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Abstract: Knowledge, as well as skill acquisition in the art and science of negotiation is paramount to the attainment of peace which is conducive to the development of the economy of a nation, particularly such societies that are not properly integrated, diverse in culture and fractionalised. It is also significant that peace and a corrupt free institution are also essential for development. Be that as it may, this paper argued that Nigeria’s problem today stems from unprofessionalism and lack of proper skills in the art and science of negotiation among the personnel in her institutions. It is evident from the way and manner as well as attitude and absence of patriotisms on the part of public servants and negotiators alike in strategic areas including, the economic, social and cultural sectors of our society. The paper which adopted the descriptive approach was anchored on Zartman’s theory of ‘the weak confront the strong’ and relied on secondary sources of information for data collection, while content analysis was adopted for data analysis. The paper concluded that until and when public officials are educated and have acquired the relevant skills, gathered the experience, ready and developed the self-will, development and sustainable peace will continue to elude the Nigerian nation and corruption will continue to reign. Finally the paper recommended rigorous education in training and development of skills in the art and science of negotiations in various schools abroad and also for the institutions of government to be able to build in its citizens the culture of patriotism at every level of government.
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Introduction
Negotiation is the art or science of securing agreements on issues of conflicting or conflicting interest and values between two or more parties who are interdependent, and who are seeking to maximise their outcome or payoffs through a non-violent means or process.
and based on mutual acceptance of or/and commitment to such a means or process. According to Fisher and Ury (1992) negotiation is a fact of life. It is a “back-and-forth communication designed to reach an agreement when you and the other side have some interests that are shared and others that are opposed”.

Kissinger (1969) sees negotiation as “a process of combining conflicting positions into a common position, under a decision rule of unanimity”. Hence, Alfredson and Cungu (2008) sees negotiation as a central component of national policy-making processes, from setting agendas, to determining what issues are to be addressed by policy makers and securing needed support from relevant parties in order to ensure that planned policies are sustainable.

Alfred and Cungu (2008) maintain that while formal definitions of negotiation vary, theorists do accept certain basic tenets. Foremost among them are the assumptions that parties who negotiate agree in at least one fundamental respect; they share a belief that their respective purposes will be better served by entering into negotiation with the other party. Implicitly then, negotiating parties have come to the conclusion, at least for a moment, that they may be able to satisfy their individual goals or concerns more favourably by coming to an agreed upon solutions with the other side, than by attempting to meet their goals or concerns unilaterally. It is this mutual perception that leads to the onset of negotiations and betrays the dependence that exists (to whatever degree) between negotiating parties.

The seven elements of principled negotiation according to Alfred and Cungu (2008) include identifying interests, people, alternatives, identifying options, criteria/legitimacy, commitments, communication. This common interest in a shared agreement is the starting point for the “common interest and mutual dependence that can exist between participants in a conflict with which, Schelling writes, “negotiation is concerned” (Schelling, 1960 cited in Alfred and Cungu, 2008).

Adekanye (2006) points out that negotiation is only possible if/where/when the parties have achieved, or are close to achieving, or find themselves having a convergence of interest; a readiness for settlement such as the “timing for” and “ripeness of” negotiation and seizing the initiative at opportune moment; or even threat of circumstances such as the threat of force, state of desperation, or of a mutually hurting statement.

Adekanye (2006) further points that, the most important element in any negotiation are the ‘parties’ (which also according to him can be found variously referred to in the literature as “actors”, “opponents” “adversaries”, “negotiating adversaries”, or “partners”). He thus avers that:

Parties opt for negotiation only when they are ready to do so, although it may be because the parties now observe or sense a convergence taking place regarding the issues of conflicting interest or values hitherto dividing them. But the resolve to negotiating an end to conflict may have arisen from realization that alternative, usually unilateral
methods of achieving a satisfactory result are blocked and the parties feel that they are in an uncomfortable and costly predicament that is the moment, in the exponents’ view, to grab onto proposals and initiatives for a negotiated settlement (Adekanye, 2006 p. 2).

In essence, all other elements of negotiation depend on the attitudes, actions, responses and willingness of the parties involved. Although Adekanye (2006) places emphasis on the necessity of parties’ involvement in consolidating and sustaining negotiation settlements, he, however, states that the existence of parties and other elements listed above is not sufficient to ensure success of the negotiation process.

**Review of Literature**

From the literature negotiation has several definitions; they varied according to the number of specialist in the field’ however their contents revolve around describing negotiation as the process based on continued communication between two parties or more, in order to solve all the issues, subject of the conflict, to address all the existing disputes through mutual dependence and propose alternatives and choices in order to reach an acceptable solution (Hazzouri 2011). Although, some scholars such as Wheeler (2013) see negotiation as purely an art that depends on the intuitive capacity of negotiators and their experience in analysing the situations that face them and responding to them in all the stages of negotiation process, Hazzourri (2011) views negotiation as both an art in that light and a science in form and content.

**Negotiation as an Activity and Discipline**

As we have pointed out earlier, the art and science of negotiation spanned various disciplines as well as areas of conflicting interests. For instance, negotiating international trade agreements which could sustain development for any nation has become a full-time job for developing countries. They negotiate often in pairs, in regional groups, and as members of the World Trade Organization (WTO), where they make up the majority of members. The WTO in particular is one of the premier sites where globalization will be either managed or mismanaged. Some official talks aim for deal that shape international rules and state policies. Other talks seek settlements for legal disputes arising in the showdown of those rules. Ultimately all this bargaining helps determine who receives the gains and bear the burden of trade, with powerful consequences for local communities across the globe.

Less developed countries have become dramatically more active in trade as well as political power negotiations in recent years, as their policies and societies have become more dependent on trade and power sharing. Even the smallest traders and political leaders are better organized and prepared than in the past. They were particularly prominent players in WTO ministerial conference in Seattle in 1999, Doha in 2001, and Cancun in 2003. The result-for the entire world- depend more than ever on how developing countries negotiate.

The extant literature is replete with evidence that social science still does not understand, for instance the process of trade negotiation- as distinct from the
institutions, laws, and economics of the issues—well enough. In particular, negotiation process research has under-
represented the experience and needs of developing countries, where the large majority of the world’s people live. Empirically grounded research on their negotiations is still in its infancy. What happens inside these frequent talks between delegations? What negotiation strategies have developing country delegations attempted and have they made any difference, considering the power disparities they face? How do they process information and influence their counterparts’ beliefs during the talks? Why do some bargaining coalitions hold together while others fragment? Most centrally, what accounts for the varying outcomes we see? Is it possible to generalize about this complex process? Can one find any valuable lessons for practitioners who will face future negotiations? Essentially, after 1990 developing country participation in dispute settlement talks increased and their participation in multilateral trade negotiations exploded. During and after the GATT’s Uruguay Round (1986-1994) more developing countries shifted their policies towards reliance on international markets for development. After creation of WTO in 1995, more countries reinforced or established their missions in Geneva. Most notably, in 1999 during preparations for the WTO’s ministerial conference in Seattle, developing countries voiced concerns and injected dozens of formal proposals into the negotiation process. This participation explosion drew in many smaller trading countries that had been passive or not signatories at all prior to 1994. Many states increased their investment in training their officials for international commercial negotiations, with the help of UNCTAD, the WTO, and regional organizations. Many delegations formed or joined bargaining coalitions to defend common negotiating positions through direct coordination. Almost every member state sent its minister to Seattle and again to Doha in 2001 and Cancun in 2003. These events and developing countries’ role in them became front–page news worldwide (Emerson, Nabatchi & Balogh, 2012; Gleeson, Legge, O’Neill & Pfeffer, 2011; Perkin, 2010; Raiffa, 1982).

In international affairs, diplomatic bargaining has long been considered a useful tool for the settlement of issues of inter-state disputes, including territorial boundaries, fishing rights in territorial waters, avoiding war between states, arms control, and negotiating treaties. In the environmental sphere, sustainable development and environment, reduction of industrial pollution, including carbon monoxide and climate change, protection of wild life share of water resources, are among the areas that have today increasingly attracted the interest of global negotiations in the United Nations and other world bodies of course, in the economic sphere, negotiations can cover that whole gamut of areas or activities, such as haggling of the market place, wage negotiations between management and workers, business to business relations, tariff negotiations, debt negotiation, import prohibit on, trade liberalization, and such other trade and trade related issues of which of course the business of
negotiating EPA between ECOWAS and EU (Adekanye, 2006).

At this juncture, it is imperative to state the importance of education and training in the art of negotiation. This comes to fore as capacity building for working professionals in the field. Capacity building entails the development of a workforce through the acquisition of technical and managerial efficiency and effectiveness in the overall performance of an organization. Indeed, the efficiency of a workforce can only be enhanced and sustained through continuous capacity building. It could also be defined as the internalization of the knowledge, skills and processes that enable the formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of set goals in an efficient manner. Yet, it could be viewed as a series of activities, which an organization, enterprise or even a nation needs to undertake to provide for itself, on a continuous basis, as well as the regular supply of skilled manpower to meet its present and future needs. Capacity building entails investment in human capital, institutions and practices necessary to enhance human skills, overhaul institutions and improve procedures and systems. This requires forecast of the manpower needs and other requirements of the economy over a period of time in respect of each industrial and occupational group, supported with policies and programmes that guarantee their sustainability. Capacity building, thus enhances the ability of human resources and institutions to perform or produce and could be through any or a combination of “on-the-job training” and “off the job training.”

In much of the United kingdom, the United States of America, and Canada, where the field has come to be recognised as a distinct area of academic research and training, negotiation studies have come to be increasingly accepted as a useful branch of political and other social sciences and often in the context of peace and conflict studies, where the subject is taught as part of course offerings on conflict mediation, conflict management or conflicts resolution. But in a few of the universities in the countries mentioned, courses on negotiation are also sometimes referred to as studies in dispute resolution or alternative conflict resolution, as well as taught as part of law school programmes. The Harvard negotiation project was one such a programme, and happened to have been a pioneering force in the teaching of the theory and practice of negotiation in the United States.

In some of Britain’s institutions of higher learning, newly emergent professional schools and colleges that specialize in Masters in Business Administration and Management Studies, including some of the older established universities, have been quick to add course offerings in negotiation to their list of training programmes. One of the most well-known and prestigious examples is the programme on negotiation based at Said Business School, University of Oxford.

A useful aspects to most of those programs offering executive training courses on negotiation, particularly the Oxford University which happens also to be the best, is that they are not confined to merely formal teaching and by rote but combine the latter with
interactive lectures and discussions, group meetings and tutorials, case-studies, role-play, simulations of real-world problem-solving situations, and informal seminars. However, in a bid to be cost effective and make capacity building an option available to all and sundry, there are institutions in the country that offer similar training. Capacity building institutions in this light include the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA), the Administrative Staff College of Nigeria (ASCON) and the National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS).

The NIIA is an institution established and versed in the art of creating foreign policy blueprints for the Nigerian government. With frequent conferences, roundtables and lectures on the instrument of foreign policy formulation in Nigeria, it serves as an intellectual base upon which decision-makers rely for informed opinion and expert advice in order to make rational choices between contending policy options. This veritable organization provides a ready ground of capacity improvement for negotiators, especially in the field of diplomacy. The ASCON on the other hand was established to train effective leaders at all levels of organizations in the country thereby enhancing the capacity and capability of such organizations both in the public and private sectors. The National Institute of Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS) is a high-level policy formation center for bureaucrats, private sector leaders, Army officers, and medium-rank and senior civil servants, who will conceptualize and anchor the implementation of innovative and dynamic policy initiatives and strategies critical for national development. These institutions offer available capacity building capabilities within the country, especially in the art of negotiation. However, for one to succeed in any negotiation, skills in the following areas are a must: knowledge, information- and data gathering, rational decision making, persuasion, innovation, implementation and enforcement. These skills are acquired through intuition and critical thinking, by training and learning, through internship and apprenticeship, by practice on the job, from experience, from studies, drawing and applying lessons learnt.

Adekanye (2006) for example submitted that the skills and experience of persons who would engage in economic partnership agreement (EPA) negotiations on behalf of ECOWAS with the EU must:

1. Possess qualification, skills, and insights for contributing towards the negotiation and building of good and sustainable economic partnership agreements (EPAs) between the Economic Community of West African states (ECOWAS), as a regional community and the European Union (EU) or for that matter any other regional groupings;
2. Be able to analyse complex negotiation issues involved, including the contradictions between EPAs and development objectives, and to identify the key interests, process, and relationships;
3. Possess persuasive style and convincing logical and empirical evidence for advising
the ECOWAS management on the need to alter situations and reframe issues to support member states goals where necessary;

4. Understand the roles and purposes that international non-governmental organization (NGOs) can and do play in this process, and why and how inputs of such organization can be useful for assessing that conduct and outcome of EPA negotiations;

5. Capable of setting up a range of scenarios for benchmarking economic and development impact of any given EPA.

In Adekanye’s observation however, the ECOWAS Executive Secretariat has virtually no installed capacity and pool of professional expertise and technical skills for conducting and sustaining good and sustainable trade negotiations with the EU, and find it relying on a sprinkling of mostly foreign consultants and experts donated by our development partners to assist (Adekanye, 2006). The above is not limited to the ECOWAS institution alone, it cut across most strata of our existing institutions whose personnel are largely unprofessional and unskilled. The EU and other developed institutions abroad obviously does not suffer from any such structural and institutional incapacity, but has abundance of trained skills and expertise to tap into particularly in its negotiations on EPA, Adekanye (2006). In essence our institutions must build up its own in-house capacity and professional expertise drawn from among the regional economic community’s own trained and competent personnel, including the ex-Diaspora. If member states as a group are to succeed in achieving better negotiations skills and stronger bargaining power.

**Approaches to Negotiation**

Over the years, scholars have tried to provide various approaches to negotiation. Druckman (1977) advanced four approaches. Raiffa (1982) gave three approaches and Zartman (2007) five including structural, strategic, processual, behavioural and integrative approaches. According to Adekanye (2006), negotiation as an activity has its own logic, its own methods, its own principles and precedents, and its own rules of procedure. Negotiation has its strategies, its techniques, and its tactics. All these must be clearly understood and mastered, and can only be disregarded at great cost to the process, outcome, negotiating adversaries, and practitioners alike.

Similarly, Alfred and Cungu (2008) in their own view see strategy as “a careful plan or method, especially for achieving an end” whereas the use of tactics refers to “the skill of using available means” to reach that end. According to them, the major strategies for negotiating are the Distributive and Integrative strategies. Distributive strategies, also known as “zero-sum”, competitive, or “win-lose” strategies are based on a competitive view of negotiations. They are designed to secure the biggest slice possible of the proverbial pie for one side (also called “claiming value”), while leaving the other side with the smallest helping possible(Alfred & Cungu, 2008). Integrative strategies on the other hand tend to take a slightly more nuanced
view of the role of alternatives in negotiation. Integrative strategy focuses on solving a problem without getting distracted by personal elements and coming to an agreement in a manner that will preserve the relationship.

There are five major approaches to negotiation as highlighted by Alfred and Cungu (2008). They include Structural approach, Strategic approach, Behavioural approach, Procession approach, and Integrative approach.

**Structural approaches** focus on structural features that define each particular negotiation. These may include the number of parties, issues involved in the negotiation and the composition (whether each side is monolithic or comprises many groups) or relative power of the competing parties. They are usually deterministic in nature as they tend to define negotiations as conflict scenarios between opponents who maintain incompatible goals. Thus, the focus is on the power of the parties.

Adekanye (2006) highlights the problematic nature of structure in the ongoing EU-ECOWAS EPA negotiations where he states:

> To be sure, the literature on theory and practice of negotiations recognizes the existence of such a thing as “bargaining power”, “bargaining strength”, and “bargaining skills”. It is simply to remind the analysts, actors and policymakers of the invariable fact that the more powerful, much stronger, and more skillful party tends to have an advantage over the less powerful, much weaker, and less skilful party to any negotiation, including the process and outcome. Although a few theorists of negotiation have postulated the counter-principle that, in bargaining, weakness may be strength, I cannot fathom how that counter-principles will apply in the particular case that we are dealing with here (except perhaps at the purely moral plane?). The odds are simply loaded against the weaker party to the EPA negotiations (Adekanye, 2006:13).

**Strategic approaches** view negotiators as key decision makers with known alternatives who make choices of which option will maximize their ends or “gains”, frequently described as ‘payoffs’. However, in such scenarios, negotiators face a similar challenge in their decision-making as they also have incomplete information about the other negotiator’s intentions. Thus, based on the game theory, negotiation is focused on achieving ‘best solutions’.

Behavioural approaches emphasize the role of negotiators’ personalities or individual characteristics play in determining the course and outcome of negotiated agreements. The tension that arises between these two approaches forms a paradox that has been termed the “Toughness Dilemma” or the “Negotiator’s Dilemma” (Zartman, 1978; Lax and Sebenius, 1986, cited in Alfred and Cungu, 2008). The dilemma states that though negotiators who are ‘tough’ during a negotiation are more likely to gain more of their demands in a negotiated solution, the trade-off is that in adopting this stance, they are less likely to conclude an agreement at all.

The processual/concession approach according to Zartman, sees negotiation as a learning process in which parties
react to each other’s concession behaviour. The concessions mark stages in negotiations. They are used by parties to both signal their own intentions and to encourage movement in their opponent’s position. Parties “use their bids both to respond to the previous counteroffer and to influence the next one; the offers themselves become an exercise in power” (Zartman, 1978).

The risk inherent in this approach is that participants engaged in concession-trading may miss opportunities to find new, mutually beneficial solutions to their shared dilemma and end-up instead in a purely regressive process which leaves both sides with fewer gains than they could have had if they had pursued a more creative approach (Alfred and Cungu, 2008).

It is in this light that the Niger Delta Amnesty Programme, where economic war had raged for over 5 decades, comes to mind. Negotiation teams had to follow best practices, as each side had to give in to one concession or the other. Consequently, the amnesty programme brought in a regime of tentative peace which though has been breached.

**Integrative approaches**, in sharp contrast to distributive approaches, frame negotiations as interactions with win-win potential. According to Alfred and Cungu (2008:16):

Integrative theories and strategies look for ways of creating value, so that there is more to share between parties as a result of negotiation. Integrative approaches use objective criteria, look to create conditions of mutual gain, and emphasize the importance of exchanging information between parties and group problem-solving. … integrative strategies call for participants to work jointly to create win-win solutions. They involve uncovering interests, generating options and searching for commonalities between parties.

A major shortfall of the integrative approach however, is that it is time-consuming. With regard to the ongoing EU-ECOWAS negotiations, Adekanye (2006) expressed caution about the possibility for integrative bargaining to occur between the two parties:

It will be naïve to assume that the opportunities and conditions for negotiating EPA are the same and equal for the two groups of actors involved: namely the poor, until now most heavily debt-ridden, badly organized, mostly agriculture producing and/or natural resources-exporting economies of the ECOWAS sub-region, on the one hand, and the wealthy, fiscally buoyant, well-organized, industrially and technologically advanced, and capital-or/and industrial goods-exporting economics of the EU, on the other (Adekanye, 2006:12).

In concluding about the nature and inherent problems of negotiated agreements and the consequence of the problems concerned for the sustainability question about the EPA negotiations, he drew an analogy from peace and conflict studies. His findings were based on the comparative experience of war-torn African Countries, like Ethiopia, Uganda, and Mozambique, South Africa, Mali, which transited from war / peace, and from conflict to the post-conflict stage, and used negotiated settlements as a key instrument to facilitate the process.
Adekanye, (2006) summarised as follows:

By their very nature, most negotiated agreements tend to skirt the core problem initially at the heart of the dispute or conflict, while creating new problems of their own. Equally important is the twinned question about justice (or equality) and ownership of the process and outcome, and its linkage to the sustainability problems, that may not have been sufficiently factored into the negotiated settlements. Both considerations are a key to addressing the problem about negotiated agreements that work for some time, but break down sooner than later; how and why some negotiated agreements survive, and others fail; how and why some negotiated agreements never in fact take off the ground. Negotiated agreements that leave highly differential or unequal outcomes between parties tend to create incentive for the dissatisfied party either to: cheat in its implementation of the terms of negotiated settlement, complain repeatedly or behalfed about settlement, or ultimately renege on or pull out of the deal completely (Adekanye, 2006 p.14).

In essence, negotiations in today’s world is too complex and increasingly knowledge-driven a business to be left to generalists, or amateurs and the dilettantes by those whose expert knowledge, technical skills, experience, devotion and commitment to work in the subject area are most likely to produce desirable results and outcomes.

**Negotiating Peace**

According to Wallensteen and Eriksson (2009) making a negotiated peace between warring parties has been a standard approach for how the world has handled conflicts since the end of the cold war. Likewise they talked about many lessons to be learned from how a peace making party can act to contribute to conflict termination in ways that do not fuel a recurrence of conflict. Furthermore in their study, Wallensteen and Eriksson assessed practical and theoretical challenges from three comprehensive peace processes and their subsequent peace agreements. The cases are: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sudan and Liberia. For the first, it is the matter of reconciliation among the former warring parties and their constituencies, for the second, it is the issue of power sharing, primarily between the north and the south and lastly, the focus is on post-war public security. In essence these cases and the character they exhibit points to the problematic in peace making and building in Nigeria society today.

Findings have also shown factors why negotiated agreements are concluded and made them durable and these are; the quality of the agreement, whether it addresses the pertinent issues of the conflict in such a way that the parties can live, recognise and co-exist with one another; the legality of the agreement; it is a general practice that the warring parties or partners or negotiators alike considers the peace agreements as legal documents (Wallensteen and Eriksson, 2009)

It is therefore pertinent to state that agreements arise from varied conditions which give insights into the different elements of peacemaking and peace negotiation as it has been pointed out
above in the areas of power sharing, reconciliation and public security. However several recommendations have been made to support the three general peace negotiating processes which are: to examine all previous peace agreements in the conflict and integrate lessons into the new peace peacemaking efforts; be aware of the trade-off between human urgency and agreement detail; balance local needs and international responsibilities; access and transparency, which would allow the civil society to play its role; have women involved in the negotiations; disallow a few negotiators to control the process; open separate negotiations tracks for side-lined issues; consider the legal status of the agreement.

In dealing with the basic disagreement, that is the incompatibility, the following should be considered: consider carefully whether the peace agreement should tackle the key incompatibility directly or lay out a process for its handling; power sharing includes many levels and dimensions: the mediator needs to be careful in limiting its extent and have provisions for transparency; addressing immediate public security by concentrating on improvements for ordinary citizens; paying attention to post-war reconciliation; make the agreement operational without micro-managing conditions for peace settlement. Also to be considered is the negotiation environment, and the following has been advised: keep the traditional community on your side but do not let it overpower the peacemaking momentum; strengthen international mediation in international organisation and in governmental institutions. Finally is the post accord: make implementation attractive through continued international support; connect peace agreements to shared values of justice and fairness.

In view of the above factors, choosing negotiation team, the skill of the negotiators and their styles, are impacted by the personality of the negotiators, especially where self-motivation have a very important impact on negotiation processes,(Hazzouri 2011). Hazzouri explained that negotiators should enjoy amongst other things such as must be highly smart, which helps him take quick action in the urgent and unexpected situations and to avoid falling into the traps of provocation from the other party. Also he should be a good listener and must be highly able to analyse situations and opinions while staying objective in studying the incidents and fact. Lastly the negotiator should be very patient, since anger and emotions lead to tension.

**Negotiation as Conflict Resolution Mechanism**

Negotiation is an alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in which two or more parties agree to equitable and considerable decisions on matters of common concern institutions where they are in actual or potential disagreement or conflict. The process according Ury and Patton noted that the process attempts to reach solutions that meet the interests of all parties. The process involves a negotiators understanding the strategic use of various sources of power to achieve a bargaining goal.

It may take a long time for the result to be visible. For instance, negotiating peace in Mindanao in Philippines
between the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) and theMono National Liberation Front (MNLF) held from 1975 to 1996. The case of Liberia, took fourteen peace agreements beginning from 1989 before the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2003. The negotiation may take a back and forth movement, for without peace there cannot be any meaningful or sustainable development. In the case of Sierra Leone, the peace agreement between the armed opposition and the government of Sierra Leone in 1999 ended the country’s brutality. It took three months of active negotiation that was largely supervised by the international agencies. The Lome Accord was brokered between April and July, 1999. It defined the country’s justice framework. Prior to that accord, the political situation degenerated in 1991 when rebels fighting as the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) entered from Liberia. The agreement included amnesty for the RUF, provisions for the reformation of the RUF into a political party. It also noted that serious human rights violations should go the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

In the cases of Liberia and Sierra Leone, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), United Nations (UN) and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) were actively involved in the peace making processes. The calls for peace also came from different quarters. According Kissinger (1969) was the scholar who averred that negotiation combines conflicting positions into a common position, under a decision rule of unanimity. It would be instructive to agree with Seymour (2014) that negotiation should be seen as a means to an end. That is that before a conflicting parties embark on negotiation, they should know where they want to be at the end as well as how to there. As a result, the negotiator should be guided to shape the negotiations in accordance with their own needs by setting agenda, selecting the forum and identifying participants. She identified three basic levels of negotiation namely power, rights and interest:

1. Power: Negotiations that rely on power often involve threats and coercion. This is not a long-term strategy as it has a negative impact on the future of the relationship between parties.

2. Rights: This type of negotiation is based on contracts and precedent and often leads to legal action, which can be expensive and time consuming.

3. Interest: Interest-based negotiations are what you should strive for. They often involve good communication and collaboration, resulting in win-win situations for both parties.

Effect of Conflict of Development
The effects of conflict on the development of states cannot be overemphasized. The development of a state is one of the social contract between leadership and followership. It is the desire of a ‘living’ state to achieve this through institutions which are saddled to achieve this goal. But, be that as it may, Kofi Annan former United Nations Secretary General in 1999 noted that if “war is the worst enemy of development, healthy and balanced
development is the best form of conflict prevention. Thus one argues that conflict prevention is a developmental issue. For instance, the table below presents the GDP per capita before and after conflict in some selected countries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>306 US$</td>
<td>181 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>207 US$</td>
<td>143 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>122 US$</td>
<td>103 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>240 US$</td>
<td>150 US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>214 US$</td>
<td>150 US$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: siteresources.worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ImpactofConflict.pdf

It is very obvious, development cannot exist where there is no peace. Thus, the development of various institutions to reduce the likelihood and escalation of violent conflict exist. The alternative dispute resolution (ADR) which is the settlement of dispute outside the courtroom has been there since the existence of man. In this process, early neutral evaluation, negotiation, conciliation, mediation and arbitration have proven effective. These processes allow conflicting parties to be part of the reconciliation process.

With conflict resources are diverted from productive activities to destruction. This is a double cost on the people. Instead of repairing social and economic infrastructure, government recruits more soldiers and buys weapons and ammunition. In a study involving eighteen countries and cited in worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ImpactofConflict.pdf it was discovered that:
- in 15 countries per capital income fell
- in 13 countries food production dropped
- in all 18 countries external debt increased as a percentage of GDP
- in 12 countries export growth declined.

The social costs of conflicts are heavy as economic investments and earning are likely to reduce access to education and health care, increase risk of predatory and contagious disease in refuge habitations and camps. There is also the case of population displacement, forced migrations, people fleeing to avoid violence or recruitment or looting of family assets. The economic and political legacy costs include the persistent heightened military expenditures, capital flight; loss of social capital and insignificant post-war progress in policy worldbank.org/PSGLP/Resources/ImpactofConflict.pdf

**Conclusion**

Generally, this paper sees negotiation as a process of communication and deliberation between two or more parties where each views are expressed towards solving a conflicting situation. Whereas negotiation is an art and a science at the same time, it needs talent refined with the knowledge of all kinds of negotiation in order to implement practical negotiation strategies in addition to the stages that the
negotiation process goes through. Consequently the negotiator or practitioners alike should enjoy a series of characteristics enabling him to represent his country or institution on the negotiation table and to speak on its behalf to achieve its best interest. The paper shared the opinion that most of our institutions lack capable and skilled professionals to represent it on negotiation tables or platforms at every levels of government. This is traceable to the corrupt system that allows culture to infiltrate recruitments of personnel into managing its institutions, with the resultant effect of underdevelopment.
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