

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
IACM
FOR CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

24th Annual IACM Conference
Istanbul, Turkey
July 3-6, 2011



IACM BOARD AND OFFICERS 2010-2011

Dan Druckman	President, George Mason University, USA and University of Southern Queensland, Australia
Martin Euwema	President Elect, Leuven University, Belgium
Michele Gelfand	Past President, University of Maryland, USA
Astrid Homan	Board Member (2009 – 2011), VU University Amsterdam, Netherlands
Matthew Cronin	Board Member (2009 – 2011), George Mason University, USA
William Bottom	Board Member (2010 – 2012), Washington University in St. Louis, USA
Peter Coleman	Board Member (2010 – 2012), Columbia University, USA
Shirli Kopelman	Officer, Executive, University of Michigan, USA
Don Gibson	Officer, Treasurer, Fairfield University, USA
Cheryl Rivers	Officer, Communications, University of Otago, New Zealand
Godfrey Steele	Officer, Signal Newsletter, University of the West Indies, Trinidad & Tobago
Linda Steele	Officer, Signal Newsletter, University of the West Indies, Trinidad & Tobago
Mara Olekalns	Officer, NCMR Editor, Melbourne Business School, Australia
Karen Jehn	Officer, NCMR Editor, Melbourne Business School, Australia
Wolfgang Steinle	Officer, Web Development, Leiden University, Netherlands
Shelly Whitmer	IACM Administrative Assistant, University of Michigan, USA

Ex-officio Board Members – 2011 Conference

Corinne Bendersky	Program Chair, UCLA Anderson School of Management, USA
Esra Cuhadar	Local Arrangements Chair, Bilkent University, Ankara, Turkey

2011 Program Committee

Nicholas Hays	UCLA Anderson School of Management, USA
Ming-Hong Tsai	UCLA Anderson School of Management, USA

2011 Conference Local Arrangements Committee

Arzu Kibris	Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey
Michael Mousseau	Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey
Resat Bayer	Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey
Belgin San Akca	Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey
Stephanie Subocz	Event planning consultant, Boston, USA

Breakout session (Paper Session) 2F: Multilateral Negotiations and International Organizations

Yavuz

Observations on multilateral environmental diplomacy from 1992-2012

Lynn Wagner (IISD, lynn@iisd.org), Pamela Chasek (IISD, pam@iisd.org)

Abstract:

At the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, the majority of the world's leaders set their back on the old world order and a 'Cold War' security paradigm and constructed a new 'sustainable development' paradigm that promised to enhance environmentally sound economic and social development throughout the world. The proliferation of multilateral environmental agreements and summits that followed 1992 points to an unprecedented achievement in international diplomacy, but is also worth examining for its accomplishments and shortcomings. This paper presents case studies drawn from a book project that examines accomplishments and shortcomings from the last 20 years of multilateral environmental negotiations. This comprehensive review was conducted by approximately twenty writers for the International Institute for Sustainable Development's Earth Negotiations Bulletin, and was co-edited by the paper's authors. All of the contributing authors to this book project have participated in the post-Earth Summit negotiating processes and use their first-hand knowledge as they examine the evolution over the past 20 years.

Turning points in multilateral trade negotiations on intellectual property

Larry Crump (Griffith University, L.Crump@griffith.edu.au), Daniel Druckman (George Mason University & University of Southern Qld, dandruckman@yahoo.com)

Abstract:

Detailed chronologies of events that transpired during the discussion of intellectual property issues (TRIPS) in the GATT Uruguay Round and prior to and during the WTO Doha Ministerial are used to trace the unfolding negotiation processes through time. Of particular interest are departures from earlier trends in the chronologies: A departure is defined as a clear and self-evident change from earlier events or patterns in the form of an impactful decision taken by one or more parties. By coding the causes (precipitants) and effects (consequences) of the departures, we perform a turning points analysis: These three-part sequences reveal the triggers and impacts of departures during the extended TRIPS negotiation process. The analyses will allow a comparison of the patterns that unfolded during the two phases of TRIPS negotiations. This comparison will highlight the breakthroughs that occurred during the Uruguay Round and the crises that emerged later, prior to and during the Doha Ministerial. It will also have implications more generally for the way that comparative analyses of international negotiation are performed.