

# Avoiding Pitfalls in Transformative Mediation: The Connection Between Purpose and Practice

Following the transformative approach to mediation is no easy matter, even with a good model and clear examples. The approach is just beginning to be articulated, even though some mediators have long tended toward it intuitively in their practice. Therefore, even those who try to follow it consistently and conscientiously are bound to be imperfect in their practice, as was the mediator in the Landlord-Tenant case. In fact, the various principles and examples offered in this book must be understood as first steps toward a full understanding of how to implement this approach. As more people practice and study transformative mediation, more will be learned, which will almost certainly require modifications and extensions of the descriptions of transformative mediation practice offered here.

Beyond the inevitable difficulties of learning the contours of a new approach, however, a number of predictable pitfalls await those who try to practice transformative mediation. These pitfalls are predictable because of what is already evident about the elements of transformative mediation and their nuances. However, with advance warning and careful attention, it may be possible to avoid most of them most of the time.

## Thinking Empowerment Means Mediator Passivity

Because the transformative approach emphasizes empowering parties and placing decisions in their hands, mediators may be hesitant

about making certain moves, thinking that these moves may disempower the parties. Sometimes such hesitancy is a healthy guard against overdirective practice. However, mediators may become so concerned about avoiding disempowerment that they avoid initiating any positive intervention and instead adopt an almost passive posture.

For example, mediators may feel obliged to use only the parties' exact words in repeating or summarizing what they have said; they may be reluctant to do anything that would "impose order," even if the discussions degenerate into a shouting match; and perhaps most serious, they may hesitate to raise tough questions that would encourage the parties to evaluate options carefully and consider each other's perspectives seriously. All these responses involve acting as though party empowerment requires mediator passivity, so that the mediator becomes a mere "convenor" of the discussions.

This pitfall involves a misunderstanding of empowerment. Empowerment means encouraging and helping parties to deliberate and make decisions, because this support from the mediator helps parties find their own strength. Simply standing by—while parties struggle, flounder, and exchange reflex reactions—does nothing to strengthen them at all. Instead, reframing the parties' language in ways that help them fully express themselves and understand each other is empowering—as long as the mediator checks to make sure the parties' meaning has not been changed or "lost." Intervening to raise questions that remind and help parties to consider the consequences of different options, instead of reacting reflexively and impulsively, is central to empowerment. Indeed, "[B]oth empowerment and recognition require . . . a mediator . . . to 'push' the parties . . . in the positive sense of inviting, supporting, encouraging, motivating, and urging the parties to work through the processes of self-determined choice and mutual acknowledgment" (Bush, 1989, p. 277).

Nevertheless, a hesitancy to push the parties at all, even in this positive sense, can result from misunderstanding the emphasis transformative mediation puts on party control of decision making.

Those just starting to explore the transformative approach may be particularly vulnerable to this pitfall. For example, in one housing case, in which the mediator had only recently begun to use the transformative approach, the tenant began by stating very angrily that, because the landlord had insulted and mistrusted him, he had made up his mind to “get even with” the landlord by staying as long as possible and moving out without paying a cent. Though the situation was very similar to the Landlord-Tenant case, the mediator here hesitated to raise any questions with either party and simply restated the tenant’s position in much the same terms. The session was over very quickly, and the students who observed it questioned whether either party was really empowered, because the session essentially began and ended with these initial emotional accusations. The mediator did nothing to encourage either side to consider either their own options or each other’s perspectives.

### Carrying “Positive Pushing” Too Far

The second pitfall of the transformative approach is in effect the converse of the first. While the first pitfall is for the mediator to err on the side of not enough intervention, the second is for the mediator to go too far, in the name of empowerment and recognition, with “positive pushing.” The warning to mediators here is that, like too little intervention, too much can also undermine both empowerment and recognition.

While raising tough questions is important to help parties fully consider their options, the mediator can carry the questioning so far that a party feels the mediator is “looking for” certain answers. Overly tough questioning can thus wind up conveying a directive message to the party, even though the mediator’s real purpose is only to encourage deliberation and not to influence its direction. The effect may be disempowering, the very opposite of the mediator’s intent. For example, in the Landlord-Tenant case, the mediator questions the landlord in caucus about his plan to evict the

tenant (segment 12). After a series of questions that in effect ask the landlord to consider whether a "buyout" arrangement would be preferable to court action, the landlord says, "I'll do whatever you say. What do you think I should do?" Clearly, given the mediator's overall conduct in this case, his questioning is intended to encourage deliberation, not to pressure a settlement, and the questioning here is not even particularly tough. But the pitfall is there anyway, and the mediator must be on guard against it.

Avoiding this pitfall means that, even while questioning and inviting parties to consider options, the mediator must listen to himself or herself and stop short of being directive, in tone or substance. Moreover, since this is itself difficult and partly dependent on parties' perceptions, the mediator needs to be sensitive to parties' reactions and prepared to pull back quickly and clarify the point if parties get the wrong message. The mediator in the Landlord-Tenant case acted precisely this way, explaining that the questions were only intended to help the landlord clarify his choices. Beyond this, the mediator can guard against this pitfall by "framing" moves in advance, telling parties the purpose of the questioning and reminding them that all decisions are still up to them. And when a party does change views in response to a mediator's questioning, a further safeguard is for the mediator to pause and doublecheck that the new view is genuinely the party's choice.

As with inviting parties to consider and evaluate options, mediators can also err by going too far in encouraging parties to seek or offer recognition. For example, offering possible positive reinterpretations of past conduct involves active intervention with each side. But if a mediator goes too far in arguing for the suggested interpretation, it may wind up provoking even greater hostility, both toward the other party and toward the mediator for seeming to be an advocate for that party. Thus the mediator in the Landlord-Tenant case was careful only to suggest reinterpretations (in the causes), and not to argue forcefully for them, and he allowed the parties to reject them on first hearing (segments 9 and 11).

On another level, if the mediator goes too far in trying to open up opportunities for recognition—for example, by asking the parties to elaborate on statements already offered to describe their feelings or problems—this may also be counterproductive. Stepping in to ask for such elaboration may simply interrupt, and even short-circuit, a flow of recognition that is already under way. Or it may be unduly intrusive and invasive of the parties' sense of dignity and privacy, like stepping across the line that divides mediation from therapy. In the Landlord-Tenant case, the mediator avoided this pitfall by limiting his intervention in the joint discussion, once a flow of recognition began to occur between the parties (segment 14). Although the comment there suggested that he might have pushed the parties a bit further in this exchange, doing so might have risked going too far and bringing about the negative consequences just described.

In general, the discussion of the first two pitfalls suggests that transformative practice requires mediators to walk a careful line—between not doing enough to encourage empowerment and recognition and, on the other hand, going too far in working for these objectives. On either side of this line is a pitfall, and leaning over too far to avoid one may mean falling into the other. Keeping on the center course between the two is difficult but certainly not impossible. The better mediators understand each of these two pitfalls, the better they will be at walking this line.

## Protecting Too Much, Protecting Too Little

Transformative mediators have to walk another line, between two opposite pitfalls. In one sense, these two pitfalls are variants of the two just discussed, but they are important enough to mention separately. On one side of the line, because transformative mediation emphasizes party choice based on full consideration of options, mediators may think they have a special obligation to ensure that parties have adequate information before making decisions. After

all, if a party lacks information—factual, legal, or otherwise—how can that party make an informed choice about what to do? In this view, allowing people to make choices on the basis of partial information is not empowerment at all.

However, this view overlooks the point that party choice includes the choice of how much information to consider an adequate basis for decision making. While mediators can and should call parties' attention to the question of whether they think their information is adequate, it is possible to go too far on this point, as on others. When mediators do so, they can wind up discouraging decisions the parties themselves feel prepared to make. In effect, the mediator falls into the pitfall of "protecting parties from themselves," shifting from pursuing empowerment into protection—and disempowerment.

In one case, for example, a husband and wife were at odds because, after a decision to separate, the wife had left the house while the husband was at work, taking all the furniture with her. The wife maintained that she valued the furniture much more than the husband did, and indeed that she was prepared to have him take the house (jointly owned) if she could keep the furniture. The parties discussed estimated figures, which put the value of the house at roughly six times that of the furniture, and the wife still sought the exchange of furniture for house. The mediator suggested that she not make this decision without first consulting an attorney, accountant, and other information sources, but the wife insisted that whatever the value differential, this was her preference. The mediator, however, insisted that the mediation be discontinued until she got more information. Clearly, he saw this as encouraging "full deliberation," but in making this move the mediator deprived the wife of her freedom to make her own decision on what was adequate information even if she was "making a mistake." Self-determination includes the freedom to make one's own mistakes. Unless there is reason to believe the party lacks the capacity for decision making, protecting parties from themselves by insisting on more information is a pitfall that undermines empowerment.

On the other hand, this last comment points to the pitfall on the other side of the center line. In some cases parties do lack capacity for decision making, and if the mediator does not recognize this and discontinue the process, empowerment and recognition are both at great risk. Perhaps the most important example is when one party is the victim of past violence by the other. In this case, fear of future harm may negate that party's capacity to engage in genuine deliberation and decision making on issues involving the abuser, even if the party is otherwise completely competent. The pitfall is that, because of the supposed importance of leaving choices up to the parties, a mediator may feel reluctant to raise questions about capacity when the parties have not and they seem willing to proceed.

Avoiding this pitfall means that, if something suggests the element of violence and fear, the mediator needs at the very least to pursue this question in depth with the possible victim party and not proceed unless satisfied that nothing has occurred to negate that party's capacity for free decision making. A transformative mediator should not hesitate to do this, thinking that because it involves "protection" it is beyond his or her scope. When protection means ensuring that the fundamental condition of capacity is not lacking, what is being protected is the party's opportunity to participate meaningfully in the process. This kind of protection is part of empowerment.

A connected point is that, while protecting parties from their own decisions is a contradiction to empowerment, helping parties fully participate in the mediation process is not. For example, if one party is monopolizing the discussions, or cutting off the other party, or addressing abusive comments to them, the mediator might feel obligated to refrain from intervening, so as not to take control away from the parties. Again, the pitfall is mistaking passivity for empowerment, and help with participation for disempowerment. On the contrary, in such a situation the mediator can and should intervene, although not by "imposing control" on the session.

Instead, as illustrated in the Landlord-Tenant case, the mediator can ask questions that help both parties decide how they want to proceed and whether they think the present course of the discussions is productive (i.e., will it get them where they want to go). With the “quiet” party in particular, the mediator can ask whether that party feels their concerns are getting sufficient attention and whether they find the tone of the discussion acceptable. If the answers are negative, the mediator can explore what each party is willing to do to alter the tone and course of the discussions, and then help them pursue this to the satisfaction of both, before proceeding further. Helping both parties to participate fully in the discussions is itself empowerment and can lead to further empowerment in dealing with the substantive issues.

Again, the discussion here suggests that taking the transformative approach requires avoiding pitfalls in two opposite directions: going too far to protect parties from their own decisions, and not going far enough to protect parties’ opportunity to participate meaningfully and fully in the mediation.

## Focusing on Empowerment Alone or Recognition Alone

As discussed in Chapter Four, the transformative approach sees empowerment and recognition as linked. Neither is really valuable without the other, because neither alone produces transformation. Recognition without empowerment involves no freely made choice to reach beyond the self. It is simply a forced concession, a grudging admission unaccompanied by any real change of perspective or heart. It accomplishes no transformation of the “giver,” because it is not really given at all but taken.

Conversely, empowerment without recognition, while it certainly involves development in one dimension of moral growth, is just that: one-dimensional. If not employed as the foundation for relating to others, for recognition, empowerment simply transforms

weak and selfish people into strong and selfish people. It accomplishes a transformation but one of questionable value, and certainly not the one envisioned and valued by the transformative orientation.

Nevertheless, empowerment and recognition can be treated as separate, independent objectives, and pursued in isolation from one another. Another pitfall of transformative practice is doing just this. Forgetting about the invaluable connection between the two, mediators may not make the effort—a considerable one—to work constantly for empowerment and recognition together. Instead, they may focus only on one or the other.

Thus mediators may make the mistake of trying to evoke recognition between parties without any concern for empowerment, by forcefully telling them how they should see and treat each other, and then lecturing them about the need for empathy and consideration. This approach loses sight of the crucial difference between the parties' choosing to give recognition and being shamed or pressured into it. The most it is likely to produce is forced recognition, which has little transformative value.

For example, in one case involving a dispute over noise between upstairs and downstairs apartment dwellers, the mediator told the upstairs party,

You have to realize that the people below are not hypersensitive—they're being driven crazy by the noise from your apartment, with its bare wood floors. Imagine what your music and walking sounds like to them, and be more considerate. I know you think wood floors are very nice, but when you live right on top of somebody like this, you have to understand what it's like for them. It's just not right not to put down a carpet.

In another case involving a couple who had threatened a woman with whom their teenaged son was having an affair, the mediator told the couple,

You have to understand, your son is legally an adult, and adults have the right to choose their own friends, male or female. This person he's chosen to associate with has done nothing unusual for this day and age. She didn't force him into anything—she's just acting as she might with anyone else on your son's level. You may not like your son's choices, but you obviously can't tell him how to run his life, and it's not fair to hold other people responsible for his choices.

In both cases, the mediator was focusing on having one party "recognize" the other's perspective, but he was trying to force the recognition rather than inviting the parties to see and respond to each other in more positive terms, and then letting them decide for themselves whether to do so.

On the other hand, mediators may make the converse mistake, taking care to empower parties but then doing nothing to foster recognition. In one landlord-tenant case, for example, the landlord complained against a longtime tenant for keeping her shopping cart and overshoes in a common hallway/foyer. The tenant was adamant that she had a right to use the area and would not move her things unless a judge forced her to. Each party was indignant at the other, whose behavior and attitude they saw as offensive and inexcusable. The mediator reviewed the options and their consequences with both parties thoroughly but made it clear to each that decisions were in their hands. Indeed, at one point the tenant turned to the mediator and said, "I see what you're doing; you're not telling me what to do, you're helping me to think out what I really want to do. I appreciate that." Eventually, the parties reached an accommodation.

Afterward, however, a trainee who observed the case voiced her disappointment with what had happened, because despite empowering the parties, the mediator did practically nothing to foster recognition between them: "I understand that he didn't need to do more in order to help the parties decide what to do; but there was so much these parties didn't really understand about each other, and

could have understood more of, if the mediator had only focused some effort on recognition." The trainee put her finger right on the point: Empowerment could be accomplished alone; but when this was done, it seemed a somewhat empty achievement. The failure to build on empowerment by pursuing recognition left the transformative potential of the interaction largely untapped.

Avoiding these twin pitfalls—pursuing empowerment without recognition and vice versa—requires that mediators always practice on both levels, seeking both empowerment and recognition together. They must always try to foster empowerment, so that there is both a strengthening of self and a real foundation for recognition. And they must also always try to take every opportunity to encourage parties (without forcing them) to use the foundation of empowerment to give recognition. It is essential to work on both in every case, to the fullest extent possible, because only this can tap the full transformative potential of the parties' interaction. Avoiding the pitfall here means attending to both empowerment and recognition, because both are essential to transformation.

## Losing Sight of the Transformative Orientation Entirely

The last pitfall to be guarded against in transformative practice is the most serious of all. Because of the fundamental shift of orientation that underlies the transformative approach, it is often difficult for a mediator to keep the new orientation clearly and firmly in mind, especially in the pressurized atmosphere of an actual session. However, when the orientation wavers, it is possible to forget about both empowerment *and* recognition—not just one or the other—because the mediator loses sight of the underlying purpose of transformation altogether.

For example, a group of mediators were discussing how the transformative approach could have been applied in a case that one had recently mediated: Complainant (C) and respondent (R) were

lifelong best friends who had an argument at C's wedding, at which R was a bridesmaid. C threw R out of the wedding party, and their friendship broke up. But R refused to return the dress C had given her as bridesmaid, and the ensuing complaint came to mediation. The mediator said that she sensed R wanted to reestablish the friendship, but C just wanted to be paid for the dress and call it quits. The mediator asked her colleagues, "I felt C and her new husband would regret their choice later on—R was a life-long friend, and people don't have many such friends. But how far do you go in pushing them to see this, if you're using a transformative approach?" Someone suggested that empowerment would involve asking C if she'd considered the value of the friendship, if she'd firmly decided that the argument was too serious to overcome, and so forth. But if C had considered these things, empowerment meant letting her make her own choice and not pressuring her into a different one. At this point, another mediator in the group burst out excitedly:

What kind of mediation is that? She's going to sacrifice a life-long friend over a stupid argument and a dress, and you're telling me I should sit there and let it happen? If I see people about to drive off a cliff, and I can stop it, are you telling me not to? Why not? I can understand letting people decide things themselves, but at a certain point you have to step in to stop them from hurting themselves, or help them see and do what's best for them. I can't see what's wrong with doing that. That's the whole reason I'm there!

This was an unwittingly perfect statement of the pitfall in question. The mediator who made it, at some point in thinking about the case presented, lost sight of the aim of transformation altogether and slipped from a transformative into a problem-solving orientation. When he did so, empowerment quickly ceased to matter, in comparison to the objective of avoiding suffering by solving the

problem. Without a firm foothold in the transformative orientation, "letting people decide things themselves" is fine up to a point; but if things go too far off track, the mediator must "step in" to make sure the problem is solved in the best way.

Even mediators who have made a conscious attempt to follow the transformative approach to practice have experienced how easy it is to lose a transformative focus. They have found that the demands of some cases—and their own emotional reactions to them—can lead them to lose sight of the transformative orientation itself.

Consider the example of one mediator who is explicitly committed to using the transformative approach. He was mediating a case involving two sixteen-year-old high school girls that started over a "dirty look" at a basketball game. The look had led to two physical fights, one with several of the girls' friends involved. The girl who was attacked last said she had to get even before the fighting would stop. This was a frustrating and frightening case for the mediator. His attempts at empowerment seemed to go nowhere—the girls kept restating their desire to continue fighting until things got settled. And they adamantly resisted seeing things from the other's point of view. In fact, there was only one instance when recognition occurred. One of the girls had been attacked by the other while holding her three-month-old baby. The attacker said she realized this was unfair, and she could understand the other girl's desire not to be attacked while she was holding the baby. She then said that "next time," the other girl should let her sister hold the baby, and the sister should then "stay out of it."

In the face of these tough stands, the mediator felt a strong pull to become directive. He found himself preaching to the girls, instructing them on the way in which the escalating violence was a game without end if both sides kept wanting "last licks." He pushed for one particular solution—having one of the girls move to another high school—even though the girls strongly resisted this option and would make no commitment to it. The session ended

without an agreement and with the mediator feeling frustrated and worried because the violence seemed likely to continue.

This case is particularly instructive because it shows how easily a mediator can lose focus on transformative objectives, even when openly committed to them. During the course of the session, the mediator became worried about the violence, about what would happen after the mediation if no settlement were reached. This concern was clearly legitimate and, in many ways, unavoidable. However, because of the strength of this reaction to the dispute, the mediator became increasingly frustrated with the girls' resistance and the slight progress he seemed to be making in the session toward addressing this concern. As a result, he lost sight of the transformative potential of the dispute.

The desire to do something about the violence pulled this mediator away from watching for and working with opportunities for empowerment and recognition. Rather than building one step at a time on comments the girls made, he pulled back and looked for a solution that would address the real and alarming prospects of what would happen if a settlement of some kind were not reached. In retrospect, he saw many places where he could have probed about how the girls saw each other, how they wanted to be seen, and what choices they thought they might have before them. But he missed the chance to explore these opportunities because he became so concerned about ensuring that the immediate problem did not go unsolved. And ironically, his attempts to find a solution may have thwarted the chance to have the parties *construct one themselves*.

Trainees who observed this case said afterward that trying to persuade the girls to go to different schools, or to commit to some similar solution that at least diminished the chances of violence, was justifiable here. They argued that given the age of the girls and likelihood of serious violence, a more directive approach was necessary. The mediator himself, thinking it over afterward, disagreed. He said that although he had felt the same way during the session, and his own moves indicated he was being pulled in that direction, he

should have resisted this pull. There would have been little point in imposing a solution that the girls had not constructed themselves. Separating the girls at school would not stop the violence from occurring on the streets, in shopping malls, or anywhere else their paths might cross. In fact, the girls seemed ready to seek each other out to continue the attacks. Unless a settlement was built on the choices the girls made and unless it was based on some degree of recognition for each other, there was little hope that *any* agreement would end the fighting. Most important, the mediator pointed out, simply stopping this fight would not, in any event, have *changed* either of the girls—made them stronger and less defensive, understanding and more tolerant of others. But without such change in the girls themselves, the overwhelming likelihood was that one or both would soon get involved in other fights, on other occasions, with other people. Violence would not be avoided in the long run, because the parties themselves had not changed. In short, the “justification” for a directive approach was illusory; the mediator simply fell victim to the pitfall of losing sight of the transformative orientation.

The mediators’ reactions in this case and the bridesmaid case were not unlike the reactions mediators have in other types of cases and contexts. In divorce and family, public policy, business, and landlord-tenant cases, mediators often have strong reactions that lead them to be directive and to try to protect parties from their own decisions, including the decision to keep fighting. Moreover, at some point in almost every case they handle, mediators begin to sense the looming presence of the “unsolved problem” about which “something must be done.” These are often visceral reactions, and they prompt mediators to advise parties what is best for them and to attempt to reach settlements at all costs. Mediators who try to follow the transformative approach are not immune to these kinds of reactions, which can easily undercut this approach in any conflict arena, by causing mediators to lose sight of the transformative orientation altogether.

It is worth noting, additionally, that the dangers posed by this pitfall are similar to those of trying to “integrate” the problem-solving and transformative approaches, a point made in Chapter Four. In fact, the examples presented here can help clarify the reasons offered there to explain why integration of the two approaches is, as a practical matter, impossible. Like transformative mediators who lose sight of the overall transformative orientation, mediators who try to integrate the two approaches will inevitably be pulled to abandon a transformative objective like empowerment, whenever doing so seems necessary in order to keep parties from suffering dissatisfaction or harm. The bridesmaid and basketball cases clearly illustrate what is likely to happen in such circumstances, whether as the result of losing sight of a consciously transformative orientation or as the result of trying to integrate the two approaches into one. In neither instance are transformative objectives likely to be successfully achieved.

What can help mediators avoid this ultimate pitfall of the transformative approach? The best safeguard, perhaps the only one, is for mediators to have a profound understanding of the values underlying the transformative approach. It is not simply the *specifics* of empowerment and recognition, as detailed earlier, that constitute the alternative approach to mediation being proposed here. This approach includes the *overall orientation* on which these two concepts are based, and the critical element of that orientation is its conception that the purpose of mediation, as a method of responding to conflict, is not simply satisfying parties’ needs but transforming parties as moral beings. Keeping the transformative orientation firmly in place, despite the visceral pulls described here, requires both great clarity about and deep commitment to this view of mediation’s purpose.

## The Importance of Purpose to Practice

The heart of the transformative approach, and the orientation on which it rests, is the goal of transformation: the realization by individuals of their highest potential as moral beings, and with this a

changed and better world. It is the commitment to this goal or purpose that has attracted many to the transformative approach and to the Transformation Story of the mediation movement. Asking mediators to make the major shift from the problem-solving to the transformative approach means asking them also to see transformation as the most important goal or value of mediation and as superior to other important values, like the value of satisfaction that underlies the problem-solving approach and orientation.

In earlier chapters we stated that transformation should be considered the most important goal of mediation, indicating that a full explanation of the basis of this view would be offered at a later point. This is the time for that explanation. For unless mediators are convinced that transformation matters—that it is the highest purpose mediation serves—they will not be inspired to make the shift to a transformative approach. And unless mediators clearly understand this value and why it matters so much, they will find it difficult to maintain this approach when faced with the pulls and pressures of practice.

This was precisely the challenge posed by the questioner in the discussion of the bridesmaid case. In effect, he was asking someone to identify the value that would be served by empowerment and to explain why it was more important than the value of satisfaction (or avoidance of suffering) that he felt would be served by directive intervention in that case. What could be more important than avoiding suffering and securing satisfaction for people with problems? And if a more important value cannot be identified, then why should he and other mediators stick to empowerment and recognition rather than “stepping in” where necessary to solve those problems? Solid answers to these questions are necessary, both to persuade mediators to consider adopting the transformative approach and to help them maintain it and avoid its most serious pitfall.

The aim of the following chapter is to explain the view that, in mediation, transformation is the most important goal. We will show that the value of transformation is connected to a coherent world-view, which makes profound sense of our human world and which

is gaining currency across the whole range of human knowledge and inquiry. For some, this explanation will confirm ideas and intuitions they already hold. For others, the ideas and concepts will be unfamiliar, even surprising. But the explanation is important for all, because it is the foundation on which the transformative approach ultimately rests. If this explanation makes sense, then so does transformative mediation. The question then is how to accomplish a shift to that approach within the present institutional context of the mediation movement.