

Министерство образования и науки Российской Федерации

Владивостокский государственный университет
экономики и сервиса

АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК: ПЕРЕГОВОРЫ НА ВЫСШЕМ УРОВНЕ

Хрестоматия
по специальностям
«Международные отношения»
и «Регионоведение (США и Канады)»

Владивосток
Издательство ВГУЭС
2011

Рецензенты: М.Б. Григорьева, ст. преп. каф.
межкультурной коммуникации
и переводоведения;
М.Б. Ковалева, ст. преп. каф.
межкультурной коммуникации
и переводоведения.

Анкудинова И.Ф., Уткина С.А.

**А 64 АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК: ПЕРЕГОВОРЫ НА
ВЫСШЕМ УРОВНЕ [Текст] : хрестоматия. – Влади-
восток: Изд-во ВГУЭС, 2011. – 48 с.**

Хрестоматия по дисциплине «Английский язык» включает 3 раздела, включающих аутентичные тексты общественно-политической тематики: визиты и переговоры; документы, заключаемые по итогам переговоров; особенности ведения переговоров с представителями иностранных государств. Цель хрестоматии – сформировать навыки чтения аутентичных текстов общественно-политической направленности.

Для студентов специальностей 350200 «Международные отношения» и 350300 (специализация 350305) «Регионоведение (США и Канада)».

ББК 81.2 Англ.

© Издательство Владивостокского
государственного университета
экономики и сервиса, 2011

ВВЕДЕНИЕ

Настоящая хрестоматия представляет собой тематически обусловленный сборник текстов. Цель пособия – развить навыки профессионально-ориентированного чтения аутентичных текстов.

Хрестоматия состоит из 3 разделов:

1. Визиты и переговоры.
2. Документы, заключаемые по итогам переговоров.
3. Культурные особенности ведения переговоров.

Хрестоматия рассчитана на студентов 3 курса специальностей 350200 «Международные отношения» и 350300 (специализация 350305) «Регионоведение (США и Канады)». Она предназначена как для студентов, изучающих английский язык углубленно, так и для тех, кто изучает английский язык самостоятельно.

Материал хрестоматии апробирован на кафедре межкультурных коммуникаций и переводоведения Института иностранных языков.

ARRIVALS, VISITS, TALKS

Text 1

1. Friendly Talks in Moscow.

The Prime-Minister of Vietnam arrived in Moscow yesterday at the invitation of his Russian counterpart.

2. Russian-Chinese Foreign Ministers to Meet.

The Russian Foreign Minister will meet the Chinese Foreign Minister in New York later this month, it was announced yesterday in Moscow. The meeting will take place during the forthcoming session of the United Nations General Assembly.

3. The President of Senegal Here for Talks.

The President of Senegal arrived in London from Paris on a 4-day state visit during which he will meet and have talks with the British Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary.

4. Russian Foreign Minister for London.

The Russian Foreign Minister will make an official visit to Great Britain, it was announced here today. The visit is in return for the recent visit to Moscow of the British Foreign Secretary.

5. US President to Visit France.

The US President will pay an official visit to France next month, it was announced here today. The State Secretary is expected to accompany the President on this visit which is in return for the French President's visit to the US.

6. India's Premier to Visit Moscow.

India's Prime-Minister has accepted an invitation to visit Moscow and is to arrive on July 1 on a three – day state visit, the Foreign Ministry announced.

7. Saudi King Arrives in Britain.

King of Saudi Arabia arrived in Britain yesterday at the start of an official four-day visit.

Talks with the British prime-minister and Foreign Office representatives are expected to focus on the oil market and on Britain's relations with Syria.

8. British-Hungarian Contacts.

Broadening contacts between Britain and Hungary were welcomed yesterday in a joint communique issued in London at the end of the visit by the Hungarian Foreign Minister.

It's the first Hungarian leader to make an official visit to Britain for 20 years.

The British Foreign Secretary has accepted an invitation to pay a return visit to Hungary.

9. Head of State to Visit Russia.

The Vietnamese head of state will pay an official visit to Russia from May 10 to 16, it was announced in Hanoi today.

He is expected to discuss with the Russian leaders a wide range of problems.

The Vietnamese delegation headed by him is to visit some European countries after its stay in Moscow.

10. Finnish Foreign Minister to visit Moscow.

The Finnish and Russian Foreign Ministers will hold a meeting on Saturday in Moscow, it was announced in Helsinki today.

The Finnish Foreign Minister will be accompanied by three advisers, including the head of Foreign Ministry's political department. Trade, scientific and technological cooperation will be among the questions discussed.

The Finnish Ambassador to Moscow is expected to be present during the talks.

11. Jordan and Syria Hold More Talks.

Yesterday in Amman the Prime-Ministers of Jordan and Syria held a second round of talks aimed at overcoming political differences between their countries.

The Premiers who met for more than three hours on Tuesday night are expected to issue a joint communique.

12. A Treaty with Slovakia.

A Russian government delegation led by the Russian Premier arrived in Bratislava yesterday on an official visit to sign a treaty of friendship and mutual assistance. The delegation includes the Foreign Minister, the Defence Minister and some political advisers.

The head of the Russian delegation will also discuss with the Slovakian leaders the topical problems of the current international situation and some questions of mutual interest.

13. South Africa's Foreign Minister in France.

South Africa's Foreign Minister arrived in Paris yesterday on a two-day visit.

According to a French government spokesman, the French Foreign Minister returned to the capital for a meeting with his South African counterpart after accompanying the French President on part of a tour to South America.

The ministers are expected to discuss state-to-state relations. France is one of South Africa's five major trading partners.

14. British Premier to Visit South Africa Next Month.

The British Prime-Minister is to travel to South Africa next month, the first British Prime-Minister to visit the republic since Harold Mcmillan made his landmark "winds of change" speech there 34 years ago.

The two-day visit is beginning on September 20. It will be a "broad-based" visit to Cape Town, Pretoria and Johannesburg designed to cement the new political economic and cultural ties between Britain and Pretoria.

15. Polish Premier Visits Italy.

A Polish delegation led by the Polish Premier arrived in Italy yesterday on a 3-day visit which is designed to improve economic relations between the two countries.

Welcoming the Polish Prime-Minister at Rome's airport the Italian Prime Minister said he saw the visit as part of his government's efforts to overcome differences between their two countries.

16. Canadian Prime-Minister in Moscow.

At the invitation of Russia's Government the Canadian Prime-Minister was on an official visit to Russia from May 17 to 28.

During his stay in Russia the Canadian Prime Minister had official talks with Russian leaders. The talks were held in an atmosphere of understanding and cordiality. The parties exchanged views on the Russian-Canadian relations, prospects for broader cooperation and other problems of mutual interest. The Russian and Canadian premiers signed a protocol which provides for regular high-level consultations on important international problems as well as questions of mutual interest.

The Canadian Premier got a warm welcome in Russia.

17. Britain in Dubai Talks.

The British Defence Secretary held talks yesterday on military cooperation in the United Arab Emirates, the official news agency said.

The Defence Secretary who had arrived from Saudi Arabia met with his Arab counterpart for talks on a number of bilateral issues and regional and international matters of mutual interest, the agency said. The British embassy sources said that the meeting also covered military links but they ruled out the signing of any agreement.

Text 2

1. Middle East Talks.

The UN Secretary-General has called for a resumption of the Geneva talks on the Middle East and expressed confidence that the forthcoming UN General Assembly session would deal with the Middle East problem. He also

added that this part of the world is one of the most dangerous hotbeds of tension.

2. British Prime-Minister Pleased with Russian Visit.

The British Prime-Minister flew back to London last night after his five-day visit to Russia. Before leaving Russia's capital the British premier said in a farewell ceremony in the Kremlin that he was satisfied with the results of the visit and believed the two countries had made a big step forward toward the development of a dialogue in all fields.

The Russian leader agreed with that assessment and reiterated Russia's preparedness to deepen cooperation with Britain.

3. Meeting between the Russian Premier and Finnish President.

A non-official meeting was held in St. Petersburg on mutual agreement between Russia's Prime-Minister and President of the Finnish republic. In the course of the meeting the sides exchanged opinions on the further development of bilateral relations and noted with satisfaction that such meetings bring positive results. Touching upon the issues of international relations and European security both leaders emphasized the importance of solving all disputable questions through negotiations.

4. London Invites the French President.

The British Queen has invited the French President to pay an official visit to Britain. With the close relations between London and Paris cemented by cooperation in Bosnia there is talk of forging now a special relationship between them. The French President may also be invited to address a meeting of the Houses of Parliament. The undeclared aim of Britain's policy towards France is an attempt to prevent a solid Franco-German union.

5. Syrian – Israeli Talks.

The US Administration will next week bring Israeli and Syrian negotiators together in a bid to resume peace talks which were suspended six months ago amid disagreement over Israel's withdrawal from Golan Heights.

The US Secretary of State announced their resumption last Saturday after visits to Damascus and Jerusalem and appeals from Israel's Prime-Minister to Syria's President.

The negotiators will begin their talks next Wednesday. After three days they will go home for consultations, then return for three more days of talks early in January.

6. Russia's View of the British Premier's Visit to Moscow.

The British Prime-Minister's visit to Russia and discussions he held with the Russian leaders in Moscow helped them understand better the view

of the British Government and its attitude to prospects for the development of Russian-British relations. The visit gave a fresh impetus to these relations. The two sides signed a series of agreements that will broaden and strengthen trust between them.

The visit showed that on some issues the two countries have close positions, but the negotiations in Moscow also revealed deep differences on some major problems, such as disarmament and arms control.

It is the British Premier's commitment to old thinking on these very important issues which prevented the sides from achieving greater progress in strengthening Russian-British ties.

However, the Russian-British summit meeting was very important for bilateral relations and the international situation as a whole.

7. China's and Russia's Presidents Meet to Boost Sino-Russian Ties.

China's president arrives in Russia tomorrow for a four-day visit aimed at broadening and deepening strategic and political co-operation between the two countries.

8. US Secretary of State to Visit Syria on Mideast Trip.

The US Secretary of State is planning to go to Syria for talks with Syria's President during his first official trip to the Middle East, senior American officials said today. The US is interested in restarting suspended peace negotiations between Syria and Israel because peace with Syria is key to a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East.

His trip will also take him to Israel, Egypt and Jordan. The primary goal of the visit is to get the Palestinians and Israelis talking seriously to each other again about peace based on cooperation to achieve security.

The State Department has not formally announced the dates or itinerary of the trip which is expected in the second week of September.

9. South Africa's Links with Iran.

A visit by the South African Foreign Minister to Iran to promote economic cooperation has raised concern in the West over the foreign policy pursued by the South African government.

The Pretoria government rejected Washington's attempts to flunche its relationship with Iran which is accused by the Americans of terrorism. Iran's official news agency quoted South Africa's Foreign Minister as saying that South Africa did not follow the American policy of trying to isolate Iran. "Relations with Iran are good and talks were held in the atmosphere of mutual understanding. Both sides welcomed further contacts in the interests of the peoples of our countries".

10. Presidents Meet to Boost Sino-Russian Ties.

China's President arrives in Russia tomorrow for a four-day visit aimed at broadening and deepening strategic and political co-operation between the two countries.

For the Kremlin, his visit is a welcome counterbalance to domestic concerns about NATO enlargement and worries that Russia is being excluded from the western club of nations.

China's President and the President of the Russian Federation are due to sign two historic pacts aimed at giving substance to improving Sino-Russian ties.

These are a "strategic co-operative partnership" agreement and a treaty on further reducing troop numbers and extending military cooperation along the two countries frontier.

The two presidents will also be concerned to promote trade ties which have not developed as both countries might have wished.

11. Greek – Turkish Talks.

The Greek Prime-Minister held urgent meetings with his senior ministers yesterday to discuss a European Union (EU) initiative for starting a dialogue with Turkey, according to the government officials. They said Athens and Ankara were close to agreeing the establishment of a committee of experts from each side to discuss ways of tackling differences.

It is the first time the two rivals have considered talking since January last year when they came close to war over rights of two small uninhabited islands in the Aegean Sea.

The sudden rapprochement was the result of a meeting in Malta this week between the Greek Foreign Minister and his Turkish counterpart at which the EU initiative was put forward.

Text 3. Summits and talks in news

1. Peace Talks to Proceed

New Delhi, India (Reuters) – India and Pakistan will hold peace talks next week in New Delhi despite the political crisis threatening Prime Minister D. G., Foreign Minister I. K. G. said Friday.

G. said he would meet his Pakistani counterpart, G. A. K., during and after a meeting of foreign ministers of the Non-aligned Movement, set for April 7 to 8.

Foreign secretaries of the two countries held four days of talks that broke a three-year stalemate and ended on a positive note last Monday when they agreed to hold a subsequent round in Islamabad.

2. A leading American envoy pulled out of the talks on the long-delayed Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank city of Hebron last night.

D. R., the American Middle East peace negotiator, said he was returning to Washington and would return only if the Israelis and the Palestinians needed his services.

His departure was seen as US pressure on both sides to resolve their differences and seal the agreement so that Israeli troops can start leaving the last Palestinian city they still occupy by next month's American presidential elections.

3. Seoul, South Korea. Eager for more outside assistance in the face of famine, North Korea said Friday it will attend preliminary peace talks in New York.

North Korea has never before agreed to peace talks directly involving rival South Korea, which it calls a U.S. puppet. And Friday's announcement was a measure of its desperate need for aid.

The North's agreement came after South Korea and the United States promised \$16 million in food aid and Seoul held out the carrot of much more help if the talks are fruitful.

4. Seoul. South Korea on Thursday shrugged off as a temporary setback a decision by North Korea to cancel talks with the United States on missile proliferation.

The South said it was still preparing for four-nation peace talks designed to end a state of war on the Korean peninsula and expected the North to attend those discussions in New York in mid-September.

Pyongyang pulled out on Wednesday from the missile talks with Washington, demanding the return of two of its top diplomats who sought refuge in the United States.

5. China, Taiwan Visit. Beijing (AP) – Taiwanese and Chinese intermediaries worked Monday on arranging a visit to the island by Beijing's top negotiator in an effort to restart talks suspended since 1995.

Taiwan presented two possible dates for China's W. D. to visit this fall, said J. J., deputy secretary general of Taiwan's Straits Exchange Foundation, which handles contacts with China. Beijing will decide on the dates later, J.'s Chinese counterpart, L. Y., told reporters.

China also plans to hold a forum in late August on relations between Beijing and Taiwan, L. said. Senior Taiwanese statesmen responsible for Chinese contacts and scholars will be invited, L. said.

The two sides did not set an agenda for W.'s visit to Taiwan to meet his counterpart, K. C. But L. said there would be no restrictions on the topics to be discussed.

6. The chancellor, EL K, hopes to iron out some of the differences between the two countries when he meets President J.C. in Perigueux in the Dordogne today and again in Paris on Tuesday. The two leaders are due to hold their regular Franco-German summit in Nuremberg on December 9.

7. Seoul. North and South Korea on Tuesday edged closer to holding their first bilateral talks since 1994 after Seoul said it would accept Beijing as the venue for talks.

"It has not been finalized but the talks will most likely be held on Saturday in Beijing", said P. W. H., spokesman for the South Korean Foreign Ministry. He said Seoul would accept Pyongyang's request to set Beijing as the venue.

On Saturday, Pyongyang suggested that direct talks between the two Koreas be held April 11 in Beijing to discuss fertilizer aid and other issues.

South Korea had responded that it would prefer that the talks be held on the Korean Peninsula, but the North reaffirmed Beijing as its preferred site.

President K. D. J. of South Korea has made it clear since the start of his term that inter-Korean relations would be expanded. He said business and political issues between the two Korean would be kept separate.

8. Israel's foreign Minister D. L. said Tuesday his country was ready to resume direct peace talks with Syria "at any time, at any level".

"We hope that very soon the first step with Syria will come", L. told reporters at an airport in Amman after talks with Jordanian leaders.

"We leave it open to the Syrian side at which level, at which hierarchy, at which time the talks would be resumed", he said.

9. Korea Talks: The United States and North Korea ended high-level talks in Geneva without an agreement on inspection of Pyongyang's suspected construction of an underground nuclear facility. Kim Kye Gwan, the leader of North Korea's delegation, said that the two sides agreed on the necessity of resolving questions about the suspected nuclear facility at Kumchangri. But he said differences remain on what should be done.

10. Israel and the Palestinians agreed to accelerate peace talks, but a senior aide to Israeli Prime Minister B. warned that the sides may still miss a Feb. 13 deadline for an outline of a final peace treaty. Cabinet Minister H. R. cautioned that despite the decision to pick up the pace of talks, made in a predawn meeting between B. and Palestinian leader A., the framework agreement may be delayed up to two months.

11. Officials seeking a permanent peace for the divided Korean peninsula said they have removed the last obstacles to fullblown talks. Delegates from the U.S., China, North Korea and South Korea said Saturday that two working groups will be formed to discuss ways to reduce tensions between the neighbors and to establish mechanisms for maintaining peace.

Text 4. Korea Talks End Before Agreement

Washington – The effort by the United States, China and the two Koreas (...) aimed at formally ending the Korean War (...) unexpectedly after failing (...) over which topics those talks would cover, including the future of 37,000 U.S. troops in South Korea.

It was a setback to the long, tortuous effort by the United States to entice the North Koreans into (...) to replace the fragile armistice that has held on the Korean Peninsula since 1953.

After a third day of meeting Thursday at Columbia University in New York City, the four countries could only (...) on the (...) that officials described as the least contentious. They agreed (...) in Geneva six weeks after the current preliminary meetings end, according to administration officials.

The delegations failed to resolve sharp differences over (...) for the talks, as North Korea insisted that any further discussions focus on (...) of U.S. troops.

(...) of North Korea's delegation, (...) K. G. G., said his country had also insisted on negotiating a separate peace with the United States that would exclude South Korea, something Washington has repeatedly ruled out.

The United States, joined by South Korea and China, had argued that the agenda should deal with the broader issue of establishing peaceful relations first, the officials said, speaking on condition of anonymity. The four countries agreed (...) in New York City starting Sept. 15.

Text 5. China (проведет переговоры по вопросам безопасности) with Japan and South Korea

BEIJING – President J. Z. (проведет переговоры по вопросам безопасности) with the leaders of Japan, South Korea and Southeast Asian nations in December, a Chinese (представитель МИД) said Thursday.

(Представитель), S. G., gave no details of what appeared likely to be (неофициальная встреча на высшем уровне) among East Asian powers at a time of (интенсивная дипломатическая активность) in the region.

Leaders of South Korea, Japan and China (будут присутствовать на) the Malaysian gathering, which will be the first time so many East Asian leaders meet without (участие Запада).

Mr. S. said Mr. J.'s talks with the leaders of Japan, South Korea and Southeast Asia (о поддержании мира и безопасности в регионе) would be held in December, but declined to provide details.

His comments follow a flurry of (дипломатические обмены) over the past several weeks, (включая встречи на высшем уровне) between China and the United States, China and Russia, and Russia and Japan.

Mr. S. also indicated that China was ready (расширить диалог по вопросам безопасности) with Japan, Russia and the United States.

He was alluding to a proposal made by Y. N., (бывший премьер-министр Японии), to Prime Minister Li Peng in Tokyo on Wednesday that China engage in four-way security talks.

Text 6. (Соперники) India, Pakistan Meet after 3 Years

New Delhi, India – Indian and Pakistani diplomats (провели двухчасовые переговоры) Friday, their first in three years, to try (уменьшить напряженность) on the subcontinent.

(Делегации, возглавляемые министром иностранных дел Индии) S. N. and his Pakistani (коллегой), S. A., met in an apparently (сердечной атмосфере) at Hyderabad House in New Delhi. The two sides have agreed (поддерживать, соблюдать) a virtual news blackout until Monday, when the talks are due to end.

"We had (официальные переговоры) followed by (неофициальные переговоры). We discussed all topics", N. told reporters after the session. "The atmosphere was (дружественная), and we are very hopeful something will emerge from it."

The arch (соперники) (возобновили диалог) that collapsed in January 1994 over the disputed Himalayan territory of Kashmir.

For Pakistan, Kashmir remains (главный вопрос), but India is hoping for progress on (торговое и экономическое сотрудничество) as a means of (ослабление напряженности).

Text 7. France UK Summit

The message from the Elysee Palace and from Downing Street is one of harmony, with Tony Blair and the French President in broad agreement on a range of issues.

When the two leaders met in Paris in June last year, they disagreed so publicly over the EU budget that Mr Blair was left holding a press conference on his own, rather than at the Elysee Palace. That won't be happening today. Both men plus a host of accompanying ministers will focus on common ground.

Ways to deal with global climate change and diversify Europe's energy supplies will be near the top of the agenda. The future of the European Constitution will barely feature, as both sides agree that the current pause for reflection should continue, after France's 'No' in the referendum last year.

This could be the two men's final summit together in Paris. Both Jacques Chirac and Tony Blair are seen as leaders in their last terms in office

and both seem determined to focus on what unites rather than divides their two nations. The storms that once characterised their relationship seem to have abated, perhaps leading to an unusually serene last summit in Paris.

Text 8. Russia's President Dmitry Medvedev to pay visit to Azerbaijan

Russia's President Dmitry Medvedev will pay an official visit to Azerbaijan on September 2–3, the Kremlin spokesperson said.

Within the framework of the visit, President Medvedev will sign a range of agreements, among them on delimitation of borders, reconstruction of the bridge over Samur River and the use of river's water, and an agreement on property-related issues for diplomatic offices.

Nearly a week ago, Medvedev was on a visit to Armenia for governmental purposes.

Text 9. Lao Prime Minister to Visit Vietnam

Prime Minister of Lao People's Democratic Republic Bouasone Bouphavanh will pay an official visit to Vietnam from Sept. 15 to Sept. 17, according to Vietnamese Foreign Ministry on Thursday.

During the visit, Bouasone is expected to hold talks with Vietnamese Prime Minister Nguyen Tan Dung and meet other Vietnamese leaders, the ministry's spokeswoman Nguyen Phuong Nga told a press briefing.

The talks and meetings are aimed at further enhancing special friendship between Vietnam and Laos and boosting economic cooperation between the two countries, said Nga.

The two sides will also exchange views on regional and international issues of mutual interest, according to the spokeswoman.

Text 10. Martin, Canadian Parliamentarians end successful visit in Armenia

YEREVAN, ARMENIA – A Canadian parliamentary delegation led by MP Harold Albrecht, Conservative and chairman of Canada – Armenia Friendship Group, Rob Oliphant, Liberal, and Tony Martin, New Democratic Party, paid an official visit to the Republic of Armenia from September 6 to 10, 2010.

Immediately upon arrival, the Canadian MPs met with their colleagues in the National Assembly of the Republic of Armenia.

The members were greeted by the Chairman of the Armenia Canada Parliamentary Group, MP Hovhannes Sahagian, discussing potential venues for developing bilateral relations between the two parliaments.

Following this meeting with Armenian Parliamentarians, the RA National Assembly President, His Excellency Hovik Abrahamyan received the Canadian delegation.

The RA National Assembly speaker expressed his high appraisal for Armenian - Canadian relations.

He noted that the visit of Canadian parliamentarians will certainly stimulate and further promote the established friendship between the two countries and continue to strengthen the existing inter-parliamentary relationships.

RA National Assembly president emphasized the role of the parliaments and parliamentary diplomacy in the rapidly changing world.

The speaker of the house noted that opening of a Canadian Embassy in Yerevan would greatly benefit the development and strengthening of bilateral relations between Armenia and Canada.

At the meeting the two sides also touched upon the Nagorno Karabagh conflict and the Armenian-Turkish relations.

That day, the delegation visited Armenian Genocide Memorial Dzidzer-nagapert and the adjacent center to pay homage to more than 1.5 million Armenians who perished under the Ottoman Empire.

Memorial wreaths were laid to honor their memories and a short requiem prayer service was led by His Eminence Bishop Bagrat Galstania, primate of the Armenian Church Canadian Diocese.

In the afternoon His Excellency Edward Nalbandian, minister of foreign affairs received the Parliamentary delegation for a very productive discussion.

On Wednesday morning, the parliamentary delegation headed to the spiritual birthplace of Armenian Christianity, the Mother See of Holy Etchmiadzin, where they were greeted by His Eminence Bishop Bagrat Galstania, primate of the Armenian Church Canadian Diocese.

Canadian politicians toured the complex of the Holy See of Etchmiadzin and visited the Mother Cathedral.

The same day, RA President His Excellency Serzh Sargsyan received the Canadian delegation.

President Sargsyan welcomed the group to Armenia and noted that Armenia and Canada are cooperating efficiently in bilateral and multilateral formats.

The president highlighted the importance of developing more active inter-parliamentarian relations.

"Canada is an important state, with a powerful economic and democratic system."

President Serzh Sargsyan said he appreciates the 2006 decision for the recognition of the Armenian Genocide.

"We are grateful to the Parliament and Government of Canada for their position on the recognition of the Armenian genocide."

MP Harold Albrecht, head of Canada Armenia parliamentary friendship group, stated that the presence of the Armenian community in Canada has been an important factor in the development of the great friendship between the two countries.

He added that Armenians have made great contributions to the development of Canada's economy, political life, culture and other spheres.

During the meeting the representatives underscored the necessity of making the Armenian-Canadian cooperation in all spheres more active by promoting Canadian investment in the economy of Armenia.

They noted the importance of Canada's experience in the areas of agriculture and mining, as well as the potential for cooperation in the areas of culture and education.

Following the meeting with the president, Canadian MPs visited the government building of the Republic of Armenia and met with RA Prime Minister Tigran Sargsyan who greeted the guests.

The Right Honorable Prime Minister Tigran Sargsyan emphasized the importance of establishing economic and trade cooperation between the two countries.

The prime minister presented the prospects for the development of bilateral cooperation in the field of business and economy, especially, in the sectors of mining, industry, IT, tourism, healthcare and energy.

The two sides also touched upon the need for establishing Canada's Embassy to Armenia noting that it would encourage and strengthen development of political, economic and cultural relations.

The permanent representative of Karabagh in Armenia Mr. Karlen Avetisyan shared information on the peace process of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict.

During the stay of Canadian parliamentarians in Armenia they visited key historical-cultural sites and also had a meeting with the mayor of Yerevan.

On behalf of the Canadian Armenian community Hagop Arslanian and Hrag Darakdjian accompanied the parliamentary delegation in Yerevan.

FINAL INSTRUMENTS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS AND VISITS

Text 1

Meetings between heads of government or state, as well as between ministers for foreign affairs, to discuss policies or problems of mutual interest to their countries have become common practice in intergovernmental relations. The results of such meetings are usually, for lack of time, not set out in formal treaties or agreements signed in the traditional manner. Very often, the participants confine themselves to the drawing up of a joint statement, declaration or communique, handed out during a press conference and usually published in newspapers. Such instruments, however important or binding upon the participating governments, have none of the classic character of international agreements.

The final documents of intergovernmental negotiations or visits – joint statements, communiqués or declarations (whether signed or unsigned) – come to life only if there is prior agreement between the participants on each paragraph, phrase or word in the text.

A communique is an official report on the course of international negotiations, and on the agreement achieved. It may be brief and contain an announcement of some fact or facts in general terms. Sometimes, however, it may be long and elaborate, and then it will include a detailed description of the course of negotiations, a declaration of the decisions adopted by the participants and the terms of the agreement achieved.

Prior to World War II a shorter variety was predominant.

Today the idea has undergone substantial change. Final documents of negotiations or visits now embrace a wide range of important international issues and are becoming more meaningful. Communiqués as well as joint statements and declarations have become increasingly widespread, playing a far more important role in international relations than they used to play in the past.

The nature, content and tone of a final document are determined primarily by the nature of the states adopting the document – states with similar or different social systems, allied states or states members of the opposing military groupings, and so forth.

The first task a communique (joint statement or declaration) is called upon to fulfil is faithfully to reflect the outcome of the negotiations or exchange of views. In most cases the participants are interested in positive results – otherwise why enter into talks at all?

Although communiqués, joint statements and declarations (either bilateral or multilateral) are similar in their purpose, there are certain differences between them. A communiqué is a more general kind of document. Its prime objective is to inform the press and the public at large of the results of the talks and of the atmosphere in which they were held. A joint statement is a document that is more binding on the sides. It presumes that something substantial has come out of the negotiations – either in the field of general international problems or in the field of bilateral relations – and in view of that the participants decided to issue a joint statement. Finally, a declaration is a still more weighty and binding document. Declarations proclaim identical views and joint intentions. All three forms of documents – communiqués, joint statements and declarations – record the decisions which have been adopted during the talks (for instance, it is announced that a consular convention has been signed during the talks, or that an invitation to make an official visit has been extended or accepted, and so forth). The language of communiqués is business-like and dryish. Elevation of style is characteristic of joint statements, and particularly declarations.

In terms of its subject matter, a final document (unless devoted specifically to one question or event) breaks down into two groups of questions – international and bilateral relations.

Each side tries to reflect in the communiqué (joint statement or declaration) its attitude to the burning issues of the day (both global and regional ones). If such questions or events have been avoided in the final document, the omission invites the assumption that the sides have no common viewpoint on the topic.

The chief merit of communiqués (joint statements or declarations) lies in a precise, realistic and faithful reflection of the results achieved and of the positions of the sides expounded during the talks. The final document does not reflect the ups and downs of negotiations but their end results, and it is in setting down those results on paper that each phrase, word or punctuation mark should be thoroughly weighed.

In most cases communiqués, joint statements and declaration have their own protocol part. When, besides negotiations, there has been a tour of the country, mention is usually made of the cities or important industrial, scientific or cultural centres or projects that were visited and of the reception accorded by the population. In listing the participants in the negotiations, it is important to be very precise in stating their surnames and initials in conformity with the rules of the language concerned, and in observing the precedence dictated by the protocol.

The usual pattern of a communiqué (joint statement, or declaration) is as follows: mention is first made of the negotiations (or a visit) that have taken

place and their duration; then follows a reference to the meetings that have taken place and a list of their participants; then comes a general appraisal of the atmosphere of the talks and a range of issues considered; the part setting forth the results of the talks on international problems usually precedes the one relating to questions of bilateral relations. If an invitation to pay a visit has been extended, agreement on that is generally recorded in the final part of a document. It has been customary to note, at the very end of a final document, the significance of the negotiations for the development of relationship between the two countries, as well as for international security.

Final instruments of intergovernmental negotiations are sometimes drawn up in the form of a memorandum of understanding, which has become common practice of late.

Text 2. Final instruments of international conferences

Final instruments of international conferences and meetings are usually drawn up in the form of a final act or a declaration.

The term "Act" is used to describe a multilateral treaty, which seeks to lay down rules of general international law which may be formulated at international conferences. Final acts of conferences are, however, not agreements of a binding character. The final act is usually a formal statement or summary of proceedings of a congress or conference enumerating the treaties or conventions drawn up as the result of its deliberations. Signature in the final act does not in itself signify acceptance of the treaties or conventions so enumerated, which require separate signature. Sometimes, however, depending on circumstances the final act may itself become a treaty. The title "General Act" is given to an instrument promulgated by an international conference, which lays down rules of general international law which are intended to be binding upon several states.

Communique

At the invitation of President of ... , President of ... paid an official working visit to (*name of country*) from April 26 to 28, 20__.

During the visit, talks were held between President of ... and President of....

The meetings and talks were held in the atmosphere of cordiality and mutual respect, which is a traditional feature of relations between peoples of our countries.

During the talks, priority was given to examining the most topical problems of our time from the standpoint of further steps aimed at consolidating the policy of detente in Europe and all over the world, eliminating the seats

of tension, strengthening international security and confidence between states. Mutual understanding was reached on the issues discussed.

A detailed exchange of views was also held on the further development of the basic areas of bilateral cooperation in various fields. [...]

The Sides agreed to continue efforts to deepen economic relations on a stable and long-term basis. The activity of the permanent commission will be of major significance in the realization of this aim. [...]

Determined to contribute to the development of their economic relations, the Sides agreed to take all necessary measures to ensure a further considerable growth of trade turnover...

The Sides noted with satisfaction the successful development of cultural exchanges and cooperation between the two countries. [...]

As a result of the talks President of... and President of... signed a Programme for the Further Development of Cooperation between (*name of country*) and (*name of country*).

President of... and President of... are convinced that this summit has been useful and will serve the cause of peace and security in Europe and all over the world.

President... invited President... to pay an official visit to (*name of country*). The invitation was accepted with satisfaction.

Joint Statement Environment of Durable Peace and Security

The prime ministers of India and Pakistan held a bilateral meeting on the sidelines of the UN general assembly in New York on 2 September 20__.

Their discussions covered the whole range of bilateral relations. The two prime ministers also carried out a detailed review of new developments in the region during the past few months.

They reaffirmed their common belief that an environment of durable peace and security was in the supreme interests of both India and Pakistan, and of the region as a whole.

They expressed their determination to renew and reinvigorate efforts to secure such an environment. They agreed that the peaceful settlement of all outstanding issues was essential for this purpose.

The two leaders reiterated their commitment to create conditions which would enable both countries to fully devote their resources, both human and material, to improving the lives of their people, particularly the poorest among them.

The two prime ministers noted with satisfaction the agreement reached between the foreign secretaries on operating the mechanism to address all items on the agreed agenda of 23rd June, 20__ in a purposeful and composite

manner. They directed the foreign secretaries, accordingly, to resume the dialogue on the agreed dates.

New York, N.Y.
23 September 20__

Prime Minister
of India

.....
(signed)

Prime Minister
of Pakistan

.....
(signed)

Text 3. Treaties and conventions

In international law and diplomatic practice the term "treaty" is used in two senses. In a generic sense, it refers to all agreements between states which are of a binding character, and in a restricted sense it refers to a title given to instruments containing such international agreements. Instruments setting out agreements between states bear different titles, such as Treaty, Agreement, Convention, Protocol, Act, Declaration, Statute, Regulations, Provisions, Pact, Covenant, Compromis, Accord, Arrangements, Modus Vivendi, Exchange of Notes and Concordat. It is, however, not obligatory to give a title to an international agreement, as agreements can be concluded even by exchange of letters or notes. Some of the agreements are highly formal in character whilst others are not. The titles given to international agreements have little significance from the legal point of view, as all international agreements, by whatever name called, are equally binding in nature. In diplomatic literature, the terms "treaty", "convention", and "protocol" are all applied more or less indiscriminately to international agreements. Sometimes the same instrument is designated in different places in its text by different terms. There is no obvious explanation for this diversity of terminology.

International law prescribes neither the form nor the procedure for the making of international engagements, and consequently their form depends upon the will and convenience of the parties. In practice it is governed also by usage and varies depending on whether agreement is reached between states, heads of state, governments (increasingly used), or particular ministers or departments.

It is not every international instrument, however formal it may be, that would be regarded as a treaty. Unless the instrument creates contractual obligations between two or more states, the essential requirements of a treaty are not fulfilled. The binding nature of treaty obligations is the oldest and doubtless the most fundamental rule of international law.

Of all international engagements which are intended to have an obligatory character the most important are "treaties", the term being derived from the French *traiter*, which means "to negotiate".

The next most solemn type of international engagement is the "convention", derived from the Latin word *conventio* meaning "agreement". This term is frequently, though not necessarily, employed in connection with agreements to which a large number of countries are parties, and especially to agreements of the law-making type.

The treaty document covers the following parts:

1. The preamble containing:
 - (a) a list of the heads of state in whose names the treaty is concluded;
 - (b) a list of plenipotentiaries;
 - (c) usually a statement of the purposes and objectives of the treaty, sometimes accompanied by a recital of principles and circumstances;
 - (d) a declaration that the plenipotentiaries have the necessary powers.
2. The text generally containing, in the form of numbered articles, the respective agreements of the signatories. It also indicates:
 - (a) the requirements for bringing the treaty into force;
 - (b) its duration;
 - (c) the place where the exchange of ratifications will take place.
3. The final clauses, specifying that the plenipotentiaries have signed the treaty and have affixed their seals thereto, and including information on:
 - (a) the number of signed copies;
 - (b) if in more than one language, the languages used, and that each is equally authentic;
 - (c) the place and date of signature.

According to the importance of a treaty, the preamble can be more or less enlarged. The statements in the final clauses are, on the contrary, usually identical.

The provisions of a treaty determine the manner in which and the date on which the treaty enters into force. Where the treaty does not specify a date, there is a presumption that the treaty is intended to come into force as soon as all the negotiating states have consented to be bound by the treaty.

After a treaty is concluded, the written instruments, which provide formal evidence of consent to be bound by ratification, accession, and so on, and also reservations and other declarations, are placed in the custody of a depositary, who may be one or more states, or an international organization. The depositary has functions of considerable importance relating to matters of form, including provision of information as to the time at which the treaty enters into force. The United Nations Secretariat plays a significant role as depositary of multilateral treaties.

As regards treaties, conventions, etc., these, when concluded between two countries, are now ordinarily signed in two texts, viz., in the respective languages of the two countries, though exceptions occur. In the case of treaties of a general nature – multilateral treaties – concluded between many states, the usual practice was to use French, but now French and English.

Those concluded under the auspices of the United Nations normally have texts in its official languages, all equally authentic.

The authenticity of the text is established by means of the signatures of the plenipotentiaries. It will depend on the circumstances whether signature alone is sufficient to bring the treaty into force or whether some further step, such as ratification, is necessary.

Sometimes, however, when an appreciable interval occurs between the conclusion of the negotiations and the signature of a treaty, the plenipotentiaries append to it their initials *ne varietur* as a guarantee of the authenticity of the text.

Text 4. TREATY of Friendship and Cooperation between (name of country) and (name of country)

The Republic of ... and the Republic of ...,

Proceeding from the close relations of all-round cooperation existing between them;

Firmly believing that the all-out strengthening of friendly relations between the Republic of ... and the Republic of ... is in the vital interests of the peoples of both countries and serves the cause of world peace;

Expressing their firm resolve to contribute to the development of good relations and mutually advantageous cooperation between states with different social systems;

Striving to continue the development and perfection of all-round cooperation between the two countries; (1) in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations Organization;

HAVE RESOLVED to conclude this Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation AND AGREED as follows:

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties shall continue strengthening relations of friendship, solidarity and mutual aid. They shall steadfastly develop political relations, deepen all-round cooperation, and give each other all-out support based on mutual respect for state sovereignty and independence, equality and non-interference in each other's internal affairs.

Article 2

The High Contracting Parties shall join efforts to strengthen and expand mutually advantageous economic, scientific and technical cooperation with

the aim of steadily improving the material and cultural standards of the peoples of their countries [...].

Article 3

The High Contracting Parties shall promote ties in the spheres of culture, education, literature and the arts, public health, environmental protection, tourism, and in other fields [...].

Article 4

The High Contracting Parties shall contribute in every way possible to the defence of international peace and the security of nations, and shall support the just struggle for the eradication of racism in all its forms and manifestations.

Article 5

The High Contracting Parties shall consult each other on all important international issues affecting the interests of the two countries. In case one of the Parties becomes the object of attack or of a threat of attack, the High Contracting Parties shall immediately begin mutual consultations with a view to removing that threat and taking appropriate measures to ensure peace and the security of their countries.

Article 6

The treaty shall not affect the rights and obligations of the Parties under bilateral and multilateral agreements now in force, concluded with their participation [...].

Article 7

The treaty is subject to ratification and shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of instruments of ratification which shall take place in the city of ... at the earliest date.

Article 8

The treaty is concluded for a period of 10 years and shall be automatically prolonged every time for another 5-year period, unless either of the High Contracting Parties gives notice of its wish to terminate it twelve months before the expiration of the respective period.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorized for that purpose, have signed this Treaty.

DONE AT ... this ... day of ... one thousand nine hundred and ... , in duplicate, each copy in the English and Spanish languages, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Republic of
.....
(signed)

For the Republic of
.....
(signed)

**Text 5. CONVENTION on the Prohibition
of Military or Any Other Hostile Use
of Environmental Modification Techniques**

The States Parties to this Convention,

Guided by the interests of consolidating peace, and wishing to contribute to the cause of halting the arms race and of bringing about general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,

Determined to continue negotiations with a view to achieving effective progress towards further measures in the field of disarmament, [...]

Realizing that the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes could improve the interrelationship of man and nature and contribute to the improvement of the environment for the benefit of present and future generations,

Desiring to prohibit effectively military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques [...], HAVE AGREED as follows:

Article 1

Each State Party to this Convention undertakes not to engage in military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques [...].

Article 2

As used in Article 1, the term "environmental modification techniques" refers to any technique for changing - through the deliberate manipulation of natural processes - the dynamics, composition or structure of the earth, or of outer space.

Article 3

The provisions of this Convention shall not hinder the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes and shall be without

prejudice to the generally recognized principles and applicable rules of international law.

Article 4

Each State Party to this Convention undertakes to take any measures it considers necessary in accordance with its constitutional procedures to prohibit and prevent any activity in violation of the provisions of the Convention anywhere under its jurisdiction or control.

Article 5

The States Parties to this Convention undertake to consult one another and to cooperate in solving any problems which may arise in relation to the objectives of the Convention. [...]

Article 6

Any State Party to this Convention may propose amendments to the Convention. The text of any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the Depository, who shall promptly circulate it to all States Parties. [...]

Article 7

This Convention shall be of unlimited duration.

Article 8

Five years after the entry into force of this Convention, a conference of the States Parties to the Convention shall be convened by the Depository at Geneva, Switzerland.

Article 9

1. This Convention shall be open to all States for signature.
2. This Convention shall be subject to ratification by signatory States. Instruments of ratification or accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. [...]

Article 10

This Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit duly certified copies thereof to the Governments of the signatory and acceding States.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Convention, opened for signature at Geneva on the eighteenth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and seventy-seven.

For the Government of

.....

(signed)

For the Government of

.....

(signed)

Text 6. Agreements

The term «agreement», like the term «treaty» itself, is used in a number of senses. In a generic sense, it covers any meeting of minds - in this case the minds of two or more international persons. A distinction must always be drawn between agreements intended to have an obligatory character (i. e. the assumption of legal rights and duties) and agreements not intended to have such a character. In a restricted sense, the term «agreement» means an agreement intended to have an obligatory character but usually of a less formal nature than a treaty. Like treaties, agreements in this restricted sense may be concluded between Heads of State, between States or between Governments.

No doubt because of its general and relatively innocuous meaning, «agreement» is the term invariably used to describe understandings intended to have an obligatory character concluded (a) between the United Nations and the specialized agencies (including the «relationship agreements» covered by Articles 57 and 63 of the Charter) and (b) between the specialized agencies themselves («inter-agency agreements»).

A term substantially equivalent to «agreement» is «arrangement». The view that an «agreement» implies an undertaking somewhat more definite than an «arrangement» is not believed to be correct. Other terms sometimes used instead of «agreement», though believed to be substantially similar, are:

- (a) memorandum of understanding constituting an agreement;
- (b) understanding;
- (c) agreed joint statement;
- (d) memorandum constituting an agreement;
- (e) joint declaration constituting an agreement.

Sometimes agreements are concluded between a Government Department in one country and a Government Department in another. It depends on the circumstances whether such «interdepartmental agreements» are binding under international law or whether they are merely private law contracts.

Agreements are frequently concluded by exchange of notes, sometimes referred to as «letters». In such cases, the representative of one government

sends the representative of another government a note setting forth the arrangements proposed or to be agreed upon. The reply agrees to and frequently repeats the terms of the first note.

A temporary or working arrangement made in order to bridge over some difficulty pending a permanent settlement is usually referred to as *modus vivendi*. This type of a temporary arrangement is made in a most informal way and does not require ratification. Commercial agreements of a temporary nature have often been entered into in the form of a *modus vivendi* by the United States as well as Great Britain.

Most agreements of a binding nature follow the same compositional design, with some variation, as treaties and other international compacts. Generally speaking, diplomats divide international agreements into three parts. First, the preamble, which states the overall purpose of the act. The second part embodies the substantive commitments undertaken by the parties and comprises most of the «text». The third part is the «final forms», more or less stereotyped, equivalent to the precautions that governments have been traditionally called to take to guarantee juridical regularity of the negotiation and the qualification of the plenipotentiaries, and the specifications of how the agreement shall be brought into force, how it may be terminated and, sometimes, how it may be amended. This is what is called the «protocolary» or «formal provisions».

CULTURAL AWARENESS IN INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATION

Text 1. The Art of Negotiating

The art of negotiating involves finding a balance between achieving the best possible result, while at the same time establishing a mutually beneficial working relationship with your counterparts. Much negotiation literature, including the best-seller book *Getting to Yes*, emphasizes inventing options for mutual gain rather than negotiating on a win-lose basis. The former tries to expand the pie by discovering new options, while the latter sees negotiations as a fixed pie where the more one side wins, the more the other side loses. The idea behind the "Getting to Yes" approach is that it is unproductive to lock yourself into a fixed position because that will prevent you from finding alternatives that will be mutually beneficial. One example is when a major American soft drink producer was attempting a market penetration in the former Soviet Union. One of the major problems was the means of payment. The soft drink producer wanted payment in dollars, but the Soviets did not want to exhaust their limited dollar reserves. The whole deal could have fallen apart if both sides had locked themselves into their predetermined positions and simply repeated the importance of the other side accepting it. What they did instead was to seek out alternative solutions to satisfy mutual needs. You will be asked to analyze this case and find a solution in the exercise at the end of this chapter.

Another problem with fixed positions and a win-lose orientation is that most business relations involve long-term cooperation. Naturally, you want to achieve the best possible result for your company, but at the same time you do not want to poison the ongoing business relationship on which your future success depends. Negotiations are a case of give and take, and good negotiators are sensitive to the priorities and musts of the other side. Beating the other side into submission, even though it may give you a sense of victory, is certainly not the way to establish the atmosphere of mutual understanding necessary for an ongoing business relationship.

Thus, in negotiating you should consider the following:

Establish Interests and Not Positions

As suggested, emphasizing interests allows negotiators to arrive at mutually satisfying solutions that will become the basis for a positive ongoing business relationship. Establishing interests is a two-part process. First, you must clearly establish your interests; second, you must strive to understand your counterparts' interests. You should try to put yourself in the others' shoes and let them know that you have tried to understand their position. For

example, in the case "Tourism Comes to Zanir," the Abenteuer Urlaub team could establish an understanding of the interests involved by stating first that they see Zanir as an attractive tourist destination because of its unspoiled nature and beautiful beaches, which would be highly attractive to the German tourists and thus profitable for both parties. They could go on by saying that they understand the Zanirian authorities' concerns about economic development and the protection of their cultural traditions. So as not to sound as if they are presupposing the Zanirian position, they could preface their statements by "as we understand it" or "correct us if we are wrong."

Do Not Underestimate the Importance of Socializing and Protocol

Almost every case will begin with some socializing before sitting down at the negotiating table. This can involve the exchange of business cards and "gifts" and conversation with compliments, expectations for a mutually beneficial relationship, and sharing of interests and hobbies—for example, your golf handicap and favorite courses—anything to create a relationship. You will also want to establish a sense of mutual respect and, when important to the culture of your counterparts, respect for senior members. The socializing will be followed by the host team's leader seating the delegations and officially presenting the members of his or her team, including their titles. The visiting delegation's leader will then present his or her team in the same way. All members will have name cards with their titles in front of them.

Breaks in the negotiations will also provide an opportunity for socializing and for sounding out individual members concerning their feelings about issues. Each team must carefully determine how much leeway its individual members have in discussing positions outside the negotiation room.

Take the Other Side's Position Seriously

As an extension of focusing on interests and not positions, do not just look at the other side's position as something to be brushed aside on your way to victory. Put yourself in their shoes and try to understand why they want what they want.

This will help you understand interests and not focus on positions, which in turn will help you arrive at creative alternative solutions. For example, in the Zanir case, the German team must be sensitive not only to African history but to present needs. In order to understand Zanirians' skepticism to tourist development, they must understand what centuries of colonialism have done to Zanirian perception of Europeans' intentions. The Zanirians could easily view their German counterparts as there to exploit Zanir's natural resources as has historically been the case in European-African relations. Thus, the Germans must emphasize that they understand the Zanirians' need for economic development and create a sense that this project can result in mutual gain. Naturally, this may weaken the German position, but failing to understand the Zanirians' needs may spoil the entire deal.

Depersonalize and Focus on Substance

Establishing good chemistry among negotiators is important since you will be involved in a long-term relationship where problems will arise. Thus, you have to establish a good working relationship in order to have a basis for dealing with the eventual problems. However, at the same time, you must avoid taking disagreements personally. You must focus on the problem and not conclude that your counterpart is unfair, unreasonable, or unreliable. It is easy to resort to such attacks when negotiations become deadlocked or problems arise, but emotional responses and personal attacks will destroy a working relationship faster than anything. Attack the problem and not your counterpart. Remember, both sides have their perception of the problem, their interests, and usually a mutual interest in solving the problem.

Listen and Observe Actively

Entering negotiations with a preconceived notion of the "only right outcome" and a fixed position will prevent you from listening to and observing your counterparts. They will be sending you verbal and non-verbal signals constantly, and you must perceive them and acknowledge them if you are to arrive at a mutually satisfying agreement. Thus, expressions such as, "As I understand your position," or "If I understand you correctly" help you to ensure that you have understood your counterparts' position as well as sending them a message that you are honestly trying to understand their position and take it into consideration. This helps establish a sense of mutuality which is the basis of negotiations geared at reaching a satisfying agreement.

Furthermore, listening can help you pick up signals as to how far your counterparts are willing to go to meet you. A classic case is that of a soft drink producer who wanted to break into a restaurant chain dominated by the "number 1" producer. The negotiating team went in trying to be accepted along with the existing supplier and couldn't understand why they were getting nowhere until one of the team members picked up a hint that the restaurant chain was dissatisfied with the present supplier and was willing to give the entire contract to the new supplier. Naturally, this is an extreme case, but awareness of your counterparts' communication, both verbal and non-verbal, is an important part of negotiations. This is extremely important in international negotiations, where verbal and non-verbal signs differ. You must not only be aware of these signs, but capable of interpreting them in their context. For example, if an American says, "that might be difficult," it means that something still might be worked out. However, if a Japanese negotiator says the same thing, it is most likely a polite way of saving face while rejecting a proposal. With non-verbal communication, otherwise known as body language, there are further problems. In-high context cultures (cultures where words' meanings have to be interpreted from the social context in which they

are spoken and verbal communication is imprecise), body language, pauses, even grunts can be more communicative than words. This subject will be taken up in the next chapter along with the importance of understanding the culture of those with whom you are negotiating.

Periodically Summarize Agreement As You Are Going Along

In order to avoid misunderstandings that lead to two different interpretations of the final agreement, summarize what has been decided. Use sentences such as, "So far we have decided ...," or "Now let us move on to the question of..." So as not to seem to dictate the summary of what has been decided, you can add, "As we understand it, we have arrived at the following agreement. / We have decided ..."

Establish a Feeling of Fairness by Using Objective Criteria

When resolving disputes, resort to established criteria rather than ones that simply favor your position. One means is to look at similar cases and see what criteria were used and what agreement was arrived at. Another means is to subject the case to a neutral party – an independent consultant. A third approach is to carefully examine how both sides arrived at their figures. Often this will lead to compromise, especially if one or both sides cannot document how they arrived at their figures. When making your proposals, present your statements in a positive way by using expressions such as: "Don't you think a fair compromise would be ...", "To reach a fair solution, we propose ...," or "We are willing to approach your position/meet you half way and propose" These expressions are also tactical since they suggest that your counterparts are unreasonable if they reject your position.

Document Your Position and Present It Logically

Your position will be more convincing if you have the facts to support it. Thus, use statistics, figures, and examples from similar negotiations. A position presentations worksheet is provided in Appendix 4 and should be filled out in advance of your negotiation. An example drawn from the Zanirian team's presentation in the case "Tourism Comes to Zanir" would look like this.

POSITION: We require 51 percent ownership of the project, including the cost of the hotel stay. Thus, we require that you break down the cost of the package sold in your country and transfer 51 percent of the cost of the hotel stay to us in German marks (Deutsche Marks).The calculation of the hotel stay will be determined by agreement between your accountant and ours.

DOCUMENTATION: Our neighboring country developed a similar resort project to that which you propose based on 100 percent ownership of the resort by the foreign company. Their experience shows that 90 percent of the money spent by tourists was either spent in buying the package in the

company's country or spent at the hotel. Thus, the profits for the country, DM 1,000,000 per year, were not sufficient to cover the costs of the improvements in the infrastructure necessary for the project. Here are the figures furnished by the Sendalian Ministry of Commerce for your review. (Then you present the figures.)

CONSEQUENCES: Based on these figures, the project would result in negative cash flow for our country. You must admit that for a project to be attractive, there has to be a profit potential in it for both sides. (Note the appeal to fairness and commonly accepted good business practices.)

Establish a Positive Mind Set Before Entering the Negotiations

Do not look at your counterpart as someone who is out to cheat you or someone whom you are going to manipulate to your own advantage. Enter negotiations with a positive attitude that an agreement can be reached which will be mutually beneficial. Establish this feeling at the beginning of the negotiations by being friendly toward your counterparts. The protocol of introductions, exchanging business cards, complimenting your counterparts and their company, showing due respect for senior members, and being pleasant are all part of establishing the right tone. Do not overlook the importance of the social aspects of negotiations.

Emphasizing the mutual benefits that can be achieved early in the negotiations is also a means of expressing a positive attitude toward the result of the negotiations.

Emphasize the Positive

As a follow-up to the tone established in the beginning, emphasize the progress made as you move through the negotiations and the benefits to be gained by further progress. Use phrases such as, "Good, we have made good progress on items one and two, so let's see what we can do with item three" or "Good, I think we both feel encouraged about our progress so far and we are on our way to a mutually satisfying agreement."

Know Your Limits

Before the negotiations, set your opening offer and your resistance point – the point you would resist going beyond. Factor into your resistance point the concessions you would require to move beyond that point. Finally, set your bottom line – the limit you are willing to go to before breaking off negotiations. When approaching that point, in a last attempt to save the negotiations, you might add: "It looks as if further negotiations seem pointless." In an attempt to save the negotiations, you can mention the advantages of achieving an agreement, but that any agreement must be based on mutual gain. You can emphasize your desire to achieve a satisfying agreement by saying, "We had hoped to achieve a mutually satisfying agreement and still do, but you will have to be willing to meet us half way," or something similar.

Be Prepared

Assess the balance of power and get as clear a picture as possible of how much you need what the team can offer you and what your alternatives are and how much they need you and what their alternatives are. This will require filling out the negotiations worksheet in Appendix 3 – Furthermore, gain an understanding of your counterparts' culture and its impact on their approach to negotiations, which is discussed in the next chapter.

Be Aware of Tactics and Tricks

In spite of everything that has been said about the importance of achieving a mutually satisfying agreement, both sides wish to achieve the best possible agreement for themselves. Negotiating is a tightrope act between mutual-ity and individual gain. Thus, tactics and even tricks will be involved. If your counterparts feel that you are vulnerable to their tactics or tricks, they will naturally be tempted to use them. What you must do is to be aware of the kinds of tactics and tricks they may use. You can even confront them with, "You're not using the "good cop, bad cop" on us, are you?" I thought we were going to try to reach a mutually satisfying agreement "You appeal to fairness, while at the same time showing them that you know what tactic they are trying. In doing this at the outset, your counterparts will be less tempted to try to manipulate you, and negotiations can move on to the next level where mutually satisfying solutions can be achieved. The following section discusses some important considerations and some tricks to be aware of.

HOME FIELD ADVANTAGE: There are definite advantages with playing on your home field. You have your own support network, both social and business, while your visitors are far from friends, family, and business support. Staying in hotels and dealing with foreign cultures can wear them out to the point that they will more readily accept a deal just to get back to the comforts of their environment.

STALLING: If your counterparts know that you have a return flight or a deadline, they can wait you out, forcing you to accept their terms due to the deadline. Make it quite clear that you have all the time in the world, even if you do not.

WEARING You OUT: Pretending to be social, the host team can provide many social activities to wear you out and dull your senses. Negotiating is a demanding activity requiring complete alertness. You need to be rested and alert, so do not let yourself be exhausted to the point where you are on the defensive. Simply decline those invitations that prevent you from staying rested and alert.

UNFAVORABLE POSITIONING: Positioning around the negotiating table may sound like a simple matter, but it can be part of psychological warfare. For example, if your hosts know that the sun will shine in your faces at 3:00 PM just about the time that you are reaching an important decision,

they may place you on a certain side of the table. You must either be aware of this possibility and mention it in the beginning or politely ask to be moved when the sun starts shining in your face.

MISREPRESENTING FACTS: "How to lie with statistics" is a well-known phrase. If you doubt the accuracy of your counterparts' facts or figures, you may ask them to document them – that is show how they arrived at them, including the source of their information. If they have obviously invented the facts or figures, your questioning may be enough to have them revise them. If necessary, you can have an independent consultant/assessor go over figures, especially in assessing the value of something. Another approach is to hire your own assessor and use those figures as a point of departure in negotiating the true value of the thing in question.

TWO BITES OF THE APPLE: This is a question of the authority of your counterparts to conclude a deal. You must establish early that the people with whom you are dealing have final authority to sign an eventual contract. Otherwise they might use the "two bites of the apple" approach, which means that after you have reached an agreement and exposed your position, they say that they have to submit the proposal to their boss for final approval. The boss then accepts those parts of the contract that are favorable for him or her and subjects the remainder to further negotiation.

GOOD COP, BAD COP: A negotiating team is divided into two groups – the good cop and bad cop. In this approach, taken from police interrogation, the bad cop players take a very hard-line approach and try to wear you down. After hammering at you, a break is taken where the "good cops" talk to you, try to flatter your ego, and suggest a slightly moderated position, but one that you would not normally accept if you had not been so badly battered by the "bad cops." The "good cops" seem friendly, considerate, and reasonable in comparison to the "bad cops," and they get you to go along with an unfavorable compromise. The best way to avoid this is simply not to allow yourself to judge the situation relative to the "bad cop," but to maintain your original goals.

These are just a few examples of important considerations and standard tricks used in negotiations. Your job is not to be tricked, and the best way is simply to confront the opposing side. While showing that you understand the tactic, you also establish yourself as being both professional and ethical and can then demand that you move on to "real" negotiations based on mutuality, honesty, and fairness.

MAKING THREATS: Typical threats are "Accept this or I'll buy from company X" or "We'll take you to court." When confronted by such threats, one has to determine the likelihood of them being carried out. Ways of assessing this likelihood are (1) the seniority of the person making the threat – the higher up in the organization, the more power he or she has and the greater the likelihood, (2) past performance – has this person carried out threats

before, and (3) what this person and company stand to lose if the threat is carried out and the question of who needs whom more – the balance of power discussed in the Negotiations Worksheet in Appendix 3.

FISHING: Overstating a demand to discover a counterpart's reaction. If the reaction is strong, including body language (crossing of arms, angry expression), then the resistance on that point will be strong. This is a way of determining where your counterparts will be less flexible (their high-priority items) and where they are likely to make concessions and you can push for an optimal result. If someone tries this tactic on you, here are various possible responses:

Confrontational "You can't be serious." (Followed by silence. Often used to attack what is considered to be a bluff.)

Polite rejection. "I'm afraid we cannot consider that a reasonable offer." (followed by silence.)

Treating it as a misunderstanding. "Perhaps there is a misunderstanding here. Could you explain your position?" (This forces your counterparts to expose their position.)

STANDARD CONTRACT: Your counterpart presents the proposal as "This is a standard contract for the industry." You can counter by saying that the contract, if it is unfavorable, is unlike the contracts you have dealt with in all your other negotiations.

PLEASE REPEAT THAT, AS I AM NOT SURE I UNDERSTAND: A tactic used when a person wants to get a counterpart to reveal inconsistencies which can be used against her or him. The more a person speaks, the more likely he will reveal the real motives, thus exposing and weakening that bargaining position. This also gives you more time to consider a response.

NO INITIAL COMPROMISE: Typical for Western negotiators is to agree on areas where agreement can be reached with limited concessions and then negotiate questions where the gap in the two positions is wider. However, some negotiating styles are based on no initial compromise on any point, even when taking an extreme position. The point is to wear down one's counterparts and make them compromise more than they normally would.

Text 2. Cultural Awareness in International Negotiations

Negotiation is not just a matter of arriving at a contract – the deal. It is a complicated process that involves a number of factors, many of which are culturally determined. You must never assume that your counterparts from another culture think like you do. Doing so can lead to misunderstanding, frustration, and distrust, which may sour the climate of the negotiations and even lead to failure to arrive at an agreement. Classic examples are (1) the question of time, (2) disagreement on the importance of protocol, and (3) conflicts arising from a deal orientation versus a relationship-establishing

orientation in negotiation meetings. The question of time can create frustration and misunderstanding between a culture emphasizing punctuality, such as Germany, and one where punctuality is of less importance, such as in Latin cultures. German negotiators can easily interpret "Latin time" as being disrespectful if they are kept waiting. On the other hand, representatives from Latin cultures can feel that the German emphasis on punctuality is "pushy." These conflicting reactions can create an underlying tension, which could sour the atmosphere surrounding the negotiations. Disagreement on the importance of protocol between formal cultures, such as Japan, and informal cultures, such as the United States, can be equally disruptive. The Japanese culture is characterized by rituals such as bowing and the formalistic exchanging of business cards (with two hands), which shows the status of the individuals and others' acceptance of this status. The American emphasis on informality and the attempt to be on a personal first-name basis may be interpreted as disrespectful, particularly among the older and more traditional members of a Japanese delegation. This can lead to a loss of face, which is serious in Japanese culture and in most cases is irreversible. Finally, the goal of the negotiation process may be totally different for the two teams. U.S. negotiators are traditionally deal-oriented, and the purpose of their negotiations is to arrive at a written, binding contract. Saudi negotiators, on the other hand, are more relationship-oriented, and their goal is to form a friendship which will be the basis of a long-lasting business relationship. The standard saying is, "establish friendship and business will follow". Thus, a Saudi might regard an American push for the signed contract as a sign of distrust. Furthermore, the establishing of a relationship takes more time than many American negotiators have "budgeted." With a return ticket on a specific flight purchased, the American may push for the conclusion of negotiations, where the Saudi would like to take the extra time necessary to get to know his counterpart(s).

The purpose of this chapter, and the resulting exercise at the end of it, is to create an awareness of the possible differences in values underlying approaches to negotiations, which can lead to misunderstandings, frustration, conflicts, and failed deals. It will contain certain generalizations about the way representatives from different cultures negotiate – the culture of negotiations – which, like all generalizations, will not hold true in all cases. However, they will form a framework with which to deal with members of another culture. The applicability of the generalizations will vary from culture to culture. They will hold true to a greater degree with formalistic cultures, such as Japan, where there are rigid rules of behavior. They will be less accurate in individualistic cultures, such as that of the United States, where there is more individual freedom of action. Nevertheless, they should be learned so that (1) you avoid the mistake of assuming that everyone thinks and negotiates like you, and (2) you develop a sensitivity to different meanings attached to dif-

ferent gestures, means of expression (direct versus indirect communication), concepts of time, and so forth. Negotiation is a dialogue, and a dialogue requires an understanding of the differences associated with acts, statements, and body language. Understanding these differences will help you avoid misinterpretation, mistakes in communication, and even insults, all of which can result in failed deals.

The American culture of negotiation is used in this chapter as an example and compared with contrasting cultures on each point.

TIME: Negotiations should begin on time. "Time is money," and thus negotiations should not take more time than necessary. This means that American negotiators are sometimes frustrated by what they see as "Latin time" where meetings don't start promptly or the Arab tendency to want to establish friendship before negotiations can really begin. Americans are very goal-oriented, set up time schedules, and hope to conclude negotiations within those time frames. They can appear to be impatient or "pushy" (pressuring the opposite side to come to an agreement). Whereas a Chinese negotiator must convince his superior that he has fully explored the limits of his counterpart's position, an American negotiator may want to prove his efficiency by making a quick deal.

Another conflict may arise due to differing perceptions of time. Some cultures such as North American, British, and Germanic function under Monochrome time, which is linear and has segments which can be compartmentalized allowing people to concentrate on one thing at a time. Thus, negotiations should proceed from A to Z and not be interrupted. This is typical of American thinking. Other cultures, notably Arab, function under Polychrome time, where many things can occur at the same time. This can be a source of conflict between American and Arab negotiators because the latter allows many things to occur at the same time. For example, a telephone call or a secretary's interruption are perfectly acceptable in a Polychrome time culture, whereas they would be considered impolite and frustrating for a member of a Monochrome time culture.

CONTRACT: American look at negotiations as a means of reaching a contract and stress legality and the binding nature of a written document, which sets out rights and duties that can be upheld in a court of law. Other cultures look at negotiations as a means of establishing a relationship that will be the basis of future business. For Americans, a contract is the sign of closing a deal, while for some other cultures it begins a relationship. The emphasis on a binding legal document may be interpreted by other cultures as a sign of a lack of trust. They often see a contract as a general outline of the present situation, which can be altered if a new situation arises. Thus, for legalistic cultures, such as Western European and North American, the Oriental tendency to look at a contract as a point of departure is very frustrating. The legalist interprets changes in a contract as breach of contract, which can

be brought to court. Many Oriental negotiators feel that if a situation changes, the agreement should change, and that the original agreement was a statement of principles that can be worked out over time if the relationship between the two sides is good.

DEAL VERSUS RELATIONSHIP: A basic source of misunderstanding is an emphasis on making a deal versus establishing a relationship. Making a deal is typical of legalistic cultures such as Western Europe and North America, whereas establishing a relationship is typical of Oriental, Latin American, and Arab cultures. Legalistic cultures try to establish an "airtight" contract that takes into consideration all contingencies. Members of a relationship-oriented culture realize that the world is not static and unanticipated changes will occur that will require the reinterpretation of the original agreement. Thus, when a Japanese businessman seeks to modify a contract, the American will likely feel that he is being cheated. Whereas the Japanese will likely feel that the American is being unreasonably rigid and distrustful. The difference in emphasis on deal versus relationship may even affect the emphasis of the negotiations. A Japanese or Chinese negotiator will likely begin with an agreement on general principles, while an American will begin with specific details.

Naturally, the emphasis on building a relationship results in a more prolonged negotiation period. The American impatience to close the deal might not consider the importance of establishing a sound relationship, which is disconcerting for representatives of relationship-oriented cultures. Failure to recognize the importance of personal relationships can undermine the basic foundation of a working relationship. It is almost contradictory that Americans, who are extremely social, often place so little emphasis on relationship-building in international negotiations.

PROTOCOL: Protocol concerns the importance of the formal aspects of negotiations. It includes aspects such as how to address people (first or last names), use of titles, dress, gift giving, exchange of business cards, the respect for age, the shape of the negotiating table, the placement of negotiators, etiquette of conducting business over a meal, and so forth. Americans are informal and have a tendency to overlook the importance of protocol, which can be interpreted as impoliteness. Protocol functions to establish a relationship, and those who overlook the importance of relationship may overlook the importance of protocol. It helps to establish respect through gift giving and business card exchange, and respect for culturally determined rules of the game. Failure to consider protocol can be interpreted as both a personal affront and an affront to the culture of one's counterparts. Griffin and Daggatt cite Americans' tendency to address the member of the other negotiating team who speaks English best, thus overlooking a senior member of the other team, an act which ignores seniority and implicitly shows disrespect to the point of causing loss of face. As protocol establishes recognition of seniority

among counterparts, failure to observe it can be equal to an unintentional insult. In analyzing one's counterparts, one has to decide both how important protocol is and what aspects of protocol are important.

DECISION MAKING: Approaches to decision making can be divided into individual and consensus. While in American teams the decision-making power often lies in the hands of individuals, other cultures emphasize group agreement by consensus, which naturally takes longer to achieve. Several negotiation experts have characterized the American approach as a "John Wayne" style where an individual arrives on the scene, conducts the negotiations as quickly as possible, and hopes to leave with a signed contract. This individualistic approach has several drawbacks. First, it is Monochrome, second, it overlooks the importance of establishing relationships, and third it can lead to excessive ego involvement. Believing that success or failure is individual, the John Wayne negotiator may take his counterparts' maneuvers personally and emotionally and lose his calm objectivity. This may lead to overreaction, which may decrease his effectiveness as a negotiator as well as poison the personal relationship between himself and his counterparts. Another problem can arise through misinterpreting the decision making process. Members of a team from an individualistic culture may conclude that the members of the negotiating team have the power to make the final decision. They will then be frustrated to find out that an agreement which they thought was final will be submitted to a larger group for approval. By then, they have stated their position, which makes them vulnerable, and the senior official of the other team can keep what is acceptable and demand that the rest be renegotiated.

An individual versus consensus approach will also impact on the concession process. An individual approach will allow for more flexibility in concession making. American teams tend to begin with an ideal contract and then make concessions until a compromise is reached. However, consensus-oriented teams have very little leeway in making concessions due to the difficulty they have in reaching consensus in their group. The consensus approach makes concessions difficult for the Japanese. The Russians often adopt an even more inflexible position, since they view compromise as a sign of weakness. Thus, whereas the Americans are generally willing to make concessions to reach an agreement, this approach may conflict with other cultures' negotiating styles.

In negotiating with other cultures, you must understand their negotiating approach, their attitude toward compromise, and who has the final say in accepting an agreement. Otherwise, you will be ineffective and frustrated.

CONFLICT: Conflict is not seen as necessarily negative by American negotiators and is often seen as part of the negotiating process. Emotions perhaps are more accepted than in some Asian cultures. Thus, American negotiators can appear more confrontational than some of their Asian counter-

parts, the Koreans being a notable exception. Certain aspects of conflict are (1) stating that you disagree, (2) making threats in terms of "if you do not accept this, we will", including threats of breaking off negotiations, (3) using the word "no", and (4) interrupting. This is one of the classic differences between Western European and Japanese negotiators. Japanese learn at an early age to avoid social conflict and save face. The Japanese generally do not like negotiating across a table. They sound out their counterparts in advance and hope to use formal meetings to present areas of agreement. The Japanese will question their counterparts in detail, not because they do not understand what is being said, but because they are looking for areas of agreement on which to build a consensus. Often adjustments in positions will be worked out outside of the negotiating room during breaks, where the Japanese negotiator will fish for possible agreement. The negotiator must be constantly aware of statements made outside of the negotiating room, since a suggestion may be subtly raised so as to be as easily withdrawn if not met by approval. This allows the all-important face saving. Thus, subtlety is the key. As Thayer and Weiss state, "Japanese negotiating style has been described as *awase* (to combine and adjust one thing to another). Instead of directly addressing issues, openly stating proposals and counterproposals, and generally relying on exact concepts and standardized meanings – features of an *erabi* (to select) culture such as the United States – *awase* style entails inferring the positions of the parties, assuming approximate meanings and adjusting to the situation. This style emphasizes proper form and process, even over the substance of decisions, and explains the Japanese preference for informal explorations and agreement behind-the-scenes prior to formal sessions." Thus, those from cultures where conflict is acceptable must be extremely sensitive to subtle forms of communication by members of cultures where conflict is unacceptable. This leads us to a discussion of direct versus indirect communication.

DIRECT VERSUS INDIRECT COMMUNICATION: Direct communication involves stating exactly what you mean and expecting straight answers from others. It also involves asking questions and expecting direct answers. This is referred to as low-context communication, where facts and not the situation are important. In high-context communication, cultural constraints prevent a direct answer, and thus one has to interpret responses. For example, "no" is rarely used and can be replaced by "a bit difficult." "Yes" may not mean agreement, but simply that a request has been understood. "I'll think about it," for an American, will mean that a possibility of acceptance exists, whereas for a Japanese it might be a polite form of "no."

Eye contact is another area of difference. Americans look each other directly in the eyes, which may be considered impolite in some other countries. However, an American can interpret not looking one in the eyes, as a reason for distrust. Silence is another source of misunderstanding. Silence is perfectly acceptable in certain cultures, whereas it can be a source of embarrassment

in others. It can even be used to gain concessions, where the members of one culture simply outwait the members of another who find silence unbearable, break down, and make a comment that leads to a concession. Often body language or grunts express more than words, and negotiators from low-context cultures must be careful about their own body language so as not to send false messages. They must also be aware of high-context culture representatives' body language to infer meaning where verbal communication does not exist.

WIN-WIN VERSUS WIN-LOSE: Win-win is when both sides win, while win-lose is where one side benefits at the other side's expense. The emphasis in the United States on winning may tend to push American negotiators toward win-lose strategies. Another factor is American emphasis on the individual rather than the group, which can lead to considering selfish interests higher than collective interests. Cultures that emphasize the importance of relationships will most likely emphasize win-win relationships, the idea being that a good business relationship will allow the partners to weather eventual conflicts and establish a mutually beneficial partnership. The win-win approach emphasizes finding interests that both sides have in common and developing them. The win-lose approach emphasizes making gains at the other party's expense, which creates a competitive and not a cooperative atmosphere. The win-lose approach is based on the idea of a fixed pie where one's gains result in another's losses. Win-win suggests that the pie can be expanded by looking for common interests and synergy. Needless to say, negotiations will be difficult if the two sides approach the table with conflicting strategies. Win-win negotiators must be careful that their counterparts share this approach or they will be easily exploited. It is wise to set down the win-win ground rules at the beginning if negotiations are to be profitable for both sides.

Text 3. Negotiating body language

How Does Your Opponent Size You Up?

How Do You Size Up Your Opponent?

The experts at the Negotiation Institute offer the highest quality seminars in the world. Negotiating body language is an important part of these training programs. Social cues, different stances and various poses give off important non-verbal communication information. Two key questions are:

- (1) Are You Unknowingly Sending "Signals" Your Opponent Can Read?
- (2) Are You Failing To Read Signals Which Are Being Sent to You?

Insights into non-verbal behavior will add to your negotiating strength. You learn to interpret what the other side is saying in addition to their words. At the same time you can become more aware of what your body language is saying to your opponent.

What Does Your Opponent See In Your Gestures

Negotiation seminars help you to become better able to see yourself as your opponent sees you with an analysis of gestures, gesture clusters and attitudes that are all part of your negotiating posture.

Examples of Body Stances

In these examples of body language, you will note that none of these people indicate a receptive negotiator:



Defensive and Superior

His locked ankles indicate he is holding back. His thumb out of pockets shows feelings of superiority. His leaning back shows an air of defiance.

Defensive

He is in locked pose. His hand and arm are linked behind his back. He shows that he is frustrated by holding his arms in this position. He is not open to negotiating.

Defensive

Crossed arms shows he is defensive. Standing up straight with back arched and chest out shows defiance. One leg forward shows he is aggressive (confident).

Defensive

His arms are crossed over his upper chest with his hands clinched. This shows that he is holding back something (anger). Both his legs are together holding his negotiating position.

On the other hand, based on their body positioning, you can see that these people are ready to negotiate.



Ready

His hands are on his hips In the British style with elbows pointed back indicates a readiness to negotiate.

Openness

He shows confidence with his hands. They are slightly open holding the cigar and the walking stick behind him. He is standing up straight but is in a forward position showing a willingness to negotiate. This person is easy to negotiate with.

Authority

His hands are clasped behind his back which indicates authority. Understand this position when negotiating.

Mixed Signal

This is a mixed signal. One hand is on his hip (ready). The other hand in his pocket (hiding).

CONTENTS

Введение	1
ARRIVALS, VISITS, TALKS	4
Text 1.	4
Text 2.	6
Text 3. Summits and talks in news	9
Text 4. Korea Talks End Before Agreement	12
Text 5. China (проведет переговоры по вопросам безопасности) with Japan and South Korea	12
Text 6. (Соперники) India, Pakistan Meet after 3 Years	13
Text 7. France UK Summit	13
Text 8. Russia's President Dmitry Medvedev to pay visit to Azerbaijan	14
Text 9. Lao Prime Minister to Visit Vietnam	14
Text 10. Martin, Canadian Parliamentarians end successful visit in Armenia	14
FINAL INSTRUMENTS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS AND VISITS.....	17
Text 1.	17
Text 2. Final instruments of international conferences.....	19
Text 3. Treaties and conventions	21
Text 4. TREATY of Friendship and Cooperation between (name of country) and (name of country).....	23
Text 5. CONVENTION on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques	25
Text 6. Agreements.....	27
CULTURAL AWARENESS IN INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATION	29
Text 1. The Art of Negotiating	29
Text 2. Cultural Awareness in International Negotiations.....	36
Text 3. Negotiating body language	42

Учебное издание

Анкудинова Ирина Федоровна
Уткина Светлана Александровна

АНГЛИЙСКИЙ ЯЗЫК: ПЕРЕГОВОРЫ НА ВЫСШЕМ УРОВНЕ

Хрестоматия
по специальностям
«Международные отношения»
и «Регионоведение (США и Канады)»

В авторской редакции
Компьютерная верстка Н.А. Тятовой

Формат 60×84/16.
Бумага писчая. Печать офсетная. Усл. печ. л. 3,0.
Уч.-изд. л. 2,8. Тираж 0 экз. Заказ

Издательство Владивостокского государственного университета
экономики и сервиса
690600, Владивосток, ул. Гоголя, 41