**Marianella Sclavi**

1. Being invited to this workshop has being for me an unique occasion to meet researchers and practitioners whom I feel are moving in the same field of interests as mine.

I can say that never before I experienced in an academic context, this feeling of communality and of "being heard" with and by so many persons. Before this meeting I had read and met and knew of the existence of only few other partecipants. So few that I can name them: I had read and met John Forester , Larry Susskind and David Laws, only read but not met James Fishkin and Jay Rothman. I had heard about Carolyn Lukensmeyer's work in Washington and New York ad was very curious to know more. That's it.

The fact that next year I will spend four months ( March to June 2006 ) of my sabbatical at MIT gives breath to the intention to get better acquiented with many of these scholars and to play a role in bridging this kind of approaches in the States and in Italy and Europe.

2. I found the organisation of the workshop ( scenarios plus papers to be read apart ) a much better format than any traditional call for papers – meetings because at least there was the space of looking each other in the eyes and trying to build a dialogue. The very fact that the dialogue was between political theorists and dispute resolution professionals gave it a momentum that compensated some pitches of frustration during the day. Perhaps if the scenarios were more bent towards "real" stories and situations, we might have avoided the lamentation that more contingency, and story-telling was needed . In conflict transformation the difference between "role playing" and "character enacting" is very important, precisely because creativity can be enacted only by unique persons in unique situations which must be ( both) appreciated as such. At the same time "real stories" could limit the possibility by panelists and partecipants to tell their own experiences. It is difficult to find a good recipe. On the whole my opinion is that those who will discover how to organise less boring academic meeting, and have the courage to present them as such, will be the winners ( in the long term).

A lot of ideas are turning over in my mind after this workshop.

I see a certain confusion between Consensus Building at large ( which refers to a plurality of approaches and methodologies, often complementary to each other ) and Consensus Building as a specific methodology, the one that sees Larry Susskind as maximo inventor, practitioner and teacher. While at the background of the first there is "how to build a consensual democracy" , at the background of the second there is "how a consensual democracy builds specific formal and administrative agreements" ( = "a package of committments" that makes all stakeholders better off ) . The second is much more "technical" or at least formalised in steps and outcomes , and it is appealing to administrators who are looking for the certainty of alternative administrative procedures.

I completely agree with Jane Mansbridge' s idea that deliberative democracy cannot be thought of, ( nor built ) if a consensual democracy does not exist also at the levels of everyday life conversations and dialogues. I also agree that the two conceptions of democracy, the "adversary" and "consensual" are both needed in a postmodern society.

I add Jane Mansbridge, Dan Yankelovich, Will Isaacs  to an author I have being quoting a lot lately, namely David Augsburger ( Conflict mediation across cultures )  with the intention of illustrating  that argumentation is not the only democratic way of dealing with conflict.  This kind of entry into deliberative democracy spans from the dynamics of listening in a friendly conversation ( see Martha Nussbaun, also quoted by John Forester) to the distinction between raw opinions and solid assumptions by Dan Yankelovich, to the experiences of deliberative pooling by James Fishkin.

The bigger picture is one of democratization of democracy and the interlocutors are all those interested in becoming active citizens and facilitators and inventors of partecipatory planning  approaches  to urban (and rural) social life.  Carolyn Lukensmeyer's  birds eye view approach to this bigger picture is very rich and interesting indeed, and I hope to learn more about it.  But perhaps the one major thing that I might do during my sabbatical should be an "Italian  narration" of the Chelsea case starting from  Susan Potziba's paper and experience.  I say "Italian narration" because in Italy we have a lot of Chelseas, and I find estremely interesting the insights about the social construction of a democratic common ground that we can learn from  this  experience. And the relation between government, institutional and everyday life.  It may be a good example about how Consensus Building at large and  the more specific one, need each other  and interact.