Re-Orienting the Trainer to Navigate – Not Negotiate – Islamic Cultural Values
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Editors’ Note: Business decisions based on faith? What conventional Western bargaining wisdom might deem folly, Bernard labels as mission critical as soon as Westerners step into other cultures, and perhaps increasingly at home. She makes a convincing case that the next generation of negotiation training must account for bargaining parties’ “full and complex identity,” including the religious values that profoundly shape perceptions and conduct even among many of those who on the surface appear thoroughly secular.

Navigating the Human Geography
Skeptics may deem it naïve or nostalgic to propose that cultural values grounded in faith traditions play a role in modern business transactions. Granted, commercial transactions seeking short-term gains from episodic contractual arrangements may operate satisfactorily without focusing on deep cultural context. However, entrepreneurs seeking long-term, self-sustaining international business partners want and need more. Especially if markets involve suppliers, manufacturers, financing or labor entrenched in Islamic cultures, the business person seeking maximum satisfaction strives to understand the human geography of the operating environment and how to navigate through it.

Standard Westernized/Americanized templates for business negotiation “flatten” the human terrain, enforcing a false homogeneity. Explicit reference points to “landmarks” of Western clothing,
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education, technology are taken as implicit assimilation of Western material values. Not so. Islamic values embedded in culture may shape the perceptions and conduct of persons who otherwise appear thoroughly secular.

Istanbul – straddling both Asia and Europe – offers an actual and metaphorical bridge between Eastern and Western cultures, non-Western spiritual traditions and Western modernity. The Western negotiator who can bridge intangible values across cultures will attain greater tangible results for long-term commercial ventures. However, most Western negotiation trainers feel ill-equipped to address such sensitive matters.

In an experiment for the Istanbul Rethinking Negotiation Teaching conference, two dozen conference participants met in small groups of three to five with moderate, relatively progressive Muslim businessmen in Istanbul to discuss whether and how their faith affected their commercial affairs. These dialogues were a new venue for outreach by the Institute for Interfaith Dialog for World Peace (“IID”), a Turkish-Muslim organization headquartered in Houston, Texas.

This chapter describes and contextualizes the dialogue in which this author and the co-editors of this book participated. To the extent feasible, I shall refer to experiences of other conference participants shared informally during and after the conference. Final thoughts offered include a second round of interviews addressing the primary issue that opens this chapter: namely, in a rough and tumble world of hard bargaining and sharp practices, is it misguided to assume faith-based values play a bona fide role?

Dialogues on Faith and Folly in Commerce
One must grant that among Jews, Christians and Muslims alike we find business people who profess religious principles they do not actually practice. This remains such a truism that standard negotiation training presumes party hypocrisy rather than sincerity. Impasse due to “a matter of principle” is deemed in reality impasse due to “a matter of money.” Western negotiators generally assume that no one would make business decisions based upon faith, for that would be folly.

The Istanbul dialogues exposed Western negotiation trainers to a way of doing business that seeks a balance between faith and what skeptics would consider folly. Most businessmen in these dialogues were members of the Confederation of Turkish Businessmen, working with IID – all of whom are part of the sometimes controversial Gülen Movement. The movement’s middle-of-the-road approach earns them few supporters. They are too devout to gain the confi-
dence of secularists, yet too modernistic for radical Islamists. The leader of the movement, Mr. Fetullah Gülen, has embraced global peace and cooperation,\(^1\) often placing him at odds with the views of powerful Turkish politicians and the military (Yavuz and Esposito 2003).

These businessmen fully engage in commerce with a wide array of global entities. On the surface their businesses – auto dealerships, textile manufacturing, food import and export, construction, mining, oil products – appear little different than any other highly Westernized, modern commercial undertaking. However, they operate their businesses according to values embedded in their faith and in traditional Islamic culture, which differ significantly from the core principles that typify the aggressive, commodity-oriented brand of Western business negotiation training.

Discussions with conference participants during the days after the dialogues, and this author’s own follow-up interviews in Turkey, suggest that while devout, these businessmen are not “soft”; they can be demanding, yet fair.\(^2\) They also recognize that not every prospective business partner will share their principles. As discussed later in this chapter, approaches to business negotiations may shift, depending upon orientation of the parties. When both parties seem ready to operate according to the traditional Islamic cultural values described in this chapter, negotiations may follow that path. When values diverge, the otherwise traditionally-oriented businessman shifts methods, and brings in the lawyers.

The central lesson or theme of the many dialogues and this author’s follow-on interviews could probably be encapsulated through a saying attributed to the Prophet Muhammad: “Trust God, but tie your camel.” Negotiate in good faith, but write a contract, especially when dealing with entities where the levels of trust and mutual understanding are not high.

For negotiation training, this represents a different orientation entirely: not idealism or pragmatism, but both. This requires more than changing a few exercises or role-plays. It asks for a change in the fundamental orientation of negotiation training.

**Challenging the Standard Orientation of Negotiation Training**

Stripped bare, the core principles that shape much of the most popular, interest-based, “get the most that you can” training in Western/American-style commercial negotiation can be summarized as follows:

1) Everything is negotiable.

2) Everything has a price.
The goal of negotiation is to identify the price both parties are willing to accept for a service or substance. It should be as low as possible for the buyer, and as high as possible for the seller.

Thus, negotiation trainers – consciously or not – fundamentally teach how to monetize the world. When something is not already overtly a commodity – to be bought, sold, traded – trainees learn how to make it so. Intangibles such as sentiment, loyalty, identity and values matter insofar as they can be manipulated to achieve the one goal that matters: the best price.

Next generation negotiation would retire the commodity-orientation, because not everything is negotiable. Not everything has a price. Sometimes a business person’s values – including reputation and religion – matter more than price. Any price. The standard training orientation teaches how to negotiate – that is to say, how to lead people to compromise – personal values. We do this generally by assuming that such values have only illusory or manipulative significance. A shift in orientation would recognize that such values actually shape the business landscape. Cultural and religious values make meaning for international trading partners, whether the unstated implications of that meaning are fully appreciated, or not.

**Cultural Reciprocity as a Key to Business Success**

Americans and Western Europeans frequently observe that it is difficult for outsiders to enter the seemingly closed system of business relationships in Turkey and other Islamic cultures (Morris 2005). Established local commercial relationships appear insular, distrustful of outsiders. This chapter argues that these allegedly closed systems may be more permeable than they appear. For the Westerner open to learning about that “closed” system – doors can open. It begins by acknowledging and respecting the complex nature of cultural identity among persons in modern Islamic cultures.

Consider the observations of a French-Lebanese intellectual, Amin Maalouf, analyzing current discourse about identity. He notes that trust and openness increase among Middle Easterners when Westerners sincerely appreciate Islamic culture and traditions. Of course, the highest mark of appreciation occurs when Western business people speak the native tongue of the people with whom they seek to trade. A large number of Turkish business people know not only English, but several other languages (French, German, Russian, Bulgarian, Greek, and Arabic being typical). Few Americans or Western Europeans can claim the obverse.

Maalouf identifies the deeper layers of mistrust embedded in such lack of reciprocity: “If I study someone else’s language, but he
doesn’t respect mine, to go on speaking his tongue ceases to be a token of amity and becomes an act of servitude and submission” (Maalouf 2000: 43). Most non-Western business people would not state this aloud. Yet, it remains as a silent, unacknowledged roadblock to building sustainable commercial relationships.

Maalouf attempts to identify other interior, private roadblocks to successful globalization efforts; the sorts of things negotiators also seek to know. What groups does the person identify with in terms of religion, family, clan, music, literature, education, age cohorts? These factors create an internal subtext that may not be shared externally. Nevertheless, the various “belongings” a global businessperson identifies with all matter and are, likely, indivisible.

Negotiation workshops cannot fully teach language, culture and history as part and parcel of a forty-hour, twenty-hour or even shorter training. However, next generation trainer-teachers can introduce the importance of respect and reciprocity with regard to cultural values embedded in faith traditions. The enlarged understanding of the trainer-teacher will manifest in how this workshop leader conducts feedback, observations, the set-up and debriefing of role-plays; it may also lead to new confidence in seeking opportunities for contextual learning. As much as anything else, the next generation teacher-trainer will lead by example.

The Negotiation Trainer as Leader, “Adapter” and Guide

Attaining these different goals asks the commercial negotiation trainer to reframe the very nature of the undertaking and his/her role. “Training” implies that negotiation consists of a mechanistic set of skills that can be learned through rote conditioning of demonstration and drill (Avruch 2009). Many workshops operate as if a single template can apply to most, if not all, transactions.

This template fails to address adequately the complexities and nuances especially of non-Western, indigenous and Islamic cultures. A capacity to recognize and accommodate the ineffable cannot be transmitted as part of a set of tactics. It is found instead in the additional insight the workshop leader can share if he or she is acquainted with the cultural landscape. The more familiar and direct the leader’s exposure, the more alternative interpretations, nuanced problem-solving, and embodied, contextual learning the leader can offer in organizing exercises, debriefing role-plays, and providing feedback.

The basic sets of communication skills to be learned – stating, restating, framing and reframing to identify interests underlying stated positions – remain largely the same in first and next genera-
tion approaches. However, in the next generation they are transmitted through an enlarged understanding of issues now pigeonholed as “diversity.” Abramson argues that “interests” are a culturally neutral concept, but that trainers need to be “consummate guests” – “flexible, open-minded and elicitive about local practices” (Abramson 2009: 296-297). One analogy familiar to international travelers might assist. Visualize the frequent dilemma of converting the electrical voltage common in one country to the voltage your own laptop computer or cell phone has been hardwired to accept as normal. An adapter converts the electrical power into a form that is usable.

Similarly, when considering the teachable skills for negotiating business deals, skills are skills, just as electricity is electricity – although abilities and knowledge are different. But, as with diverse international standards for electrical power, skills must be adapted to suit different environments. In negotiation workshops, the “converter” or “adapter” is the trainer; here, referred to as workshop leader. We teachers become suitable “adapters” by placing ourselves in environments where we become learners. Finding such environments may not be easy, but they exist.

Not Secular or Sacred, but Secular and Sacred
Some years ago, discussions about globalization usually accepted unquestioningly the theory that modernization (through international business deals) and secularization go hand in hand. Presumably, standardized templates of law and business practices would not only harmonize the law but eventually nullify the impact of religion. As the globalization theory went, faith would have little impact on commerce except perhaps among the less educated, less sophisticated, lower class masses.

Emerging reality has not tracked past theory. Globalization and modernity thrive in a secular world, while not requiring people to jettison cultural values rooted in religious tradition (Berger 1999). Many of the traditional patterns and rituals of commerce in modern Turkey reflect cultural norms inextricably interwoven with the tapestry of Islamic business ethics. To open doors to this lucrative international market, it is worthwhile to learn those norms; to create opportunities for both the workshop leader as adapter and workshop participants as contextual learners to give voice to the unspoken subtext of Islamic cultural values in business affairs.

Finding Suitable Forums for Dialogue
The pre-conference dialogues provided formal opportunities for informal discussions where teachers and scholars could become learners, asking questions that otherwise might seem intrusive, and
allowing more revealing responses than would otherwise be considered polite. Afterwards, some participants described the dialogues as “moving,” “illuminating,” “one of the most powerful experiences” in memory. For most, if not all, the dialogues were a surprising, refreshing, often unsettling encounter with “the Other.”

Included among the dialogue participants were self-described atheists, agnostics, lapsed and practicing Catholics, secular and observant Jews, devout and disaffected Protestants, some Zen practitioners, and many who would describe themselves as “spiritual” but not “religious.” Smaller groups of three to five, accompanied by a Turkish translator from IID, traveled to one or another Istanbul business where they met members of Gülen local circles active with IID. (Most businessmen actually understood English, but felt more comfortable having a translator available.) These local circles among businessmen committed to the Gülen movement provide peer support in their social outreach. Further, the circles encourage adherence to a faith-inspired sense of business ethics that may not be shared by the general population.3

A key characteristic of businessmen inspired by the Gülen movement is the commitment to “quality education for the development of the human person and, simultaneously, for bringing Turkey into the modern era” (Ebaugh 2010: 52). Businessmen support these efforts through large and sustained donations that average ten percent of yearly income; with many persons contributing as much as one-third of their income to support Gülen schools, hospitals, and other activities to promote tolerance and modernization (Ebaugh 2010: 59).

At the request of this author, Dr. Orhan Osman, Director of the Raindrop Turkish House in Oklahoma City, arranged the dialogues, working long-distance through his contacts in Istanbul. The Istanbul IID dialogues were a unique extension of IID activities linking Oklahoma City and Turkey, in which this author had previously participated. While these dialogues fit the general mission of IID and the Gülen movement, nothing like this had previously been envisioned. The experiment was in many ways a mutual exercise in courage, trust and hope: courage to speak candidly in a secular state backed by a powerful military; trust that the dialogue would be heard with compassion and patience; hope that these personal engagements would have some positive impact.

**Speaking Aloud the Silent Content of Business Customs**

Much of the learning was contextual. Each group learned by experience the bedrock of Islamic business custom: hospitality. In Turkey,
as throughout the Middle East, hospitality means far more than mere courtesy. It is an expression of sacred obligations dating to times that some believe even predated Islam. Further, in a time and place where the rule of law and even-handed law enforcement were virtually unknown, accepted norms of hospitality filled the gap. Even if parties were unsure about what external law should apply, everyone had a reasonably consistent understanding about what rituals of hospitality required – and that those norms would be enforced through the actions of clans, bonded by friendship to mutual protection.

Under Islam, however, these bonds and rituals gained enriched value. Hence, the “courtesies” of sharing tea are not merely secular, but also sacred. Embodied in the rituals of hospitality one sees fundamental principles seriously at odds with the supposedly core principles of negotiation enunciated earlier in this chapter. I would describe them as focusing on “three T’s”: 1) tempo; 2) tea; and 3) trust.

The tempo of negotiations is far slower than is usual in America and much of Western Europe. The pace allows time for parties to understand each other, their stated and unstated interests. The slower tempo allows time to consult with and consider the needs of others whose interests are affected by the transaction. Given time, the Western potential partner who believes they have all the answers may recognize that they have much to learn from their non-Western hosts. The slower pace creates opportunities for such learning. This mutual education will usually take place over cups of tea.

There are, of course, different ways to interpret this slower tempo and its role. For, inevitably, it places at a disadvantage the Western party who does not believe s/he has time “to waste,” but instead needs to proceed on a faster schedule. Here, we gain insight into why some Westerners may feel shut out from Turkey’s lucrative markets, while others find opportunities. As Maalouf pointed out in his observations on identity, the Westerner who cannot speak the local language, but at least tries to accommodate local customs, will be perceived more as a friend than as an interloper. The significance of friendship cannot be overstated.

Drinking tea is a central ritual establishing the business relationship. As described in the bestseller Three Cups of Tea: One Man’s Mission to Promote Peace…One School at a Time, “The first time you share tea...you are a stranger. The second time you take tea, you are an honored guest. The third time you share a cup of tea, you become family, and for our family we are prepared to do anything, even die” (Mortenson and Relin 2006: 150). Drinking tea is more than imbibing a refreshment. It is a ritual filled with symbolic significance. The
end-point of the ceremony is to understand whether, and to what
degree, the parties can trust each other. It is a rite of negotiation.

Trust is the essential ingredient, without which no business will
be conducted. The higher one’s earned reputation for being reliable
and trustworthy, the greater value the person’s name can carry
(note, however, the distinct kinds of trust discussed in Roberge and
Lewicki, Should We Trust, in this volume.) All transactions are based
upon trust, particularly since the commitment made extends far be-
yond the individual to that person’s extended family and clan. The
commitment to do business with a person steeped in these traditions
extends much deeper than the understanding many Western-
ers bring to the table; at least some Westerners, however, operate on
related principles. Consider, for example, the quiet but firm recogni-
tion among “old school” New York businessmen that “pride, reputa-
tion and good will” are important in negotiations and,
“although…intangible,…are absolutely real” (Rose 2006: 714).

The Three T’s in Action
The IID host of the particular small group I went with, Mr. Hossein
Guzell, operates the family business Guzella, Inc., an international
high fashion design and textile business. As did virtually all of the
other pre-conference dialogue hosts, he taught by example, through
“total immersion” – demonstrating the “three T’s” in action. We ob-
served many teaching moments, which he graciously explained.

But one key resource that I sought out was not displayed in a
manner that facilitated easy access. It was a framed poster situated
across from his desk, out of the line of sight for visitors, but directly
in Mr. Guzell’s own view. Translated from the Turkish, “I Say to My-
self (The Way of Life)” articulated principles of servant leadership
that many business people might recognize, including those from
humanist Western, or observant Christian, or Jewish backgrounds
(Beekun and Badawi 1999).

I shall discuss next how the principles articulated in this poster
fit into the “three T’s” of tempo, tea and trust.

Tempo
Two seemingly contrasting concepts demand equal respect: industri-
ousness and neighborliness. “Be punctual, straightforward and just”
(Osman, trans. 2010: line 4); “Work hard, be insistent, and look at
the lives of those who are successful” (Osman, trans. 2010: line 11);
“Don’t waste your time. God doesn’t like those who kill time” (Os-
man, trans. 2010: line 14). This suggests support for a tempo and
profit-driven focus similar to the fast pace and goals of Western
commerce.
Yet much more emphasis is placed on how to prioritize one’s time, which also sets the pace to conduct work. The overarching guideline is to remember: “The things that you do today should serve today and tomorrow. The things that you do in this world should serve this world and hereafter” (Osman, trans. 2010: line 28). In today’s world, one must take the time to serve others. It is seen not only as a duty, but as a source of happiness. “Live for the other more than yourself; happiness is a perfume that makes you more aromatic if you shower it on the ones around you” (Osman, trans. 2010: line 19).

These concepts are synthesized in the Turkish understanding of neighborliness, where persons are expected never to be in such a rush that they cannot take time to show caring and compassion for others no matter how “thin” the relationship may be. Virtually everyone acts in relationship to/with others. Acknowledging this interdependency renders business in Istanbul much more like business in rural America, where even if you do not know a person’s name, you are expected to exchange greetings, engage in conversation, as a sign of respect and membership in the community (Honeyman 2007).

**Tea**

In a Western world that admires multi-tasking, where Tweets and text messages often constitute conversation among family members and intimate friends – the concept of taking time to give one human being undivided, face-to-face attention becomes less and less familiar. Yet, this is what the ritual of tea as part of business negotiations achieves. At the surface level, the lengthy process of drinking tea together carves out time and space for people to engage in mindful conversation. In this process people can begin to build relationships.

At a deeper level, the ritual of tea is a modern iteration of an ancient tradition, born from nomadic cultures where life depended upon mutual assistance, later reinforced and given a spiritual dimension by Islam. Groups that visited a Turkish business host were lavished with not only tea, coffee, soft drinks and pastries, but with full meals and gifts. This phenomenon is common throughout the Middle East, and was repeated with each pre-conference dialogue group. Often Westerners (including some conference participants) either take the hospitality for granted, or react skeptically, questioning whether it is merely a gimmick to lay the foundation for getting the best price.

Turkish generosity, however, springs both from sincerity and from the desire to be virtuous in the eyes of God. Hospitality is open-ended, not necessarily tied to a commercial result. That being said, generosity can work for commercial purposes (Chamoun and Hazlett
2009). Given that these particular businessmen are part of a movement marked thus far by tangible works of faith – highlighted by building and supporting schools for students of all ethnicities, clinics and promoting the education of females in developing nations around the globe – skepticism must reach a level of near-conspiracy theory. Moreover, shouldn’t one at times simply accept a person and their culture on that person’s own terms?

This may be difficult for some Westerners to accept, until they consider the deep roots of the modern practice of generous hospitality. Turkish oral traditions describe the underlying principle, which predates Islam: “If a stranger knocks at the door, s/he should be invited inside, given ample food and shelter for three days; and only at the end of three days should the cause of the visit be asked” (Ebaugh 2010: 68). A guest who arrives unexpectedly should be considered “a guest from God” (Ebaugh 2010: 69). The tradition is not unbounded. After three days a guest becomes family, and is expected to help with chores.

More frequent than the tradition of household hospitality that can confer family status upon guests, there is the third cup of tea, which similarly marks the crossing of a threshold. With the third cup of tea, the relationship, the trust has built to a point of mutual obligations that extend beyond merely completing the terms of a commercial contract. They mark bonds of unquestioned loyalty and integrity; levels of performance that few Western businesses contemplate in an ostensibly straightforward business deal.

How much should one rely upon these constraints, especially in regions famous not only for hospitality, but also for treachery? In a follow-up visit to Turkey, I addressed this issue directly with businessmen who were followers of Mr. Fetullah Gülen, but engaged in commerce in legendarily corrupt areas: construction and mining in Central Asia and Russia. Their answers blended idealism and pragmatism. I venture to summarize: 4

1) You cannot do business with thieves, period. Even if a deal sounds enticing initially, over time the problems that inevitably arise will outweigh any benefits.

2) Therefore, you need to be ready to not do business at all in some areas. So be it. Short-term profits are not worth long-term regrets.

3) When dealing with persons who are merely “slippery,” but not treacherous, do not take a step without good legal counsel.

Again, we see the theme: “Trust God, but tie your camel.”
Trust in business deals in Turkey – and other Middle Eastern cultures – goes well beyond soft sentiment. Among other reasons, integrity is vital because traditionally transactions are handled based upon a person’s word, their reputation. Cash is the preferred method for doing business. Thousands, even millions, of dollars will transfer from person to person across vast distances based solely upon a verbal request. How? Why? Because the sender knows that the receiver – and the receiver’s family – will fulfill the obligation no matter what. It is difficult to imagine a Western business with the same expectations about commitments.

Trust serves as a guiding principle not only outside but inside the company. Most Western concepts of management do not contemplate trust within the corporation as a central feature of the business model. However, at Guzella it is.

The Guzella human resources model puts in action a consultative, shared notion of power in the workplace. It sounds nearly “New Age” but actually stems from a commitment to Islamic concepts of leadership. A leader, including an officer of a for-profit business, must fulfill a sacred duty of trust, whereby all decisions are made with an eye toward protecting the best interests of the entire organization, as a community. Indeed, one might go so far as to identify them as a family; albeit a family with over 700 members/employees.

The worldview shows in the vocabulary used; the value of the framing is something negotiators can appreciate. To paraphrase Mr. Guzell: “I do not call my employees ‘workers’ or ‘employees.’ I call them ‘friend.’ I eat what they eat. I believe in their honesty, so they believe in my honesty.” He deals similarly with business colleagues, and has never been to court.

The Value of a Values-Orientation Instead of a Commodity-Orientation

The experiential learning obtained through the IID dialogues with Turkish businessmen was a rare opportunity. Still, key elements can be replicated in other settings. Because the “three T’s” are so pervasive in Islamic cultures, a trainer should not have difficulty finding a Muslim professional, teacher or even graduate student willing to share their experiences: recreating the ritual of tea and hospitality during the training itself, while explaining the significance, should be possible.

Can learning how to have tea make enough difference to render it a valuable addition to commercial negotiation training? Does it
matter enough to merit seeking out some of the many moderate Muslim organizations throughout North America whose mission is to promote better cross-cultural understanding? Especially when a trainer’s own experiences run counter to the message of trust, should this even be attempted?

I found sufficient confirmation when participating in April 2010 at the TRADOC Culture Summit IV, supported by the Army’s Training, Development & Support Directorate centered at Fort Huachuca, Arizona. This approach to building relationships in Islamic cultures – one cup of tea at a time – has become standard operating procedure for American operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. (For more on this theme, see Lira, Design: The U.S. Army’s Approach, in this volume.) I asked several officers to help me understand why we – academics – are far more skeptical and slow to embrace these concepts. To condense the responses:

It’s because for us, it’s a matter of life and death. We have to stretch, to learn how these cultures do things, instead of just doing everything our way. In the early years of the Iraq war we lost a lot of good people – military and civilian, ours and theirs – because we didn’t understand Islamic culture. We made a lot of costly mistakes. We don’t intend to repeat those errors. At least, we’re trying not to.

The book Three Cups of Tea and the principles articulated in it – largely the same principles underlying the Istanbul dialogues – are now standard reading for American troops deployed to Islamic countries, where the military negotiates much more than commercial arrangements. They use the principles to negotiate how to stay alive. Surely, if they deem this knowledge so valuable, it merits our full attention in teaching how to negotiate successful, sustainable arrangements for commercial ventures in Islamic cultures.

Conclusion

While the U.S. military may have made the shift (see Lira, Design: The U.S. Army’s Approach, in this volume), many multinational businesses thus far seem content to continue with a status quo reliance on a standardized Western model of negotiation. Why then should a “Next Generation” model of negotiation training incorporate cultural norms that seem nearly anachronistic?

To answer this question, let me share the insights of Mr. Guzell concerning the typical approach of American multinationals, compared to the values he follows:
They have looked at the money, at financial gain as the measure of success, not giving due consideration to morals, values, people and relationships. A focus on money can only take you so far. And now such companies have maxed out. They’ve gone as far as a money model can take them. Now they are slipping backwards. They are having to relearn, restructure around these more lasting cultural values which have sustained other businesses for generations.

We, as teachers, must learn and then teach others how to navigate a human geography of embedded cultural values. Those values are real to the parties involved – even if we, personally, may not accept them as our own. The next generation of negotiation training will be defined, as much as anything else, by its capacity to encourage basic steps that demonstrate reciprocal respect for the other party’s full and complex identity – instead of asking them to compromise what matters most.

Notes

1 In a 2008 Foreign Policy/Prospect poll the Islamic/Sufi scholar Fetullah Gülen was voted “the world’s top public intellectual,” winning “in a landslide.” Foreign Policy, August 2008 at 12.

2 This became a topic of intense discussion in one workshop following the dialogues. At least one participant found a disconnect between perceptions of hospitality and relationship developed during the visits, and actual negotiations with the same business person later in the Spice Bazaar; i.e., shouldn’t the prior relationship have translated into a lower price for purchases the next day? On the other hand, one could ask whether it was appropriate to apply insights offered “off the record” in the pre-conference dialogue to obtain special advantage later in the field exercise of bargaining for merchandise? This led to a valuable insight about subtle differences between “relationship” – as concerns business transactions – and “connection.” One might further question, as described later in this chapter: Had the prior day’s visit to the Spice Bazaar merchant’s offices reached the point of “three cups of tea,” or only one? Was the conference participant still a stranger – not a friend?

3 Follow-up interviews conducted by this author sought and obtained specificity that concretized general statements in other texts about this. Business colleagues in the Gülen movement support not only the local Gülen-inspired school or college, but also support schools in particular countries overseas. They contribute money, personal time, and – it was stressed to me – prayers and friendship. One group may adopt a school in Angola, another group will choose a school in Haiti, and so on. These schools are open to all students, free of charge, so long as they and their parents are willing to set
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aside traditional ethnic or religious animosities, to live and learn in a cooperative environment. They must also be willing to encourage the education of females and to take instruction from female teachers. As an example, businessmen of Kutahya (a rural city of fewer than 200,000 persons) contribute $15,000 (U.S.D.) per month to support a Gülen-inspired school in Kyrgyzstan. This school’s mission is to educate a new generation of Kyrgyz, Uzbeks and Russians who will be less likely to tolerate or participate in long-standing violent conflicts. (Personal interviews with members of the Confederation of Turkish Businessmen in Kutahya: Suleyman Doğan, Husein Karakuzu, and founder of the Kyrgyzstan school, Suleyman Akkay, May 26, 2010.)

4 Summary based on personal interviews with Süleyman Malatça (Kutahya May 27, 2010); Metin Sağil and Eyüp Kaynak (Istanbul May 25, 2010).
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