

Chapter 1 : Talking With The Enemy | The Story

Talking with the Enemy By Anne Fowler, Nicki Nichols Gamble, Frances X. Hogan, Melissa Kogut, Madeline McCommish, Barbara Thorp Published in *The Boston Globe*, Sunday, 28 January, Focus section.

January 17, , The premier example is Taliban reconciliation. President Hamid Karzai first called for the Taliban to reconcile with the Afghan government after his election in 2001. The Bush administration developed a reconciliation policy around the same time frame, establishing as redlines that the Taliban must renounce violence, sever ties to al-Qaida, and accept the Afghan constitution – the same redlines the Obama administration is adhering to, according to all the press reporting on it. As Mitchell Reiss rightly points out, we were even talking with the Taliban during the Clinton administration. Nonetheless, the idea pops up every 18 months or so as the new silver bullet that promises to end our involvement in the region on the cheap. And when it does, it reopens a tired debate between, on the one hand, those who reject all negotiations as a morally-troubling compromise with evil, and, on the other, those eager to accept any face-saving deal that allows a decent interval between our withdrawal and the outbreak of civil war. Allow me to imitate President Obama here and reject the false choice between two straw men. Both sides are wrong. Negotiations are a useful tool and probably the best means to end the war. I would love to see a president or a general pound his fist on the table and bellow "Taliban delenda est! On the other hand, talks are not an abandonment of our war aims or our Afghan allies. Talking with the Taliban does not lessen our commitment to defeating the Taliban as a military force. Talks are a weapon in the arsenal of counterinsurgency. These can all have useful battlefield effects. What matters is not whether or not we talk with the Taliban, but what kind of agreement emerges at the end of talks. This seems to be where the Obama administration is on shaky ground. Obama and his team seem eager, too eager, to get any agreement from the Taliban on a set timetable. But it should be the content of an agreement, and its enforcement mechanisms, not its timing, that matters the most. Done right, an agreement could be the best and most cost effective opportunity to secure our interests in South Asia, including denying safe haven to al-Qaida, reversing the momentum of the Pakistani Taliban insurgency, and denying Iran a proxy in Kabul. Done wrong, a settlement could be the excuse the U. All this begs the question: The answer is because until 2001, we were losing the war. The Taliban had no incentive to sit down at the negotiating table because they believed, with good reason, that they stood to gain more by fighting than by talking. The fact that they are now openly talking about negotiations with the United States and the Afghan government, even seeking to open a political office in Qatar, is an indicator that the increased military pressure of the last two years is working. As DoD announced in October, violence actually decreased in for the first time in at least five years. At least some of the Taliban leadership seem to believe they have more to gain from talking than fighting. Our military progress has started to change their cost-benefit calculation. This a heartening sign that, at long last, our tactical military successes are contributing to strategic progress. That explains why negotiations are not a silver bullet. They only work when the enemy feels talks are the only alternative to defeat. Talks must be matched with ruthless, withering firepower. Talks are not cheap, and they are not easy. To get the Taliban to agree to a ceasefire that protects our interests in the region, we have to keep up the military pressure for some time yet. The deadline for withdrawal directly harms this goal. People who regularly seek to kill American soldiers in combat are our "enemies. Bush and Barack Obama.

Chapter 2 : Talking with the enemy – Foreign Policy

"Talking to the Enemy is Atran's impassioned call for evidence-based policy, but it's also an ambitious survey of culture and violence. Research is the trump card here, played often and well." (David Shariatmadari, The Guardian).

A fellow hiker stopped near us and a pleasant conversation began. It was going smoothly until this person said how right Trump was to get rid of Obamacare. At that point, my friend lost it. It took everything she had not to explode at our fellow hiker. My friend is an experienced psychotherapist with excellent communication skills. How will we ever all learn to get along? So, what can we do? Jumping right into controversial topics is seldom a good way to converse with someone. When I go back to visit rural Ohio, where I grew up, I look for something in common with every Trump supporter I meet I am related to many of them. Once we have a good connection going, then we can consider wading into murkier waters. Be willing to be wrong; needing to be right is a type of power struggle. Set an intention to be open and respectful: You may call them your pain-in-the-ass neighbor, annoying uncle or arrogant co-worker. Instead, do as Michelle Obama wisely opined: My client who is in the midst of a divorce settlement. He and his very dominant husband are dividing up the furniture; my client has to negotiate with his soon-to-be ex over who gets to take what when they sell their house. My friend who has a very combative and aggressive boss enough said. My brother who is living with a family member no names, please who is very critical of his every move. I encourage you to try an experiment: We often learn the most from people who are the radically different from us. Michael Kimmel We may feel helpless when we look at how polarized our country has become, but we can do something about it: Why not start today? Contact him at or visit lifebeyondtherapy.com.

While U.S. officials would not confirm the details of any specific meetings, sources in Washington told TIME that for the first time the U.S. is in direct contact with members of the Sunni insurgency, including former members of Saddam's Baathist regime.

For six years, leaders on both sides of the abortion debate have met in secret in an attempt to better understand each other. Now they are ready to share what they have learned. In the morning of Dec. He seriously wounded three people and killed the receptionist, Shannon Lowney, as she spoke on the phone. He then ran to his car and drove two miles down Beacon Street to Preterm health Services, where he began shooting again, injuring two and killing receptionist Lee Ann Nichols. Anne Fowler is rector of St. We believe in one universal truth. We three, as Catholics, believe that each human life has its origin in the heart of God. This divine genesis of the human person calls us to protect and respect every human life from the moment of conception to natural death. The truth regarding the intrinsic dignity of the human person can also be understood through reason and scientific principles of human reproduction and genetics. Indeed, faith and reason resonate, both affirming the inviolable truth that every human life is inherently sacred. Abortion kills the most vulnerable member of the human family: The right to be born is the most basic of human rights. If it is not protected then all other rights are threatened. We understand, all too well, the often desperate and overwhelming circumstances that some pregnant women face. We remain committed to creating an environment in which no pregnant woman feels that she must choose between her own well-being and the life of her child. It is an utter failure of love and community for a pregnant woman to feel that abortion is her only choice. We recognize no single, universal truth that determines our moral decisions. On the contrary, we must consider a broad range of values whenever we seek to make wise, ethical, and compassionate choices. We live out our destinies in a world of vast and profound complexity, where claims upon our compassion and our judgment compete and often conflict. A woman respects the preciousness of human life by acknowledging and honoring the intricate tapestry of her relationships and commitments; indeed, we believe that the complexity of human life can be a source of moral wisdom and courage. Prochoice advocates were grief-stricken, angry, and terrified. Prolife proponents were appalled as well as concerned that their cause would be connected with this horrifying act. Weld and Cardinal Bernard Law, among others, called for talks between prochoice and prolife leaders. We are six leaders, three prochoice and three prolife, who answered this call. Wade decision, we publicly disclose our meetings for the first time. How did the six of us, activists from two embattled camps, ever find our way to the same table? In the months following the shootings, the Public Conversations Project , a Boston-based national group that designs and conducts dialogues about divisive public issues, consulted many community leaders about the value of top-level talks about abortion. Encouraged by these conversations, the project in July invited the six of us to meet together four times. The meetings would be confidential and we would attend as individuals, not as representatives of our organizations. Our talks would not aim for common ground or compromise. Instead, the goals of our conversations would be to communicate openly with our opponents, away from the polarizing spotlight of media coverage; to build relationships of mutual respect and understanding; to help deescalate the rhetoric of the abortion controversy; and, of course, to reduce the risk of future shootings. Still shaken by the murderous attacks in Brookline, we each agreed to participate. As we approached the first meeting, we all were apprehensive. Anne Fowler, rector of St. What if the wrong person found out about the dialogue? That first discussion was grueling. We could not agree on what to call each other. This stand frustrates Thorp and her colleagues. The chasm between us seemed huge. To help us listen and speak across this divide, ground rules were critical. We would seek to use terms acceptable or at least tolerable to all participants. We would not interrupt, grandstand, or make personal attacks. We would speak for ourselves, not as representatives of organizations. Most important, the meetings would be completely confidential unless all of us could agree upon a way to go public. We also made a commitment that some of us still find agonizingly difficult: This agreement was designed to prevent rancorous debates. And indeed, we believe this ground rule has been essential to the long life of our dialogue. Knowing that our ideas would be challenged, but not attacked, we

have been able to listen openly and speak candidly. But it has not been easy. Prochoice members are offended by labels such as anti-child, anti-men, anti-family, elitist, frivolous, self-centered, and immoral. Despite the strains of these early meetings, we grew closer to each other. At one session, each of us told the group why she had devoted so much of her time, energy, and talents to the abortion issue. These accounts - all deeply personal - enlightened and moved us. After the fourth meeting, we agreed to extend our sessions through the one-year anniversary of the shootings - an occasion, we feared, when tensions over abortion might ignite in Boston. On the evening of Dec. All our prochoice participants attended the service. Fowler and Gamble officiated. In the solemn crowd were Podziba, one of our facilitators, and two of our prolife members, Hogan and Thorp, accompanied by David Thorp, her husband. Much has been transformed, and much will be. As our mutual understanding increased, our respect and affection for one another grew. This increased understanding affected how we spoke as leaders of our respective movements. The news media, unaware that we were meeting, began noting differences in our public statements. The answer seems to be a qualified yes, at least among some activists. We reach people we may never otherwise have reached with the message. One host of a radio talk show actually encouraged me to attack my opponent personally. At one point, prolife advocates acted to keep proponents of violence away from Massachusetts. In February, the Rev. They suggested that she was betraying the cause. But he did not come. The prolife leaders alerted Gamble when there was a possibility of imminent physical danger. When addressing divisive topics, we expected to disagree. But at times, conflicts caught us by surprise - flaring when one side unwittingly used certain words in a way that struck the other as presumptuous or offensive. In writing this article, we came to an impasse when one side mentioned the Declaration of Independence. The prolife participants wished to cite the Declaration as a presentation of their core belief that the right to life is inalienable and self-evident. The prochoice members passionately objected to what they saw as an appropriation of a document that they also cherish. In these and all of our discussions of differences, we strained to reach those on the other side who could not accept - or at times comprehend - our beliefs. We challenged each other to dig deeply, defining exactly what we believe, why we believe it, and what we still do not understand. These conversations revealed a deep divide. We saw that our differences on abortion reflect two world views that are irreconcilable. If this is true, then why do we continue to meet? First, because when we face our opponent, we see her dignity and goodness. Embracing this apparent contradiction stretches us spiritually. This has been a rare opportunity to engage in sustained, candid conversations about serious moral disagreements. It has made our thinking sharper and our language more precise. We hope, too, that we have become wiser and more effective leaders. We are more knowledgeable about our political opponents. We have learned to avoid being overreactive and disparaging to the other side and to focus instead on affirming our respective causes. Since that first fear-filled meeting, we have experienced a paradox. While learning to treat each other with dignity and respect, we all have become firmer in our views about abortion. We hope this account of our experience will encourage people everywhere to consider engaging in dialogues about abortion and other protracted disputes. In this world of polarizing conflicts, we have glimpsed a new possibility: PCP offers dialogue facilitation, training, consultation, and related services, working to transform antagonism into respect and isolation into community. To learn more, visit www.pcp.org.

Chapter 4 : Rabbi Froman and "talking with the enemy" | Harvey Stein | The Blogs

Talking with the enemy One of the frustrating things about watching news coverage of Afghanistan is the regularity with which old ideas or initiatives are breathlessly reported as new.

In return, the United States and its allies would lift sanctions on Iran that have devastated their economy. With the deadline fast approaching, and details of the agreement still under construction, many are starting to question the necessity of negotiations. In the grand tradition of American politics, ignoring the problem is often better than finding a solution. The discord seen in Congress over the past few weeks has all too well highlighted this reality, leaving the U. The instinctual response to this question is simple: Enemies are against us, so negotiating with them would undermine our efforts to combat them. Indeed, this philosophy has been quite popular; for years, disputes have remained stagnate because of a refusal to negotiate. Take, for instance, the relationship between Cuba and the U. Although our enemies have changed since the Cold War, this blanket philosophy towards our enemies has largely remained the same. We should be careful, however, in adopting this primitive mindset in the 21st Century, especially towards current cases such as Iran. Rand Paul offered a glimpse of rationality on the topic. Are you ready to bomb them? Are you ready to send in , troops? Towards other non-democratic regimes, Sen. And he may be right. Over time, isolationist policies have the tendency of not only being ineffective, but of producing unintended effects within that country. Furthermore, history tells us that ideas especially those of freedom and democracy spread quickly through trade; without it " due to sanctions and embargos " isolated countries tend to revert to poorer, medieval standards of human rights. We have seen both of these cases happening in Iran over the last decade. As the unemployment rate soared over the past decade in that country, more Iranians point fingers towards the U. In addition, there has been a marked increase in human rights violations in Iran over the past decade. Regardless of whether or not negotiations with Iran yield any results, it is the obligation of the United States to maintain communication with Iran " even if it ignites members of Congress from time to time. That is, for comparison, to say that if I talk with a bully, I become a bully myself. Yet House Republicans, desperately trying to pander support from their electorate, neglect the fact that a Republican President, Mr. Ronald Reagan, negotiated with the Communist Soviet Union to reduce their nuclear stockpile. Ironically, just twenty-five years later, when these talks proceed with a theocratic regime such as Iran, their willingness to negotiate suddenly deteriorates. You might argue that U. The General Secretary of the Soviet Union during these talks was Mikhail Gorbachev, who was celebrated for going against Communist Party doctrine and trying to introduce economic and social reforms. Gorbachev faced tremendous difficulty usurping Communist elite and party headliners. Hassan Rouhani, the current President of Iran: Rouhani faced strong opposition from fiery religious clerics, who adamantly opposed the quick liberalization of Iran. Despite both of these presidents serving under non-Western liberal democracies, both of them expressed a strong desire for a peaceful nuclear program. While the talks between Gorbachev and Reagan cumulated into the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, which removed over nuclear missiles, the talks between Obama and Rouhani have yet to manifest anything. The Trust Barrier We may have overstepped ourselves here. How do we know that Mr. Maybe the devil lies in the details, and that rhetoric keeps policy makers and analysts scrambling on their feet. We know that Iran has dramatically increased the number of centrifuges in the past decade. Maybe, but also maybe not. For one, these centrifuges can also be used to produce fuel for nuclear reactors. Although Iran has one of the largest oil and gas reserves in the Middle East, they lack onshore refining capabilities, making them dependent on foreign gasoline. Nuclear power could be a step towards energy independence, as well as lowering their unemployment rate that sits at Why, then, is Iran so secretive about their nuclear program? One explanation, according to the Center for Strategic and International Studies, is that Iran does not want foreign countries knowing the location and capabilities of their nuclear facilities. Iran does not want to risk revealing the centre point of their economy to the West or Israel, knowing that such facilities would be key targets during a military invasion. Certainly this cannot prove everything. Iran has taken clear measures to acquire the bomb; however, as in the Cold War, the threat of having the bomb may be more valuable than the bomb itself.

Decreasing the breakout time “ which is the time it would take for Iran to develop the nuclear bomb “ would grant Iran leverage over Israel and the United States in future negotiations, as it has in current ones. The United States has a long and burdensome history of making conflicts in the Middle East. As the long-term harms of not negotiating are high, and Iran having shown a desire for negotiations, negotiations are the correct path towards peace. By being persistent and realistic, diplomatic talks have been successful in the past. Let us, for the last time, set the precedent that the pen is truly mightier than the bomb. The Guardian Share this post If you enjoyed this post, be sure to subscribe to our RSS Feed or just share the love and let your friends know about us.

Chapter 5 : Talking with the Enemy | HuffPost

The Project adds to these on-going conversation through 'Talking with the Enemy,' a documentary film that seeks to uncover some of the strategic considerations that went into recent negotiations, and the creation of a learning community - both online and via academic classes at Tufts University.

She asked him if he knew what he was doing to his family. And she asked whether she could have done anything differently. He told her no. And asked to leave a conference: How dare I re-victimize them? Today, Banks carries out this unprecedented practice, and her nonprofit, Domestic Violence Safe Dialogue , has conducted more than conversations between abusers and survivors. In each session, a woman who was abused talks for about two hours with a man who was violent toward another woman. Survivors are never put in the same room with their former abusers. The men and women are typically in counseling, and their therapists suggest they take part only if it might help them deal with their respective pasts. Four counselors are there to observe and guide the conversations. This month, Banks is trying to take the program national. Banks plans to mail hundreds of copies of the DVD to colleges and universities in Oregon and Washington. She believes the DVD provides a model that can help abused women get answers. Her nonprofit gets funding from her family as well as wine tastings and raffles. There are no government grants: The dialogue reflects the kind of restorative-justice programs made most famous in post-apartheid South Africa and post-genocide Liberia. Many experts questioned whether the approach could be applied successfully to the ongoing and intimate nature of an abusive relationship. Many offenders realize during a conversation just how much their abuse affected their own partners. Crying is not unusual on both sides. The man admits no approach by his wife could have defused him. I became a new person after I did that.

Chapter 6 : Pulling Weeds out of Potholes: Talking with the "enemy"

The Dalai Lama Talks with Chinese Leaders in New York. While governments negotiate about negotiations, debate who they can talk to, and enforce hard parameters for diplomatic discussions, the.

The Chinese Government accuses him of being a demon and a separatist. They will not talk with him. But this does not stop the ever laughing monk from speaking with Chinese people, every chance he has. It is both a religious and spiritual practice for him, and something we can all learn from. The audience stood as he entered. Then he sat and discussed issues of history, culture, and current politics as they relate to the situation of his homeland. He emphasized the need for Tibetans to have autonomy, not national freedom; he also said that the Chinese government needed to be helped out of its political problems by the Tibetan and Chinese people themselves. When the meeting was over, groups clustered around him for photographs. This leads him to be attacked by the Chinese government as a Western Imperialist. He laughs often at the accusation, as has his own problems with capitalist democracies. His efforts have had considerable effect. Except, that is, for the billion plus people living in China, the country that took over Tibet in 1951. Until recently this decision, to focus on the western audience, seemed to be a necessary choice. Tibetans and their friends in the west have freedom of speech and a democratic process, not to mention capitalist dollars, to help their important non-violent cause. Meanwhile how to communicate with the Chinese people under a dictatorship? Besides, the Tibetans have never had a problem with the Chinese, but with their government. Or so the line went. Yet with the latest Tibetan uprising that took place a little over a year ago, besides the horror of monks and civilians being killed, the most shocking aspect was the popular Chinese response, which was overwhelmingly anti-Tibetan. Even when the Dalai Lama came here, he was confronted with angry Chinese students. He said as much in this meeting. But some were really angry. So now I think it is best for me to meet them, whenever I can. Now things seem to cool down. While engaging Hollywood will not affect the Chinese government, perhaps their own citizenry will. Things have changed in China in the last decade. There are now human rights lawyers in China who openly represent Tibetan clients who are under arrest from the uprising. And there are many cases of the government responding to the growing force of their new civil society. In this meeting, without being explicitly Buddhist, the Dalai Lama continued to use Buddhist ideas. That anger could be dispelled through honest discussion. That honest discussion and questioning was critical to problem solving. That having an equanimous mind was important for political leaders as much as for religious leaders. That religious freedom was essential for all of China, and for Tibet. In fact, though Tibetans have played down their relationship with China as a way to emphasize their unique culture, there were deep relationships between the two nations, through Buddhism. As Gray Tuttle, a scholar of Tibetan History at Columbia University has said, "For over years these Buddhist connections have been the prime means of intercultural contact, and even in the past years when national politics have come to the fore in Asia, Buddhism has consistently been the one area where the two cultures had the most promising developments. For peace to be restored in the troubled Chinese-Tibetan relations, respect for Buddhism is probably the key element. One student leader in attendance said that he had originally organized an anti-separatist meeting when the Dalai Lama visited Michigan last year, but now "I am somehow in the middle. I am not against the Dalai Lama. This is a good meeting to see.

Chapter 7 : Talking with the enemy - The Boston Globe

We may feel helpless when we look at how polarized our country has become, but we can do something about it: Start talking with the "enemy" and begin to close the gap.

He is here to talk to two members of the U. One of them, an officer, takes notes during the meeting. The other, dressed in civilian clothes, listens as the Iraqi outlines a list of demands the U. The parties trade boilerplate complaints: Members of the insurgency are open to negotiating an end to their struggle with the U. An account of the secret meeting between the senior insurgent negotiator and the U. He says two such meetings have taken place. Pentagon officials say the secret contacts with insurgent leaders are being conducted mainly by U. A Western observer close to the discussions says that "there is no authorized dialogue with the insurgents" but that the U. But in recent months, the persistence of the fighting and signs of division in the ranks of the insurgency have prompted some U. A senior official in the U. Behind the scenes, the U. Says a senior U. Some of the earliest advances were made last year through Jordanian intelligence officers, but insurgents balked at the idea of meeting in Jordan. Meanwhile, some Americans showed openness to a dialogue. In meetings with Sunni tribal leaders, Lieut. Colonel Rick Welch, the senior special-operations civil-military affairs adviser to the commanding general of the 1st Cavalry Division in Baghdad, put word out that the military was willing to talk to hard-liners about their grievances and that, as Welch says, "the door is not closed, except for some very top regime guys. What do the insurgents want? The insurgents also seek a guaranteed timetable for U. But there are some hints of compromise: Insurgent representative Abu Mohammed says the nationalists would even tolerate U. But al-Zarqawi and his allies have silenced nationalists by threatening to kill them if they negotiate. Leaders of the victorious political parties say they have no interest in continuing dialogue with the insurgents.

Chapter 8 : Talking with the Enemy - TIME

As part of our series on negotiating with the Taliban, Dick speaks to U.S. Marine Gunnery Sgt. Terence D'Alesandro about his combat in Afghanistan.

Time February 20, Inside the secret dialogue between the U. The secret meeting is taking place in the bowels of a facility in Baghdad, a cavernous, heavily guarded building in the U. He is here to talk to two members of the U. One of them, an officer, takes notes during the meeting. The other, dressed in civilian clothes, listens as the Iraqi outlines a list of demands the U. The parties trade boilerplate complaints: Members of the insurgency are open to negotiating an end to their struggle with the U. An account of the secret meeting between the senior insurgent negotiator and the U. He says two such meetings have taken place. Pentagon officials say the secret contacts with insurgent leaders are being conducted mainly by U. A Western observer close to the discussions says that "there is no authorized dialogue with the insurgents" but that the U. But in recent months, the persistence of the fighting and signs of division in the ranks of the insurgency have prompted some U. But in interviews with TIME, senior Iraqi insurgent commanders said several "nationalist" rebel groups--composed predominantly of ex--military officers and what the Pentagon dubs "former regime elements"--have moved toward a strategy of "fight and negotiate. A senior official in the U. Behind the scenes, the U. Says a senior U. Some of the earliest advances were made last year through Jordanian intelligence officers, but insurgents balked at the idea of meeting in Jordan. Meanwhile, some Americans showed openness to a dialogue. In meetings with Sunni tribal leaders, Lieut. Colonel Rick Welch, the senior special-operations civil-military affairs adviser to the commanding general of the 1st Cavalry Division in Baghdad, put word out that the military was willing to talk to hard-liners about their grievances and that, as Welch says, "the door is not closed, except for some very top regime guys. What do the insurgents want? The insurgents also seek a guaranteed timetable for U. But there are some hints of compromise: Insurgent representative Abu Mohammed says the nationalists would even tolerate U. But al-Zarqawi and his allies have silenced nationalists by threatening to kill them if they negotiate. Leaders of the victorious political parties say they have no interest in continuing dialogue with the insurgents.

Chapter 9 : Enemies Quotes (quotes)

Gen. George Casey's remark last week that the United States might begin to draw down troops in Iraq reminds me of the words of another George almost 40 years ago. In a Republican senator from.