ALM | LAW.COM

THE AMERICAN LAWYER

Raising the Bar's Bar: A New Ethical Imperative for Lawyers in Complex Global Negotiations

By Giuseppe De Palo

March 7, 2025

The Ineffectiveness of Zero-Sum Bargaining

Zero-sum bargaining—the notion that one party's gain always comes at another's expense—remains prevalent in some negotiation circles. Traditional economic theory, emphasizing Nash equilibrium, reinforces this belief by assuming that rational, self-interested actors compete for finite resources. However, behavioral economics and neuroscience suggest that real-world negotiations are far more complex than zero-sum logic allows.

Cognitive biases, such as loss aversion, often push individuals to defend the status quo rather than seek mutually beneficial solutions. Meanwhile, neuroscientific studies show that adversarial negotiation triggers the brain's threat response, reducing creativity and problem-solving capacity. In contrast, research demonstrates that a collaborative mindset activates social and reward circuits in the brain, fostering trust, empathy and openness to more inventive solutions.

In today's volatile business environment—where trade barriers and tariffs shift rapidly—clinging to zero-sum tactics can sabotage valuable relationships. A fixation on dividing a "fixed" pie leads to suboptimal outcomes, while integrative

bargaining encourages parties to explore joint gains, uncovering hidden value.

The Cultural Dimensions: When Settlements Fail

Global commerce has added new layers of complexity to negotiation, as companies increasingly engage with international clients, suppliers, employees and partners—far beyond the contexts in which traditional negotiation theories were developed.

Even well-conceived strategies can collapse when cultural differences are misunderstood. Culture shapes negotiation styles, from power

distance and collective versus individualistic norms to relational versus transactional approaches. Failure to interpret these cultural cues can derail promising negotiations.

Consider two cross-border examples:

1. European–Chinese Breakup:

A Northern European firm, operating under egalitarian assumptions, sought immediate, open discussions about new tariffs with its Chinese partner. However, the Chinese side, adhering to hierarchical protocols, deferred decisions to high-level executives, who prioritize "face" and internal consensus. The European negotiators, misreading the delays as stonewalling, pressed for quick concessions, eroding trust. The deal collapsed—an outcome that cultural intelligence could have prevented.

2. U.S.–South American Coffee Contract Collapse:

A U.S. retailer, facing sudden import duties, demanded immediate price cuts—viewing the request as a practical cost-mitigation measure. Yet, its South American supplier perceived this demand as a breach of relational norms, expecting a more collaborative, long-term approach. Mutual distrust mounted, and the contract crumbled—inflicting financial losses on both sides.

In both cases, zero-sum approaches eclipsed creative, empathetic solutions. A negotiator skilled in cultural dynamics could have bridged the gap through adjustments such as staggered payments, restructured deliveries or shared marketing initiatives—saving and even enhancing the partnerships.

Despite its critical importance, intercultural competency is often dismissed as a soft skill, especially among lawyers. Yet, in my 30-plus years of professional practice, I have found it to be one of the hardest—and most consequential—skills. Failing to navigate cultural dynamics can mean the difference between closing a deal and losing it.

Complexity, "Negotiation Malpractice" and the Need for Creative Forums

In today's high-stakes commercial environment, adversarial negotiation strategies can amount to what I term "negotiation malpractice"—a failure to explore solutions that serve the client's broader interests. This risk is especially pronounced in forced contract renegotiations triggered by economic shocks, tariffs or supply chain disruptions.

A zero-sum mindset often results in either drawn-out litigation or sudden deal collapses—both costly outcomes for clients. Today's business clients need more than legalistic cost-splitting. They need strategic counsel that unlocks Pareto-optimal solutions—creative agreements that expand value rather than merely divide it. These solutions might include:

- **Reconfiguring product lines to reduce tariff exposure:** For example, redesigning a product to qualify for a different customs classification with lower import duties.
- **Joint investments in technology to lower shipping costs:** Such as co-funding automated warehouse facilities or adopting blockchain for supply chain transparency, reducing delays and overhead.
- **Diversifying supply chains to increase resilience:** Securing secondary suppliers from different regions to minimize the risk of disruptions from geopolitical conflicts or natural disasters.
- **Shared marketing initiatives:** Collaborating on joint promotions or cross-branding campaigns to reduce marketing costs and expand reach into new markets.
- **Flexible payment structures:** Implementing milestone-based payments or revenue-sharing agreements to distribute financial risk more equitably.
- **Collaborative R&D efforts:** Pooling research resources to develop new technologies or products, sharing both costs and intellectual property rights.
- **Joint ventures in new markets:** Entering emerging markets together, leveraging combined local expertise, networks and capital to reduce individual risk.

Lawyers who funnel clients into rigid adversarial battles without exploring integrative solutions may not only squander opportunities, but also fall short of their professional obligation to act in the client's best interest.

Mediators, collaborative law processes and structured dialogue forums offer powerful tools for reframing disputes, aligning incentives and bridging cultural divides. These methods help parties defuse conflicts before they escalate—often saving multimillion-dollar partnerships from destruction. Ignoring these tools could be seen as failing a lawyer's ethical duty to act in the client's best interest. The ethical imperative is clear: Lawyers must expand their toolkits, embracing collaborative methods that serve their clients' long-term goals.

Addressing U.S. Lawyers' Concerns and ABA Ethical Standards

Some U.S. lawyers may argue that labeling adversarial approaches as "negotiation malpractice" oversteps ethical norms, pointing to the American Bar Association (ABA) Model Rules of Professional Conduct as their defense. Key objections could include:

- "Negotiation malpractice" is not a recognized standard.

Critics may note that legal malpractice claims are rooted in violations of duty of care or professional negligence, not in subjective assessments of negotiation style. They may argue that competence (Rule 1.1) and diligence (Rule 1.3) do not mandate collaborative approaches.

- Client autonomy prevails over style choices.

According to Rule 1.2 (Scope of Representation), lawyers must prioritize the client's objectives. If a client demands a zero-sum, hardline approach, lawyers are ethically bound to comply.

- Adversarial tactics can be effective.

In certain disputes—such as high-stakes commercial conflicts—aggressive bargaining may produce results faster and at lower cost than prolonged dialogue or mediation.

- There is no mandate for AI or cultural intelligence.

Rule 1.1 requires technological competence but does not prescribe the use of AI tools or intercultural strategies as obligatory.

The ABA's Recent Resolutions Support Collaborative Practices and Early Dispute Resolution

However, these arguments miss a crucial shift in the ABA's recent policies, which explicitly advocate for collaborative approaches to dispute resolution.

ABA Resolution 500 (2024): The ABA House of Delegates unanimously adopted Resolution 500, urging lawyers to increase the informed and voluntary use of early dispute resolution (EDR), including direct negotiation, mediation and ombuds services. Resolution 500 highlights the ABA's recognition that non-adversarial methods can:

- Enhance party self-determination
- Resolve disputes efficiently and cost-effectively
- Preserve relationships
- Enable creative, nonbinary outcomes

The resolution underscores that failing to consider EDR approaches could deprive clients of value—a concept that aligns closely with the caution against "negotiation malpractice."

ABA Resolution 703 (Collaborative Law): Further, the ABA's adoption of Resolution 703, supporting the Uniform Collaborative Law Act (UCLA), promotes collaborative law as an ethically sound form of limited scope representation. Collaborative law and EDR methods are no longer niche strategies, but rather part of the mainstream toolkit recognized by the ABA.

These resolutions emphasize that integrative and collaborative strategies are not just "nice-to-haves," but they also form part of a competent lawyer's duty under Rule 1.1 (Competence) and Rule 2.1 (Advisor). Ignoring these approaches, especially in complex commercial disputes, risks falling below the evolving standard of care for legal practitioners.

AI's Emerging Role—Illustrated by a Recent Experiment

While cultural acumen and integrative strategies are essential, the future of dispute resolution will also be shaped by artificial intelligence (AI). A recent blog post from **JAMS—'AI's Double-Edged Role in Dispute Resolution"**—described an experiment where machine learning systems generated settlement proposals in a mock complex international dispute.

Surprisingly, the AI uncovered settlement opportunities that even seasoned negotiators had missed, particularly by detecting hidden patterns within complex data. This experiment highlights AI's potential to enhance negotiations by analyzing vast data sets to identify patterns and risks, scoring proposals against multiple criteria and simulating outcomes to guide decision-making.

However, the experiment also exposed AI's limitations. While adept at data analysis, algorithms cannot yet fully grasp the cultural, emotional and relational nuances that define human negotiations. Trust-building, interpreting subtle cues and managing interpersonal dynamics remain the domain of human negotiators.

The future of negotiation will likely belong to those who seamlessly blend AI's analytical power with human emotional intelligence, cultural fluency and relationship-building skills. Lawyers who harness AI to generate creative deal structures, evaluate scenarios and expedite multiparty talks—while maintaining the human touch—will gain a significant advantage.

Meeting Evolving Ethical Standards

The days of simplistic, winner-takes-all bargaining are fast receding in the rearview mirror. Economic theory, behavioral science and neuroscience illustrate the pitfalls of purely adversarial negotiation. Real-world examples confirm how deals can slip away when cultural factors are ignored. Meanwhile, AI is emerging as a powerful—though not infallible—tool for navigating complex disputes and generating innovative solutions.

ABA resolutions 500 and 703 mark a pivotal shift in what constitutes competent legal practice, emphasizing that collaborative methods and EDR approaches are no longer just options—they are increasingly seen as integral to a lawyer's duty of care.

Ultimately, the best negotiators will be those who balance analytical rigor with interpersonal sensitivity, harness new technology without sacrificing the human touch and integrate cultural awareness into every aspect of their strategy. For lawyers navigating an increasingly complex, globalized world, the ethical imperative is clear: Embrace knowledge from experienced mediators, cultural intelligence and AI-driven insights—or risk failing the very clients you are sworn to serve.

***Giuseppe De Palo**, Esq., serves as a JAMS mediator, arbitrator and neutral evaluator, handling bankruptcy, business/commercial, employment, financial markets, intellectual property, international and cross-border, personal injury/torts, professional liability and telecommunications cases. With over 30 years of experience, Mr. De Palo is a renowned international mediator who has mediated more than 2,500 domestic and cross-border disputes in over 60 countries, involving individuals from more than 90 nations.*