

Presidency of the republic
Department of Intelligence
Center for Studies and research

Conflict strategies of the American president
Bill Clinton and methods of confronting them

Faculty of economics and management
May 1994

Table of contents

1- General

2- Objective

3-Theoretical background for conflict management

4- Research methodology

5- Practical implications of President Bill Clinton's decisions

6- Analyzing Bill Clinton's methodology

7- Conclusions

8-Recommendations

ONE General

Conflict is considered one of the demonstrative behaviors humans - including leaders — practice as they go about their daily lives for the purpose of survival. Modern science clarified this phenomenon through the concept of scientific measuring; the objective here is to predetermine the behavior of the other party to the conflict, what specific strategies will he use, and what method will he follow in managing the conflict.

This research is of vital importance because it follows scientific rules in analyzing the way the American President Bill Clinton deals with conflicts. We will attempt to identify the ways he approaches conflicts, and predict the path he will follow in tense situations or when facing a specific threat.

TWO Objective

This study aims to:

- A : Diagnose the conflict strategies that President Bill Clinton uses in his conflict with Iraq, this will help us understand what measures he will take against Iraq.
- B: Suggest some recommendations to confront the strategies and methods President Clinton would probably use in certain situations.

THREE

Theoretical background for conflict management

- A : Conflict management means the methods and measures utilized by the leader in diagnosing the conflict and dealing with it, would he capitalize on it? or would he terminate it?. Conflict management consists of three elements; first diagnosing the conflict, second dealing with the conflict through strategies and tactics, and third administering it.
- B: Many management experts and academics paid a lot of attention to conflict management, they worked hard to come up with ways to deal with it; they came up with methods and tactics to handle quarrels and disputes borrowed from the the following strategies:
 - 1st. Lose-Lose strategy whereby both parties end up losing.

2nd. Win-Lose strategy [among the most common strategies used to terminate a conflict] it concentrates on the use of bargaining, negotiating, evading, coercing, avoiding, and ignoring. This strategy is ineffective, does not resolve the conflict, it creates bad conditions that allow the conflict to deteriorate and fester.

3rd. Win- Win strategy; one of the best strategies, it uses confrontation as a means to come up with comprehensive and practical solutions. Those in the know about such matters say that this strategy produces acceptable outcome to all parties.

C: The means and methods of dealing with conflicts could be identified as follows: 1st.: Collecting data and concentrating on human relationships.

2nd.: Calming down and persuasion in resolving disputes be it minor or major, making sure the atmosphere is pleasant & friendly and interactions are cordial.

3^{1-d}.: Bargaining: Parties to a conflict should be willing to reconcile, and bargain in good faith.

4th.: Parties to a conflict should gather in a cordial and friendly environment.

FOUR Research methodology

We depended on scientific sampling in the theoretical side of this research, as to the practical side we depended on important decisions taken by the American President Bill Clinton in dealing with issues and conflicts that faced him. We analyzed the paths he chose when faced with contradicting conditions, and compared them to the identified methods and known strategies for dealing with conflicts.

The author of this study depended on numerous samples presented by management experts and academics in their attempt to measure the styles of conflict management, the most notable were Black and Mouton; they presented five methods to deal with conflicts, those methods are borrowed from the three strategies for conflict resolution, i.e. (Lose-Lose, Win-Lose, and Win-Win). These are their five methods:

A: The withdrawal method: Both parties remain quiet, resort to neutrality, retreat and complain. In this method both parties are using the Lose-Lose strategy.

B: The averting method: Both parties abide by calming down tensions and preserving superficial harmony based on peaceful coexistence. In this method both parties are using the Lose-Lose strategy.

- C: The interception method: Both parties resort to power, coercion, and authoritativeness in trying to impose their will on the other side, ignoring their wishes and point of view in the process. In this method both parties are using the Win-Lose strategy.

- D: The Bargaining method: Both parties resort to negotiations to resolve their outstanding issues (In the course of negotiating both parties use the phrase: We have to do this.....) , resolution is achieved by reaching middle and common grounds. In this method both parties are using the Win-Win strategy.

- E: The Confrontation method: Both parties resort to problem solving through fact finding and data collection, they take the sensitivities and reservations of the other side in consideration. In this method both parties are using the Win-Win Strategy.

FIVE

Practical implications of President Bill Clinton's decisions

The American President Bill Clinton took many decisions to deal with the issues and crises that he encountered during his presidency; the following is a summary of those decisions:

A: Decisions relating to his presidential campaign:

Inclusion was the theme chosen by President Bill Clinton for his election campaign, his campaign did not favor one segment of the American public over another, it paid attention to and covered all segments of the American society.

B: Decisions relating to his economic plan:

President Clinton touched a chord with the average American citizen by relating to their daily struggles; he promised to create new jobs, tax the rich and cut taxes for the rest of Americans, he delivered on the new jobs promise by creating one hundred and six thousand new jobs, however he raised taxes on all Americans earning over thirty thousand Dollars a year (not only the rich as he had promised).

C: Decisions relating to the conflict with Iraq:

1st. Bill Clinton gave a promise to study the "Iraq File" once he is in office, however after his election he changed his approach and moved to resolving the "Iraq problem" in accordance with the aspirations of Iraq's enemies and the Zionist lobby [They supported his presidential campaign].

- 2nd. Wavering was evident in Clinton's policy towards Iraq; those who favored a firm policy towards Iraq believed for a moment that Clinton will adopt a reconciliation approach based on his campaign statements, those statements were interpreted as positive signals by Iraq, however after the strike on the Iraqi Intelligence Headquarters there was no more doubt about where Clinton stood on this issue.
- 3rd. Clinton was unable to change his position towards Iraq; even after replacing the strategy of "Balancing act" between Iraq and Iran with the strategy of "Dual containment", this new strategy aimed at weakening and containing both countries, however Clinton did not go along with the voices calling for the partitioning of Iraq.

D: Decisions relating to the Palestinian cause:

- 1st. In light of the public statements by the American officials regarding the Palestinian-Israeli negotiations, it became evident that Washington had resolved to adopt those talks and pave the way to their ultimate success, any attempt to create obstacles or derail those talks would be considered a direct threat to America's interest prior to them being a threat to the state of Israel.
- 2nd. America's commitment to the success of those talks became very clear when its role evolved from being a facilitator to being a full partner and participant, America presented a new strategy that required the Arab states to forego their Boycott of the Israeli state after the Palestinian Liberation Organization and Israel concluded the Gaza-Jericho agreement.

E: Decisions relating to abortion and gays in the military:

- 1st. The first two decisions taken by the American President Bill Clinton were to preserve abortion rights and allow gays to serve in the military, (Gays were not allowed to serve in the military prior to that), this led to fierce opposition from the military institutions so President Clinton was forced to suspend the implementation pending a vote which he subsequently lost; 43% voted for and 48% voted against.
- 2nd. Above decisions were a fulfillment of a campaign promise. Clinton vowed to represent all Americans with no exceptions including "Those deviants" whose numbers total four million. Clinton wanted to mix ideal humanity with practical realities by transforming overnight what was illegitimate and making it legitimate.

F: Decisions relating to Bosnia and Herzegovina:

The highest level of contradiction between what America says and what America does showed clearly in the way Bill Clinton handled the Bosnian crisis. Clinton decides to adopt a policy of preserving peace, but this peace is not in favor of Islam and Moslems, he later decides to attack the Serbs but not before giving Russia a role to play (Within defined parameters of course).

G: Decisions relating to China and the alliance with industrial nations:

- 1st. The American leaders in the seventies signed a protocol of multilateralism; this required involving the European allies and Japanese more effectively in managing western affairs, a tripartite committee was established to serve as a joint leadership. This is in stark contrast with Washington's unilateral and vicious behavior in economic and commerce affairs, especially when it comes to customs, tariffs, trade agreements like GAT.
- 2nd. At the same time we see the Japanese American relationship swing dangerously between all out confrontation on economic issues and affirmation of commitment and cooperation on security issues.
- 3rd Clinton's policy towards China is full of contradictions; on one hand he denounces the violations of human rights and democracy in China and affirms his deepest convictions and firm position on these issues, on the other hand he renews China's special status and priority treatment. Clinton adopted the policy of perpetuating the status quo due to America's political and huge economic interests, he did not want to isolate China (a position advocated by many) due to its regional influence especially on north Korea.

H: Decisions relating to the state of world economy:

President Clinton found himself faced with a staggering national debt of fourty trillion American dollars, this debt was piled up due to financing the Vietnam War during the Johnson presidency, and got out of control in the final stages of the arms race during the Regan presidency. President Clinton was burdened by his campaign promises, he promised to improve the economic conditions for the American citizen, find half a million work opportunities for the unemployed, pay off the national debt, and reduce the deficit by cutting military spending and foreign aid, those domestic policies contradicted America's goals of world dominance. They spent a lot of money purchasing the Soviet Union's stock piles of enriched uranium to guard against proliferation of nuclear weapons, Clinton committed to supporting and aiding Boris Yelsen ignoring one of the primary rules of politics that prohibits forming a policy towards a nation based on supporting a particular individual.

I: Decisions relating to the crisis in Somalia:

It is clear to everybody that ambiguity, confusion and lack of strategy characterized the American intervention in Somalia. President Bush had hoped to capitalize on the Somali issue in his reelection campaign but ended up bequeathing a predicament to President Clinton, who in turn was baffled trying to find an exit strategy that saves face for America, yet restores hope for the Somali people.

SIX

Analyzing President Clinton's Decisions

In the course of examining the aforementioned decisions taken by President Clinton, and by comparing them to the theoretical principles of strategies and methods of conflict resolution we learned the following:

A: In his presidential campaign against President Bush; President Clinton used the "Interception method" he resorted to dealing forcefully and authoritatively, using all means at his disposal to impose his opinion on the other side, he tried to expand his area of support into the opposing party's area by appealing to the people's emotions and feelings, he was able to push the right buttons by relating to the daily struggles of average citizens. In other words Clinton used the Win-Lose strategy in his presidential bid.

B: President Clinton used the "Interception method" initially to promote his economic plan, he used his power and authority to coerce, he spoke softly but stuck to his guns, he ignored the opinions of the other side but not for long, he soon realized that this is a very sensitive issue and for his plan to pass he needs to take the sentiments and opinions of the other side into consideration, so he switched to the "Confrontation method" using the problem solving approach, he could not avoid the negative impact of the influential rich class should he raise their taxes only, he resorted to a middle ground compromise by raising taxes on those earning over thirty thousand dollars per year, he was also able to reduce the deficit by cutting military spending. In other words President Clinton switched from using the Win-Lose strategy to using the Win-Win strategy.

President Clinton's fluctuation between those two strategies exemplifies the power of the rich class in America and their influence on decision making. President Clinton had a true, strong and sincere desire to improve the economic and social conditions for the average American citizen, yet at the same time he did not want to alienate the rich class whose support helped put him in office. Campaign promises and dreams are always under the microscope of the "Elite Class" they serve as a shadow government, so as long as the President's actions coincide with their interests and objectives he remains secure.

C: President Clinton used the following strategies in his conflict with Iraq:

1st. Clinton had intended to use the Win-Win strategy which implied adopting a problem solving approach, but he switched to the Win-Lose strategy, which requires authoritative measures, coercion, the use of force and ignoring the other side's point of view. This shift is attributed to the bargain that was struck between him and the Zionist lobby after his winning the presidency. The strategy Clinton used deviated from his campaign statements that showed a willingness to open a new page with Iraq and negotiate with its leader.

2nd. In spite of the change in strategy, Iraq remains as a political and economic power that needs to be contained in order to secure America's interests in the region. Strategically speaking this issue is a national security matter.

3rd. Clinton's fluctuation between different conflict resolution strategies will always be contingent on maintaining a balance between American interests and the security of Israel. America will keep on imposing endless conditions on Iraq because the length of the blockade works in its favor, so it is important to mitigate the internal damages caused by this blockade.

D: President Clinton used the Win-Win strategy in dealing with the Palestinian issue, he resorted to the problem solving approach and spared no effort in bringing both parties together.

E: President Clinton started with a Win-Lose strategy but switched to the Win-Win strategy in dealing with abortion and gays in the military. He tried to use his power and authority to twist arms and coerce the other side, he ignored their sentiments and wishes, but the public opinion polls and the fierce resistance he faced especially from the military forced him to change the strategy and reach a compromise.

F: President Clinton used the Lose-Lose strategy in dealing with the Bosnian issue, he resorted to the avoidance approach; he delayed and postponed, issued hollow threats and conditions that had no chance of being carried through or implemented.

G: When tensions escalated President Clinton switched from a Win-Lose strategy to a Win-Win strategy in his dealings with the industrial nations and China, he had to stick to the policy of maintaining the status quo. Since the end of the cold war America's economic interests became at the heart of its national security and thus America had to adopt a more practical strategy in economic matters adhering to the political paradigm: "Befriend the enemy you can not defeat"

H; President Clinton used the Win-Win strategy in dealing with the great seven nations for the purpose of using their economic surplus to balance the American trade deficit.

I: The biggest area of fluctuation in Clinton's style of leadership is evidently his handling of the Somali crisis [Which he inherited from President Bush]. He went back and forth between the three conflict resolution strategies looking for an exit strategy that saves face for America yet maintains its political and military might and status.

SEVEN

Conclusions

The preceding analysis makes it clear that the behavior of President Clinton when it came to dealing with issues was neither hardheaded nor egoistic. Even though he tries to take a firm stance at the onset of a conflict [This is his way of measuring the situation and gauging the reactions of the other side] he could change or switch between conflict resolution strategies; like de-escalation of tensions, comprehensive negotiations and eventual settlement.

Capitalizing on this trait of Clinton's behavior to positively affect our conflict with the American administration should not be interpreted as backing down; it is merely a vital push in the course of achieving what is in Iraq's interest.

What America did to Iraq does not reflect anything other than its attempt to score the highest gains possible in accordance with the rules of conflict between warring parties. This should not cloud our thinking or stop us from perusing what is in Iraq's best interest. History reminds us of a great case in point and a good example to follow: The master of the human race Prophet Mohammad signing of the "Hudaybiyah peace treaty" with the heathens. He changed from the interception method to the averting method, but when the heathens breached the terms of the treaty he switched back to the interception method; so in a manner of speaking the Prophet switched from a Win-Lose strategy to a Lose-Lose strategy then back to a Win-Lose strategy.

Hence we find at this time that it is in both parties interests to change our method with President Clinton from the "Interception method" to the "Averting method", i.e. pulling President Clinton calmly from the Win-Lose Strategy to the Win-Win strategy, this approach saves both parties gains and losses that results from the "Interception method". We have to use official and formal language with President Clinton, we have to address his intellect and his conscience, reach out to him as a person and not as a president we have to remind him constantly of his statement: "I am ready to negotiate with Saddam in deeds and not in words".

To put our conclusions into a nut shell we could say that President Clinton shifted between the three conflict strategies and used all methods of conflict resolution; he used the "Confrontation method" then shifted to the "Interception method" in his presidential race, as to his economic plan he shifted between the "Interception" and "Bargaining" methods. In the Somali crisis he shifted between the "Averting" and the "Withdrawal" methods, in the Israeli peace process he stuck to the bargaining method, on the abortion and gays in the military issues he started with the "Interception method" then shifted to

the "Averting" method. In the Bosnian crisis he used the "Averting method", In the case of China he moved between the "Interception" and "Bargaining" methods depending on the circumstances, he did not want to offend or alienate the Chinese.

If we were to draw a summary chart of President Clinton's decisions for the purpose of identifying the conflicts strategies he used and the methods of resolving those conflicts we come up with the following:

Presidential Race	Withdraw	Avert	Intercept	Bargain	Confront
Economic plan			s		
Somalia					
Israel Palestine				.	
Abortion Gays				..	
Bosnia		1.			
China				/	
Industations				.	
Iraq					11111111

An initial look at the above chart shows clearly a zigzag pattern in dealing with conflicts and shifting between methods to resolve them. Clinton's leadership style could be characterized by "The Seesaw style". Clinton's philosophy reminds us of "Mooaweyah's hair" [Mooaweyah was an Umayyad Caliph whose political philosophy revolved around tightening and loosening the rope depending on the circumstances but making sure not to sever the rope nor lose control of it, he believed that when one party tightens the other should loosen and vice versa].

In my opinion Clinton's philosophy towards Iraq is not different from Mooaweyah's, our conflict with President Clinton is a conflict of principles and policies. Our understanding of his zigzag style and method switching should not preclude us from dealing with him; on the contrary we should engage him and put him in a position where he worries about "severing the rope" and thus loosens it (give some slack). So what America gets from us should not be gains they get at our expense, but rather us giving up to them some of our acquired gains.

SEVEN

Recommendations

- A: In the interest of fairness, we should stick to objectivity and avoid pushing President Clinton into a personal conflict with Iraq. His mentality and the way he sees conflicts is formulated by conditions on the field, this means dealing with disputes according to what is happening on the ground as opposed to dealing with them in a consistent way. President Clinton is a practical and pragmatic thinker, he does not feel any embarrassment when he changes his position or switches between strategies and conflict resolution methods.
- B: We should work on developing a network of influential contacts, we should enhance interactions and communications between both parties, this helps expose the damages that both parties suffer if they are not engaged. Hence a meeting with President Clinton is beneficial, it will satisfy some of his needs and enhances his role as America's leader.
- C: Avoiding the language of swearing and insults and replacing it with the language of "Logical debate" otherwise known as "The art of systematic dialogue"
- D: We should pay attention not to frustrate President Clinton; we can not create a big gap between his prescribed role as President and what he hears from us. We have to guard against pushing him into using the Win-Lose strategy out of pride, he resorted to this strategy through the initial use of the "Interception method" in seven of the conflicts he faced.