

## **Chapter Ten — We Need Win/Win Commitments For All Groups to Sustain Intergroup Peace In America**

We need to anchor Peace for America on the concept and the goal of win/win results for all of the groups of people who make up the rich and diverse fabric of America. That commitment and that achievement will be the key to our success.

We need to have all groups win. We need to not have any groups of people who are losing and who are not being granted full access to the American Dream because of their race, ethnicity, culture, gender, gender preference, philosophical alignments, or religious beliefs.

We need to be an America where people from all of those groups can work hard, make contributions, and be fully able to benefit from the opportunities that America creates.

We need everyone to win and we need everyone to want everyone else to win as well.

Win/win should be the clearly stated goal for all groups — with each group succeeding and with each group also celebrating, endorsing, supporting, and appreciating every other group's success.

We need people from all groups to understand the value and the benefits to us all that result from a commitment to win/win results for everyone — and we need to put the processes in place to help win/win be the actual path we go down for our future as a nation.

That win/win approach can work for America as a country. It also can work in communities and in various other organizational settings.

Schools, businesses, and community organizations can all use win/win approaches as internal commitments and as guidances for thinking and behaviors. People in each of our various settings who believe in win/win as a value and a benefit can focus on the specific details and the specific realities that can create win/win outcomes for each setting.

Some people believe that someone has to lose if someone wins. That belief is commonly held — and it is wrong.

There does not need to be a loser in intergroup situations. All parties can win. It is logistically possible for all groups to win and it is actually strategically desirable and functionally preferable for all groups to win.

### **The Supply Of Wins Is Not Finite**

We need people in this country to realize at a very direct level that we don't need anyone to lose so that someone else can win.

There isn't a finite supply of wins in the world. Wins for all groups are not only possible — wins for all groups will make us all collectively stronger.

We will all be better off economically when everyone in the economy is doing well. When more people in America achieve the American Dream, their collective success will make America stronger.

*The Art of Intergroup Peace* is aimed at everyone winning and at everyone doing well. That goal and that outcome were very clearly and very obviously not true and not expected for Sun Tzu when he wrote *The Art of War*.

War, Sun Tzu preached, was clearly about someone winning and someone else losing. War is aimed at achieving wins for one side and at creating losses and defeats for everyone else. Sun Tzu built strategies that were designed to create losses for the other side in each war.

That win/lose approach made strategic and functional sense for Sun Tzu. Having the other party lose is the usual goal and the most commonly

targeted outcome for war. War and losing are generally tied together at a very basic level.

Peace is different. Very different. Peace is tied together, perpetuated, achieved, and maintained by having everyone win.

Peace, *The Art of Intergroup Peace* preaches — when it is done well and when it is done right — is about everyone winning.

### **Win/Lose — Win/Win — And Lose/Lose Are The Options**

There are three sets of basic outcomes that can result from intergroup interactions. One set of outcomes — the win/lose approach — has winners and losers in each setting.

Another set of possible outcomes — the win/win approach — has only winners.

And the third set of outcomes — the lose/lose approach — has everyone in a setting or a situation losing.

Lose/lose outcomes need to be on the list of options to be understood in thinking about intergroup Peace because lose/lose outcomes actually do happen. Sometimes, when groups interact, everyone loses.

Losses for all parties in a lose/lose setting can be accidental and unintended, and they can be completely intentional and the goal — of at least one relevant party.

Lose/lose strategies — the most negative possible set of outcomes that can result from groups interacting with one another — is actually not advocated or supported by either *The Art of War* or by *The Art of Intergroup Peace* — but they do happen and they need to be understood as part of the intergroup process.

Lose/lose outcomes do happen. In many cases, the lose/lose outcomes that happen in various settings are entirely unintentional. Those unintended outcomes that end up with double losses — with both parties losing — sometimes result when both sides in a setting were attempting to win and both were attempting to achieve overall wins in the context of a win/lose situation and both groups simply, purely, and unintentionally failed.

Failure happens.

Having all parties fail in a conflicted setting is a generally unintentional, but very real risk that exists as a logistical possibility in the functional context of win/lose strategies and situations.

Sometimes both groups in a conflicted or contentious setting simply and unintentionally fail to achieve wins. Both groups in the setting and situation are damaged and sustain losses.

No one on either side planned for both groups to lose in those specific lose/lose situations. In those situations, double losses are completely unintentional and both parties tend to be disappointed when both parties lose.

The leaders in both groups in those situations tend to try to figure out ways of avoiding having their side lose in the future.

In a number of other settings where lose/lose outcomes occur, those double negative results are the fully intended result and the strategic goal for at least one of the parties in that setting.

Purely intentional and very deliberate lose/lose strategies definitely do exist. Those completely intentional and entirely deliberate lose/lose strategies are generally triggered by an extremely negative intergroup context — often inspired by intense Intergroup hatred on the part of someone in that specific intergroup setting.

Intentional and deliberate lose/lose strategies and outcomes usually result from one group in a situation hating the other group so much that the

strategic and tactical approach for the group who hates very deeply includes having their own group actually suffering — and having their own group take a loss of some kind themselves in various ways — so that the other group in that setting and situation suffers and loses even more.

### **People Who Hate Deeply Sometimes Use Lose/Lose Strategies**

#### **To Do Damage To The People They Hate**

In the most extreme lose/lose settings, group strategists are even sometimes willing to have their own group lose a lot so that the people who they hate very deeply will lose at least a little.

That set of outcomes and self-damaging approaches can make sense and can feel right to people who truly do have very deep-seated intergroup hate and who are willing to go to significant lengths and to sustain losses for their own group and their own people in order to damage the people they hate.

Both the books *Primal Pathways* and *Cusp of Chaos* deal with those lose/lose situations and lose/lose strategies in more detail.

It can be extremely challenging to get people in those settings and those belief systems to convert from lose/lose approaches to win/win approaches.

When people hate other people with so much intensity that it feels right to be damaged in order to inflict damage on the other group, there is clearly a major need to do significant repair work in that setting to reduce the levels of anger and hatred that drive those behaviors and thought processes.

When us/them instincts are triggered in those negative and extreme ways in any setting, people who hate can get so wrapped up in their own hatred that they aren't open to hearing or learning any other ways of thinking about, or perceiving whoever they are defining as "Them," to be anything other than an evil and inherently malevolent "Them" who deserves to be damaged.

It is very hard to create Peace in any setting where the kinds of feelings and beliefs have taken root and are bearing evil and damaging fruit.

Those sets of feelings should be resisted in each setting where possible, and avoided in all settings whenever they can be avoided. Peace in any setting depends on creating interactions that generate wins for all parties



in that setting — and wins are hard to achieve when any party hates so deeply that they are willing to be damaged themselves in order to damage the other side.

### **Leaders Sometimes Build Power From Their Hatred**

Leaders of groups who have their own personal Alpha instincts fully activated and who have their power base reinforced by the exacerbation of intergroup hatred tend to be very difficult to convert from a strategy of hatred to a strategy of mutual benefit and mutual gain.

Those kinds of conversions in the hearts and heads of Alpha leaders from hatred to Peace can sometimes happen — but those conversions can be very hard to do for many situations and settings.

It sometimes requires a leadership change in a group at a very senior level to get groups who are committed to lose/lose strategies to convert to any other model.

Groups who believe in lose/lose strategies need to be converted from both lose/lose and win/lose approaches to pure win/win commitments and strategies.

*The Art of Intergroup Peace* is anchored on everyone in a setting agreeing and aligning to achieve win/win outcomes for all groups.

*The Art of Intergroup Peace* strongly believes in winning. *The Art of Intergroup Peace* is also anchored on the belief that the safest win and the best win situation for each group is almost always one where the wins are shared and each group wins.

## **Most People Do Not Understand The Full Value Of Win/Win**

### **Outcomes**

That is an important point and concept to understand. That is not how people usually think. Win/win for all parties isn't a belief or a goal for people used by groups in very many intergroup settings today.

Most people do not know that the win/win option exists.

It can be very intellectually liberating to add win/win potential strategies to people's intergroup thought processes. Once people understand the beauty and the logistical value and functional benefits that result for all groups from win/win outcomes, then intelligent and well-intentioned people can come to support that strategy and can figure out how to achieve it in effective and creative ways in their relevant settings.

But before that understanding of the advantages of win/win strategies exists for people, win/win outcomes can seem both improbable and vaguely undesirable. We are so used to being in situations where we want the other side to lose that it can seem wrong and even alien to change to a mental model and strategic approach where we want the other side to win.

### **All Those Approaches Are Possible — One Is Preferable**

We are used to win/lose strategies and we are used to win/lose thinking relative to other groups. To succeed at The Art of Intergroup Peace, we need to understand that all three sets of consequences are possible.

Those three alternatives are clearly three very different concepts, strategies, approaches, goals, and outcomes for intergroup interactions.

It is important to understand all three approaches — because all three have their supporters, advocates, and fans, and all three create strategies in the real world that we need to deal with as we target Peace for America.

We need wide and growing numbers of people in this country to understand why win/win solutions are functionally superior to either of the approaches that involve anyone losing. We need to use that knowledge to guide people away from win/lose and lose/lose expectations and approaches

to a more positive overall intergroup strategy that is aimed at having all parties winning.

### **When We All Win — We All Win**

When you look clearly at all of the options, win/win is obviously the most sensible, enlightened, positive, and desirable approach. That outcome of having each group win is clearly good for each and every “Us” because — by definition — each group wins. In a functional win/win outcome for all groups, our own group — our own “Us” — obviously wins.

That point of having your own group winning is key to the win/win strategy. Everyone wants to win. When everyone wins, our group wins. We win.

Having our own group do well in the areas where we want our own group to do well is clearly a good thing for our group. When we win in those areas, we win as a group.

### **No One Needs To Avenge A Victory**

People need to understand that it isn't necessary for the other group to lose in order for our group to win. Each and every other group in a setting

can also prosper. Each group can also achieve their own group goals without having their success hinder or impede or diminish our group success.

Success can be infinite and success can be simultaneous.

When winning is simultaneous and when victory is shared by all groups, then each of the other groups in our setting is less likely to want to damage, destroy, defeat, or get revenge on our group for their loss.

No one needs to avenge a victory.

We need people to understand that we can win — and we can all get our group's very real needs met — without the other group being damaged or defeated in any way.

### **Our Enemies Drain Us**

The standard strategies that involve having the other group in a setting lose are extremely seductive to far too many people. Having “Them” lose is the way we usually think.

When we have our us/them instincts activated in a setting, we very clearly tend to want whoever we perceive to be them in that setting to lose.

When the other group loses, that loss by them can create a functional and at least temporary situational win for our group. But that win for us far

too often happens at the expense of creating an enemy and at the expense of setting up a permanent adversary group for that setting.

Creating an enemy or an adversary is never a good thing.

Too often, the most expensive things we have in the world are our enemies. Our enemies drain us. Our enemies intentionally and inevitably function in various enemy ways.

Our enemies do what they can to damage us. They tend to perpetually threaten us and they very consistently try to undermine us, even when we have achieved a situational win.

If we do win in a win/lose setting, the victory we achieve is often time limited because our enemies tend to want to avenge their loss and very often want to get revenge in some way for our win.

Unless the other group disappears, we generally have to defend ourselves forever against our defeated enemies because of their permanent presence and their clear negative intentions that do not disappear. In permanent win/lose intergroup settings, we need to defend ourselves in perpetuity against the intentions of the defeated group.

### **We Do Not Need To Defend Ourselves When Everyone Wins**

We do not have to defend ourselves at all when we all simultaneously win.

That win/win outcome can clearly be a better win for our group than a win/lose outcome for our group — because it is a less risky and much less expensive win over time for our group. The essence of the issue is that we lose the expense of having a functioning enemy in a setting when the other group in a setting simultaneously.

### **Everybody Wins is the Goal — Everyone is Inclusive**

To convert people who do win/lose thinking now and who have done that kind of win/lose thinking for years into using a win/win strategy and a win/win approach, we need all people to understand that win/win outcomes are actually a very real win for their group.

This is not the way most people think about those issues today. We need to help people understand those issues.

We will only achieve intergroup harmony and intergroup Peace in a setting if we can achieve a sense on behalf of all the relevant groups that their own group is and can be part of a win/win reality and that their own group will not lose and will directly benefit from the Peace that we create.

## We Need To Understand The Other Group As Well

Creating win/win outcomes in any setting is most likely to be done successfully when each of the groups in that setting very clearly understands themselves and their own goals. The win/win process works best if each group in a setting also clearly understands the goals and the wins that are needed by the other group.

Understanding the other group is part of the strategic process for both Peace and War. In that respect, *The Art of Intergroup Peace* and *The Art of War* books make almost identical recommendations about the need for understanding the other group in any setting.

*The Art of War* very clearly calls for each general to understand his enemy fully — to know all things about the relevant enemy. Sun Tzu calls for that level of knowledge about the other group because he believed the general in a war situation needs to use extensive and accurate knowledge about the enemy to ensure the enemies defeat.

In war, knowledge is power.

For the people who want to create lose/lose situations in any setting, a deep knowledge of people who are hated lets the lose/lose strategist identify



both their strategies and the specific targets for the intergroup damage that is inspired by that hate.

So both win/lose approaches and lose/lose approaches call for understanding the enemy in each setting well.

*The Art of Intergroup Peace* tool kit also calls for a deep understanding of the “other” sets of people in any intergroup situation. But the goal of that deep understanding of the other party in *The Art of Intergroup Peace* is for the exact opposite reason that people need that information in war.

In Peace, we need to understand the other group so we can help the other people, in any Peace setting, achieve their group’s legitimate goals. In Peace, we need to understand the other group clearly and well so that we can help the other group of people win — not cause them to lose.

Wartime winning — as described in *The Art of War* — is victory that is achieved by one party at the expense of the other party. Winning — in *The Art of Intergroup Peace* — is done by both parties simultaneously in the context of Peace.

Mutual winning is the goal and mutual winning for all parties is clearly and explicitly set up and mutually understood to be the clear and basic goal for all parties who are included in the Peace process.

### **The Wins Need To Be Legitimate And Beneficial Wins**

The wins that are created in a win/win setting need to be legitimate wins. They need to be real. Sham wins lack stability and that instability can trigger future negative responses and intergroup difficulties for that setting.

Each of the parties in a win/win setting need to help each group in that setting achieve their own wins — including having each group able to achieve the goals and values that we need to collectively commit to in order to create a culture of enlightenment and Peace for America.

That is in stark contrast to those settings where one or both parties are attempting to create lose/lose outcomes and negative intergroup consequences. As noted earlier, a number of people feel so much anger and hatred today that they are going beyond win/lose interactions all the way to deliberate and intentional lose/lose interactions.

### **Lose/Lose Strategies Inherently And Intentionally Create**

### **Losses For Everyone**

Lose/lose acts and activities are sometimes symbolic. Many lose/lose acts are aimed at creating a sense in the other group that their enemy hates them and that their enemy is unpredictable, dangerous, and even willing to be harmed themselves in order to create harm to the other group.

Instability is often a goal of lose/lose tactics. Revenge and retribution are generally key aspirations and goals of lose/lose strategists. We need to understand lose/lose tactics where they exist, and we need to take steps when we can to defuse the intense hatred that triggers those behaviors and those strategies.

To defuse those hatreds, we need to use all the tools at our disposal to soften the level of intergroup misunderstanding and hate.

We need to reach out broadly in Peace to the other parties — knowing that reaching out will often be rejected by leaders and group members who hate at pure and intense levels, and rejected by the people who actually do the lose/lose behaviors. But we need to reach out anyway in hopes that presenting a call for Peace as a human-to-human agenda can have a positive impact on the broader population in those conflicted groups.

Almost all people do prefer Peace when legitimate Peace is an option.

People prefer safe and Peaceful settings to conflict and war. People who want Peace in a setting need to convey that opportunity to create safe Peace for the other parties in the conflicted setting.

People in groups generally don't like being in situations of perpetual conflict. Offering honest and respectful alternatives to that conflict can create support from people on both sides of a conflict.

The alternatives need to be respectful, viable, and real to have a positive impact on people's perceptions and thoughts.

Instead of triggering intergroup hatred, the goal of the communication and teaching process from people who want Peace needs to be to trigger intergroup longing in each group for Peace and to convey a belief that real and respectful Peace is possible in that setting.

### **Win/Win Has To Be Mutual And Achieved In Trust**

Win/Win is the right approach, but it can be very hard work.

To be successful and to work as a strategy, the win/win approach needs to be mutually understood, mutually agreed upon, and mutually supported by all of the parties in a Peace setting. Mutual support is

extremely important. Everyone in a setting needs to agree that it is a good thing when everyone wins.

Old animosities can die hard. Old negative energies — levels of long-standing anger and bitterness — can linger on and can dominate people's thinking and emotions for very long periods of time. When someone has been clearly perceived to be the enemy in any setting for any period of time, all of the thought processes that have been triggered in that setting by our instinctive reactions to our enemies over all of those conflicted years need to be addressed.

That can be done. But it can be very difficult to do and it needs to be done thoughtfully and well.

### **Peace With Former Enemies Can Be Fragile**

The reality is that any understandings about Peace, and even truces that are set up in a setting that are reached with former enemies, are particularly fragile.

Those approaches tend to be unstable because we are always on alert at both a conscious and subconscious level when we are dealing with a former enemy.

The concern that underlies those situations is the possibility that our former enemy might not really want Peace, and might possibly use the pretense of Peace as a way to damage us in some way again.

Trust can be hard. Trust is needed — and it can be very hard to achieve. Trust has to be earned in any setting and it has to be reinforced by the passage of time and by consistent good behavior.

We need people to trust each other as people. — and to do that, we need people to get to know each other as people.

We need people to reach out in our various settings and get to know other people in their setting. We need people-to-people contact and we need people-to-people trust.

The trust created in our various intergroup settings is more likely to succeed if it can be anchored on interpersonal relationships that let us interact with each other across groups as individuals and as real people and not just as categories or some level of token representations of “Them.”

### **All Parties Need To Agree To Win/Win Strategies**

All parties need to begin by understanding and agreeing to the concept of win/win in order for that strategy to fully succeed. That agreement for everyone to win needs to anchor the process.

Then we need to do real things to make that commitment real.

It's important for us generally to explicitly acknowledge that mutual commitment to win/win outcomes when the basic situation is one where all of the parties in a setting have long had their own most negative us/them instincts functionally activated.

It is hard when those energies have been activated for any significant degree for any length of time for any of us to trust the other group in that setting.

### **It Can Be Hard To See A Former Enemy Achieve A Win**

It can be very hard for any group to accept the legitimacy, the appropriateness, and the desirability of the other group in their setting — their former enemy — suddenly having any of its key needs met by the process of Peace and by win/win outcomes.

That acceptance problem needs to be anticipated and understood. It can be very difficult for any of us in any setting to see someone you have grown to hate doing well.

We need to recognize that issue to be exactly what it is and then we need to deal directly with it.

It can be very hard to see your long time enemy happy with a situation or an outcome. That happiness for the long-term enemy will happen if our win/win approaches are successful — and that can create its own set of issues.

We need to expect those outcomes to make some people unhappy. Old hatreds can die very slowly.

For some people who have that set of negative us/them perceptions firmly embedded in their mindsets and emotions, it is sometimes easier to migrate from win/lose strategies all the way to pure lose/lose strategies than it is to migrate from win/lose interactions to win/win outcomes.

Unless both groups in a setting agree to that desired win/win outcome, however, and unless both groups end up wanting the other group to actually do well — Peace can be very difficult to achieve.



## Win/Win Isn't A Passive Strategy

Ideally, each group in a win/win setting helps the other group win.

In a functional win/win situation, each group is committed both to achieving its own group goals and to either helping or allowing the other group to achieve their own group goals.

Win/win isn't a passive strategy. To be most effective, it isn't just a generic positive leaning toward doing good deeds of some kind for people. Win/win outcomes often require practical, functional, and situationally specific approaches to determine how to help each party win.

The process of communicating about specific elements of win/win outcomes for each group can help create trust and understanding for the parties who are communicating with each other.

Good intentions can be both clearly communicated and clearly demonstrated in that communication and learning process.

Practical consequences and real wins are important. Win/win isn't a theoretical or ideologically conceptual commitment to create mutually passive and neutral intergroup behaviors that provide no real benefits to either party.

Mutually passive interactions are clearly far better than mutual anger and they are significantly better than instinct activated win/lose or lose/lose interactions, but simply passive and neutral outcomes are not as good for all parties as achieving real win/win outcomes for each group.

Winning is the key word. For all parties, the win/win process can and should actually result in wins for each of the parties involved. All groups need to win to make the model work.

The next chapter of this book outlines two important collective win/win initiatives that could be used by us as a nation to demonstrate collective good will and to create true and obvious benefit for all of the groups in the country.

If those specific initiatives are successful, they will create win/win results for all groups. One initiative deals with our children. The other deals with our health. Both of those initiatives are extremely important topics that create benefit for all parties at a level that our instincts and our intellect can appreciate and value.

### **We All Want Our Group To Benefit**

The reality is, all groups do have their own self-interests — often their own selfish self-interests. Each set of people tends to want their own group

of people to benefit from any situation that exists. Benefiting is not a bad thing. Benefiting as a group is an entirely legitimate aspiration for each group.

It is good and appropriate for each of us to want good things for our own group. We all should want our own group to benefit.

To create sustaining Peace, however, it is important for each of the groups involved in a win/win strategy in any setting to know that their own group's legitimate needs are being met by the win/win process and to understand clearly that their group is actually achieving a legitimate win at the exact same time that the other group is winning.

People need to understand that no one loses when win/win is done well because each group will win when both groups win.

### **“Legitimate Needs” Are The Key**

The term the “legitimate needs” for each group is used as part of *The Art of Intergroup Peace* strategy to describe each groups “win” — because the needs of each group must be “legitimate” needs for the group that do not do damage to other people or to the other group.

Wins need to be good, beneficial, and non-damaging wins. A win can't involve a group achieving some kind of problematic outcomes for a group that can do damage or undermine the collective or individual well being of the other group in a win/win setting.

At an extreme and clear level, if a particular group has racist goals or if a particular group wants to do some kind of functional racism-linked damage to other people in some way, that goal is not a "legitimate" need for that group and that outcome can't be included as a win/win outcome.

The basic win/win precept of mutual support for each group does not expand and extend to include helping any group achieve any of an array of dysfunctional, negative, or damaging goals.

Wins need to be "legitimate." The "legitimate goals" and the "legitimate needs" of each group — the need for a group to be safe and the need for a group to prosper, for example — should be included in the win/win strategies that are embedded in *The Art of Peace*.

Those legitimate needs identified for each group should become the mutual goals of all groups.

### **Win/Win Involves A Commitment And A Set Of Values**

When win/win approaches are done well, they represent a strategy, a set of tactics, a shared commitment, and a functional set of beliefs and basic collective values.

A key value embedded in the win/win approach is that each group recognizes the validity of the goals of the other group and that each group in a win/win setting agrees to do appropriate things to help the other group achieve those goals.

As noted above, recognizing the validity and the legitimacy of the goals held by the other group of people is sometimes much more difficult than it sounds. Instinctive behaviors and emotions are highly relevant for that particular point.

We sometimes need to understand and overcome our instinctive desire to damage the other groups in some way. When any people believe that another group of people is a “Them,” our instinctive value set calls for us to want “Them” to lose and to want “Them” to be damaged at multiple levels.

Our instinctive desire is for “Them” to fail and for “Them” to be defeated wherever defeat is possible.

When any of those negative us/them values have been activated for any people, the goals that are defined and desired in any setting by “Them”

are usually opposed, damaged, rejected, resisted, derided, disparaged, derailed, and often attacked very directly by the other group.

As part of the win/win process, we need to overcome the desire to obstruct “Them” and we need to replace that desire with the goal and the intentional and deliberate process of helping them.

Clarity is extremely useful for that process. We need to mutually define what sets of goals will be a win for both us and them, and then we need to help each other achieve those goals in order for all of us to achieve our goals.

## **Equal Protection Of The Law Is A Legitimate And Primary**

### **Win/Win Goal**

When the needs of a group are as basic as equal protection under the law or basic voting rights for all people in the group, then the alignments and the intergroup agreements that tie to those wins can be very clear and even relatively easy to do.

When the needs of a group of people are to have all children from all groups educated — and to have all children from each group receive the stimulus in the first months and years of life that is needed to strengthen

their brains to the point where education can be a functional and beneficial tool for those children — then we need all people to recognize those legitimate and very basic needs for all children and we need all people to support each group of people in achieving those basic needs for their own children.

Those specific issues are discussed in more detail in the next chapter of this book.

That collective commitment by all groups to the mutual achievement of goals for each group may seem very appropriate and basic, at one level, but that is obviously not the way most groups interact with one another in the real world today... either in our country or elsewhere in the world.

Groups generally each seek to achieve their own goals — economic, social, political, functional, and governmental goals — as wins for their groups. But groups usually do not enter into a shared commitment or engage in a process to either understand the goals of any other groups and to help any other groups achieve their goals.

### **“Interest Based Bargaining” Can Create Win/Win Results**

In union/management negotiations, a win/win based approach that includes having each side clearly recognizing and then respecting each other's goals is often called "interest based bargaining."

That can be a very effective way of conducting a wide range of labor management negotiations.

The basic foundational approach that is used by the organizations that do "interest based bargaining" in labor negotiations is to first recognize the theoretical legitimacy of each other's goals and then to understand those goals clearly.

Once both parties' goals are clearly understood by both parties, the people doing the negotiations can work together to find sets of solutions through the negotiation process that can help both sides achieve their goals.

The alternative to "interest based bargaining" in many negotiation settings is to fall back into more basic and primal us/them behaviors, values, and emotions – with the parties involved in the negotiations too often clearly perceiving each other to be a "Them" — invoking too many of the energies, values, and perceptions that can be activated when those particular intergroup instincts are triggered in any setting.



In some parts of the world — and even in this country, earlier in our own history — those instinctive us/them reactions to union organization efforts sometimes triggered bloodshed.

Laws have been put in place to make that whole organizing process safer for all parties involved in this country — but the truth is that union organizers are still being killed in some parts of the world today. They are being killed in those settings because the people who run the companies in those countries perceive the union organizers to be a “Them” and have hired people to do those killings — feeling no guilt for killing a “Them” because the people doing the hiring have their us/them instincts fully activated.

That set of negative and conflicted intergroup behaviors in those more conflicted settings can echo the more negative win/lose activities, and values embedded in *The Art of War*.

By contrast, using *The Art of Intergroup Peace* approach, the goal is to create situations where each set of people first understands their own goals, then has their own goals clarified, and then each group learns to understand the goals of the other group.

## **The Process Works Best When People Have Aligned Goals**

When all goals are understood, the win/win process works to help each set of people help the other sets achieve their goals. The process works particularly well when the parties involved in any setting agree on aligned goals that apply to all people — like freedom from attack, democratic selection of leaders, or the mutual and improved health of all populations.

In looking at the factors that can cause us to agree to a strategy of win/win goals, the alignment trigger pyramid that was outlined in Chapter Six of this book can be a useful reference point for the discussions.

Danger is the bottom level on that alignment trigger pyramid. We are clearly facing collective danger as a country if we don't come together to create a country that is not at war with itself.

Common enemy is another legitimate alignment motivator that is the second level on that pyramid. That is a valid trigger for us today. We do have external enemies that we can overcome and defend ourselves against if we are a unified country aspiring to win/win outcomes for all of our people.

Team behaviors are the third tier of the alignment triggers. Team actions can also help us get to win/win outcomes. Early childhood development and our collective community health are discussed in the next

chapter as key goals that we should all focus on and commit to achieving.

Both of those goals can benefit from team behaviors.

Creating a sense of us based on our shared beliefs leads us to a win/win set of strategies and behaviors. Seeing ourselves as an us based on our beliefs is the point of Chapter Twelve of this book.

Collective gain is at the heart of win/win behaviors. Creating collective gain is the most obvious link between the win/win strategy and the alignment pyramid. We will all do better as a country when all segments of our country have full access to the American Dream and when we have economic success across all groups.

Our country will be stronger economically when all segments of our economy are strong.

Having a collective vision that helps us all achieve the American Dream is very much a key a win/win alignment motivator. We all win if we all have access for the American Dream and we all win when our most enlightened values are embedded in our collective and individual behaviors and realities.

## **Peace Is Sustainable When All Parties Achieve Their Goals**

Both shared goals and individual group goals can be involved in the various win/win goal sets.

When all parties in a setting achieve their goals, Peace is much more likely both to be created, and to be sustained over time in that setting.

As noted earlier, when any party in a negotiation doesn't have their key goals met, that party is likely to take steps in the future to end any truce or temporary alignment, and to undermine what appears to be a situational state of Peace. Win/lose outcomes have an inherent instability because at least one party to the situation is unhappy and wanting change.

### **We Need A Collective Commitment To Peace**

As a first and immediate step, it would be a good thing for people in this country — collectively and individually — to decide and agree that we do both want and need Peace — both as a country and as a society.

We need individual people who are committed to Peace as a mission and a goal.

We also need to collectively agree that clear win/win commitments need to anchor that Peace. We need to all agree that we should create a win/win approach to Peace in our communities.

We also need to agree that Peace will and should involve each group of people appreciating, valuing, and supporting both the goals, and the well being of each other as groups of people. Our only path to Peace that can be sustained over time will be one that is achieved using win/win as both a baseline strategy and a foundational value set.

We are an increasingly diverse country. That is an undisputable fact. We can either celebrate and take full advantage of our diversity — growing in strength as a country — Or we can tribalize, follow the slippery and too often seductive slope presented to us by our us/them behaviors and by our us/them instincts, and we can allow our diversity to split us into us/them factions with high levels of intergroup dislike, stress, and a predictable pattern of intergroup interactions that will create sporadic, damaging, dysfunctional, and sometimes destructive episodes of pure intergroup conflict and direct and intentional intergroup damage.

That is an obvious potential danger to us all that we need to have people understand clearly so that the people who understand it are motivated to be aligned and understand the value and benefit of a win/win approach to intergroup interactions to keep us off that slippery slope to conflict and division.

## **We Need Several Key Goals That We Can Achieve Together**

Win/win is clearly a mutual gain focused strategy. We can achieve mutual gain for all of us if we create win/win solutions that apply to all of us.

At this point in our history, we should recognize that reality and we should set some collective mutual gain goals for ourselves. To make the intergroup Peace process very real and immediate, we need to set some clear goals now that will benefit all of us and we need to work together to achieve these goals.

We need some initial sets of goals that we all share that can help bring us all together because we all believe in those goals and because we will all benefit from achieving those goals.

The end of discrimination in hiring by race, ethnicity, or gender is one obvious aligning goal that creates mutual benefit.

The end of active intergroup conflict is all by itself an obvious goal. Setting up a set of interactions that can prevent future mobs and future riots is another area where mutual goals could be set.

We should want all groups to be explicitly supportive of that goal in order to make it possible. When riots are threatened because of a triggering event, we need leaders from all groups to serve as the voices of reason to calm the situation and keep people in those settings from damaging one another.

Freedom from being damaged may seem obvious, but it isn't an actively pursued value for some people today, and riots do damage people as a result.

Peaceful demonstrations can be a very powerful and effective way of communicating key concerns and information relative to key intergroup issues. Actual riots — with damage and violence — can sometimes have a significantly more destructive impact on people's lives and intergroup good will.

## **We Need To Believe In The Shared Values Of An American**

### **“Us”**

As the final chapter of this book points out, this is a good time to agree on some very basic principles and values that benefit us all in order to function as a collective American “Us.”

The rule of law is very clearly one of those common and basic mutual benefit values. Equal rights for everyone — man or woman, race or creed — is another.

Win/win commitments on issues of education, healthcare, and public safety by each group to every other group is another set of mutual benefit goals that help us all.

We need to set up collective mutual benefit goals that we all share as a country. Having collective mutual benefit goals can also help us create team behaviors and those goals can help create a functioning sense of us.

Both of those approaches are key trigger steps from the alignment pyramid. Having collective goals in those areas can obviously trigger our sense of collective gain as well as collective good will.

The next chapter of this book identifies two key goals that can both help us achieve intergroup alignment, and that can create wins for each group. If we achieve both of those goals this country will be a stronger, better, and safer place for us all.

People will be healthier. People will be more successful. Fewer people will be in jail.



Those would be win/win outcomes and can help anchor the heart and  
Art of Intergroup Peace.