PREFACE

Hiroshi Kimura

Whether we like it or not, we are always negotiating with someone—our boss, colleagues, friends, or even family members. We are constantly engaged, tacitly or not, in negotiating, bargaining or making a deal. Our work, for example, whether it be for the government or a private company, is determined by a contract that is a result of negotiation. Shopping done by a housewife, or daughter's decision to accept an invitation for a date from her boyfriend as well as almost all of her conduct during dating—all these are acts that have something to do with negotiation, bargaining and making deals. Negotiation is necessary in a situation where there are two people or more. Robinson Crusoe (the hero of Daniel Defoe's novel), after living for a long time in complete isolation on an island, a situation in which naturally no negotiating activity was needed, suddenly discovered the necessity of negotiation when "Friday" arrived on the scene.

Negotiations take place at various levels—among individuals, groups, and states. Negotiations are necessary not only among rivals, opponents and enemies, be they potential or actual, but even between close friends and allies. In other words, even among people whose objectives, tasks and interests are identical, negotiations are still necessary for the purpose of adjusting their differences in terms of approaches, methods, division of labor and burden—or cost–sharing. Naturally, negotiations are even more necessary among people, groups or states who have conflicting interests.

The methods to resolve conflicts of interests can be largely classified into two kinds: those that resort to force and those that use peaceful means. Negotiation constitutes a typical example of the latter method (Israelian and Lebedeva, 1991, 48 : Kohler, 1958, 901). Resolution of conflicts by force, such as military means, may appear to be an efficient way of resolving a conflict, but resolution by force is, in fact, often more time–consuming and costly, because it may lead to a vicious circle of counterforce by other side. The forceful method is thus not regarded as an appropriate way to reach a long–lasting settlement. It does not succeed in providing a resolution that is acceptable to all the parties concerned (Putman and Roloff, 1992, 3). Consequently, no matter how much time, energy and other resources may be consumed, we have no practical

alternative but to choose the peaceful solution of a conflict, relying upon negotiation as the best means.

The Cold War was, as its name implies, a war, but not one in which gunfire was actually exchanged on a battlefield. It was, rather, an intermediary situation between war and peace (Nagai, 1978, 6–7). No matter how this "war" may be defined, it was an extraordinary set of events that continued for nearly half a century from the end of World War II to around 1989–1992 (Lebow and Stein, 1994, 3).

To be precise, however, it is mainly in the European theater, that we have clearly witnessed the end of the Cold War, but not necessarily in Asia and other areas. In Asia, North Korea, China, and Vietnam are still, by their own definition, "socialist" countries ; the confrontation between the two Koreas still persists on the Korean peninsula ; and with the unresolved territorial dispute, Russia and Japan have yet to normalize their relations and conclude a peace treaty.

However, if we define the Cold War as a global confrontation between "liberal democracies" headed by the U. S. A. and the "socialist" camp led by the former USSR (Walker, 1993, 1), it is reasonable to conclude that the Cold War has indeed ended (Gaddis, 1992, 21–22).[1]

Negotiation, the central theme of this book, is a universal human behavior, whose origin can be traced back to the very beginning of history. Negotiation is also the main means for resolving conflicts, thereby serving as an important tool of diplomacy. With the end of the Cold War, the significance of negotiation in international politics has increased. Let us elaborate on these points.

The end of the Cold War has led a situation in which certain types of local wars (national, ethnic, territorial, or religious) erupt more easily than they did previously. On the one hand, the end of the Cold War greatly softened the confrontation between the two superpowers, the U. S. A. and the former USSR, over ideology and nuclear weaponry, which in turn contributed to the solution of certain kinds of local war. For example, proxy wars between the two superpowers (e. g., in Angola) have ceased, or are now much less likely to occur.

On the other hand, there are other kinds of local wars, arising not from ideological confrontation or differences in racial or politico–economic systems but from national, ethnic, racial or religious differences ; economic poverty and social discrimination ; or dissatisfaction over existing borders. During the Cold War, such conflicts had been restrained and successfully contained, largely because of the firmly established hegemonic control by the former Soviet Union over its satellites ; the solidarity among the Western camp countries ; and the general apprehension that events might escalate to a nuclear war. However, with the decline of Communist ideology, the breakup of the Eastern bloc, and the

collapse of the Soviet Union, which occurred between 1989 and 1991, such conflicts, suddenly became prominent, like magma that had been contained under the surface.

To recapitulate, the end of confrontation originating from ideological and politico–economic disparities in the world did not bring about the end of all kinds of local wars. On the contrary, the disintegration of the USSR and the withdrawal of Soviet military forces from Eastern Europe have resulted in some local *conflicts* in the former "socialist" camp countries escalating into local *war*. The breakup of the Soviet Union, for instance, not only led to the eruption of nationalism within the USSR's former domain but also resulted in an enlargement of internal conflicts and confrontation that had been previously contained, or at least kept at a low level, due to the apprehension of inviting intervention from a military superpower, the USSR.[2] The civil war that erupted in former Yugoslavia is a good example. To be sure, the civil war in former Yugoslavia occurred mainly due to domestic reasons. Yet, without the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is doubtful whether this civil war would have escalated to such a large scale. Yugoslavia may be an extreme case, but it does not constitute the only example of a local *conflict* escalating into a local *war*.

Another reason for the recent increase in the role of negotiation in international affairs is the emergence of disparities in opinions and interests in the Western camp since the end of the Cold War. Although such disparities existed during the Cold War, the most important task for Western countries at that time was to unite against their actual or potential enemies—the former Soviet Union, China, and other Communist states. With the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of common enemies, however, differences in views and interests in the Western camp emerged as important issues. In the world of politics, once one enemy has gone, new enemies tend to appear, or have to be discovered or even created (Arendt 1951 : 422–425). This argument is best illustrated by Samuel Huntington's popular theory of "the Clash of Civilizations." (Huntington, 1993, 22–49)

Although all of this seems to be almost self–evident, it has not been sufficiently appreciated and recognized that it will continue in the future. The well–known axiom of Carl von Clausewitz that "war is a mere continuation of policy by other means" (von Clausewitz, 1971, 119, 401–402) must now be changed, into a dictum that "negotiation is a continuation of policy by other means." (Winham, 1987, 188)

NOTES

1. For the variaty of reasons why the cold war ended, see, for example, Ralph Summy and Michael E. Salla, *Why the Cold War Ended : A Range of Interpretations* (Westport, CT : Greenwood Press, 1995), pp. 249–259. For a view that questions the end of the Cold War even in the European theater, see Denise Artaud, "The End of the Cold War : A Skeptical View," in Hogan, *op. cit.*, pp. 185–193. For a radical reinterpretation, see also, John J. Maresca, *The End of the Cold War is Also Over* (Stanford : Center for International Security and Arms Control, 1995), pp. 3–24.

2. For a reason why *peregovory* (negotiations) have recently began to play an important role, Russian specialists point out that local conflicts, war, based on nationalism, and a wave of strikes that have all of sudden erupted in the former USSR. V. Israelian, M. Lebedeva, "Peregovory–iskusstvo dlia vsekh," *Mezhdunarodnaia zhizn'*, No. 9, 1991, p. 48.

REFERENCES

Arendt, Hannah (1951) *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (Cleveland : The World Publishing Company)

Fisher, Roger and Ury, William L. (1981) *Getting to Yes* (Boston : Houghton Mifflin)

Gaddis, John Lewis (1992) "The Cold War, the Long Peace, and the Future," in Michael J. Hogan, ed., *The End of the Cold War: Its Meaning and Implications* (Cambridge : Cambridge University Press)

Huntington, Samuel P. (1993) "The Clash of Civilizations ?" *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 72, No. 3 (Summer)

Israelian, Victor and Lebedeva, Marina (1991) "Peregovory—iskusstvo dlia vsekh," *Mezhdunarodnaia zhizn'* (November)

Kohler, Foy D. (1958) "Negotiation as an Effective Instrument of American Foreign Policy," *U. S. Department of State Bulletin*, 38 (June 2)

Lebow, Richard Ned and Stein, Janice Gross (1994) *We All Lost the Cold War* (Princeton : Princeton University Press)

Nagai, Yônosuke (1978) "Reisen no Kigen [Origin of the Cold War]" (Tokyo : Chûô–Kôron–sha).

Putnam, Linda L. and Roloff, Michael E. (1992) *Communication and Negotiation* (Newbury Park, CA. and London : Sage Publications)

von Clausewitz, Carl (1971) *On War* (London : Penguin Books)

Walker, Martin (1993) *The Cold War: A History* (New York : Henry Holt and Company)

Winham, Gilbert R. (1987) "Multilateral Economic Negotiation," *Negotiating Journal* 3, 2 (April)