

**Diaspora Discussions: Moving From Jewish Enclave Deliberation to Interfaith Dialogue—
A Case Study in Conflict Resolution at Rutgers University**

Introduction

In 2007, on their way to the NCAA National Championship final, the Rutgers University women's basketball team made national news after Don Imus infamously made racist and sexist remarks about its members.¹ Although they lost in the final, the Rutgers women were lauded in the press for the maturity and grace they exhibited in agreeing to open a dialogue with Imus specifically, and the country, generally.² At the very same time, a less visible group of Rutgers women were engaging in an experimental dialogue of living, learning and community organizing, by participating in the inaugural Middle East Coexistence House, a housing unit on Douglass Residential College, the all female campus of Rutgers University.³ The House was created in response to a history of on campus conflict between pro-Israel and pro-Palestine student activists.

The following are the stories of these other Rutgers women, examined through the narratives of two Jewish student leaders.⁴ Shira Pruce was a pro-Israel activist who mobilized

¹ Bill Carter, *Radio Host is Suspended Over Racial Remarks*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 10, 2007, available at http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/10/business/media/10imus.html?_r=1&n=Top/Reference/Times%20Topics/People/S/Sharpton,%20AI&oref=slogin.

² See e.g. Mechelle Voepel, *Rutgers Women Should be Celebrated—Not Insulted*, Apr. 13, 2007, available at http://sports.espn.go.com/nw/columns/story?columnist=voepel_mechelle&id=2830562; Bill Brubaker, *Rutgers Team Accepts Imus's Apology*, WASH. POST, Apr. 14, 2007, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/04/13/AR2007041300884.html>.

³ Rutgers University abolished the "college" system in 2006, reorganizing to consolidate its various colleges and renaming the old colleges, "campuses." As part of this change, Douglass College, the all-female college, was renamed Douglass Residential College. See Patricia Valdata, *Douglass College Saved—Sort of: Following a Strong Outpouring of Support from Alumnae, Rutgers' Women's College Retains its Identity*, DIVERSE ISSUES IN HIGHER EDUC., Apr. 20, 2006, available at http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0WMX/is_5_23/ai_n16418661.

⁴ The facts attributed to Shira Pruce and Danielle Josephs were told to the author during a series of interviews. Interviews with Shira Pruce were conducted on March 14, 2008 and March 15, 2008 and April 1, 2008. Interviews with Danielle Josephs were conducted on March 12, 2008, March 13, 2008, March 14, 2008.

A "generation" as used here, means the period during which each woman was enrolled at Rutgers. "Generation 1" chronicles Pruce's experience from 2001-2004. "Generation 2" documents Josephs's experience from 2003-2007.

Jewish students to engage in a discussion of what it means to be Jewish in America and the significance of Israel as a Jewish homeland from a cultural, rather than a political perspective. Danielle Josephs was a Jewish organizer who recognized the importance of interfaith dialogue and created a framework for Jewish and Muslim women to attempt coexistence.

Pruce enabled the exploration of previously suppressed cultural viewpoints by creating programming for Jewish students to participate in a discussion about Judaism and Israel in the face of perceived anti-Semitism and intimidation. The resulting addition of diverse Jewish cultural and religious viewpoints to the public forum in turn set the stage for the formation of the Coexistence House as a place to transcend intra-religious conversation and attempt coexistence.

Part I of this paper examines the Jewish in-group response to the conflict at Rutgers between pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian activists from 2001-2004 (Generation 1) and the Interfaith initiative to participate in the Coexistence House from 2003-2008 (Generation 2). Part II evaluates attempts at resolution during both Generations by applying concepts rooted in social science and conflict resolution scholarship. This analysis examines both the benefits and dangers of enclave deliberation and its application to creating an interfaith dialogue. Finally, the success of the House is measured using both qualitative and quantitative rubrics.

Part I: Rutgers University: The Little *Intifada* and Peace in the Global Village

The 35,000 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at Rutgers University, on the principal campus, New Brunswick, includes roughly 5000 Jews and 4500 Muslims and Arabs.⁵

⁵ See Marek Fuchs, *The House That a Hope for Peace Built*, N.Y. TIMES (Religion Journal), Dec. 2, 2006, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/02/us/02religion.html?partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>; 2007-2008 Rutgers Fact Book, <http://oirap.rutgers.edu/instchar/factpdf/enroll07.pdf> (last visited Mar. 27, 2008).

A: GENERATION 1: THE STORY OF SHIRA PRUCE⁶

After spending a gap year in Israel, Shira Pruce arrived on campus in August 2001 and immediately became involved at Rutgers Hillel.⁷ Shortly after September 11, 2001, Pruce read an opinion piece in the DAILY TARGUM, the Rutgers student newspaper, blaming Israel for the strike on the World Trade Center. As a Jew with personal ties to Israel, she felt personally attacked and insulted. She had developed strong pride in Israel and a love of Zionism during her year there.⁸ In 2000, the Second *Intifada*, or Palestinian uprising, broke out in Israel, resulting in a number of terrorist attacks against Israelis.⁹ Pruce decided to remain. However, she was perilously close to several suicide bomb attacks in Jerusalem. These experiences made the article personal to her and she was worried about those who did not share that experience, and who would read something in print and might accept it as true.¹⁰ As more heated opinions appeared in the DAILY TARGUM,¹¹ she sought assistance from Hillel and Chabad,¹² to no avail.

⁶ The following account is taken from interviews and is the opinion and perception of Shira Pruce. This is the narrative of Pruce, a Jewish student activist, as she experienced Rutgers University from 2001-2004. All opinions and quotations are attributed to Pruce, unless otherwise footnoted.

⁷ Rutgers Hillel is the local chapter of a national organization providing programming, religious services and social life to bring about “a renaissance in Jewish life.” See <http://www.hillel.org/about/default>. Rutgers Hillel styles itself as the “foundation for Jewish campus life at Rutgers University.” See www.eden.rutgers.edu/~ruhille/ (last visited Mar. 13, 2008).

⁸ Pruce defines Zionism as “the belief in a Jewish state of Israel in the land of Israel.” She notes that the historic land of Israel is much bigger than the current borders of the state of Israel, and so she defines Zionism as the general basic belief in Israel as the Jewish homeland.

⁹ Also known as the Al-Aqsa Intifada, the Intifada began after the collapse of the Camp David summit in July 2000, and a cycle of violence began, characterized by Palestinian suicide bomb attacks, targeting Israelis and Jewish tourists in public places, and by Israeli army retaliation via air strikes, gun battles and targeted assassinations. See Al-Aqsa Intifada Timeline, http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/3677206.stm (last visited Apr. 3, 2008). The violence lasted from 2000-2005 when Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas and Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon agreed to a truce. *Id.*

¹⁰ “The independent campus media becomes the voice of the student body, but bears no accountability either to the school or the students (who usually do not pay a subscription fee).” Yonit Golub, *An Analytic Approach to Campus Pro-Israeli Activism—Case Study: The Johns Hopkins University*, 16 JEWISH POL. STUD. REV. 205-13 (2004) (cited in Rebecca Lebowitz, *Defeating Anti-Israeli and Anti-Semitic Activity on Campus—a Case Study: Rutgers University*, 17 JEWISH POL. STUD. REV. 1 (2005)) [hereinafter *Defeating Anti-Israeli and Anti-Semitic Activity*].

¹¹ See generally *id.* (Calls were made for Israel to be ‘dismantled, either politically or physically.’). Many of the opinion articles were written by members of a group called New Jersey Solidarity, a school funded student offshoot of Palestinian Solidarity Movement (PSM), also known as International Solidarity Movement (ISM). See www.dailytargum.com (search New Jersey Solidarity). New Jersey Solidarity had a very vocal presence on campus

However, in voicing her concerns, she met other like-minded students and formed the Israel Action Committee at Rutgers University (IACRU).

1: IACRU and Israel Advocacy

IACRU received advocacy training in Israel during Winter break 2001-2002, the message of which was empowerment. The students were told that administrators were not going to advocate on the students' behalf, and they had to take the fight on themselves. When IACRU came back to campus in Spring 2002, they were an unfunded group, which made it difficult to organize, but gave them the ideological freedom to espouse their views publicly without the threat of economic penalties, e.g. the removal of school funding. Pruce and the other members of IACRU began responding to the charges against Israel in the DAILY TARGUM, writing under their group name in a show of solidarity. The leaders of IACRU felt that it was important to respond as a group because it demonstrated that a number of likeminded people were supporting "the same school of thought." IACRU recognized the power in presenting a united movement as a means to engage other Jewish students in the conversation.

This was precisely the effect that occurred. Back on campus in Fall 2003, with a little bit of funding as a recognized Rutgers student organization, other Jewish students began seeking out IACRU.¹³ As the group expanded, they decided to set up a table at the Campus Center, in the middle of the New Brunswick campus, directly across from a table maintained by New Jersey

during this time and became the leading voice for Palestinian freedom and resistance to "Israeli occupation." See <http://www.newjerseysolidarity.org>.

¹² Rutgers Chabad House has an all-women's dorm, religious services and programming that offers kosher food and outreach to Jewish undergraduates. See <http://www.chabadnj.org/page.asp?pageID={04DA6C83-AAEC-4C7B-B53C-7055AD5A389A}> (last visited Mar. 15, 2008).

¹³ However, at the same time, there were some Jewish students, especially secular Israelis, who were angry with both sides for starting this controversy. There were also liberal "peacenik" Jews who avoided the discussion, but who Pruce felt would have been helpful in adding to the conversation. The Israeli students in particular, told Pruce that they wished to fly under the radar and resented the assumptions that were made about them by other students based on their nationality.

Solidarity.¹⁴ IACRU trained its new members by preparing them to answer typical questions about the Israeli/Palestinian conflict and challenges to Israel's existence and actions.

Both IACRU and New Jersey Solidarity passed out flyers to passersby as well as buttons and pins. The tables were set up and staffed all day from two to four days a week. Pruce recalls that one could see the Israeli and Palestinian flags from all the way down College Avenue, and people of all faiths would approach both tables for information. Thus, there was a battle of ideology, a battle for the campus occurring on a daily basis between these two student groups.

2: Coalition Building and Escalation

By the Spring semester of 2003, the tabling was at its height, and as New Jersey Solidarity's presence increased, IACRU worked reactively, to match its visibility. During 2002-2003, IACRU began monitoring New Jersey Solidarity email list serves in an effort to be prepared to respond to their activities. Most of the postings came from New Jersey Solidarity's leader, Charlotte Kates, a Rutgers alumni and then Rutgers law student. Pruce began responding to the postings to combat what IACRU felt was misinformation and propaganda. Pruce became consumed with trying to stop "the lies and myths" that were being spread about Israel. She felt that Kates never slept, because she was constantly planning and posting. It affected Pruce's work and her sleep, and eventually she had to be convinced to stop responding to the emails.

Nonetheless, the tabling continued and Jewish students and student groups traditionally not active in the same ways as IACRU, such as Hillel, became involved and had the funding to support IACRU's efforts. This mobilization was a response to New Jersey Solidarity's

¹⁴ According to its website, New Jersey Solidarity is a "community/student alliance and a registered Rutgers student organization . . . engage[d] in activism and education to support and build solidarity for the national liberation struggle of the Palestinian people." See <http://www.newjerseysolidarity.org/> (follow Our Mission tab) (last visited Apr. 11, 2008). New Jersey Solidarity is "opposed to the existence of the apartheid colonial settler state of Israel . . . and stand[s] for the total liberation of all of historic Palestine." See *id.*

protestation of events sponsored by Hillel and the Jewish Student Union at Rutgers.¹⁵ Thus, opposition to Israel began to be conflated with opposition to Judaism. With a solid base of students and with Hillel now recognizing that the Israeli/Palestinian debate had implications for Jewish students' safety and comfort on campus, the group began actively programming. For one event, they brought in a number of speakers to train Jewish students to be able to answer questions about Israel, Zionism and charges of apartheid and racism. New Jersey Solidarity lined up outside Hillel, and despite the event being private, one of New Jersey Solidarity's affiliated members, Abe Greenhouse, attempted to enter.¹⁶ When he was refused entrance, he physically launched himself at Pruce and Hillel administrators, who were standing outside, and tried to break through the door, while his fellow protestors took photographs. Although not threatening in that he was throwing his body around to create what appeared to be a premeditated photo opportunity, the Israel/Palestine debate had crossed the line from peaceful to physical and potentially violent.

Around this time, the conflict on campus escalated. Mirroring the increased action and counteraction in Israel during the Second *Intifada*,¹⁷ each time there was a major attack abroad, there would be a protest on campus and a counter protest across the street. After one particularly large Palestinian suicide bombing, IACRU held a rally to condemn the bombing and to speak

¹⁵ Jewish students who merely wanted to participate in "religious activities" hosted by Hillel were dragged into the conflict when Hillel and its surrounding property were defaced with markers and chalk, proclaiming "Hillel is racist" and "Zionism is racism." See *Defeating Anti-Israeli and Anti-Semitic Activity*, *supra* note 10, at 2.

¹⁶ Abe Greenhouse was a Jewish student at Rutgers, a former member of New Jersey Solidarity and the founder of Jews Against the Occupation. He has made news for allegedly desecrating the Wailing Wall and for showing up on the scene of Palestinian suicide bombings amidst the carnage to protest Israeli occupation. See Event: Natan Sharansky is attacked by Abe Greenhouse, a Rutgers University Student, <http://www.mrdrybones.com/Peek/PieMan.html> (last visited Mar. 14, 2008); Elexis Silverman, *Greenhouse to Face Charges on Pie Incident*, DAILY TARGUM, May 3, 2004, at 1, available at <http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2004/05/03/PageOne/Greenhouse.To.Face.Charges.On.Pie.Incident-677068.shtml>. Greenhouse's dissent represented a Jewish political viewpoint that was not included in the Jewish conversation on campus, perhaps due to his propensity for violence and attention-seeking behavior.

¹⁷ See *supra* note 9 and accompanying text.

about peace—stopping the killing. Led by Kates, the pro-Palestinian protestors crossed the street and began to infiltrate the rally, matching up one New Jersey Solidarity member for every pro-Israel member. Standing face to face, the pro-Israel participants felt threatened.

Much of the intimidation during this time consisted of quick, personal interactions. A Jewish student was drawing in chalk on one of the walkways,¹⁸ when a Palestinian member of New Jersey Solidarity stepped on her chalk. When the Jewish student told her to move, and threatened to draw on her shoes, the Solidarity member told her she would buy a new pair because she wasn't "cheap."¹⁹ Solidarity students protesting with signs began hitting Jewish students over the head with their signs saying "Zionism = Racism" and "Zionism = Nazism."²⁰ One of the larger tension-fueling actions was the display in February-March 2003 of a banner reading "From the River to the Sea, Palestine Will Be Free" at the Rutgers College and Douglass College student centers. Jewish students perceived that the banner carried the implicit message that Israel, whose borders are compromised of the Mediterranean and the Jordan River, must be destroyed in order for that slogan to come true.²¹ Twenty five members of the Jewish community organized a sit in to protest the banner.²² The signs remained.

During Spring 2003, New Jersey Solidarity staged "Guerilla Street Theater" outside of Hillel as Jewish students walked to services and events. The most poignant episode featured men dressed in army fatigues with Jewish stars on their arms pointing plastic guns and shoving

¹⁸ "Chalking" is a common and accepted form of promoting events at many campuses in the United States.

¹⁹ The Jewish student and Pruce perceived this to be an anti-Semitic exploitation of a derogatory Jewish stereotype.

²⁰ "When Israel is demonized and its leaders are vilified—by comparing them to Nazi leaders or by using Nazi symbols to caricature them—that, according to the [U.S. Department of State 2005 Report on Global Anti-Semitism], is not valid criticism on controversial issues, but rather indicates a bias toward anti-Semitism." See United States Commission on Civil Rights, *Campus Anti-Semitism: Briefing Report 13* (2006), available at <http://www.usccr.gov/pubs/081506campusantibrief07.pdf>.

²¹ See Joel Landau, *Banners Spring Up Around Campus, Question Free Speech*, DAILY TARGUM, Mar. 10, 2003, available at <http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2003/03/10/News/Banners.Spring.Up.Around.Campus.Question.Free.Speech-389580.shtml>.

²² *Id.*

around Muslim women and children from neighboring communities in New Jersey and pretending to be operating an Israeli check point. The significance of this event is that they were wearing Jewish stars and proclaiming to be Jewish. They were not wearing symbols of the Israeli Defense Forces. Thus, their demonstration was about Judaism, not about Israel.²³

3: Attempted Dialogue

Towards the end of the 2003 school year, the leadership of IACRU realized that they had contributed to the tension on campus and felt a sense of responsibility to the larger community. At the Campus Center tabling, an increasing number of students began approaching IACRU and urging them to “just give it up, go home and let it go.” In discussions, IACRU leaders concluded that they did not feel responsible for the global aspect of the conflict, but as student leaders, they had the opportunity to sit down with New Jersey Solidarity and have a dialogue about peaceful coexistence on campus.²⁴ IACRU and Pruce in particular, were drained from the tension, and realized that their actions were reactive and defensive. However, IACRU felt compelled to react so long as New Jersey Solidarity remained vocal in its rhetoric.

²³ This runs counter to the group statement that New Jersey Solidarity is Anti-Israel not Anti-Semitic. See Charlotte Kates, “*Tension on Campus*”: A Call to Silence, CounterPunch, Dec. 4, 2002, <http://www.counterpunch.org/kates1204.html>.

The blurring of this distinction was eloquently explained by Professor Mike Reibel, a former Hillel advisor at California State Polytechnic University.

My most serious concern as a former Hillel advisor is the ways Pro- and Anti- Israeli politics complicate anti-semitism [sic]. Anti-Israeli activists are indeed often antisemitic [sic], but where is the line? The line separates criticism of Israel from blaming all Jews as a people for Israeli policies. Thus, in graphic terms, Israeli flag = swastika is nasty, but it is not anti-semitism [sic].

Take away the rectangular outline and stripes, and Magen David=swastika is anti-semitism [sic]. Posting of Mike Reibel to http://www.hillel.org/about/news/2007/dec/12dec2007_antisemitism.htm (Dec. 17, 2007, 9:06 EST).

²⁴ There had been an impromptu dialogue at a Fall 2002 event co-organized by Hillel and the Muslim Student Union, a group that included many New Jersey Solidarity members. The event brought in Israeli and Palestinian children participants from Seeds of Peace. Seeds of Peace is an organization geared towards empowering young leaders from conflict regions to build leadership skills and work together towards reconciliation and coexistence. See www.seedsofpeace.org/about. After the program, the students from both sides engaged in a conversation touching the issue of peace in the Middle East and not merely trading talking points. However, there was no further dialogue planned after this session.

Pruce approached one of the members of New Jersey Solidarity and proposed a dialogue to talk about the tension on campus and what they could do as leaders to improve the situation. Both sides agreed and scheduled the meeting. Members of New Jersey Solidarity said that they knew an experienced facilitator who had worked in conflict resolution in the Middle East who would help manage the meeting. Pruce encouraged people to come to the dialogue with an open mind, to be relaxed and calm and to focus on the on campus issues. She felt positive going into the dialogue because “for the first time [she was] able to do something progressive, productive and proactive [for the Rutgers community at large].”

The session took place in a cafeteria, with the pro-Palestinian activists seated on one side of a long table, the pro-Israeli activists on the other side, and the facilitator at the head of the table. There was a large group of people watching from the perimeter comprised of students who were interested in getting involved in healing the campus tensions. The facilitator opened the session by setting one ground rule for speaking, consisting of standing up and stating one’s name which would then be written down on a speaking list. Each side took the floor and alternated talking. The facilitator did not explain what his role would be; neither did he set nor explore ground rules for the dialogue. In addition, he never helped the group develop an agenda of the issues to be addressed during the session. Pruce opened the proceedings by stating that her goal was to talk about the situation on campus, and how as leaders and activists, they shared a responsibility to the larger student body to try and ease the tensions to which they had contributed. As soon as Pruce sat down, Kates, the New Jersey Solidarity leader, stood up and stated that dialogue was not possible on campus when there were murderous Israelis and an apartheid state committing genocide in Palestine. In Pruce’s view, Kates shunned responsibility for the on campus tension, saying that any on campus problems were justified by the struggle for

Palestinian freedom.²⁵ The session quickly devolved into an unmoderated platform for global ideology, on the one hand to support a free Palestine, and a plea for a commitment to local conflict resolution on the other, as the pro-Israel students sought to discuss the possibility of coexistence. The facilitator's failure to take any meaningful control led to a screaming match and he merely parroted the issues of New Jersey Solidarity, the group that had brought him into the dialogue. Pruce and other Jewish students felt sand bagged and trapped, and walked out of the session.

4: Israel Inspires: Transcending Reactive Counter-programming

At the end of the Spring 2003 semester, New Jersey Solidarity announced that Rutgers would be home to the third annual National Student Conference of the Palestine Solidarity Movement (PSM).²⁶ IACRU and Hillel decided not to respond. Rather, they decided to create a pluralistic celebration of Judaism and Zionism and to focus on positivity by programming to promote cultural aspects of Israel instead of political aspects of the Middle East conflict.²⁷ Thus was born, "Israel Inspires."²⁸

²⁵ Pruce's perceptions are supported by an article written by Kates in December 4, 2002 in which she stated, inter alia, "justice will not be obtained through any number of well-meaning dialogues about 'tension on campus.'" Charlotte Kates, "*Tension on Campus*": A Call to Silence, CounterPunch, Dec. 4, 2002, <http://www.counterpunch.org/kates1204.html>.

²⁶ See Jeff McKay, *Rutgers University Pro-Palestinian Forum Draws Political Fire*, Cybercast News Service, Jul. 14, 2003, <http://www.cnsnews.com>. The announcement of the event drew the concern of New Jersey Senate GOP leader John Bennett and Governor Jim McGreevy that the conference would not present a balanced forum, and that it was being used as an opportunity to spread messages of "hate and intolerance." *Id.*

²⁷ See Grace Sica & Sean Havey, *Rally Denounces "Israel Inspires" Event*, DAILY TARGUM, Oct. 13, 2003, available at <http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2003/10/13/University/Rally.Denounces.israel.Inspires.Event-526239.shtml>.

²⁸ The event was reactive in the sense that it was intentionally scheduled to take place during the same weekend as the PSM conference, but it was proactive in that it was not a protest of the PSM event, but a separate event, designed in lieu of a protest of the PSM conference.

When students returned to campus for the Fall 2003 semester, Israel Inspires went to work and brought in Israeli cabinet minister and Jewish hero Natan Sharansky²⁹ to give a lecture called “Human Rights Justice and Democracy: A Human Approach.” The event was protested by New Jersey Solidarity and members of Naturei Karta, an ultra-orthodox Jewish sect who do not believe in the validity of the current state of Israel. Just as the lecture was about to begin, Abe Greenhouse stood up and pulled a pie out of his bag and hurled it towards Sharansky. No one could see what it was until it hit the podium and Greenhouse had been punched in the face and subdued by security forces. Greenhouse was arrested and yet came back to try and force his way into the dinner that followed the speech. Tensions were so high that Pruce implored Greenhouse to leave, actually fearing for his safety if he was to enter, because of the anger of the diners inside who had witnessed the pie scene. Greenhouse left voluntarily.

A few days later, on September 20, 2003, Swastikas were painted on the property of Rutgers Hillel and on the house of Alpha Epsilon Pi, a Jewish chartered fraternity.³⁰ Pruce calls this the height of the tension on campus, with Jewish students looking over their shoulders while walking around campus.

Nonetheless, the weekend of October 9-11, 2003, 7000 people attended a conference of events celebrating Jewish and Israeli pride also called “Israel Inspires” at Rutgers.³¹ The event

²⁹ Natan Sharansky was a Soviet Jewish dissident jailed for almost ten years and then released to Israel where he received a “hero’s” welcome. See Zev Chafets, 2005 TIME 100: Natan Sharansky, TIME, Apr. 18, 2005, available at <http://www.time.com/time/subscriber/2005/time100/scientists/100sharansky.html>. He has been a writer and a politician in the Israeli Knesset from 1996-2005. See http://www.knesset.gov.il/mk/eng/mk_eng.asp?mk_individual_id_t=127 (last visited Apr. 1, 2008).

³⁰ See Max Gross, *AEPi Overflows with Brotherly Love*, JEWISH DAILY FORWARD, Nov. 7, 2003, available at <http://www.forward.com/articles/7033/>. See also Carmen Cusido, *Vandalism Investigation Continues*, DAILY TARGUM, Sept. 24, 2003, at 1, available at <http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2003/09/24/PageOne/Vandalism.Investigation.Continues-473803.shtml>.

³¹ The event, from planning committee to participants included a range of Orthodox to Reform and Secular constituents.

had three components: a rally with politicians;³² a cultural music and arts fair; and an advocacy conference with activists from all over the country. At this time there was relative peace in Israel, and the large event seemed to have neutralized the tensions on campus. Furthermore, Israeli and leftist “peacenik” Jews participated in the art and cultural component and attended the celebration. While there had been no successful inter-group dialogue, there was at least a sense of calm.³³

B: GENERATION 2: The Story of Danielle Josephs³⁴

1: Conflict Resolver—Moving from Intra to Interfaith Dialogue

Danielle Josephs was a freshman at Douglass College in 2003-2004, and immediately became aware of the tension on campus when she heard someone in a crowd at a pro-Palestinian rally on College Avenue mutter “death to Jews.”³⁵ Josephs’s initial response to what she saw at the rally was to embrace Hillel, where she found a welcoming community of Jewish students.

She started out as a chairperson in “Israel Inspires” as part of the Pruce regime in Generation 1, and later served as the Vice President of Religious Affairs at Hillel and then as President. In these roles, Josephs had to hash through ideological differences within subsets of the Jewish community and create a religious space where all could flourish and succeed.³⁶ As a sophomore in 2003-2004, Josephs realized that although she had helped create a harmonious and

³² Speakers included Governor McGreevy, Sen. Frank Lautenberg and Sen. Jon Corzine, and a then-little known Senator from Illinois, Barak Obama, amongst others.

³³ See Posting of Ben-Zion Jaffe, *Big Jew on Campus: New Israeli Activism* to http://cgis.jpost.com/Blogs/jaffe/entry/new_israeli_activism (Nov. 05, 2007) (“Although Rutgers is now a more comfortable place for many students to express their positive feelings for Israel, it was not always this way. Things have changed for Israeli activists and Jewish students at Rutgers in a few short years.”).

³⁴ The following account is taken from interviews and is the opinion and perception of Danielle Josephs. This is the narrative of Josephs as a Jewish and Interfaith student activist and as she experienced Rutgers University from 2003-2007. All opinions and quotations are attributed to Josephs, unless otherwise footnoted.

³⁵ See Patricia Lamiell, *Middle East Coexistence House Fosters Jewish-Muslim Understanding*, FOCUS, Sept. 27, 2006, available at <http://news.rutgers.edu/focus/issue.2006-09-26.4918544960/article.2006-09-26.3469442009>.

³⁶ For example, she faced questions about whether women could make *Kiddush*, the prayer over the wine on Shabbat, whether women could hold the *Torah* and whether there could be mixed dancing at events.

pluralistic Jewish community through “Israel Inspires,” there was still a vast gulf between Jewish and Arab/Muslim students on campus.

Josephs decided to parlay her success in community building into the Middle East Coexistence Project—a convention of Douglass women designed to (1) bridge the gap between Israeli/Jewish and Arab/Muslim women and to (2) encourage women to pursue international conflict resolution and negotiation. The group brought in Israeli and Palestinian female negotiators to shed light on the peace process and to explain why women should be involved as leaders. They also arranged for a visit from Standup for Peace, a Jewish/Palestinian comedy duo seeking to encourage “a dialogue in support of a peaceful, political resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.”³⁷ This programming continued into Fall 2004, but Josephs realized that while she had made some progress, “the reason why dialogue fails is because there is no reinforcement; meeting for one dialogue session a month is not going to change a whole lot.”

Josephs devised the Middle East Coexistence House, hypothesizing that if she could secure women from both communities to live together in a dormitory, they would be forced to “sit down and hash it out in an intimate way.” After Josephs presented her idea to the Dean of Douglass College, the administration instantly found room for the House as part of Douglass Global Village, a living learning community. Once she got the go-ahead, Josephs began actively recruiting, despite facing several obstacles in each community.³⁸ Nonetheless, in the spring of 2005, Josephs arrived at a core group of twelve women committed to living in the House for the full academic year of 2006-2007.³⁹ The House had several components: (1) Residential—all of

³⁷ See Standup for Peace, <http://www.standupforpeace.com/ourshow.html> (follow tab Our Show) (last visited Mar. 7, 2008).

³⁸ In the Muslim community, many of the students were religious and lived at home with their parents. Josephs met with mothers, brothers, uncles and fiancés in an effort to persuade them of the House’s value. In the Jewish community, the distance and safety of the Shabbat walk from Douglass to Hillel on College Avenue were issues for orthodox women, as was the lack of a kitchen in the dormitory for kosher students.

³⁹ This group included five Jews, four Muslims, one Irish Catholic, one Hindu and one Agnostic.

the women lived in the space and each had a roommate; (2) Academic—the House collectively enrolled in a once a week year-long seminar course called “Middle Eastern Conflict Resolution and Negotiation,” with curriculum designed by professors in the Political Science and Middle Eastern Studies departments;⁴⁰ and (3) Programming—each woman was responsible for taking the lead on community programming activities to foster and promote coexistence on campus.⁴¹

2: Challenges

a: Josephs: Neutrality and Opinion—The Role of a Facilitator

From behind the scenes, Josephs set to facilitate dialogue by balancing party presence. She successfully fought the administration to pair Muslim and Jewish students as roommates in the double occupancy rooms, when the administration thought that grouping the women by religion would be more comfortable. The administration eventually agreed, recognizing that the project’s goal was to push the women outside of their ideological, racial, and political comfort zones.

Because Josephs was also a resident and a class member in the Seminar, she had to think about what her role would be in the day to day conversations about politics and religion. Initially, Josephs aimed to conceal her personal views and wanted to serve simply as a resource for her residents. Immediately however, she realized she wanted to be a more active participant. It was her passion for Israel and for conflict resolution that served as the catalyst for this project. She felt that if she was not able to engage in the dialogue as an invested party, she would not have been able to serve as an effective coordinator.

⁴⁰ The class was taught by two graduate fellows: one in the Fall and one in the Spring.

⁴¹ Other successful interfaith dialogue programs have utilized similar multifaceted elements. For example, The E Pluribus Unum, an interfaith high school program utilized (1) an academic track; (2) spiritual arts and worship; (3) volunteerism; and (4) advocacy and community life experience to maximize the opportunity to forge connections between participants. See Sidney Schwarz, *E Pluribus Unum*, in *BUILDING THE INTERFAITH YOUTH MOVEMENT: BEYOND DIALOGUE TO ACTION* 219, 220 (Eboo Patel & Patrice Brodeur, eds., 2006) [hereinafter *INTERFAITH YOUTH*].

b: Including “the Other”

The first year residents of the House included a Hindu, an Agnostic and an Irish Catholic. Josephs thought it was important to include women from different backgrounds that didn't necessarily have an affiliation with the Middle East because they represented a different perspective on the conflict. The Jewish and Muslim women, who had familial connections to the region, were emotionally anchored in their viewpoints, having been raised with a particular narrative. As Josephs suspected, the three non-Middle Eastern participants were able to bring a fresh perspective to the conflict. For example, Katherine O'Connor, a white Catholic sophomore in 2006-2007 explained how she was able to present a Christian viewpoint on Middle Eastern affairs.⁴² When Pope Benedict XVI made controversial statements about the origins of Islam in September 2006, O'Connor was able to provide a perspective on Catholic-Islamic relations that would have otherwise been absent.

c: Threat of Rutgers Old

The women moved into the House during the Israeli and Hezbollah war in Northern Israel and Southern Lebanon.⁴³ During the first few days, the residents were worried about what they might say and how they reacted to the statements of others. In the first Seminar, tempers became explosive and the class devolved into a screaming match. After the niceties of the first few days, the women realized the explosive nature of the issues.⁴⁴ Additionally, the Fall

⁴² See Posting of Katie to On Campus: Middle East Co-Existence House: The Blog, http://www.mtvu.com/uconnect/middle_east_coexistence_house/blog.jhtml (Oct. 4, 2006).

⁴³ Israel fought a war with Hezbollah militia beginning on July 12, 2006 when Hezbollah crossed the border into Israel and killed three soldiers while capturing two others, after which Israel launched air and ground strikes in Lebanon. See Matti Friedman, *A Year After War, Israelis Resilient*, U.S.A. TODAY, Jul. 11, 2007, available at http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/2007-07-11-1109976489_x.htm#uslPageReturn. After thirty four days of fighting, 159 Israelis and more than 1000 Lebanese were dead. *Id.*

⁴⁴ Josephs was a senior, but most of the women were not on campus at Rutgers during the height of the on campus tension from 2002-2004 to witness the explosiveness of Generation 1.

Seminar leader was not equipped to facilitate this conflict and sat back as the women argued. Those arguments continued as the students left the classroom.

However, the women channeled this energy into the programmatic function of their project, convening a committee of men and women to organize a university-wide toy drive for children's hospitals in Northern Israel and Southern Lebanon. The outside committee members came from the Islamic Society of Rutgers, Hillel and the Rutgers chapter of the American Medical Students Association. The initiative was called "Kids in Conflict" and 600 toys were raised and distributed.⁴⁵

The route from screaming to philanthropy built the confidence of the women, who pledged to continue the dialogue through active listening. In the second Seminar, they agreed to a policy of non-interruption, steering away from reactive rebuttal, towards listening and reflecting before speaking. Thus, the women were equipped to tackle serious issues in a respectful and courteous space.

d: Threats of External Derailment

Although the women had committed to work, study and live with each other in a peaceful and respectful manner, there were outside forces that sought to derail their efforts. At times, New Jersey Solidarity denounced the House, calling the Palestinian participants traitors.⁴⁶ Additionally, in October 2006, the House was defaced. There was a poster in the hallway containing pictures and biographies of prominent Middle Eastern women and under the picture of Golda Meir, anti-Israeli propaganda had been taped to the photograph and on the surrounding

⁴⁵ The toy drive, named Kids in Conflict, led to speaking engagements including a talk given by Josephs and Nadia Sheikh, on their project of coexistence at a local synagogue. See Debra Rubin, *Muslim, Jewish College Students Offer Hope for Peace in Middle East*, N.J. JEWISH NEWS, Dec. 29, 2006, available at <http://www.jewishagency.org/JewishAgency/English/Home/About/Press+Room/Jewish+Agency+In+The+News/2006/5/dec29njjn.htm>. Thus, the impact of the House led to dialogue in the community outside of Rutgers University.

⁴⁶ Josephs's recollection of New Jersey Solidarity after "Israel Inspires" consists of mostly poorly attended workshops on campus, with skewed one-sided speakers, and no nuanced presentation of the Middle East conflict.

walls. The police were notified and the incident was documented as a hate crime. Josephs had no doubt that some of the residents in the House probably agreed with the messages on the papers but the incident strengthened the women's resolve to coexist. Because they shared a stake in their living quarters, their safety and privacy were tied to their solidarity. The House came to a collective agreement that this was a fundamentally inappropriate action. All residents viewed the incident as an imposition of a viewpoint through passive aggressive means, while they were engaging in open and constructive dialogue. Once the women presented a unified front, no other major incidents occurred.⁴⁷

3: Programming

a: External

The House placed an emphasis on training individuals as ambassadors to return to their respective communities. It was through their programming efforts that the House sought to broaden their dialogue experience and reach other members of the community.

During the first year, Kids in Conflict was the central program created by the House. However, the residence also brought in lecturers and field experts to discuss international conflict and conflict management focusing in such areas as Kosovo and the Middle East. These projects were co-sponsored by more than thirty other groups on campus. Programming during 2007-2008 has included a speaking engagement at the Brookdale Community College Center for Holocaust Studies and a Poile Zedek Cemetery Desecration Rally.⁴⁸

b: Internal

⁴⁷ There was one minor incident later in the year where offensive symbols were drawn on a small Israeli flag near the door of one of the residents, but the police were not alerted.

⁴⁸ See Jim O'Neill, *Middlesex Teens Sentenced for Desecrating Jewish Cemetery*, STAR LEDGER, Mar. 17, 2008, available at http://www.nj.com/news/index.ssf/2008/03/four_teenage_boys_who_admitted.html (Jewish cemetery was desecrated by four local teens resulting in damage to 499 grave stones and over \$200,000 in damage.).

During winter break in 2006-2007, the majority of the residents traveled to Turkey on a grant from the Interfaith Dialogue Center at Rutgers University, a group of Turkish professionals seeking to enhance interfaith dialogue in New Jersey. The purpose of the excursion was to introduce the women to the rich tradition of Turkish interfaith coexistence.⁴⁹ By traveling to Turkey, the residents gained a global perspective on ethnoreligious coexistence.⁵⁰ In Turkey, the women met with official representatives of the Jewish, Muslim and Christian communities who have been parties to a successful coexistence for several decades. This trip allowed the women to view what they were working towards at Rutgers and in Israel/Palestine.

4: Academic: Conflict Resolution Class

One of the central components of the House was the academic aspect. In order to be trained for international conflict resolution and negotiation, the Seminar undertook to educate the residents in the history of the Middle Eastern conflict and the role that women play in international conflict resolution.⁵¹ During the first semester, the women analyzed the conflict by exploring the different interpretations of history from the varying religious and ethnic vantage points. The second semester challenged the women to put knowledge into action by analyzing the myriad peace proposals and partition plans dating back to 1948. They evaluated why each failed and attempted to engineer a new framework to broker new solutions to the conflict.

Having the Seminar was crucial to the success of the dialogue between the residents. The residents regarded the Seminar as a safe space to discuss charged issues that they felt

⁴⁹ For a discussion of this history, see Ekmeleddin Ihsanoglu, A Culture of Peaceful Coexistence: The Ottoman Turkish Example, Address at the Turkish American Conference on Technology, Business and Culture (May 13, 2004) (transcript available at http://www.lightmillennium.org/2004_14th_issue/eihsanoglu_stevens.html).

⁵⁰ According to Josephs, although the women wanted to travel to Israel and Jordan, the university could not obtain proper security clearance.

⁵¹ The Syllabus was modified to some extent by the two instructors who led the Seminar. See Danielle Josephs, Under One Roof: The Middle East Coexistence House as a Model for Conflict Resolution 33-34 (May 2007) (unpublished B.A. thesis, Rutgers University) (on file with author) [hereinafter Under One Roof]. Josephs's thesis focuses not on the study of conflict resolution, but on the House as a grassroots social movement towards effecting political change.

uncomfortable bringing up in the casual setting of the House. Dalia Gheith, a freshman in 2006-2007 of Palestinian descent, felt that she was more open and comfortable in class talking about the Middle East.⁵² In this way, controversial and uncomfortable discussions began in a formal and moderated environment.

Meanwhile, the informal setting of the House allowed for more free and intimate discussions that were inappropriate for a larger class discussion on the political history of the region. Ruchi Gupta, a Hindu Indian-American sophomore in 2006-2007 with no familial ties to Israel/Judaism or Palestine/Islam, found the House setting provided “a non-intimidating atmosphere in which people [were] brutally honest.”⁵³ The dual dialogue setting eased the group into a full-bodied conversation about the Middle East.

Part II: Theoretical Roadblocks; Lynchpins to Successful Dialogue and Conflict Resolution

A: Definitions

1: Dialogue

In order to analyze the effectiveness of “group dialogue,” it is imperative to define the term in its context as a tool to effectuate conflict resolution.⁵⁴ To assess the attempts towards dialogue at Rutgers University, I use a definition of dialogue developed by the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice (CRS).⁵⁵

⁵² *See Id.* at 51.

⁵³ *Id.* at 61.

⁵⁴ Common definitions of dialogue include “an exchange of ideas and opinions” and “a discussion between representatives of parties to a conflict that is aimed at resolution.” MERRIAM-WEBSTER’S COLLEGIATE DICTIONARY 319 (10th ed. 1994).

⁵⁵ The Community Relations Service (CRS) develops tools to provide “sensitive and effective conflict prevention and resolution services,” for college communities, in particular. *See* Community Dialogue Guide: Conducting a Discussion on Race (2003), available at <http://www.justice.gov/crs/pubs/dialogueguide.pdf> [hereinafter CRS]. I have adapted the CRS definition of dialogue for race discussion for use in the interfaith context.

Interfaith dialogue has been defined as a process of bringing people together from diverse religious backgrounds to intentionally engage in religion, to build a better understanding and cooperate for the common good of humanity as a whole. *See* Eboo Patel & Patrice Brodeur, *Introduction*, in INTERFAITH YOUTH, *supra* note 41, at 5.

“A dialogue is a forum that draws participants from as many parts of the community as possible to exchange information face-to-face, share personal stories and experiences, honestly express perspectives, clarify viewpoints, and develop solutions to community concerns.”⁵⁶ The CRS differentiates dialogue from debate, based on the former’s emphasis on listening to foster understanding.⁵⁷ Dialogue attempts to develop common values, encourages parties to “question and reevaluate their assumptions” and work together to develop and implement common goals.⁵⁸

“Interfaith dialogue” requires an intentional conversation about religion and is a term that is often misapplied.⁵⁹ Eboo Patel breaks down “interfaith” into two components: “inter” and “faith.” “Inter” is the relationship to others, particularly those from different traditions, and can be found in spaces where individuals from diverse religious communities gather: schools, shopping malls, universities, corporations.⁶⁰ “Faith” is the relationship that people maintain with their “cumulative historical religious tradition,” and is found in spaces where individuals from a particular religious community gather to discuss religion: synagogues, mosques, churches.⁶¹ Patel and Patrice Brodeur find that the United States has “plenty of ‘faith’ and a healthy amount of ‘inter,’ but not enough interfaith.”⁶²

2: Enclave Deliberation

The ideal of “deliberative democracy” envisions individual members of various groups—church groups, political parties, student organizations—engaging in a discussion with each other leading to the evolution of personally held beliefs and opinions through reflection and the

⁵⁶ CRS, *supra* note 55, at 4.

⁵⁷ *Id.* at 4, app. A (“The Difference Between Debate and Dialogue”).

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 4.

⁵⁹ Eboo Patel, *Affirming Identity, Achieving Pluralism*, in INTERFAITH YOUTH, *supra* note 41, at 19.

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ *Id.*

⁶² Eboo Patel & Patrice Brodeur, *Introduction*, in INTERFAITH YOUTH, *supra* note 41, at 3.

exchange of competing views.⁶³ Enclave deliberation occurs when groups of likeminded individuals engage in discourse about a particular matter.⁶⁴

Although most studies have focused on the dangers of enclave deliberation,⁶⁵ Cass Sunstein has highlighted some benefits. Sunstein states that enclave deliberation in a heterogeneous society allows for the development of minority viewpoints that would otherwise be “invisible, silenced, or squelched in general debate.”⁶⁶ Enclave deliberation has led to the development of social movements such as feminism, the civil rights movement and religious conservatism.⁶⁷

B: Generation 1: Failed Facilitation, Enclave Deliberation and the Dual Jewish Identity

The attempt at dialogue in Generation 1 did not succeed, in part, because the parties were failed by the inexperience of their facilitator. However, due to the importance of intra-faith dialogue and enclave deliberation to strengthen the comfort level of a particular ethnic or religious group, the Pruce regime directly contributed to neutralizing the discomfort of Jewish students on campus and preparing current and future Jewish students in Generation 2 to participate in a successful “living” interfaith dialogue.

1: Failure of the Facilitator

In the one formal attempt at dialogue between IACRU and New Jersey Solidarity, the facilitator failed to set an agenda stating the parties’ issues. His failure impeded any progress towards inter-group dialogue and coexistence. Setting an agenda allows a facilitator to create a foundation for enhancing discussion, encouraging clarity and working towards achieving the

⁶³ Cass Sunstein, *Deliberative Trouble? Why Groups Go to Extremes*, 110 YALE L.J. 71, 73 (2000) [hereinafter *Deliberative Trouble*].

⁶⁴ *Id.* at 111.

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.*

stakeholders' goals.⁶⁸ Furthermore, a facilitator often underscores approaches that the parties might utilize in discussing their issues.⁶⁹ Here, since the facilitator failed to set an agenda and failed to suggest discussion approaches, the parties reached a stalemate.

A successful facilitator is also responsible for recording the discussion in a manner that utilizes neutral language and is visible to the parties.⁷⁰ Because the facilitator did not record any notes during the dialogue, the parties were unable to discern those matters on which they agreed from those on which they did not. It is apparent from an analysis of Pruce's recollection of the dialogue and from the news print stating each side's position that there were at least two issues for discussion: (1) the global context of the conflict and (2) the local tension on campus. Pruce had earlier made her group's interest in ending the local conflict public, by challenging "the leaders of all Muslim, Palestinian, Jewish and Israeli student groups to . . . take an active stand for peace . . . There is war in the world, but there doesn't have to be war on campus."⁷¹ On the other hand, a member of New Jersey Solidarity espoused her group's view that "[a]ny kind of dialogue . . . [with] the Zionists are competitive dialogues where both sides get nowhere."⁷² The

⁶⁸ See Lela Love & Joseph Stulberg, *Partnerships and Facilitation: Mediators Develop New Skills for Complex Cases*, 9 No. 3 DISP. RESOL. MAG. 14, 15 (2003) [hereinafter *Partnerships and Facilitation*].

⁶⁹ *Id.* at 15-16.

⁷⁰ *Id.* at 16. The facilitation process may utilize a facilitator and separate recorder. However, whereas in this case, there is only one neutral, she must perform both tasks. *Id.* at 15.

⁷¹ Shira Pruce, Opinion, *Everyone Entitled to Their own Opinion, Viewpoint*, DAILY TARGUM, Mar. 12, 2002, available at <http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2002/03/13/Opinions/Everyone.Entitled.To.Own.Opinion.Viewpoint-216196.shtml>. Prior to issuing this challenge, Pruce was reluctant to engage in dialogue because the one prior attempt at dialogue had ended due to the participants' refusal to talk about coexistence or compromise. See Joel Landau, *Banners Spring Up Around Campus, Question Free Speech*, DAILY TARGUM, March 10, 2002, available at <http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2003/03/10/News/Banners.Spring.Up.Around.Campus.Question.Free.Speech-389580.shtml>.

⁷² *Id.* Kates's refusal to talk about coexistence at Rutgers was foreshadowed by her statement that justice for the Palestinian cause cannot be attained through on campus dialogue about 'tension on campus.' See Charlotte Kates, "Tension on Campus": A Call to Silence, CounterPunch, Dec. 4, 2002, <http://www.counterpunch.org/kates1204.html>.

breakdown occurred because New Jersey Solidarity only discussed the first issue, while to IACRU, the second issue was the main reason for the session.

The responsive speaking system that the facilitator used here may have fostered interruption and obfuscated the issues for discussion. Instead of telling the parties that he was going to record the order of speaking based on who stood up on a first-come first-served basis, he should have asked the parties to participate in forming the process rules.⁷³ By failing to initiate a group conversation about ground rules, the facilitator forfeited an opportunity for the parties to begin consensus building on issues that were less divisive.⁷⁴

Additionally, there was no discussion over who was going to be present. Although the parties should choose who participates in a dialogue session, the facilitator should take note of the participants that the parties decide to include and must be prepared for the different group dynamics.⁷⁵ Because this was a “community” dialogue, it may have been difficult to determine what parties were essential to the session.⁷⁶ In any event, the ring of observers surrounding the outside of the session may have presented a threat to any meaningful dialogue; both sides had to save face in front of this audience.⁷⁷ While these individuals might be called support people,

⁷³ See *Partnerships and Facilitation*, *supra* note 68, at 15 (The facilitator “must explicitly facilitate a discussion among the participants that focuses on who should talk, in what sequence, for how long, under what circumstances, [and] with what goals.”).

⁷⁴ See Lawrence Susskind & Liora Zion, *Can America’s Democracy be Improved?* 29 (Aug. 2002) (unpublished manuscript, available at <http://www.lawrencesusskind.com/content/contributions/democracy.pdf>).

⁷⁵ See Human Leadership & Dev. Div. of the American Soc’y for Quality, Ass’n for Quality & Participation, & Int’l Ass’n of Facilitators, *Basic Facilitation Primer 1*, 10 (2002), <http://www.iaf-world.org/i4a/pages/index.cfm?pageid=1> (follow “Facilitator Resource Center”; then follow “The Basic Facilitator Primer” hyperlink under “Articles, Journals, Books and Websites”).

⁷⁶ Facilitation typically involves “multiple stakeholders, but not crystallized ‘parties.’” See *Partnerships and Facilitation*, *supra* note 68, at 15.

The likelihood of negative conduct increases as the number of parties increases. See John Livingood, *Addressing Bias in Conflict and Dispute Resolution Settings*, 62-JAN DISP. RESOL. J. 53, 58 (2008).

⁷⁷ See Matthew Patrick Clagett, *Environmental ADR and Negotiated Rule and Policy Making: Criticisms of the Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution and the Environmental Protection Agency*, 15 TUL. ENVTL. L.J. 409, 422 (2002) (“The privacy afforded by ADR may allow parties to make concessions they might not agree to in a more public setting.”). While facilitation includes multiple stakeholders, and not necessarily certain parties, see *Partnerships and Facilitation*, *supra* note 68, at 15, it may have been beneficial to keep the first session closed to the public, including only the leadership core of each side.

“whose presence is helpful for emotional . . . or other support,”⁷⁸ in this situation, they were more of an audience, raising the stakes of the session and inhibiting the chance for change.

2: Enclave Deliberation, Intra-Group Dialogue and Jewish Faith Identity

Adolescents of minority ethnic or religious groups will be most successful engaging in interfaith dialogue if they have first engaged in an exploration of intra-faith learning with members of their same faith.⁷⁹ This is so because youth participants in interfaith movements have indicated that it is important to be “responsible agents and representatives of their traditions” in interfaith dialogue.⁸⁰ Inherent in this responsibility must be a period of ethnoreligious discovery and identification. Indeed, the particular complexity of Judaism as culture, religion and/or ethnicity can leave “Jewish” college students confused and in need of intra-group exploration.⁸¹ At Rutgers, intimidated by the perceived anti-Zionism and anti-Semitism, many Jewish students, according to Pruce, were largely silenced in the debate.⁸² The year-long “Israel Inspires” program was an open invitation to engage in a non-reactive

⁷⁸ *Id.*

⁷⁹ James P. Keen, *Young Adult Development, Religious Identity, and Interreligious Solidarity in an Interfaith Learning Community*, in INTERFAITH YOUTH, *supra* note 68, at 36.

⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁸¹ See J. Alan Winter, *The Transformation of Community Integration Among American Jewry: Religion or Ethnoreligion? A National Replication*, 33 REV. OF RELIGIOUS RES. 349, 351 (1992) (“[T]he entire basis of Jewish accommodation to America . . . has been that Judaism is a religion, . . . and that the Jews are not merely an ethnic group’ However, neither are they merely a religion. They are an ethnoreligion. That is, while primarily differentiated by their religious beliefs and practices, Jews are differentiated as well, albeit perhaps secondarily, by a sense of peoplehood (ethnicity).”) (internal citation omitted). Jewish college students identify two sets of religious influence: “‘early socialization agents’ (parents and rabbi) and ‘later socialization agents’ (representatives of the larger culture—professors, intellectuals, students in general and future occupational colleagues).” See Harold S. Himmelfarb, *The Study of American Jewish Identification: How it is Defined, Measured, Obtained, Sustained and Lost*, 19 J. SCI. STUD. OF RELIGION 48, 56 (1980).

⁸² Pruce’s assertion is supported by Abe Greenhouse, the Sharansky pie assailant. Greenhouse told the New York Times, that there was “a perception being created that there [were] only two positions on this issue, that it’s ‘kill all the Jews’ or ‘kill all the Arabs.’ . . . There [was] a tremendous spectrum of opinion . . . that [was not] getting represented.” See Maria Newman, *Mideast Divide Spawns Another Schism at Rutgers*, N.Y. TIMES, Oct. 11, 2003, available at http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9C07EED8153FF932A25753C1A9659C8B63&sec=&spon=&page_wanted=all. Furthermore, intimidation of Jewish students on campus had been recognized by more than 300 university and college presidents, who signed a petition calling for ‘intimidation-free’ campuses. See Associated Press, Pledge for “Intimidation-Free” Campuses for Jewish Students Debated, Oct. 4, 2002, <http://www.pluralism.org/news/article.php?id=3093>.

community discussion about Judaism and Israel from a cultural perspective—a deliberating enclave.

a: Enclave Deliberation and the Conundrum of Jewish Identity

In order to illustrate the positive effect that enclave deliberation had on the Jewish students in Generation 1, it is necessary to examine the modern identity of college aged Jewish-Americans.⁸³ Jews in Europe were historically categorized as non-white, based on their racial inferiority and physical characteristics.⁸⁴ Nonetheless, today, Ashkenazi Jewish-Americans of Eastern European descent have assimilated into mainstream “white” American culture and are able to pass as white because they are not visibly distinct from Anglo-Americans in terms of skin color.⁸⁵ However, Jews still face racialized barriers based on their culture and religion, resulting in a dual experience of white privilege and Jewish oppression.⁸⁶ The oppression is still relevant today, where on United States college campuses, according to a 2006 Hillel study, fifty-one percent of college students said that they had “felt” anti-Semitism during the past three years in college or while in high school.⁸⁷ The duality of Jewish identity has been used by critics of Israel to discredit the pervasiveness of anti-Semitism experienced by Jewish students, who they believe should be seen as part of the white privileged elite.⁸⁸ However, the oppression prong of

⁸³ For a fascinating account of how Jewish immigrants in America have been absorbed by the majority white Christian population, see Kelly Amanda Train, *Whiteness, White Otherness and Jewish Identity*, J. MUNDANE BEHAV. (2000), available at <http://www.mundanebehavior.org/issues/v1n2/train.htm>. See also Egon Mayer, Barry Kosmin & Ariela Keysar, Center for Jewish Studies, *American Jewish Identity Survey: An Exploration in the Demography and Outlook of a People*, Feb. 2002, http://www.gc.cuny.edu/faculty/research_studies/ajis.pdf (explanation of American Jewish demographics and different definitions of what it means to be “Jewish”).

⁸⁴ See Train, *supra* note, 83, at 3.

⁸⁵ *Id.*

⁸⁶ *Id.*

⁸⁷ See Hillel Report: Anti-Semitism on College Campuses, Dec. 14, 2007, http://www.hillel.org/about/news/2007/dec/12dec2007_antisemitism.htm. Compare this figure with the 2000 National Jewish Population Survey which reported that only twenty six percent had personally experienced anti-Semitism. *Id.*

⁸⁸ See *id.* (quoting a Duke student in an opinion piece challenging Jews to make use of their white Privilege; the student acknowledged the persistence of anti-Semitism, but claimed that all it takes is for “Jews [to] renounce their difference by taking off the yarmulke”). See Philip Kurian, *The Jews*, CHRONICLE (Duke), Oct. 18, 2004, available

the duality and an individual's Jewish self-identification becomes more salient when they are "attacked."⁸⁹ Thus, at Rutgers University, the opposition to Israel may have led some Jewish students to focus on their Jewish identities for the first time. The silence of these students in the public realm can further be explained by what has been referred to as America's "social contract" with American-Jews.⁹⁰

In the context of the Generation 1 students, the 2003-2004 Israel Inspires campaign invited all Jewish students to participate voluntarily in a conversation about Judaism and Israel. Perhaps the old reactive form of programming did not engage unaffiliated Jewish students because it would have forced them to self-identify when they had not yet fully explored their individual Jewish identities.

However, from the Sharansky lecture (despite the pie incident) to the "Israel Inspires" weekend-long event, Jewish students were able to publicly discuss their religion and homeland, without fear of retaliation or intimidation; there was a marked change in these students' willingness to voice their cultural affinity for Judaism and Israel.⁹¹

at <http://media.www.dukechronicle.com/media/storage/paper884/news/2004/10/18/Editorialcolumns/The-Jews-1471620.shtml> (full article).

⁸⁹ See Himmelfarb, *supra* note 81, at 19.

⁹⁰ See Winter, *supra* note 81, at 350 (citing MARSHALL SKLARE, *AMERICA'S JEWS* 215 (1971)). See also Anti-Defamation League, *Confronting Anti-Semitism*, http://www.adl.org/education/combat/default_combat_as.asp (last visited Mar. 27, 2008) ("The fear of being singled out as 'different' and the risk of being viewed as an 'outsider' are often cited as reasons why so many Jewish youth and adults remain silent in the face of anti-Semitism. A strong, positive Jewish identity is closely related to a willingness to respond to anti-Semitism."). This so-called contract prescribes that:

Jewishness [is] to be a private matter—its display is to be limited to the home, the synagogue, the Jewish school, and similar islands of privacy. Jews [will] not routinely appear in public as Jews.

When such appearances [are] made they [are to] be forced upon the group, as in the case of rallies protesting anti-semitic outrages.

Winter, *supra* note 81, at 350 (quoting MARSHALL SKLARE, *AMERICA'S JEWS* 215 (1971)).

⁹¹ See Ben-Zion Jaffe, *See* Posting of Ben-Zion Jaffe, *Big Jew on Campus: New Israeli Activism* to http://cgis.jpost.com/Blogs/jaffe/entry/new_israeli_activism (Nov. 05, 2007) ("Four years ago wearing an IDF t-shirt or other Zionist paraphernalia around Rutgers University might have been uncomfortable for pro-Israel students. For many Jewish students, openly showing support for Israel or even Jewish identity was an act of bravery. Today College Avenue . . . is often witness to green IDF t-shirts worn by many college students, as well as other openly Zionist pins and stickers on book-bags and elsewhere.").

Enclave deliberation can be advantageous because it improves social deliberation by allowing for the “incubation” of fresh ideas and viewpoints that ultimately add to the greater public debate.⁹² The coalition built by Hillel and IACRU organized programs for Jewish students coming from a range of religious backgrounds to gather and celebrate their culture. As Pruce and others have noted, moving from a politically reactive focus to a culturally proactive approach invited Jewish students to engage in deliberation about Jewish life and Israel.⁹³

Despite the benefits that enclave deliberation can bring to minority groups, if individuals in the enclave are “walled off from competing views,” there is a great risk that group polarization will lead to the destabilization of society.⁹⁴ Although there was no empirical evidence of group polarization in Jewish students at Rutgers, as a whole, there were some indications that group polarization was taking effect in the IACRU and “Israel Inspires” leadership core.

3: The Threat of Group Polarization

Group polarization is a studied phenomenon characterized by a shift toward more extreme viewpoints by members of a deliberating group, in the direction of their pre-deliberation, privately held beliefs.⁹⁵ Polarization occurs when groups are trying to answer factual questions, but is also applicable in evaluative inquiries, including political and legal issues.⁹⁶ The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is arguably a hybrid factual and evaluative question. It consists of the dissemination of political facts, such as the historical geographical disbursement of religious groups, and the evaluative consideration of who is entitled to the land.

⁹² CASS SUNSTEIN, REPUBLIC.COM 78-79 (2001).

⁹³ See Jaffe, *supra* note 91.

⁹⁴ *Deliberative Trouble*, *supra* note 63, at 113; CASS SUNSTEIN, REPUBLIC.COM 78-79 (2001) (Enclaves should not insulate themselves for a prolonged time period, or they risk entrenchment in group polarization.).

⁹⁵ *Deliberative Trouble*, *supra* note 63, at 74.

⁹⁶ *Id.* at 88.

The theory of group polarization posits that groups will often make more extreme decisions than the average individual in the group.⁹⁷ When individuals are exposed to a limited argument pool—that is, arguments that are similar to the beliefs held by the individuals—the entire group will move toward the most persuasive of those arguments,⁹⁸ and each individual will move farther in the direction of her initial inclination.⁹⁹ This phenomenon is conditioned on the assumption that the limited argument pool is skewed in a particular direction.¹⁰⁰

Although there is no empirical evidence of group polarization amongst the greater Jewish population at Rutgers, Pruce indicates that there were signs of polarization within the leadership cores of IACRU and “Israel Inspires.” Prior to Israel Inspires, IACRU felt victimized and traumatized by their inability to counter New Jersey Solidarity’s anti-Israel demonstrations.¹⁰¹ As a result, the members shifted to a more right-wing stance on the international component of the conflict.¹⁰² Although avoiding anti-Palestinian extremism, “there was a deep intensification of Zionism and support for Israel ... [and its] right to exist.”¹⁰³ Pruce and the other student leaders became more extreme in their commitment to Zionism.¹⁰⁴

Although there is no definitive evidence of group polarization in the Rutgers Jewish community, the leaders of the movement exhibited a propensity toward accepting a more right wing viewpoint on the Middle East. To prevent polarization from becoming entrenched, deliberating groups must expand their argument pools to include more viewpoints.¹⁰⁵

⁹⁷ *Id.* at 85 (“Extreme” is not a judgment on the substantive content of a group stance, but is an internal “reference to the group’s initial dispositions.”).

⁹⁸ *Id.* at 92 (“The persuasiveness of arguments depends not simply on the grounds given, but also on the confidences with which they are articulated.”).

⁹⁹ *Id.* at 88-89.

¹⁰⁰ *Id.*

¹⁰¹ E-mail from Shira Pruce to author (Apr. 2, 2008) (on file with author).

¹⁰² *Id.*

¹⁰³ *Id.*

¹⁰⁴ *Id.* (Pruce recalls feeling as though she was “walking around permanently with an Israeli flag in . . . hand.”).

¹⁰⁵ *Id.* at 113.

C: Generation 2

1: Qualitative Measures of Success

a: Depolarization is Essential to Initiate Inter-group Dialogue

Josephs's senior thesis project measured the beliefs and thoughts of her residents through administering surveys and conducting interviews. The students were surveyed and interviewed once in the beginning of the school year and once in the middle of the school year. She found that the attitudes of the residents shifted towards a more moderate view of the Israeli/Palestinian conflict. For example, as a whole, the women blamed Israelis and Palestinians less for the conflict in the second survey, than in the first, when they had just moved into the House.¹⁰⁶ Joseph's findings are consistent with a conclusion that participation in the House resulted in a depolarization of initially held views.¹⁰⁷ This conclusion is supported by the observations of Danielle Gougou, the Assistant Dean for the Office of Global Programs at Douglass Residential College. After nearly two years of the program, Gougou found that the women enter the House as "polarized Conservative Jews and Conservative Muslims and they move toward the middle by the end of the program."¹⁰⁸

It has been found that groups involved in dialogue tend to depolarize if they are composed of equal, opposed subgroups and if members are somewhat flexible in their initially held positions.¹⁰⁹ The group was roughly equally composed, with five Jewish women and four Muslim women. Flexibility of viewpoint may have resulted from the quasi-self-selected nature

¹⁰⁶ See Under One Roof, *supra* note 51, at 85.

¹⁰⁷ Many of Joseph's first year residents admitted little interaction with out-group members (e.g. Muslims with Jews, Jews with Muslims) prior to living in the House, and an ignorance of the "other side" of the Palestinian/Israeli conflict. See *id.* at 40-77.

¹⁰⁸ Telephone Interview with Danielle Gougou, Assistant Dean, Office of Global Programs, Douglass Residential College, in New Brunswick, N.J. (April 11, 2008).

¹⁰⁹ *Deliberative Trouble*, *supra* note 63, at 90.

of the applicants. Only women who are willing to engage in interfaith dialogue and risk a change in their own views might apply to live in the House.

Depolarization is likely when the argument pool is expanded and new persuasive arguments counter the opinions initially held by group members.¹¹⁰ Consequently, a movement towards the center of the group's opinions can be achieved through discussion where persuasive arguments are presented in both directions.¹¹¹ By bringing in speakers who represented a variety of Palestinian and Israeli viewpoints, the group was exposed to a larger argument pool.

Polarization can be reversed when new information is introduced that may alter the perspectives and incentives of the group members.¹¹² Shortly after the blow up in the first Seminar, the Muslim residents and the Muslim student groups were conflicted over the choice of the Jewish distributing agency to disseminate the toys collected in Kids in Conflict on the ground in Northern Israel. The Jewish groups had selected an organization that the Muslim students found objectionable. That organization owns much of the land in Israel and supports policies enforced by the Israeli government that the Muslim students perceived as unacceptable. Josephs was able to resolve the conflict by recognizing the interests and issues on both sides. She knew that the Jewish students thought the organization was a worthy charitable distributor and that the Muslim students perceived them as human rights violators. Josephs set out to accumulate more information, by speaking with high level officials at the organization in question and gathering statistics illustrating the organization's past commitment to help Palestinians and Arabs, specifically by arranging care for those injured in the Lebanese conflict. After presenting that information, she asked all the students if this new information changed their feelings on the issue. After a discussion, they all embraced the organization as a fair distributor. Because the

¹¹⁰ *Id.* at 92-93.

¹¹¹ *Id.* at 93.

¹¹² *Id.* at 96.

women had committed to actively listen to one another and hear each other's concerns, Josephs was able to generate movement on the subject and build a consensus.¹¹³ She developed facts and challenged assumptions.¹¹⁴

2: Quantitative Measures of Success

The success of the Middle East Coexistence House can be measured in three calculable ways: institutional and administrative support and capacity for continuation; increase in willingness of both groups to live with one another; and replication by other universities.

Institutionalization of an initiative ensures its future because it represents a commitment to provide financial and administrative resources to the project.¹¹⁵ The Rutgers administration has institutionalized the House as part of the Douglass Campus Global Village, making it a permanent fixture by funding the residence and providing the space. Additionally, the Interfaith Dialogue Center has pledged to continue funding the House trip to Turkey. The president of the University, Richard L. McCormick, has called the House a substantial benefit to undergraduate education and to the state of New Jersey.¹¹⁶ Moreover, the continuation of the House is guaranteed because Josephs has implemented a system of apprentice training. When the year

¹¹³ In approaching the conflict this way, the House residents modeled active listening to the other student groups involved in the planning of Kids in Conflict.

¹¹⁴ These are movement generation techniques recognized for their effectiveness in mediation. While Josephs was not serving as a mediator, she nonetheless demonstrated communication skills that have been identified as effective techniques for reaching agreement. See Joseph B. Stulberg & Lela P. Love, *The Middle Voice: Mediating Conflict Successfully* 67 (unpublished manuscript, forthcoming Carolina Academic Press 2008).

¹¹⁵ See Robert Ricigliano, Theodore Johnson & Andrea Chasen, *Practitioner's Corner: Problems without a Process: Using an Action Dialogue to Manage Racial Tensions*, 4 HARV. NEGOT. L. REV. 83, 110 (1999) ("Without funding, future efforts to improve the community cannot be realized. . . . More importantly, financial obligations build a commitment to continue the work."). Compare the Interfaith Service Project, a similar initiative started by university students in Chicago based in an off-campus residence. See Lori Eisenberg, *The Chicago Interfaith Service House*, in INTERFAITH YOUTH, *supra* note 41, at 232. The Interfaith Service House was successful for two years, from 2001-2003, but the founders ultimately failed to sustain the project because it was privately and self-funded. *Id.* When the private funding ended, the project no longer had the resources to remain viable. *Id.* The institutionalization of the Middle East Coexistence House ensures its future as a permanent fixture of the Global Village at Rutgers.

¹¹⁶ See Richard L. McCormick, Opinion, *Focusing on Undergraduates*, DAILY TARGUM, Apr. 27, 2007, available at <http://media.www.dailytargum.com/media/storage/paper168/news/2007/04/27/Opinions/Focusing.On.Undergraduates-2884350.shtml>.

ended, she handed the reins to one of her residents, Samantha Shanni. Josephs stays active but recognizes that since this project is grounded in self-determination, the current residents must take ownership of the process. Implementing this type of apprenticeship program to train new facilitators will lead to an expansion of the program and develop an active alumni community, giving the program long-term viability.¹¹⁷

An accepted measure of coexistence is the willingness of groups to live with each other.¹¹⁸ The willingness of Jewish and Muslim women to live together at Rutgers increased in Joseph's study, as measured through their belief in the importance of the House to achieve coexistence.¹¹⁹ Externally, student interest in the House has grown each year since its existence. The residents in the House for the 2007-2008 school year increased to fifteen. The number of applicants has increased from fourteen women in 2006, to sixteen and fifteen in 2007 and 2008, respectively.¹²⁰ Although the numbers have not increased drastically from the first year, they have increased without advertising and solicitation. In the first year, Josephs had to actively recruit and convince applicants to consider participating in the House.

Finally, success can be measured by other institutions' desire to replicate a program that has succeeded. Many educational institutions have contacted Josephs to start their own projects, including the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor and the International Christian University in Tokyo.¹²¹

¹¹⁷ Ricigliano, Johnson & Chasen, *supra* note 115, at 111. The 2007-2008 residents recently hosted a 2006-2007 Turkey Alumni Reunion Dinner on April 7, 2008.

¹¹⁸ See Mari Fitzduff, Multivariate Measure of Coexistence Index (unpublished, on file with author). Professor Fitzduff was a leader in the peace process in Northern Ireland after the Good Friday Agreement and lectures on the applicability of the Northern Ireland peace process to coexistence and peace in the Middle East.

¹¹⁹ See Under One Roof, *supra* note 51, at 86.

¹²⁰ Figures provided by Danielle Gougon, Assistant Dean, Office of Global Programs, Douglass Residential College in e-mail to author (April 11, 2008) (on file with author)..

¹²¹ See Under One Roof, *supra* note 51, at 39; Michal Lando, *Within These Walls*, JERUSALEM POST (Online Edition), Nov. 6, 2006, <http://www.jpost.com/servlet/Satellite?cid=1162378339493&pagename=JPost%2FJPostArticle%2FShowFull>.

Conclusion

Conflicts on college and university campuses are frequent and involve salient issues such as religion, ethnicity and politics. As a contained community, a college campus has plenty of “faith” and plenty of “inter.” The lessons of Pruce and Josephs teach that in order to achieve a meaningful measure of coexistence through interfaith dialogue, Jewish (or other minority group) college students must first engage in enclave deliberation to develop their own viewpoints. However, to move past the potential dangers of group polarization that result from limited argument pools in enclave deliberation, parties must engage in interfaith deliberation and dialogue with their peers from different groups.