



Professor Strong: thanks very much for your in-depth responses to the questions thus far. I have a few more for you.

Prof. Strong Question 1. What was the most intriguing analogy or insight among the various essays? What really made you think differently about conflict resolution and theory?

Prof. Ebner: what a wonderful set of questions! We'll do our best to weigh in on each of them individually. I'll kick this off by responding to your first question: What was the most intriguing analogy or insight among the various essays? What really made you think differently about conflict resolution and theory?

So. Many. Answers! One of the wonderful things about working with a group of brilliant thinkers on an out-of-the-ordinary topic was the number of times I found myself staring off into space, saying "huh!" in the middle of reading.

One thing that stood out for me in terms of making me think differently about our work in a big-picture sense was a chapter written by Joseph Allen, Emilee Eden and Katherine Castro of the University of Utah called "At the Rendezvous Point: Meetings, Councils, and Conflict". Joe is an expert in the area of meetings science, studying the dynamics, process, and outcome of the unique interactional phenomenon of meetings.

I don't know about any of you, but I had never known this area of inquiry existed! Given how much of their time professionals spend in meetings, it seems like something worthy of attention by many fields, but I had never considered it before. Moreover, given how bringing people together is at the core of our work, you'd think thought we might pay separate and special attention to this aspect of things.

This was of deep interest to me. At first I thought "that's an interesting niche area to explore" but as I engaged with it deeper, I realized it is a new overall perspective through which to consider our work. I often look at dispute resolution work through perspectives of communication, conversation, or decisionmaking. However, I now realized there was an entirely new primary frame one could put around their work as arbitrator, mediator, or negotiation, that of meeting design and implementation. What distinguishes one meeting from another? What makes for a good meeting as opposed to a bad one? What does the nature of the meetings we tend to design and convene imply about our worldview? I found this inside-out way of looking at our processes fascinating. Enlightening, too, given how it stimulates questions about the assumptions that underlie how we tend to bring people together and what purposes and benefits we think these convening patterns support.

Prof. Strong Question 2. Which of the essays do you believe is of most interest to those involved in international dispute resolution? Why is that?

Prof. Reynolds: My sense is that at any given moment, we are all dealing with different kinds of conflict-related issues in our practices, from the local (co-workers, clients) to the more global (politics, law, policy). So the answer depends somewhat on circumstances and context, of course. One of our chapters, *Han Shot First: The Ethics of First Strike*, draws on international law and domestic policy to examine the ethical considerations surrounding preemptive action in large-scale conflict as well as in interpersonal contexts. In our next book, we are going to include chapters with more obvious application to international dispute resolution, such as developing cultural awareness in negotiation and thinking through how some of the alliances and treaties are brokered in the saga (e.g., between the Gungans and the Naboo).

Prof. Strong Question 3. The world of international commercial dispute resolution is becoming increasingly interested in mediation, due in large part to the promulgation of the Singapore Convention on Mediation. Mediation, of course, requires an understanding of negotiation theory and the difference between interests and positions. However, something that is not often discussed in the literature is the conflict between interests and values, though that is a particular concern in investment arbitration, which resolves quasi-public disputes that may turn on policy (value) choices made by the host state. Can you speak a bit about the findings from chapter seven, "Between Values and Interests, Often Choose One Must?"

Prof. Ebner: Stacie, this is a great question, both in pointing out the gap in theory and also the obstacle this presents in practice. Not distinguishing when the issue that is motivating them is an interest or a deeply-rooted value can confound negotiators trained that underlying every position is an interest. And, it can cause neutrals to identify a party's motivation and still address it inappropriately, thinking that it is an interest rather than a value. Big-picture, this plays out as you noted (although, I'd suggest that some policy choices are values-based, and others are interest-based, but that's a topic for a longer conversation ☺)

In that chapter, authors Adrian Borbély, Bruno André Giraudon, and Taniel Sikharulidze do a wonderful job of surfacing this challenge. As the book is written for lay readers, they don't dive deeply into the negotiation literature and show just how flawed it is in this regard. Rather they move on to introduce the notion of different forms of motivators at a level which should be standard in any negotiation textbook:

"If positions are what we ask for, motivators explain why we have taken that position in the first place. If we ask our employer for a raise, for example, we may have an underlying interest in paying back debts, improving our financial security, contributing to our children's tuition to the Academy, or some combination of these. Such tangible interests inform or motivate our position that we should get a raise. Note that we also may have intangible interests underlying our request, such as cultivating goodwill or maintaining good relationships. Both tangible and intangible interests belong to the domain of motivators we can "get" or "have."

Conversely, values are embedded in people's sociocultural identity. They have to do with who we are, who we aspire to be, and how we want to be perceived

by others. The request for a raise, for example, may follow the discovery that our colleague doing the same job earns more than us (implicating the value of fair treatment). Like interests, values motivate the positions we take in conflict. Value violations may trigger a party's strong emotions (such as anger or grief), steer them toward aggressive behavior, or cause them to reject any form of agreement. This is even more true when values are sacred to their beholder.

*In conflict and negotiation, values are not always part of the discussion, either because they are distant from the matter at hand or because they motivate us in the same direction as our interests. When Qui-Gon frees Anakin from slavery in *The Phantom Menace*, his interests (to get a new apprentice) and values (Jedi stand against oppression) are aligned.*

Values become worthy of consideration in negotiation and conflict situations when they push us in a different direction than our interests or the interests we are tasked to defend or promote. For example, you may want to order your favorite food (interest) while simultaneously not wanting to be accused of tyranny by your family (value of democracy). If your family refuses to agree to get the takeout you crave, you have an interest/value conflict. As another example, imagine you want your staff to perform their tasks homogeneously (interest of management) while also wanting them to be free to express their identity and uniqueness (value of inclusion). If their free _expression_ runs counter to your performance expectations, you'll need to choose between promoting your interests and defending your values... ”

They continue to articulate the difference between interests and values and pick apart the various ways in which we are often required to choose between them. They demonstrate these by applying values/interests analysis to scenes in Star Wars, including Lando Calrissian and Darth Vader's negotiation over Han, Leia, and Chewbacca's future in *The Empire Strikes Back* (I can just hear C-3PO saying “What about *my* future?”, and he's right), Luke Skywalker's attempt to negotiate Darth Vader's return to the light side in *Return of the Jedi*, The most pivotal arc hinged around this issue, and the one best demonstrating its importance in Star Wars and in our real life negotiations, is Anakin Skywalker's fall to the dark side in Episode III *Revenge of the Sith*. The authors describe how Anakin's interests and values were in friction throughout this arc and were finally, strategically, brought into a binary choice moment by Emperor Palpatine who hoped to steal this bright talent from the Jedi Order and add him to the Sith roster instead. He does so by offering the dark side as the way for Anakin to save the life of his wife and children-to-be. Palpatine

“relates the story of Darth Plagueis the Wise, who Palpatine claims could bring the dead to life. This story resonates with Anakin, who has lost his mother and is terrified of losing Padmé. Palpatine tells Anakin he cannot learn Plagueis's power from the Jedi. The only way to fulfill Anakin's core interest of protecting his loved one, according to Palpatine, is to consider a different path. Anakin is now a walking and talking ethical dilemma, as demonstrated in his conversation with Padmé: “I want more, and I know I shouldn't... I found a way to save you.” For the first time, Anakin recognizes his terrible dilemma: if he wants to beat death and protect his family (interests), he may have to go against his principles (values).

At this point, however, Anakin still is not ready to capitulate to the dark side. When Palpatine reveals he is a Sith Lord, Anakin neither accepts his tutelage nor kills him. Instead, Anakin reports Palpatine to Master Windu. But when Windu refuses to take Anakin with him to arrest Palpatine, Anakin, waiting behind at the Jedi Temple, hears Palpatine's voice in his head: "if the Jedi destroy me, any chance of saving her will be lost." Incapable of resisting his interests, he rushes to Palpatine's quarters..."

There, encountering Mace Windu about to execute Palpatine,

"... Anakin's value system is shattered. Anakin can forgive the Council's infraction in asking him to spy on Palpatine as a moment of weakness, but Windu's comfort with extrajudicial killing is sharp evidence that the Jedi Code—for so long, the organizing backbone of Anakin's value system—is considered simply optional by the high ranks of the Jedi. Anakin responds first with values: "You can't. He must stand trial" (respect of the value of due process) and "It is not the Jedi way" (the value of his community's moral order). Then, realizing that these values are not sacrosanct, Anakin's own interests begin to emerge: "He must live... I need him." At this moment, Anakin's entire motivation system of interests and values aligns to stop Windu from killing Palpatine. This is enough to lead to the disarmament and death of Windu, followed by Anakin's catastrophic turn to the dark side."

While a future volume on international dispute resolution might specify how this can play out directly regarding policy-as-values, at this point I'll trust readers to make the necessary adaptations on their own.

Prof. Strong Question 4. Commercial lawyers often pick commercial law as a specialty precisely because it is not as emotionally messy as family law or criminal law. However, once you're in the trenches, you realize that emotion remains relevant to both counsel and parties, and can really affect litigation/arbitration strategy. Could you speak a bit about the findings from chapter 6, "Are Emotions the Path to the Dark Side?"

Prof. Reynolds: What you say is so true about emotions. Certainly the Jedi tried to manage conflict and decision-making by minimizing (some might say suppressing) emotional responses and relationships, and it did not turn out well. In the chapter you mention, authors Gert-Jan Lelieveld and Welmer Molenmaker explain how striving to remove emotions from social conflict leads to worse outcomes. They recommend becoming more mindful of and literate around feelings to avoid being pulled to "the dark side." All emotions are not the same, after all. Lelieveld and Molenmaker categorize emotions in four groups:

- Positive (e.g., happiness)
- Decreased self-importance of self, increased importance of others (e.g., compassion, gratitude)
- When outcomes deviate from wishes/needs (e.g., disappointment, sadness)
- When confronted with threats (e.g., fear and anger)

The first two groups of emotions are associated with prosocial feelings and behavior, which are useful in conflict and thus should be encouraged (not suppressed). The authors note that the third group of emotions, though not necessarily positive and fun

to experience, do not necessarily lead a person to the dark side-so long as these emotions don't lead to "all-consuming and lasting anger." The fourth group of emotions are the potentially dangerous ones, in terms of leading to anti-social behaviors in conflict. But, as the authors point out, fear can but does not necessarily lead to anger, hatred, and suffering (cf. Yoda). Dealing with fear and anger earlier in the process can avoid destructive cycles of conflict. But this means that the Jedi and others need to surface and examine negative emotions more carefully and thoughtfully, instead of just pushing them aside or ignoring them. The energy it takes to suppress negative emotions is wasted in two senses: (1) the negative emotions will leak out somehow, sometimes in spectacularly destructive fashion; and (2) whatever problem the conflict is around is harder to solve if the parties have less energy/focus because they are working to suppress their emotions.

On this latter point, and then I'll stop, the Jedi's rigid adherence to being emotionless / relationship-less may have gotten them out of alignment with the Force, which helps explain how they failed to notice that they had a Sith Lord in their midst (the evil Emperor Palpatine, pretending to be merely the Chancellor of the Republic)-and this failure to notice Palpatine led to war and tremendous suffering.

Prof. Strong: Many thanks for this. Just to push back a bit on your response to question four, litigation inevitably involves the third and fourth types of emotions, the ones that can increase further dispute. How do you propose practitioners get their clients to process those emotions appropriately within the confines of the attorney-client relationship? After all, we are often cautioned as lawyers not to try to act as amateur psychologists. Expressing emotion amongst one's team of professionals can also be problematic - the "myths" of angry, stapler-throwing senior partners are not always myths, after all.

Prof. Reynolds: It's common to work with co-workers, clients, etc. who are experiencing negative emotions and, possibly, expressing themselves in dysfunctional or antisocial ways. And I would venture that we ourselves experience negative emotions on a fairly regular basis (though I hope we refrain from throwing staplers).

In our book, the focus of the chapter was on developing a more nuanced understanding of emotions with the goal of facilitating more prosocial/functional emotional expressions rather than anti-social/dysfunctional ones. Having better "emotional intelligence" makes it easier to understand and manage one's own emotions, which is important when working through difficult conflicts. Emotional intelligence can also make it easier to see where clients and coworkers are coming from, which may improve our ability to listen and empathize.

In terms of your specific question about getting clients to process emotions without acting like an amateur psychologist, allow me to make a general observation around the importance of giving clients a

space to ventilate strong negative emotions. Lawyers typically want to get to the problem-solving part of the process, but taking time to hear how the client is feeling about the situation is time well spent. For super-emotional clients, dealing with their emotions often takes center stage in their experience of the conflict, and this can get in the way of resolving the situation in a way that is most supportive of their interests more broadly (e.g., settlement would be best for many reasons but client is so emotionally hooked that the client opts to continue expensive and time-consuming litigation). Additionally, by giving clients room to express their emotions, you help build trust and relationship with the client and you may gather important insight into the client's interests and values, which will help you help them going forward (indeed, it may help you move the conversation, when appropriate, from the expression of emotions to the identification of interests).

That's a short answer to a complex question, and I invite Noam and others to chime in. I will say, however, that the specter of the stapler-throwing senior partner is, in my mind, a separate issue. Negotiating with coworkers (including supervisors) and negotiating with ourselves around the appropriate ways to express emotion are important professional and personal skills. But the first step in both situations is developing more sophisticated awareness of the emotional landscape of a difficult or fraught situation.

Prof. Strong: All very true! I would also suggest that we should all know ourselves and play to our strengths while still developing alternate skills. I remember when I was at my last institution, I was asked to act as a pro bono mediator for a group that I volunteered with. I foresaw a conflict of interest that kept me from taking it on, but I also saw the file and thought I would be a bad fit, given the emotional intensity of the dispute. One of my colleagues took on the assignment, and I saw him the day after the mediation and asked how it went. He said the parties had spent the morning yelling and crying, but that they'd managed to reach agreement in the afternoon. I am absolutely convinced that I wouldn't have been able to do as well as he did - he had a natural knack for mediation that I didn't share, despite training. On the flip side, I'm know I'm a better arbitrator than him. Finding your niche, while still working to expand your comfort zone, is the key to a happy and successful career.

Prof. Ebner: That is such important guidance, Stacie!

Perhaps even more helpful than the admonitions against dabbling in amateur psychology. Seeking to back away from what appears to be a pretty wrong place to go, we limit how and how deeply we connect with our counterparts, clients, and parties. In doing so, of course, we risk losing many of the tools we need to do our job, as Jen articulated. We also risk providing parties a somewhat sterile experience, which might impact their perception of the process in the various realms we tend to lump under 'procedural justice'.

My own take on this when coaching students who back away from opportunities for engagement, empathy, trustbuilding, and the like, is to suggest that there is a huge difference between amateur psychologizing and just being human. Human interactions rely on trust, empathy, listening, emotional *expression*, relationship building, and suchlike. That these are associated with psychology is simply our own mistaken association; these are not in any way the essence of psychoanalysis. Of course, as a deeply human process, the therapeutic interaction relies on these just as much as the mediative interaction does, and the lawyer/client interaction could. But the distance between creating constructive human interaction and practicing psychoanalysis is immense, and I feel that many teachers, trainers, and practitioners create a disproportionately wide protective buffer zone around amateur psychologizing that places many essential elements of human interaction into a presumed no-fly zone. And, perhaps, pay a price for this.

Just like the Jedi did for their own disproportionate caution with human emotion and interaction. Anybody who remembers Anakin Skywalker, about eight minutes after experiencing the trauma of discovering his mother mistreated by the Tusken, having her die in his arms, enacting a terrible revenge, and feeling torn apart by it all knows what I'm talking about. "To be angry is to be human," Padme seeks to console or engage him. "I'm a Jedi, I know I'm better than this," replies Anakin, expressing the impossible standard the Jedi Order sets for its members. The next movie and a half and chapter 6 in our book show why setting this impossible standard is routinely unconstructive in conflict. They also show how it can be devastatingly destructive - to the individual, and to their surrounding environment - over time...

My two credits. May the Force be with you all!

Prof. Strong Question 5. Finally, what advice do you have as editors for junior scholars seeking to place a chapter in an anthology through an open call like this? And what kind of advice do you have for that same group in how to work with an editor? You can not only help our listserv members place their work in the future, you can help make the job of future editors easy by teaching authors the optimal way to coordinate with editors! In answer these questions, you might also enunciate what you believe the role of a book editor to be, since philosophies can differ....

Prof. Reynolds: As to Stacie's final question about crafting a proposal for inclusion in an anthology, you may want to consider the following:

- What is the purpose of this book?
- Who is the intended audience? (Is it more academic, professional, popular, etc.?)
- Who is the publisher? Who are the editors?
- What are the parameters for participating (subject matter, length of chapters) and for submitting a proposal?

- What are the relevant timelines?
- Am I excited about the prospect of doing this?
- Is there something else I want to know about this before getting involved? (e.g., previous volumes in the series, similar books, etc.)

These questions will help you answer the big preliminary question, which is whether you would find it worthwhile to participate in the project. People who submitted proposals to our first volume were generally conflict experts and huge fans of *Star Wars*. They appreciated our mission of creating an affordable book aimed at a mainstream audience. We did have one accepted author drop out after we told them no one was getting paid – this was an important piece for that person, and we totally respected that decision. Think in advance about what criteria matter to you.

When you know you want to participate, follow the instructions in the call for proposals as precisely as you can. Email the contact person if you have questions about what they want to see. And remember to choose a topic that plays to your strengths, expertise, interests, etc.

In terms of working with editors, my main advice is to meet deadlines and ask questions whenever they come up.

Prof. Ebner: Just to add two cents to Jen's comprehensive strategy (which I've copied and pasted for my own future reference!), I'll share that I tend to look at these situations through a negotiation lens. For example:

I reach out to the organizer even if I don't have any specific questions, for the purpose of relationship building. This is usually easy, as if the project passes Jen's "Am I excited about the prospect of doing this?" test, I will certainly have something to bond with the organizers over.

As I read through the call, or ask the organizer's questions, I do so from an interests-guided lens in addition to a subject-matter lens: What do they seem to really need? For example:

- What types and level of expertise do they seem to be aiming for, and how can I support my claim to having those?
- Does the way they portray the project indicate that they seek to address basic/core topics, or that they aim to provide the field with something more innovative? If the former, how can I assure them of the 'core'ness of my topic? If the latter, what can I offer them that will make their final product shine with innovation?
- How can my proposal, or my overall involvement, satisfy more than one interest of the organizers, and how can I make this apparent to them?

Finally, I write my proposal in a 'yessable' format: Structured, organized, and detailed enough to make the end product tangible and to give the organizers the sense that all they need to do is to say 'yes' and I will make the chapter or article happen without any further labor on their end.



Dr. Piotr Wilinski: Thank you so much for your answers so far. What a lovely topic it is.

Long time ago in a galaxy far far away, I gave a presentation "Are Jedi Masters and Arbitrators alike?" so reading your answers and using Star Wars to discuss conflict resolution is close to my heart.

At the outset you mentioned that the audience is/was not legal professionals nor students, I wonder, however, do you yourself make use of (or part of) the book in your teachings or (even if not) is there a particular chapter that you would recommend also to show (perhaps freshmen (*first year law students*)) students how to conceptualize sometimes complex legal concepts related to resolving disputes.

Prof. Reynolds: Thank you so much for your wonderful question. It's awesome that you did a presentation on Jedi Masters and arbitrators! We have an excellent chapter on arbitration in our book, written by Imre Szalai of Loyola.

You're right, our target audience is not law students or lawyers. That said, we both use *Star Wars* examples in our teaching. Noam has actually written a brilliant "choose your own adventure" online exercise that teaches basic concepts of interest-based negotiation in a setting inspired by *Star Wars*. And we both like to break down particular scenes with students that demonstrate certain concepts, dynamics, or approaches. For example, the conflict between Holdo and Poe in *The Last Jedi* provides the basis for a rich conversation around gender and negotiation, workplace disagreements, leadership, leverage, interests-values conflicts, and so on.

And speaking of leadership, I am giving a talk at my law school later this semester using our chapter on meetings as the reading. (I believe Noam mentioned this chapter in an earlier post. We couldn't send an attachment, so I will expand a bit here.) The authors of the chapter analyze how conflict in the *Star Wars* plays out not only in battles but also in meetings. Furthermore, they explain how "light side" or "dark side" behaviors in these meetings may have had an impact on how the story turns out.

To quickly summarize the chapter: the authors watched all the main nine movies in the *Star Wars* saga, along with *Rogue One*. After defining what a meeting is ("a gathering of two or more people with a clear purpose, requiring actual discussion between individuals and having a collaborative component (e.g., decision-making)"), they identified all the meetings in those ten films. There were more than 400 meetings in total, which Noam and I found surprising but on rewatching, it's true—*Star Wars* has tons of meetings! The authors then categorized these meetings into "light side" (Jedi, Alliance, etc.) and "dark side" (Sith, Empire, etc.) and looked for certain behaviors in each meeting, like violence and argument, as well as certain approaches to decision-making in each meeting, like authoritarian or collaborative. The article's conclusion is instructive:

Authoritarian rule worked for the Empire for many years throughout the saga and perhaps would have continued, had the Empire not created a dissenting faction through all their interactions, including meetings. Their behaviors,

including their meeting behaviors, created fuel for defection and rebellion. The dark side embraced an approach to decision-making and conflict within their own organization that mirrored how they sought to rule. Aggressive forms of conflict and conflict resolution in their meetings—just as their aggressive approach to war and governance—ultimately contributed to their demise.

We see similar themes in the new *Star Wars* series *Andor*, and these kinds of observations are useful entry points into discussions with the students around what qualities inform skillful leadership and how they may want to think about managing groups and larger-scale decision-making in their professional futures.

All this is to say – we definitely think that our book can be a useful tool for university courses that seek to introduce students to more complex ideas of conflict, negotiation, and leadership. Of course, not everyone is a *Star Wars* fan, so we try to be expansive in our selection of examples and sources.



Anne-Marie Doernenburg: I would be interested to hear more about the points you made on power, fighting/conflict styles and, particularly, the role of culture and language (barriers). My sense is that too often, conflicts arise--and their resolution fail--due to a fundamentally different understanding, for instance, in the “West” *vis-à-vis* in Asia, of when a conflict actually exists and what tools/methods are appropriate. Was that something that translates into the *Star Wars* world?

Prof. Ebner: I’ll provide a nutshell of these topics as we covered them, with some pieces of text to add the fun flavor in.

Star Wars is many things, one of which is the big powerful party vs. the smaller and ostensibly weaker one. Rachel Viscomi’s chapter about power in conflict contrasts two ways of looking at power, applying the distinction made by Peter Coleman and others between power-over and power-with. This distinction explains why the Empire’s solution to losing the Death Star to the Rebel’s attack is to build a bigger Death Star, and why the Rebels response is to reach out and bring new members into the Alliance. You can find more about this chapter, snippets of its text, and – for hardcore fans – ideas on applying this distinction between types of power to *Kenobi*, one of the new *Star Wars* shows, here <https://www.starwarsconflictresolution.com/blog/rest-in-power-tala>

Thomas Friedman and I wrote chapters related to the notion of conflict style.

In “*Lightsabers and Fighting Styles*” Tom discussed the different forms of lightsaber use (each a somewhat essentially different Force-infused martial art) and how matchups between protagonists and antagonists using varied styles made for different process and outcome in their fights. In a somewhat metaphoric way, he applied this to different approaches people take in their (non- Force-infused) conflicts, and discussed the necessity to match your approach to the one your counterpart has taken in order to achieve an advantageous outcome.

For example, this is part of this breakdown of one of the saga's most epic duels, between Anakin Skywalker and Obi-Wan Kenobi:

“By the time Obi-Wan arrives on Mustafar in pursuit of his former apprentice, the two men know each other's styles well. They had trained together and fought side by side in numerous battles. But Obi-Wan is unaccustomed to Anakin's rage and physical aggression, which now dominate his style. At different points in the fight, Anakin Force chokes Obi-Wan, kicks him in the head, and mixes in other physical blows. Anakin has slightly altered his fighting style, incorporating Sith fighting techniques that match his anger. Kenobi remains almost purely defensive throughout most of the fight, often retreating instead of attacking. While he had claimed he would do what he must (that is, destroy Anakin) his heart doesn't seem to be in it. And Obi-Wan's retreats likely are strategic. Students of warfare know that the side that picks the spot for a battle enjoys an advantage. Once you find yourself on high ground, plant your feet and make a stand.

Each Jedi has an advantage in the fight. Anakin can surrender himself wholly to rage and become one with the dark side. But blind rage unchecked by experience and wisdom leaves a person, well, blind. Anakin is incredibly powerful but he had trained for years in the Jedi way, conscious to avoid channeling one's anger into a fight. Simply put, he is inexperienced at fighting as a Sith. Obi-Wan, by contrast, focuses on duty and becomes one with the Force. He is experienced at doing so and such focus is consistent with his fighting style. So, while Anakin is a powerful yet imperfect conduit of the dark side, Obi-Wan, while less powerful, is a perfect conduit of the Force...”.

For each duel he discussed, Tom provided a story from his real-world experience as a trial attorney in order to pin down experiences in that other galaxy to those in our own. Regarding the clash between Anakin and Obi-Wan, he shared the following anecdote:

“I have been in high-stakes negotiations where Soresu-style techniques served me well. In one case, the attorney on the other side was particularly challenging, frequently cursing at and even threatening me. His rage-fueled style was designed to throw off my game, and he hoped I would respond in kind. He knew I wasn't a street fighter and if he was able to draw me down into the mud with him, we would be fighting on his turf. Instead, I ignored his rage, smiled at his antics, and bent over backward to be nice. This behavior was so at odds with his own and with what he expected that he had no idea how to deal with it. The outcome was frankly hilarious. I would get up to get a glass of water. He would curse at me about some deadline or aspect of the case. I would smile and ask if he wanted any water as long as I was up. Simply being pleasant in the face of his assault drove him completely insane. This lawyer was so blinded by rage that he made mistake after mistake in litigating and negotiating the case.

Even outside of the Star Wars universe there is a calm energy that a person can channel to find balance and remain calm in the face of fury. The ability to do so will often frustrate and defeat even the most rage-filled foe.”

My own chapter was a more direct application of the notion of conflict styles to the Star Wars universe. It laid out the fairly well-accepted notion that each of us has a deeply-rooted tendency to respond a certain way in conflict situations, as an element of our personality. Introducing the Thomas Kilman conflict modes model, it described people who are naturally accommodators, avoiders, compromisers, competitors and collaborators.

To bring these to life, I identified Star Wars characters who fit each of these modes:

- *“Anakin Skywalker is competitive. Competitive people seek to vanquish their conflict counterpart. Anakin treats every negotiation interaction like a win-or-crash podrace. More on that later.*
- *Ben Kenobi is cooperative. Cooperative people seek to turn counterparts into teammates for mutual gain. Consider how Ben doesn’t impose his desire that Luke accompany him to Alderaan by arguing, guiltig, or Jedi mind-tricking. “You must do what you feel is right,” he says, wanting Luke to decide on his own.*
- *C-3PO is an accommodator. Accommodators give in to their counterparts. The only one in the saga to suggest that “[s]urrender is a perfectly acceptable alternative in extreme circumstances,” Threepio is shut down in reward. C-3PO’s programming guides him to be deferential and yielding to his counterparts.*
- *Uncle Owen is an avoider. Avoiders try to disappear from the scene. Young Owen’s surprise when Anakin heads off to the Tusken camp is telling; clearly the notion of seeking out conflict in such a way boggles his mind. Ben Kenobi correctly pegs Owen’s core trait of avoidance when Luke protests, “I can’t get involved, I’ve got work to do ... it’s such a long way from here.” Summarizing Owen succinctly, Ben responds: “That’s your uncle speaking.”*
- *Lando Calrissian is a compromiser. Compromisers try to obtain a chunk of whatever’s up for grabs before giving in on the rest. Certainly Lando competes when he has the right card up his sleeve, but when caught up with a tough counterpart such as Beckett in Solo or Darth Vader in The Empire Strikes Back, he intuitively looks to make a deal along the path of least resistance while still looking out for his own interests as best he can...”*

Of course, any Star Wars fan might consider this characterization to be wrong, pointing out one incident or another in which the characters acted according to a different mode or in opposition to the one I had filed them under. Perhaps some of you did this too! This serves the purposes of (a) implementing what a reader has learned about conflict modes in order to actively apply it to people and (b) distinguishing between someone’s fundamental wiring and the way they acted in a particular situation.

That second point is the topic of the second part of the chapter: our ability to step away from our default mode and strategically choose to act otherwise in a given situation. Essentially, this is the difference between a skilled negotiator and one who just goes with the flow:

“Successful negotiation requires constant strategizing, choosing between tactics, considering options, and other aspects of deliberate decision-making. In short, to negotiate well, we must choose. But is such choice possible, given the power of our default conflict mode? Yes. Truly wonderful, the mind of a human is. Hardwiring notwithstanding, we can bypass default reactions to strategically decide our course of action, even in the most conflict-laden situations. But how?”

As we’ve seen, the Conflict Modes model described five behaviors as deep-rooted personality traits we each default to. Another framework, the Dual Concerns model, reimagined these very same behaviors as strategies we can choose between—mindfully and intentionally—and implement in conflict and negotiation situations. In shifting from default mode to strategic choice, we take our first steps into a larger negotiating world.

When taking the Dual Concerns approach to choosing between the five conflict modes—now, strategies—in conflict or negotiation, we must weigh two concerns: First, how important is it to us to achieve our own goals; and second, how important is it to us that our counterpart achieves their goal? Consider these two concerns, and your strategic choice will be clear. Importantly, we can choose to implement any of these strategies, whether they align with our default conflict mode or not. Cooperators can compete, competitors can avoid, and so on. Of course, implementing a strategy is easier if it aligns with our default mode, just as riding a custom-built landspeeder is easier than riding a wild blurr. However, conscious effort and intentionality allow us to implement other strategies. Throughout Star Wars, protagonists struggle between their hardwired conflict modes and their ability to choose other approaches. Their success and failure, like our own in negotiation, depend on managing this tension. Spoiler: it doesn’t always go well...”

I then gave examples of characters with one default mode intentionally choosing a different strategy in a given situation. As an example of these examples:

“Competition is generally suitable when you have high aspirations, lack interest in a future relationship with your counterpart, and do not care about your counterpart’s success. Competition is generally easier when you enjoy a clear power advantage.

Though Jabba the Hutt is a pragmatic compromiser by nature, he often chooses to compete. In Return of the Jedi, for example, Jabba refuses Luke’s bargaining overture, feeling he holds all the cards: Solo, Leia, Chewbacca, Gamorrean muscle, etc. Luke throws out the possibility of “mutually beneficial” (cooperation or compromise) agreements without resorting to “unpleasant confrontation” (competition). Jabba strategically decides not to compromise but instead to compete: “There will be no bargain.” Cue the Rancor, prep the Sarlacc.”

Finally, to your question about the role of culture and languages:

This topic wasn’t directly covered in the first book. I was surprised why this wasn’t more of a go-to topic for proposals, given the rich material Star Wars offers on this front!

One sequence of scenes providing uniquely fertile ground for this discussion is from Episode I, *The Phantom Menace*. [To relate this to Piotr's question about use of Star Wars in class to teach complex issues, I often use this sequence to discuss both culture and ethics.]

Escaping the invasion of her home planet of Naboo by the Trade Federation, Queen Amidala is on her way to Coruscant to ask the Galactic Senate to intervene on her behalf. As the Trade Federation consolidates its rule on the planet, they impose punitive measures on the population in hopes of dissuading her from her mission. Every moment counts. However, the Queen's ship suffered damage during its escape, and puts down on the desert planet of Tatooine for repairs.

The queen's rescue was effected by a pair of Jedi Knights, Qui-Gon Jinn and Obi-Wan Kenobi. While Obi-Wan stays with the ship, Qui-Gon heads into town to scrounge up the spare parts needed to repair the ship. Accompanied by the Queen's handmaiden, a droid some of you might find familiar, and a being from Naboo named Jar Jar Binks who joined them for no clear purpose, Qui-Gon encounters Watto, used-parts dealer extraordinaire.

While Watto has the necessary parts, it turns out that paying for them will not be that simple. The currency Qui-Gon has at his disposal is not locally accepted, and not even ordinarily persuasive Jedi Mind Tricks dissuade Watto from demanding full payment. Over the course of four encounters, Watto and Qui-Gon negotiate an increasingly complicated deal.

One complication – or windfall – is the intervention of Anakin Skywalker, introduced in this movie as a child enslaved to the parts dealer. Anakin extends generous hospitality to the group of travelers, and risks his life racing in a dangerous pod race in order to help them. Spoiler alert: Anakin emerges unharmed and victorious.

The sequence starts off with a somewhat conventional cultural barrier – one party's currency is not accepted in an unfamiliar environment. This continues with a cultural faux-pas, in the form of Padme/Amidala inquiring about Anakin's enslaved status and him responding vehemently that he's a human being and not a slave. Her response provides an anchor for discussion of how to surface cultural difference as a tactical challenge to communication and negotiation "I'm sorry. I don't fully understand. This is a strange place to me."

As the scene proceeds, we see Qui-Gon and his group learning about local reality and customs from Anakin and his mother Shmi. When they discover that gambling is a key source of local entertainment and greases the wheels of local business, they use this cultural knowledge to strike a deal with Watto, centered on a gamble. If everything goes their way, they will be able to fix their ship and depart Tatooine. If anything goes wrong, well, the saga would develop very differently. This entire scene and some others could easily anchor discussions on cross-cultural learnings.

Finally, when things go their way but Watto reneges on the deal, Qui-Gon has developed enough cultural sophistication to suggest a local dispute resolution mechanism as an alternative for voluntary payment, rather than relying on his lightsaber. This causes Watto to give keep his word with only a few grumbles.

If anyone has suggestions for other great cross-cultural and cross-language scenes in Star Wars to share, please do!

Thanks for the question Anne-Marie, and if you've reached this far, for enduring the answer 😊

Noam



Prof. Strong: There may be more substantive questions coming, and you all are welcome to continue the discussion, but I don't want to be remiss in posing my closing questions to Noam and Jen.

Those of you who have seen the PBS series, 'Inside the Actors Studio,' know that the long-time host, James Lipton, used to conclude the formal interview with a series of questions he said were based on those asked by French talk-show host Bernard Pivot. Pivot's questions were themselves based on a questionnaire developed by Marcel Proust. I have come up with our own list of questions that are in the same spirit. These questions are asked of all our interviewees.

To that end, I ask Jen and Noam each to answer the following questions (in other words, you're both on the hook independently!):

1. What is your favourite word?

Prof. Reynolds: Discombobulated

Prof. Ebner: I wrote my responses to these questions without reading Jen's so any duplications are coincidental or part of the joys/causes of good partnership. Hearten

2. What is your least favourite word?

Prof. Reynolds: Promposal

Prof. Ebner: Synergy

3. Which fictional hero do you consider your own personal hero? [and, given the topic of this discussion, let's have BOTH a Star Wars character and a non-Star Wars character]

Prof. Reynolds: Star Wars: Chewbacca; Non-Star Wars: Aang (from Avatar: The Last Airbender)

Prof. Ebner: Star Wars: This changes quite often... Right now, it's Ahsoka. She's a rising-star Jedi-trainee who rejects the Jedi Order's judgment and ultimately leaves it when her own moral compass tells her the Order has lost its way.; Non-Star Wars: Arthur Dent from The Hitchhiker's Guide to the Galaxy.

4. Which historical figure do you identify most with?

Prof. Reynolds: Shunryu Suzuki

Prof. Ebner: On good days, mainly with myself. And very rarely, on very bad days, with Winston Churchill listening to Chamberlain on the radio and screaming into a pillow.

5. What sound or noise do you love?

Prof. Reynolds: Rain on the roof

Prof. Ebner: The sound of an orchestra tuning together before performing: the cacophony recedes, the oboe plays an A and all the other instruments tune to it

6. What sound or noise do you hate?

Prof. Reynolds: Any mechanized roaring (leafblower, power washer, etc.)

Prof. Ebner: Fireworks. I instinctively respond to the sound as if it is gunfire. Interestingly, I dislike the sound of fireworks more than I do actual gunfire.

7. What profession other than your own would you like to attempt?

Prof. Reynolds: Something that involves solving mysteries - private detective, secret agent, escape room setter, crime novelist, etc.

Prof. Ebner: Personal fitness trainer/coach

8. What profession would you not like to do?

Prof. Reynolds: Sales of any sort

Prof. Ebner: Anything in marketing and advertising

9. What is your own personal motto?

Prof. Reynolds: "Exuberance is beauty" (William Blake)

Prof. Ebner: "Ignore how big the job is... just do your bit." (very loosely translated from the Talmud) "Never tell me the odds" (Han Solo)

10. What do you hope your colleagues will say about you when you retire?

Prof. Reynolds: That I appreciated and valued them as people; that I contributed to the intellectual life of the community; that I was a principled, effective worker; and that I made things fun.

Prof. Ebner: "Oh, nuts. He made it all more fun." [and on some days: "Wait, can you retire that young?"]



Prof. Strong: Please join me in thanking Professor Jen Reynolds and Professor Noam Ebner in what has been a fascinating discussion. Their answers to our questions were far more detailed than I anticipated, but all the more fun for us reading them.

In the meantime, please do consider buying their book, available at the link below, and put your (virtual) hands together for their efforts.

Book available here:

<https://www.amazon.com/Star-Wars-Conflict-Resolution-Alternatives/dp/1734956224>

Transnational Dispute Management is a peer-review online journal publishing about various aspects of international arbitration with a special focus on investment arbitration.

This article was made available as a free download from www.transnational-dispute-management.com/.

Young professionals and students with an interest in transnational disputes, international investment law developments and related issues, are hereby invited to join the Young-OGEMID discussion group. Membership is free.

Simply visit www.transnational-dispute-management.com/young-ogemid/ and fill in the registration form. Other summaries of our Young-OGEMID virtual seminars focussing on career development can also be found there.