

Part I

Negotiation: Modern Options to Prevent War Pass Hard Tests

Harvard-based negotiators and authors Roger Fisher and Daniel Shapiro, in their bestseller **Beyond Reason: Using Emotions as You Negotiate** (2005), lead the reader through some of their internationally tested, highly successful ways to settle differences among individuals and among nations. One chapter by the then President of Ecuador tells the story of solving a centuries old dispute between his country and Peru.

Fisher and Shapiro stress attention to the five core concerns of every participant in negotiations, from spouses to foreign delegates.

These core concerns are a workable guide for applying practical love and respect. A genuine simplicity underlies their usefulness.

All parties may be introduced to the five concerns and other considerations by workshop preceding negotiations. The framework also applies when only one or more persons practice the concerns and perhaps informally describe them. Somewhat overlapping and easily remembered in moments of high stress, these core concerns are relevant in settings from barrooms to conference rooms:

- **Appreciation:** find merit in what others think, feel, or do and show it.
- **Affiliation:** turn adversaries into colleagues; find common links with others, then work together toward best solutions but check decisions with head and gut to protect oneself from being manipulated.
- **Autonomy:** expand your freedom to make decisions make recommendations, invent options, conduct joint brainstorming, etc.; respect, don't impinge upon, others autonomy consider consulting before deciding small things that they may see differently. What is their BATNA? Their Best Alternative to a Negotiated Agreement that influences when they walk away?
- **Status:** (1) social status treat every negotiator with respect; (2) particular status acknowledge each person's expertise, experience or education, including your own; every person has areas of particular status (3) beware of status spillover be careful of opinions where expertise in that particular area is not present
- **Role:** shape or insure a fulfilling role for yourself and every participant one that has a clear purpose, real content, and is personally meaningful; create fulfilling activities within your necessary conventional roles.

The core concerns framework and its related forms of advance preparation (see below) are taught by Fisher in highly charged situations. He was advisor to both South African Nelson Mandela and the White Congress in their successful

negotiations, and as advisor to Jimmy Carter at Camp David.

In 1998 Fisher's guidance enabled the President of Ecuador to solve one of the longest and largest border disputes in the world. The contested area between Ecuador and Peru, bigger than France, had remained at issue for over 50 years with roots back to 1532. Peru's troops were poised for imminent invasion when Ecuador's newly elected President Jamil Mahuad called on Fisher. The successful resolution was a huge international conservation park, except for one small area where soldiers from both countries were buried. There, Peru gained sovereignty while Ecuador gained property ownership in perpetuity, much as Toyota might own property in the US.

Peru can say, "Tiwinza is part of our sovereign territory."
Ecuador can say, "We own Tiwinza forever."

See <http://www.beyond-reason.net/tools/index.html> for the Emotions Preparation Tool or shorter Emotions Prep Sheet.

The process of thinking about the emotional dimension from your perspective and from that of the other parties can foster better negotiating. You'll be more prepared to deal with negative emotions and to stimulate positive ones.

For ways to learn more on your own about the ideas in Beyond Reason see <http://www.beyond-reason.net/learn/index.html>

For ways to teach others see

<http://www.beyond-reason.net/teaching/index.html>

This teaching page links to a Shapiro PDF article with more on the core concerns; click in text Teaching Students to Use Emotions as They Negotiate.

Fisher is Director of the Harvard Negotiation Project, online at <http://www.pon.harvard.edu/hnp/> and part of the Program on Negotiation at the Harvard Law School, <http://www.pon.harvard.edu/research/projects/hnp.php3>. Shapiro is Director of the Harvard International Negotiation Initiative, online at <http://www.beyond-reason.net/ini/>, also part of PON.

From the Harvard Negotiation Project site:

HNP frequently tests its theories in the crucible of practice, often in the heat of some of the world's most intransigent conflicts. From South Africa to Latin America, the Mideast to the Balkans, HNP works with individuals and governments on initiatives ranging from injecting a single idea at a crucial time to initiating and framing an entire process for dealing with a conflict.

Recently, for example, Fisher and colleagues from the nonprofit Conflict Management Group tested an HNP technique called "facilitated joint brainstorming" with a high-level but unofficial group from Ecuador and Peru to generate new options that both sides could jointly present to their superiors.

The conference led to a peace initiative that ultimately settled the highly contentious border dispute (described above) that had resulted in numerous armed conflicts.

Currently Fisher and others are working on ideas that might facilitate progress in managing the complexity of stalled Middle East peace negotiations.

This work *Negotiation: Modern Options to Prevent War Pass Hard Tests* by E. Sabath is under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported License. See details at <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>

Part II

Extension 4 to Wings_V2_Negotiation and Christian
Nonviolence.doc
3100 words

"The U.S. spends 95% of its foreign policy budget on the military and only 5% on capacities and programs designed to address the root causes of deadly conflict.

As a result, when U.S. policymakers look for tools to respond to wars and escalating conflicts, they find a toolbox with only one implement--military force." (FCNL, Building a Living Peace, 2006, section You Get What You Pay For, pg. 1 of 2 pg.)

However, societies have spontaneously discovered a number of tools for the box that have been awarely studied and improved. We hear little about them in spite of their impressive record of successes around the world. The following example helps us visualize the reality of nonviolent struggle.

Nonviolent Struggle in the Philippines:

As early as 1987, Cardinal Ratzinger wrote in the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith Instruction *Libertatis Conscientia*: "that which today is termed "passive resistance" shows a way more conformable to moral principles and having no less prospects for success."

In 1986, nonviolent struggle in the Philippines defeated President Ferdinand Marcos' attempt to retain power after losing an election. One protest was called by Jaime Cardinal Sin; it gathered over 1 million people. Marcos sent tanks, which were halted by the crowd, including nuns who knelt in front of them in prayer and priests who climbed atop military vehicles to lead the people—and the soldiers—in praying the rosary. An assault dispersed part of the crowd with riot police, and set up mortars, howitzers, machine guns, rocket launchers, and 1,000 rifles, but when ordered to fire, the Marine commander Braulio Balbas stalled for hours and then ordered his troops back to base. Later that day the Marines issued a statement that they would "no longer participate in a subsequent military operation that will unnecessarily result in the injury or death of innocent unarmed civilians." By midday 90% of the Armed forces of the Philippines had defected, including a Navy frigate. An assault on the government television station resulted in 15 minutes fighting and the injury of one loyalist officer, and then it surrendered. Late in the afternoon when Marcos ordered a "final suicide assault," the US decided it was time for Marcos to go and convinced him to call off the attack and leave the country.

A BRAVE EXAMPLE FOR THE WORLD by Gene Sharp, 1986

The dramatic collapse of Ferdinand E. Marcos' regime in the face of an enormous nonviolent insurrection has important lessons. The events in the Philippines showed that

dictators need not be accepted passively, and that effective alternatives to violent revolt exist. The principle is to withdraw the sources of power....

The Philippines was not the first successful nonviolent overthrow of a repressive regime. The rule of Czar Nicholas II of Russia collapsed after about a week of the mainly nonviolent February-March revolution of 1917. The regimes of General Hernandez Martinez in El Salvador and General Jorge Ubico of Guatemala were dissolved by nonviolent insurrections of about two weeks each in 1944.

Nonviolent action includes at least 198 distinct methods ranging from mild symbolic protests to potentially paralyzing forms of social, economic, and political non-cooperation, and to the non-disruptive forms of intervention. Nonviolent resisters have been defeated, achieved mixed results, and been victorious in the face of enormous odds, as in the Philippines.

We often forget that non-violent struggle were sometimes used successfully even against the Nazis. In Norway, the teachers' resistance kept the schools out of fascist control and prevented the establishment of a totalitarian state. Non-cooperation and underground escape networks saved many Jews' lives. A more-than-week-long public demonstration by 6,000 women, most of them non-Jewish, in Berlin in 1943 resulted in the release of at least 1,500 Jews.

Each successive case of non-violent anti-communist struggle in Eastern Europe since 1953 has been more difficult for the Soviets to crush. Resistance in East Germany in June 1953 was crushed in two days. The improvised Czechoslovakian resistance in 1968-69 ultimately failed, but it held off Soviet control for eight months, which would have been impossible by military means. In Poland, resistance continues after five years with major achievements, including a large illegal information system that publishes papers, magazines, and books. (Note: Sharp writes in 1986. In 1996 John Paul II refers to "the success of those non-violent revolutions (in Central and Eastern Europe during the non-violent revolutions of 1989".)

A ruler's power depends on the degree of cooperation, submission, obedience, and assistance received from the subjects, both the population and the paid helpers....If the defiance continues despite repression, it will disintegrate even a dictatorship....

Note: Gene Sharp in 1986 was Director for Program for Nonviolent Sanctions, Center for International Affairs, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Now he is founder and Senior Scholar at the Albert Einstein Institution, www.aeinstein.org, a unique site where people from all over the world come for general educational information to help their own struggles.

The Vatican and Gene Sharp:

The Vatican is aware of various methods of nonviolent action and of Gene Sharp:

In January 1994 Gene Sharp spent five days in Italy at the invitation of the Justice and Peace Commission of the Unions of Superiors General of the Catholic Church. Dr. Sharp also held

discussions with the president of the Pontifical Council on Justice and Peace and with the secretary of the International Franciscan Conference. He was also interviewed for Vatican Radio. In the United States, (he) was asked to write an advisory paper for consideration by the Committee of the U.S. Catholic Bishops, which was preparing a new pastoral letter on war and peace, *The Harvest of Justice is Sown In Peace*. Nations should promote research, education, and training in nonviolent means of resisting evil, the pastoral says. Nonviolent strategies need greater attention in international affairs.

Gene Sharp catalogues and studies all forms of nonviolent action, defining nonviolent action (and nonviolent struggle) as a general technique of conducting protest, resistance, and intervention without physical violence. He writes: In some belief systems, not only is physical violence barred, but also hostile thoughts and words. Certain belief systems additionally enjoin positive attitudes and behavior toward opponents, or even a rejection of the concept of opponents. (*Waging Nonviolent Struggle: 20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential*, 2005, p. 547.

Christian nonviolence:

Any of the 198 or more methods of nonviolent action listed by Sharp that are consistent with love toward the other is presumed at this point to be acceptable as Christian nonviolence. Christian nonviolence must involve love, which enjoins positive attitudes.

Positive attitudes toward the opponent seem required of Catholic soldiers also.

John Paul II told chaplains: In the fertile soil of freedom of conscience you must sow abundantly, so that also in the military sphere individuals will act in a way which reflects deep reverence for God and, consequently, unfailing respect for the dignity and rights of other persons (6 February 1992).

More recently he said: Military chaplains, inspired by Christ's love, are called by their special vocation to witness that even in the midst of the harshest combats, it is always possible, and only right, to respect the dignity of the military adversary, the dignity of civilian victims, the indelible dignity of every human being involved in armed conflict. In this way, moreover, the reconciliation is fostered that will be necessary for re-establishing peace when the war is over (24 March 2003) <http://www.catholicmil.org/html/popetomilitary.php>

Negotiation and Negotiators:

<http://www.pon.harvard.edu/hnp/theory/theorymain/theory.shtml>

<http://www.pon.harvard.edu/hnp/writing/writingmain/writing.shtml>

Roger Fisher, Daniel Shapiro, William Ury, and Evelin Lindner are examples of the resources available to the nation for the resolution of difficult conflicts from family to international.

Roger Fisher and Daniel Shapiro of the Harvard Negotiation Project help persons involved in negotiation to address the five core concerns of every participant.

These are richly discussed in their book *Beyond Reason: Using Emotions as You Negotiate*. Here are brief descriptions:

1. Appreciation: find merit in what others think, feel, or do--and show it.
2. Build Affiliation: turn an adversary into a colleague--find links with others, but check decisions with head and gut to protect yourself from being manipulated.
3. Respect Autonomy (freedom to make decisions): expand yours (make recommendations, invent options, conduct joint brainstorming)--and don't impinge upon theirs (Consider consulting before deciding).

4. Acknowledge Status: social status--treat every negotiator with respect; particular status--acknowledge each person's expertise, experience or education, including your own; beware of status spillover--give weight to opinions where deserved
5. Role: shape a fulfilling role for yourself and others (one that has a clear purpose, is personally meaningful, and is not trivialized nor a pretense). Include fulfilling activities in your conventional roles.

These core concerns were also part of Fisher's workshops as advisor to South African Nelson Mandela's committee and the white Cabinet to help end apartheid, to Jimmy Carter at Camp David, and in 1998 to the President of Ecuador to solve one of the longest (over 50 years with roots back to 1532) and largest (bigger than France) border disputes in the world. The result was a huge international conservation park except for one area where soldiers from both countries were buried. There Peru gained sovereignty while Ecuador gained property ownership in perpetuity. Peru can say, "Tiwinza is part of our sovereign territory." Ecuador can say, "We own Tiwinza forever."

Roger Fisher: <http://www.pon.harvard.edu/hnp/>

Fisher also advised both the Iranian and United States governments in negotiations for the release of the American hostages in 1981. He has 30 years' experience dealing with international conflict as an advisor and strategist. He has also taught and written extensively on international law, international conflict, and for more than a decade has devoted himself almost exclusively to the task of understanding and improving the process by which people, organizations, and governments deal with their differences.

Professor Fisher has taught and advised corporate executives, labor leaders, attorneys, diplomats, and military and government officials on settlement and negotiation strategy. In recent years he has conducted negotiation seminars in Bonn, Moscow, Stockholm, Paris, London, Milan, San Salvador, Bogota, Mexico City, and the Republic of South Africa.

Daniel Shapiro , Ph.D: <http://www.beyond-reason.net/ini/>
<http://www.beyond-reason.net/about/apply.html>

Daniel Shapiro, Associate Director of the Harvard Negotiation Project, is on the faculty at Harvard Law School and in the psychiatry department at Harvard Medical School/McLean Hospital. He also has been on the faculty at the Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Dr. Shapiro holds a doctorate in clinical psychology and specializes in the psychology of negotiation. He founded and directs the Harvard International Negotiation Initiative, which focuses on the emotional dimension of conflict and negotiation.

In addition to teaching at Harvard, Dr. Shapiro travels throughout the United States and the world teaching negotiation to groups such as governmental officials, corporate executives, lawyers, psychologists, and dispute resolution professionals. His extensive client list runs the gambit from Starbucks and Microsoft to the EPA and the San Antonio School System. His international experience includes training Chinese officials, Serbian Members of Parliament, Middle Eastern negotiators, Macedonian politicians, and senior U.S. officials. He also is an advisor to the International Criminal Court. During the Bosnian War, he conducted conflict management trainings in Croatia and Serbia . Through funding from the Soros Foundation, he developed a conflict management program that now reaches one million people across more than 30 countries.

William Ury: <http://www.pon.harvard.edu/research/projects/gnp.php3>
<http://www.thirdside.org/>

William Ury, Director of the Global Negotiation Project, is an anthropologist-

negotiator. He has written several books on negotiation for a popular audience including *Getting to Peace* (the paperback is titled *The Third Side*).

William Ury describes three forms or stages of society. Evelin Lindner writes:

Ury argues that human beings are inclined to avoid violence. He points out that the archaeological record of organised violence and warfare is almost completely restricted to the last ten thousand years. This period is only a tiny proportion of all human existence. It represents just one percent of the two and a half million years during which human societies have been evolving on earth.

Ury presents a brief history of conflict that passes through three phases. The first phase is a very long period of relatively peaceful co-existence during which hunter-gatherer groups wandered over the earth. Although nomadic hunter-gatherer societies were not free from conflict and violent acts against humans, there was a great emphasis upon cooperation within and between groups, for example in hunting and sharing (very large) & prey. Cooperation was essential for survival. Disagreements had to be debated until a consensus emerged.

Ury emphasizes that in order to survive, human beings have to rediscover the skill of resolving conflicts through negotiation informed by the thirdsider perspective. ..This acknowledges the interests of the conflicting sides but also the interests they share as members of the same extended community. Everybody benefits if violence is avoided as far as possible and if disputes are settled through respectful and non-violent dialogue among all the parties concerned.

In the final part of his book, Ury presents a methodology, honed through practice, for preventing, resolving or containing conflict. He distinguishes between ten roles that Homo Negotiator may adopt: the provider, the teacher, the bridge-builder, the mediator, the arbiter, the equalizer, the healer, the witness, the referee and the peacekeeper.

More about William Ury:

William Ury is co-founder of the Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School, where he directs the Global Negotiation Project. Trained as an anthropologist, with a B.A. from Yale and a Ph.D. from Harvard, he has carried out his research not only at the bargaining table and in the boardroom, but also among the Bushmen of the Kalahari and the clan warriors of New Guinea. Bill works with community, government, and business leaders around the world on transforming adversarial relationships into mutually beneficial partnerships.

Over the last 30 years, William Ury has served as a negotiation adviser and mediator in conflicts ranging from corporate mergers to wildcat strikes in a Kentucky coal mine to ethnic wars in the Middle East, the Balkans, and the former Soviet Union. With former president Jimmy Carter, he co-founded the International Negotiation Network, a non-governmental body seeking to end civil wars around the world. During the 1980s, he helped the US and Soviet governments create nuclear crisis centers designed to avert an accidental nuclear war. In that capacity, he served as a consultant to the Crisis Management Center at the White House. Most recently, Ury has served as a third party in partnership with international organizations such as The Carter Center and The Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in Geneva in helping to end a civil war in Aceh, Indonesia, helping to prevent one in Venezuela and as a consultant on creating a peace accord in Nepal.

As a means to address the conflicts that continue to plague humanity, William Ury has either founded or works closely on a variety of Global Initiatives.

Evelin Linder:

Dr. med. Evelin Gerda Lindner is a cross-cultural social psychologist and physician. She has written numerous papers, of which one is What Every Negotiator Ought to Know: Understanding Humiliation, [PDF] written from University of Oslo Institute of Psychology, 2000.

www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/evelin/Negotiator.pdf -

Lindner's Fig. 1 in the pdf above summarized her thought:

Step one: Nature is subjugated, instrumentalised, turned into a series of tools for human purposes. Pride and pristine equality. Humiliation is rare in human relationships. Rhetoric of wrongs, grievances and restitution of fairness and equality. (99% of human history, hunter-gatherer)

Step two: Human beings are subjugated, turned into tools. Honour-humiliation involves the legitimate violation of honour. Honour and imposed hierarchy. Humiliation is a normal device of hierarchy-building. Honour is attacked, defended, won and lost within a social hierarchy of dominant and subordinate groups, and this is accepted as legitimate. (began 10,000 years ago)

Step three: Moral condemnation of the subjugation of human beings, including their use as tools or their destruction. Human rights-humiliation involves the illegitimate violation of human rights and the infliction of moral and emotional injury. Dignity and human rights. Humiliation attacks a person's core as a human

being, and inflicts very deep emotional wounds. (very recent)**The world's poor are facing a worsening life- situation at the same time as they are learning that such a situation 'ought not' to prevail.**

Despite this, in some societies the rhetoric and practices of honour-humiliation remain dominant. In fact, this tradition remains strong in almost all political establishments, especially in matters where national sovereignty and external relations are at issue.

Independent states today protect their honour as jealously as members of the French aristocracy at Versailles. This is as true of the British and American states as it is their Serbian and Iraqi counterparts. Indeed, it applies to practically every sovereign state represented in the United Nations General Assembly. Some of these honourable states claim to be implementing universal human rights within the polities they control; others do not.⁴⁸

Lindner concludes: "Most importantly, no leader can afford to overlook the fact that the modern regime of human rights makes inequality more socially and politically dangerous than ever before. This is the most urgent point this paper makes."

More About Evelin G. Lindner, M.D., Ph.D. (Dr. med.), Ph.D. (Dr. psychol.):

Evelin Gerda Lindner is a cross-cultural social psychologist and physician and also -Founding Director and President of Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies

(HumanDHS, <http://www.humiliationstudies.org/>)

- recipient of the 2006 SBAP Award

- affiliated with the Columbia University Conflict Resolution Network, New York (egl2109@columbia.edu)

- affiliated with the University of Oslo, Department of Psychology (see <http://folk.uio.no/evelin/>)

- Associate Professor, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in

Trondheim, Department of Psychology (see <http://psyweb.svt.ntnu.no/ansatte/>)
- affiliated with the Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris, and
- teaching, furthermore, in South East Asia, the Middle East, Australia, and other places globally

In 1996, she designed a research project on the concept of humiliation and its role in genocide and war. German history served as starting point. It is often assumed that the humiliation of the Germans through the Versailles Treaties after World War I was partly responsible for the Holocaust and the Second World War. It seems therefore important to understand the nature of humiliation and how it is related to the occurrence of genocide and mass violence.

From 1997-2001, Lindner began carrying out such research, interviewing over 200 people who were either implicated in or knowledgeable about the wars and genocides in Rwanda, Somalia, and Nazi Germany. **Her research indicates, that, indeed, the dynamics of humiliation may be at the core not only of war and genocide, but also of current events such as the "war on terror,"** American questions such as to "why do they hate us," or whether combating poverty would reduce terror or not.

Lindner is currently concentrating on writing planned books and articles on humiliation, as

well as establishing the Human Dignity and Humiliation Studies as an international platform for further work on humiliation, with the particular aim of linking research and practice.