

## PROCESSES OF INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATION

*Roadshow ♦ Arab Spring Seminar ♦ Reconciliation Workshop*



St. Petersburg State University (source: saint-petersburg.com)

ST. PETERSBURG, 23-24 MAY 2013

## **Contact Information**

### **Processes of International Negotiation**

E-mail: [wperlot@clingendael.nl](mailto:wperlot@clingendael.nl)

Website: [www.pin-negotiation.org](http://www.pin-negotiation.org)

The PIN network is a project of the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'.

### **Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'**

Visiting address: Clingendael 7, 2597 VH The Hague

Postal address: P.O. Box 93080, 2509 AB The Hague

Telephone: 31-70-324 53 84

Telefax: 31-70-328 20 02

E-mail: [info@clingendael.nl](mailto:info@clingendael.nl)

Website: [www.clingendael.nl](http://www.clingendael.nl)

This brochure was designed and edited by **Vlad Badea**, Research Assistant at the Clingendael Institute.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
<u><i>The program</i></u>	<u>4</u>
Day 1: Roadshow	4
Arab Spring seminar	4
Day 2: Reconciliation workshop	4
<u><i>The Arab Spring seminar</i></u>	<u>5</u>
<u><i>The Reconciliation workshop</i></u>	<u>6</u>
<u><i>The speakers</i></u>	<u>7</u>
Andreas Lange	7
Fen Hampson	7
Guy Olivier Faure	8
I. William Zartman	8
Irina Novikova	8
Mark Anstey	8
Martin Kesternich	9
Mikhail Troitskiy	9
Mordechai Melamud	9
Moty Cristal	9
Rudolf Schüssler	9
Valerie Rosoux	10
Wilbur Perlot	10
<u><i>The PIN programme</i></u>	<u>11</u>
<u><i>The Clingendael Institute</i></u>	<u>12</u>

## DAY 1: 23 MAY

09:20 – 13:00	Roadshow
09:20 – 09:30	Opening remarks <span style="float: right;"><i>Irina Novikova and I. William Zartman</i></span>
09:30 – 09:50	The who and when of negotiations <span style="float: right;"><i>I. William Zartman</i></span>
09:50 – 10:10	Asymmetric negotiation: dealing with terrorists <span style="float: right;"><i>Guy O. Faure</i></span>
10:10 – 10:30	The implications of Russia-US arms control negotiations for international security <span style="float: right;"><i>Mikhail Troitskiy</i></span>
10:30 – 10:50	France and Germany: negotiating with the hereditary enemy <span style="float: right;"><i>Valerie Rosoux</i></span>
10:50 – 11:10	Coffee break
11:10 – 11:50	Negotiating climate change <span style="float: right;"><i>Andreas Lange and Martin Kesternich</i></span>
11:50 – 12:10	The Helsinki process – negotiation for a Middle East weapons of mass destruction free zone <span style="float: right;"><i>Moti Melamud</i></span>
12:10 – 12:30	New challenges in international multilateral negotiations and diplomacy <span style="float: right;"><i>Fen Hampson</i></span>
12:30 – 13:00	Discussion
<i>Location:</i>	<i>1/3 Smolny Street, Entrance 8, Room TBA</i>
<i>Moderated by:</i>	<i>Mikhail Troitskiy</i>

14:30 – 17:00	<i>Intifadat: Negotiations in the Shadow of Social Movements</i>
14:30 – 15:15	The project and its main conclusions for theory and practice <span style="float: right;"><i>I. William Zartman</i></span>
15:15 – 16:00	Q&A with audience and I. William Zartman
16:00 – 16:15	Coffee break
16:15 – 17:00	Discussion
<i>Location:</i>	<i>1/3 Smolny Street, Entrance 8, Room TBA</i>
<i>Moderated by:</i>	<i>Wilbur Perlot</i>

## DAY 2: 24 MAY

09:30 – 13:00	Workshop: Reconciliation
09:30 – 09:50	Introduction – presentation of the project <span style="float: right;"><i>Mark Anstey and Valerie Rosoux</i></span>
09:50 – 10:10	Power <span style="float: right;"><i>Mark Anstey</i></span>
10:10 – 10:30	Timing <span style="float: right;"><i>Valerie Rosoux</i></span>
10:30 – 10:50	Ethics <span style="float: right;"><i>Rudolf Schüssler</i></span>
10:50 – 11:10	Coffee break
11:10 – 11:30	Security <span style="float: right;"><i>Moty Cristal</i></span>
11:30 – 11:50	Some major causes of failures in reconciliation attempts <span style="float: right;"><i>Guy O. Faure</i></span>
11:50 – 12:10	Israeli-German case <span style="float: right;"><i>Moti Melamud</i></span>
12:10 – 12:30	Concluding remarks <span style="float: right;"><i>I. William Zartman</i></span>
12:30 – 13:00	Discussion
<i>Location:</i>	<i>1/3 Smolny Street, Entrance 8, Room TBA</i>
<i>Chaired by:</i>	<i>Valerie Rosoux and Mark Anstey</i>

## THE ARAB SPRING SEMINAR

The world of 2011 was shaken by an extraordinary series of events in the Arab world, a domino effect of socially integrated and secular mass uprisings against characteristically corrupt, arrogant and inefficient governments. The process of this up-welling (*intifada*) continue into the present and its effects will be felt for long into the future. In a region marked by a disillusioned longing for ideology, these *intifadas* are neither class conflicts nor religious revolts, but popular spontaneous disorderly democratic outbursts. The event is unprecedented in the Arab world, but it has its predecessors in other parts of the globe—in the Serbia, Philippines, Thailand, Iran, South Africa—each with its special twist and distinction.

In a world of social analysis where nothing is new, these events nonetheless distinguish themselves from a previously well-analyzed events such as pacted transitions and revolutions. The parties and even the sides that characterized transitional pacts are absent or inchoate in the current revolts, and the ideology and social upheaval that define revolution are absent too. The challenge for the revolters (*muntafad*), the country, and the analysts has been to understand the possibilities of orderly change. So what are the possibilities and patterns? What do the unfolding events tell us to do or to avoid? What are the turning points in these evolutions? And what can the Arab world tell about this type of event and what can previous similar events tell about the evolution of the Arab countries?

The key to answering these questions is negotiation analysis. At the outset, negotiations are unthinkable: the mass wants the government out, and the government is often soon in shambles. The transition promises to be disorderly. But as the situation evolves, negotiations emerge within the sides and then between opposing parties. Rather than 2-level negotiations, it is a multi-ring circus with negotiations going on within and among the rings/sides.

There is much to learn and much to apply about negotiation in these situations. Negotiation is a choice of partners, a selection of

parties to represent sides and then to set up future cooperation among them (negotiations for coalition). But it is also about a choice of plans and visions for the future (negotiation for formulation). Both types of processes are involved in effectuating the overthrow of the Old Order and in installing a New Order (or a return to the Old, in some, doubtless New, form). How this is accomplished and how the dynamics within each ring evolve is the subject of this analysis. The situation is quite different from state to state negotiations, where the parties are constituted, even if there is internal discussion and politics involved. And it is different from intrastate negotiations between government and rebels, where primarily only one side is disorganized or in evolution. In this situation, both sides are in conflict over the Tactical Question (talk or fight) and over who should be the spokesman for the side. Furthermore, identifying two sides is not to suggest the autonomous presence of many parties, beginning with a third party, the military, and possibly other autonomous players. What role can/do negotiations play in channeling conflict away from chaos or radical takeover from either side and into stable participatory government?

Thus, there are three rings of negotiations to analyze: within the *intifada*, repeatedly over the Tactical Question; within the “other” side, over the same Tactical Question; and between the two sides, over the nature of the transition and its ultimate goal. More than most negotiations, these are as actively preoccupied with a determination of goals and demands as they are with the deal being worked out with the other side. Initially, the protestors’ demands are almost entirely negative and procedural: remove the corrupt autocrat, his despotic party and indifferent government, his hated practices; gradually they evolve (through negotiation) into positive substantive and procedural demands. The analyses, following the events themselves, do not stop with the overthrow of the Old Order, but continue to some defining event of the New Order—one or more elections, and above all a new constitution.

## THE RECONCILIATION WORKSHOP

Post-conflict situations are precarious. Crises of commitment and capacity drive the shift in attitudes required for peace agreements between adversaries. But sustaining these shifts into longer-term peace-building processes is difficult, especially where structural conditions limit capacity to distribute resources and opportunities in ways that meet needs and aspirations across stakeholder groups. The tipping point is reached when one or more parties believe violence will yield greater benefits than continued efforts within a shaky peace. In such contexts, how might reconciliation between groups with a long history of conflict be achieved? What kinds of conditions must be negotiated to develop and sustain peaceful relations between parties to carry them jointly into a non-violent future? Is reconciliation actually negotiable? If yes, under what circumstances? These questions are at the core of the workshop.

### Specificities of the project

In the context of an avalanche of texts on the subject of reconciliation, this workshop makes a unique contribution in three respects. Firstly, it seeks an articulation between the notions of negotiation and reconciliation. Both subjects reflect expanding bodies of theory and research but the interaction of the two remains relatively unexplored. Secondly, it gathers contributions from both scholars and practitioners in the fields of negotiation and reconciliation – theory and practice are inextricably linked. As scholar-practitioners the editors of this text are both from nations wrestling with issues of social and political reconciliation – South Africa and Belgium. South Africa's reconciliation process is often understood simply through the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). But this is too narrow an approach. Reconciliatory intent lubricated the negotiated transition from its inception in the talks about talks period from the mid-1980's, served as a confidence builder in giving parties the courage to enter negotiations, and helped to overcome breakdowns in negotiation at critical points. The TRC in its short existence reflected an intensive but particular approach to the post-conflict discovery of truth, and sought to lay a platform for longer-term

reconciliation in a nation with a history of deep division. But the reconciliation debate continues, and may well require a return to more substantive negotiation processes in its future phases. Belgium in turn seems to suffer from an intractable ethno-linguistic conflict. Despite being the home of the European Union, Belgium since 2007 has displayed a rather surreal degree of political chaos and constant negotiation. The maximum degree of reform Walloon parties seem willing to settle for falls far short of the desires of Flemish nationalists, whose package of demands is considered unacceptable in Wallonia. The rise of Flemish nationalism and inter-communal tensions, have seen regular calls for reconciliation through the media. South Africa and Belgium do not share a lot of common features. However, both states reflect long term struggles to develop and sustain a strong national identity. Their common, but diverse experiences raise important questions about the prospects for negotiated accords and deeper processes of reconciliation, and the links between them.

Finally, the purpose of the workshop is exploratory and pragmatic rather than to offer a normative or prescriptive view. The intention is to raise and address questions about the practical limits of the notion of reconciliation when applied on a societal rather than an individual level. Some provocative questions can indeed be raised. How can negotiators deal with such an ambitious goal? Can reconciliation be detrimental to peace and/or democracy? Is reconciliation always possible, desirable or even necessary in all circumstances?

There is much at stake. We consider that without a fundamental clarification, the notion of reconciliation may turn out to be counterproductive. Beyond a theoretical interest, this question has a direct impact for practitioners; a better understanding of the issue is actually a *sine qua non* condition for more efficient interventions. If parties confuse reconciliation with negotiated peace agreements they may enter the next phase of their relationship on the basis of misunderstanding and divergent aspirations and expectations – a recipe for further rounds of conflict. The intention of the workshop is neither to be cynical

and strictly realist, nor sentimentalist and idealist. Reconciliation carries sentiments of hope in rebuilding relationships but it seems it is often grindingly difficult to effect. So – how can we retain an element of hope without becoming unrealistic about prospects of reconciliation in the context of longstanding conflicts in deeply divided societies? Are there grades of reconciliation – deep, modest, superficial, functional? How would such concepts find resonance with all the components of the population in conflicted societies?

### **Beyond case studies**

The intention of this project is not to collect case studies as such but to analyze the scope and limits of the negotiation processes that made reconciliation possible or not. Several questions will be addressed: Are reconciliation processes and forums and terms of reference negotiated by the parties during a regime change process (that is, as an element of the change process to manage changing power realities) or are they undertaken by new regimes (retrospectively under new regimes)? Are they intended as a means of managing difficult substantive issues

during a negotiation process, or to facilitate new relations between identity groups as an outcome rather than a lubricant to negotiations? What are the beacons and benchmarks used to evaluate effectiveness of processes – are they directed at a few concrete victims of repressive regimes or at the wider populations who suffered at their hands? Structural dimensions of change (occupation of decision-making roles; redistribution of wealth and land; access to education, health and welfare) may be objectively measured but how is attitude change across a society or the quality of relations between previously antagonistic groups to be evaluated?

These questions are decisive to illuminating a number of burning reconciliation challenges in nations such as Israel, Iraq, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and now Libya and Syria and other nations involved in the so-called Arab Spring. What lessons can be drawn from analysis that might be of value for such ‘reconciliations in waiting’?

## **THE SPEAKERS**

**ANDREAS LANGE** joined the University of Hamburg as professor of economics in July 2010. Before, he was appointed as Assistant Professor at the University of Maryland. He received his PhD from the Department of Economics, University of Heidelberg. He is also a Research Associate at the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW) Mannheim, and Adjunct Associate Professor at University of Maryland, AREC. He serves as co-editor for the *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* as well as *Environmental and Resource Economics*. His research includes theoretical, experimental and applied work on issues in public and environmental as well as behavioral economics. Recently, he conducted studies on international environmental agreements, on emissions trading systems, and on policy decisions under risk and uncertainty. His current research comprises work on the voluntary provision of public goods, auctions, as well on climate policy, all combining theoretical and experimental studies.

**FEN OSLER HAMPSON**, is Distinguished Fellow and Director of Global Security at the Centre for International Governance Innovation in Waterloo, Ontario. A Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, he is also the Chancellor’s Professor and former Director of The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA), Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada. He holds a Ph.D. from Harvard University where he also received his A.M. degree (both with distinction). He also holds an MSc. (Econ.) degree (with distinction) from the London School of Economics and a B.A. (Hon.) from the University of Toronto. He is the past recipient of various awards and honors, including a Research & Writing Award from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and a Jennings Randolph Senior Fellowship from the United States Institute of Peace (a non-partisan, Congressionally-funded think tank) in Washington, D.C. He has also been a fellow at the Belfer Center for Science & Technology at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at

Harvard. Dr. Hampson is the author/co-author of nine books and editor/co-editor of 27 other volumes. In addition, he is the author of nearly 100 articles and book chapters on international affairs. His newest books, *The Global Power of Talk: Negotiating America's Interests* (co-authored with I. William Zartman) (Paradigm) and *Rewiring Regional Security* (co-edited with Chester Crocker and Pamela Aall) (United States Institute of Peace) were published in 2011 and 2012 respectively.

**GUY OLIVIER FAURE** is Professor of Sociology at the Sorbonne University, Paris V, where he teaches „International Negotiation“, „Conflict Resolution“, and „Strategic Thinking and Action“. He is a member of the editorial board of three major international journals dealing with negotiation theory and practice: *International Negotiation* (Washington), *Negotiation Journal* (Harvard, Cambridge); *Group Decision and Negotiation* (New York). His major research interests are business and diplomatic negotiations, especially with China, focusing on strategies and cultural issues. He also is concerned with developing interdisciplinary approaches in domains such as terrorism, and engages in consulting and training activities with enterprises, multinational companies, international organizations and governments. He is referenced in the *Diplomat's Dictionary* published by the United States Peace Press, Washington. He is also quoted as one of the „2000 outstanding Scholars of the 21st Century“ by the International Biographical Center, Cambridge, UK. He has authored, co-authored and edited fifteen books and over 80 articles. Among his most recent publications are *How People Negotiate* (Kluwer Academic), *Escalation and Negotiation* (Cambridge University Press) with William Zartman, and *La négociation décloisonnée* (Paris, Publibook). Together with Jeffrey Z. Rubin, he edited *Culture and Negotiation*, the third volume in the PIN series. His works have been published in twelve different languages.

**I. WILLIAM ZARTMAN** (United States) is the Jacob Blaustein Distinguished Professor Emeritus at the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) of The Johns Hopkins University in Washington, and member of the Steering Committee of the Processes of International Negotiation (PIN) Program. He has been a Distinguished Fellow of the United States Institute of Peace, Olin Professor at the U.S. Naval Academy, Elie Halévy Professor at

Sciences Pô in Paris, and holder of the Bernheim Chair at the Free University of Bruxelles, and received a lifetime achievement award from the International Association for Conflict Management. He is author of a number of books, including *Negotiation and Conflict Management; Essays in Theory and Practice, The Practical Negotiator, Ripe for Resolution and Cowardly Lions: Missed Opportunities to Prevent Deadly Conflict and State Collapse*, and *Morocco: Problems of New Power*, and co-editor of *Terrorist Negotiations: Who Holds Whom Hostage?* and *State Engagement with Terrorists: Negotiating Ends and Means*. He is also president of the Tangier American Legation Institute for Moroccan Studies (TALIM), and was founding president of the American Institute for Maghrib Studies and past President of the Middle East Studies Association. His doctorate is from Yale (1956) and his honorary doctorate from Louvain (1997).

**IRINA NOVIKOVA** is professor at the Department of European Studies, Dean of the School of International Relations, Saint-Petersburg State University. She is also an editor of journal *Vestnik [Messenger] of St. Petersburg University. International Relations*. Her research interests include the Grand Duchy of Finland, comparative studies of Northern European countries and International Relations in the Baltic Sea Region. She is the author of *Finskaia karta" v nemetskom pasianse: Germaniia i problema nezavisimosti Finliandii (1914-1918)* [“Finnish Card in German patience: Germany and the Problem of Finnish Independence, 1914-1918]. (St. Petersburg, 2002); [“*Mezhdû molotom i nakoval'ney" : Shvetsia v germano-rossijskom protivostoianii na Baltike.* [“Between the Hammer and Anvil”: Sweden in the German-Russian Conflict on the Baltic during World War I]. (St.Petersburg, 2006); “From Loyalists to Separatists: Russian Images of the Finns, 1809 - 1917”, In: *Journal of Finnish Studies*. 2010. Vol. 14. N.2. P. 25-42; “Russia’s WTO entry-Consequences for higher education”, In: *Baltic Rim Economies*. 2012. N.6.

**MARK ANSTEY** is an Emeritus Professor of Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. Between 2008-11 he was a Professor with Michigan State University’s School of Labor and Industrial Relations in Dubai, UAE. An active labor and community mediator for over 25 years, he served on South Africa’s peace structures during the political transition period, and was Director of Monitoring (Eastern Cape) for the Independent Electoral Commission in the

country's historic 1994 elections. In the post election period he served on Ministerial task groups for transformation of the police service. He conducts training and workshops for companies and trade unions, and facilitates organizational change and relationship building processes. He is the author of six books and numerous publications in journals of labor relations, negotiation and conflict resolution, sociology and social work – his book *Managing Change, Negotiating Conflict* is now in its third edition. He has worked across a wide spread of African and European countries, as well as the USA and the UAE.

**MARTIN KESTERNICH** has been working as a researcher at the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW), Department of Environmental and Resource Economics, Environmental Management since September 2010. Martin Kesternich studied economics at the University of Mannheim and the Pontificia Universidad Católica Argentina in Buenos Aires. His current research includes experimental and empirical methods to analyze cooperation among agents with heterogeneous preferences in the private provision of international public goods.

**MIKHAIL TROITSKIY** is associate professor at Moscow State Institute of International Relations (MGIMO). Troitskiy holds a doctoral degree in political science from the Institute for the US and Canadian Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences (2003). In 2003-09, he worked at MGIMO University in Moscow as associate professor and deputy dean of the School of Political Affairs. He has held visiting fellowships at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, as well as at Cambridge and Oxford Universities. His research interests include US foreign policy, Eurasian security, Russia-US and Russia-NATO relations. Troitskiy has published a research monograph and a series of book chapters, articles and papers in both Russian and English. He has contributed op-eds to International Herald Tribune and Moscow Times as well as a variety Russian-language print media.

**MORDECHAI (MOTI) MELAMUD** (Israel) is a retiree of IAEC and CTBTO. He was formerly a research physicist with a Ph.D. in experimental physics from the Weizmann Institute of Science (Rehovot, Israel) in 1976. Since 1967 Dr. Melamud was employed by the Israel Atomic

Energy Commission (IAEC) at the Nuclear research Centre - Negev (NRCN), as a senior scientist and a Group Leader in experimental physics and is co-author of more than a hundred publications in scientific journals, and two patents in non-destructive testing of steel cables by magnetic methods. Dr. Melamud's interest shifted since 1997 to safeguards and international treaties concerning nuclear disarmament, with special interest in their verification regime. Since 1998 he was employed at the IAEC headquarters as deputy director for international relations and a special assistant to the Director General for the implementation of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in Israel. From 1998 to 2002 he was as a member and later the head of the delegation of Israel to the CTBTO policy making organs. In 2000, Dr. Melamud served as a member of The International Independent Commission on the Verifiability of the CTBT established by VERTIC. From 2002 until 2012 Dr. Melamud served as Chief of inspectors' Training in the On-Site Inspection Division of the Provisional Technical Secretariat (PTS) of the CTBT Organization and later as a consultant to the PTS. He was in charge of developing and implementing the CTBT inspectorate buildup and inspectors' training program, and responsible for organizing and conducting courses and tabletop exercises for international audiences on the CTBT on-site inspection regime, in Vienna and other countries.

**MOTY CRISTAL** is a professional negotiator and expert in crisis management. Beyond his teaching at the Interdisciplinary Center In Herzlia and Tel Aviv University, he is a Professor of Practice for Negotiation Dynamics at SKOLKOVO, the leading Russian business school, he is the CEO of NEST Group, which provides negotiation consulting and training worldwide. Between 1994-2001 he served in various official positions in Israeli negotiation teams with its Arab neighbors, and has extensive operation experience in hostage and crisis negotiation. Since 2001 he consults, advises, trains and negotiates on behalf of senior executives and officials in various complex negotiations. Mr. Cristal has a law degree from Bar-Ilan Law School in Israel, and graduated Harvard Kennedy School of Government.

**RUDOLF SCHÜSSLER** (Germany) is professor of philosophy at the University of Bayreuth, Germany. He studied philosophy, sociology and economics and obtained his doctoral degree in

sociology, Habilitation in philosophy. Rudolf Schüssler is presently working on applied game and decision theory, the history of moral decision making, and several subjects of practical ethics. He is also teaching a module on negotiations and conflict resolution for the "Philosophy & Economics" course at the University of Bayreuth. His publications include: *Kooperation unter Egoisten: Vier Dilemmata*, Oldenbourg, München 1990 (2. Aufl. 1997); "Terrorismus und Menschenwürde", in: C. Fehige/C. Lumer/U. Wessels (Hrsg.): *Handeln mit Bedeutung und Handeln mit Gewalt. Festschrift für Georg Meggle*, Paderborn, 2009, 291-308; *Global Governance and Climate Change: A Question of Historical Justice?*, *Filosofski Godisnjak* 21, 2009, 51-66; "Adjusted Winner" (AW) Analyses of the 1978 Camp David Accords; "Valuable Tools for Negotiators" in: R. Avenhaus/W. Zartman (eds.): *Diplomacy Games*, Springer, Berlin 2007, 283-296; "Detention in Guantanamo: A Matrix for Moral Assessment", *Filosofski Godisnjak* 19, 2006, 141-156; "Humanitäre Intervention und Gerechter Krieg, Vierteljahresschrift für Sicherheit und Frieden", Heft 3, 19, 2001, 138-145.

**VALERIE ROSOUX** is senior research fellow at the Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research (FNRS) since 2003 and Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Louvain since 2001. She was a Jennings Randolph Senior Fellow at the United States Institute of Peace (USIP, Washington) 2010-2011. She previously taught international relations at the Instituts d'Études Politiques (IEP) of Lille and Grenoble, France. As a post-doctoral researcher, she worked at The Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS) in 2002, the Center for International Studies and Research (CERI), Institut d'Études Politiques of Paris (2001) and the University Laval, Canada (2000). By training, she is a political scientist and a philosopher. Some of her publications include: "Reconciliation as a peace-building process: scope and limits", in J. Bercovitch, V. Kremenyuk and W. Zartman (ed.), *Handbook of Conflict Resolution*, London, Sage Publications, 2008; "The Figure of the righteous individual in

Rwanda", *International Social Science Journal*, 189, 2006, 491-499; "Die Entwicklung der offiziellen Erinnerung in Frankreich: Ursachen und Folgen", in G. Schwan et al. (Hrsg.), *Demokratische politische Identität. Deutschland, Polen und Frankreich im Vergleich*, Wiesbaden, VS Verlag, 2006, 285-315; "Memory and International Negotiation: the Franco-German Case", in W. Zartman et V. Kremenyuk (ed.), *Peace versus Justice. Negotiating Forward-and Backward-Looking Outcomes*, Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield, 2005, 155-177; "Human rights and the 'work of memory' in international relations", *International Journal of Human Rights*, 3(2), June 2004, 159-170.

**WILBUR PERLOT** is senior training and research fellow of the Clingendael Academy. He is a specialist in multilateral negotiations (in the EU, EU accession and more general international negotiations) and intercultural communication. He studied Rural Development Sociology (2000) at Wageningen University, with a focus on conflict studies and refugees. In September 2001 he started his first period at the Clingendael Institute as a researcher and trainer for the Clingendael International Energy Programme (CIEP). As an energy expert, he has conducted dozens of lectures and training sessions on international and EU energy issues. From September 2006 until March 2010 he was programme editor, moderator and head of the political section of De Balie, a prominent cultural and political centre in Amsterdam. Since returning to Clingendael in 2010 he has conducted approximately 40 training sessions per year on negotiations, falling broadly into four categories: EU-based negotiations, EU accession negotiations, general international negotiations and difficult negotiations/mediations. Wilbur is an instructor in international negotiations in the master programme International Relations and Diplomacy at the University of Leiden, and in the master programme Water Conflict Management, UNESCO-IHE. Wilbur is the coordinator of the Processes of International Negotiation (PIN) programme.

## THE PIN PROGRAMME

The Processes of International Negotiation (PIN) Program is a non-profit group of scholars and practitioners that encourages and organizes research on a broad spectrum of topics related to international negotiation seen as a process. Its objectives include the dissemination of new knowledge about negotiation as widely as possible, and developing networks of scholars and practitioners interested in the subject, for the purpose of improving analysis and practice of negotiation worldwide.

The PIN network includes more than 4,000 scholars and practitioners of international negotiation. The organization is presided over by a Steering Committee, who organizes the main activities and edits the newsletter *PINPoints*.

The secretariat of PIN is based at the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'. There are currently ten PIN SC members: Dr Mark Anstey, Michigan State University at Dubai; Dr Rudolf Schüssler of Bayreuth University; Dr Guy Olivier Faure of the Sorbonne; Dr Fen Osler Hampson of Carleton University; Dr Paul Meerts of Clingendael; Dr Valerie Rosoux of the Catholic University of Louvain; Dr Cecilia Albin of the Swedish Institute of International Relations; Dr I. William Zartman of the Johns Hopkins University-SAIS; Dr Mordechai Melamud for the CTBT project; and Dr Mikhail Troitskiy, Associate Professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations. Wilbur Perlot (Clingendael) is the coordinator of the PIN programme.

Every year the Steering Committee conducts 1-2 workshops devoted to the analysis and improvement of the practice of negotiation, involving scholars from numerous countries, in order to tap a broad range of international expertise. Normally, authors are invited to draft papers for these workshops. After the workshop these papers are revised for publication. PIN has

published a book per year as a product of these workshops, using various English-language publishers, and its books have been translated into a number of languages, including an active Chinese translation program.

Topics generally fall into one or two categories: conceptual issues, often bringing together another conceptual area that has hitherto not been combined with negotiation, and current issues. *Unfinished Business: Why International Negotiations Fail* (2012), *The Slippery Slope to Genocide: Reducing Identity Conflicts and Preventing Mass Murder* (2011), *Negotiated Risks* (2009) and *Diplomacy Games* (2009) (on formal modeling) are examples of the first; *Climate Change Negotiations* (2013), *Negotiating the Comprehensive Test Ban* (2010) and *Negotiating with Terrorists* (2010) are examples of the second.

The Steering Committee also offers mini-conferences on international negotiations in order to disseminate and encourage research on the subject. Such 'Road Shows' have been held at the Argentine Council for International Relations, Buenos Aires; Beida University, Beijing; the Center for Conflict Resolution, Haifa; the Center for the Study of Contemporary Japanese Culture, Kyoto; the School of International Relations, Tehran; the Swedish Institute of International Affairs, Stockholm; the University of Cairo; University Hassan II, Casablanca; the University of Helsinki; and the UN University for Peace, San Jose, Costa Rica.

The PIN Network publishes a biannual newsletter, *PINPoints*, and sponsors a network of over 4,000 researchers and practitioners in negotiation. Past projects have been supported by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Smith Richardson Foundation, the US Institute of Peace, UNESCO and the Carnegie Corporation.

# THE CLINGENDAEL INSTITUTE

The Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael' is a prominent Dutch think tank within the realm of international relations. Focused on the in-depth understanding of global processes, the Clingendael Institute combines research with training and aims to propagate its findings to a network of scholars and policy-makers transcending national or cultural frontiers.

The Clingendael Institute is academically independent and therefore it is not affiliated to any political, social, or religious movement. As a neutral platform, the Institute provides a suitable location for conferences and round tables tackling political issues from an objective viewpoint.

In all its activities, the Institute allocates substantial attention to The Netherlands' position and role on the international arena.

## **Organisation and Expertise**

The Institute is organized into two main departments: Research and Academy.

**Clingendael Research** reunites approximately 45 researchers. The area of research varies from international security and conflict management, Europe and the European Union, governance, international negotiations through the Processes of International Negotiation (PIN) network, to specific regions such as Asia or the Middle East. Clingendael Research also develops future scenarios. Apart from the research activities on these topics, Clingendael nurtures a separate research programme for energy - the Clingendael International Energy Programme.

Clingendael's research finds its way through numerous publications, seminars and conferences, as well as media appearances.

For more detailed information, please visit [www.clingendael.nl/research](http://www.clingendael.nl/research).

**Clingendael Academy** develops and organizes courses and training seminars on international politics for a broad range of audiences and participants. Over the years the Clingendael training staff has developed a vast knowledge and experience in courses on Europe and the European Union, security, conflict resolution and international negotiation. In cooperation with Leiden University, Clingendael organizes an MSc programme in International Relations and Diplomacy.

A large number of civil servants and diplomats, policy makers, and NGO representatives, both from the Netherlands as well as from other countries, have participated in Clingendael's training programmes, contributing to enhancing their personal skills and the institutional development of their own organization or country.

For more information on specific courses, please visit [www.clingendael.nl/training](http://www.clingendael.nl/training).

## **Clingendael International Energy Programme**

A third unit, which is liaised to the Institute, but operates on an independent basis, is the Clingendael International Energy Programme (CIEP). Information on CIEP can be found via [www.ciep.nl](http://www.ciep.nl).

## **Other entities**

The Institute also hosts the editorial board of the only Dutch language magazine on international relations, the *Internationale Spectator*, and it offers a home to the secretariat of the Dutch Association for International Affairs (het Nederlands Genootschap voor Internationale Zaken - NGIZ). The Clingendael Institute is, among others, a member of *The Hague Academic Coalition* (HAC) - an 'umbrella' platform consisting of a number of academic institutions based in The Hague - which develops activities in the field of peace, justice and international affairs.