

Application of Negotiation Techniques to Actual Cases—An Analysis of International Negotiations on US Foreign Affairs

Yixuan Wang *

Illustration, School of Visual Arts, New York, New York, 10009, United States

* Corresponding Author Email: ywang179@sva.edu

Abstract. In today's fast-paced world, the positioning of countries in the global economy underscores the growing influence of international communication and cooperative relations. Central to this development is the essential instrument of negotiation. This paper reviews the case of the negotiations between the United Nations and the United States, which have significantly impacted the global community and international relations. The author explains the importance and utility of negotiation techniques in promoting cooperation, stability, and agreement and examines how these techniques can be efficiently applied in various real-world scenarios. Additionally, the paper investigates the limitations of negotiation techniques when used in isolation and how they interact with other factors. It analyzes how negotiators can enhance their overall competence to achieve better communication results. The article highlights the subtle and ongoing effects of successful negotiations on both the negotiators and the parties they represent. This case study aims to contribute to the enhancement of effective communication between nations and individuals and to popularize the use of bargaining skills and mindsets. By doing so, it seeks to enable the general public to maximize mutual benefits more efficiently during negotiations. This research not only provides insights into the practical application of negotiation strategies but also underscores their broader implications for international diplomacy and cooperation.

Keywords: Negotiation; Interest-Based Bargaining; International Relations; International Trade; Communication.

1. Introduction

1.1. Research Background

With the rapid development of the world economy, international trading has become more and more frequent and indispensable. As an essential way to promote international relations and national development, global trade has been increasingly emphasized by all countries. Under such a general environment, negotiation plays a vital role as an inevitable means to facilitate cooperation and transactions; therefore, the study of negotiation skills and processes has become a theme explored by management scholars in various countries in order to enhance the success and efficiency of reaching agreements. As mentioned by Mautner-Markhof in *Processes Of International Negotiations*, international negotiations are not only crucial in international relations but also, in some cases, have a continuous and long-term nature—meaning that they play a key role in maintaining international stability and resolving cross-border problems and disputes [1].

1.2. Literature Review

Based on the increasing importance of negotiation, many studies have been conducted to show the specific methods and process analysis used in this field. The proceedings of the International Negotiation Processes Conference organized by the IASA Project, for example, contain papers by practitioners and researchers from a variety of disciplinary fields on the role of international organizations and other multilateral mechanisms, theoretical and analytical approaches, cultural and political factors, and practical experiences with issues such as international security [1].

The purpose of this article is to analyze how negotiation techniques written in books can be applied in reality and how to choose the right approach depending on the scenario and conditions, as well as to vary and mix the techniques appropriately in order to adapt them to the specific situation and to reach the final agreement. In their research, Deepak Malhotra and Max H. Bazerman have mentioned that the best way to get to the goal in negotiation is to approach the situation like a detective approaches a crime scene. Even if the deal appears to be failing, it is important to continue to investigate; sometimes, deals fail not due to the lack of workable agreement but because there is no effective negotiation [2].

On the other hand, cultural differences may also lead to changes in negotiation styles and orientations, resulting in different outcomes; thus, making decisions that are culturally appropriate to the current situation can greatly increase the success of an agreement. As Adair, W. L., Okumura, T., and Brett, J. M. describe in their study, Negotiators from high-context cultures infer meaning from what is not uttered, whereas those from low-context cultures focus on sending and receiving accurate information or expressing it verbally [3]. Therefore, in the United States, as a low-context culture, negotiators are more likely to disclose and exchange information directly, which can lay the foundation for a smooth and understandable negotiation. High-context cultures, on the other hand, are more likely to hide explicit information and convey their ideas through hints; this means that negotiators from different cultural environments need at least one side to examine the other side's environment and adapt to the other side's linguistic habits; otherwise, it will create more obstacles to the communication that follows [4]. It is worth mentioning that the lessons learned from the cases are applicable in a wide range of scenarios, both in international trade and in personal transactions, allowing readers, regardless of their status in society, to apply the methods and learnings mentioned in the article to the events they come into contact with.

1.3. Research Framework

In this article, the author takes the negotiation between the United States and the United Nations on the reduction of the proportion of US funding to the United Nations in 2000 as a background, exploring how the then US Ambassador to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke, found a way to break the deadlock and finally reached an agreement to achieve the US funding reduction in the face of a tight timeframe and opposition from many parties. While most of the articles focus on systematic negotiation theories and comprehensive case studies from different countries, this article takes the US side as the main perspective and discusses how the US side visualized the theory of negotiation strategies to flexibly apply them to different stages of the negotiation process to achieve the goal step by step under the dilemma.

First, the article analyzes the negotiation process between the United States and the United Nations in this case, breaking down the negotiating parties from the United Nations as a whole to the individual member states and visiting each of them, in turn, to find out the root causes of their decisions. Next, the author explains how negotiators dismantle and integrate negotiation techniques to fit specific events in order to transform bilateral negotiations into multilateral ones based on the specificity of the events. The article also analyzes how to use classic and common techniques to reach a deal more efficiently by taking into account the cultural background of the countries concerned and their current environment. The article points out the limitations of negotiation techniques and the indispensability of the negotiator's awareness, as well as the fact that the combination of sensitivity to details and the overall situation with the techniques is often a necessary ingredient for a successful deal. Finally, the subsequent effects of the case on both sides of the negotiation are also reflected in the article; the agreement reached certainly proves that the interests of all parties were met while at the same time implying the position and power of the United States in the United Nations. It is clear that, as mentioned in the previous article, the negotiations affected the relationship and power structure of the parties in addition to the purpose of reaching an agreement.

2. Case Description

In October 2000, a number of changes in the United States' internal attitude towards the United Nations were followed by a series of conflicts. Some members of the Senate were proposing that the United States withdraw from the United Nations, while the US delegation to the United Nations was gradually being marginalized in committee meetings—in other words, both the United States and the United Nations were on the verge of dissolving their relationship. The problem stemmed from the fact that the United States owed the United Nations more than \$1 billion, which the United States was not willing to pay immediately, instead stating that it would require the United Nations to agree to a series of reforms before payment could be made, or else, on January 1, 2001, it would be diverted to other uses by the United States.

One of the most important reforms proposed by the United States was the downward adjustment of the United States' share of United Nations funding from 25% to 22%, which aroused strong resentment among other countries. They considered this unfair and were reluctant to bear the additional costs that the US demanded of them. Richard Holbrooke, the US ambassador to the United Nations at the time, faced a huge challenge in reaching this agreement—he had until January 1, 2001, to convince all the other member states to agree to a request that would increase the amount of money they would have to pay.

Holbrooke's intention was for Japan and Europe to bear the burden of the cuts from the US, yet Japan made it clear that it would not agree and suggested that if the US cuts were made, Japan would do the same. Similarly, Europe did not give a willing answer on this issue.

In this context, Holbrooke produced a chart covering all member countries and the contributions they bear, visiting them one by one to get their opinions. He soon received a clear negative answer that no country was willing to increase its contribution burden. However, Holbrooke did not give up on this but went further to understand the root cause of the reluctance to increase contributions, which allowed him to find a breakthrough in the negotiations—faced with the deadline of January 1, 2001, many countries that would have been willing to increase their contributions had not put this part of the funds into the 2001 budget, therefore, leading to the failure of paying the money. As a result, Holbrooke requested a change in the deadline for other member states to increase their contributions to 2002, a decision that directly affected the outcome [5].

In addition to this, Holbrooke lobbied a philanthropist, Ted Turner, into agreeing to donate more than \$30 million to cover the funding gap between the US reduction in dues and the increase in dues by other countries. In the end, the agreement came to a successful conclusion, and all parties achieved their objectives.

3. Analysis of the Problem

3.1. Position on the Amount of Money

The dilemma facing the US side in this negotiation was undoubtedly huge and unavoidable. The negotiators needed to persuade not only the representatives of one side but also the dozens of remaining countries that needed to increase their inputs; the multiplication of targets was obviously a huge challenge to the time and energy the US side had to invest. At the same time, facing dozens of targets also means that traditional interest-based negotiations were difficult to implement since if resources other than money were exchanged, the total amount of resources that the United States would need to give up to each member state would probably be tens of times more than that of the individual targets, which was a huge loss for the United States. Naturally, it would not be possible to reach an agreement. At the same time, the declining support within the US for national participation in the UN has led the US to ask for a reduction in payments, even though it was the party that owes the money. Such a decision, on the one hand, was attributable to congressional decisions and has been in evidence for a long time. Research shows that in 1971, the US Congress first refused to make a voluntary contribution to the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and, for the second year

in a row, refused to pay assessed contributions to the International Labor Organization (ILO). This was in addition to the President's request that the United States' regular budget contribution to the United Nations and its specialized agencies be reduced from the current 31.5% to 25% [6].

On the other hand, pressure from the public has been one of the major reasons for the shrinking sums. The result of the expansion of the UN membership and the decline of the relative influence of the United States in the UN was a major source of public frustration and disillusionment with its effectiveness, with its public acceptance in the United States declining from the mid-1960s onward. By early 1972, 50% of the public indicated that their respect for the United Nations had declined over the years, while only 18% responded that their respect was increasing. In March 1974, 56% of Americans believed that "the UN says too much and does too little," 43% thought it "usually passes ineffective resolutions," and 54% felt it "wastes too much US money" [7]. Based on the US government's negative attitude toward the United Nations and the increasing public disapproval, it is almost a given that funding will be cut. However, convincing the remaining dozens of countries to increase funding is an extremely difficult task; it is the best decision for the US's interests at this point.

What was even more desperate was that not only did the United States not offer any resources other than money to other United Nations Member States, but those countries that had been asked to increase their funding had not made any conditions other than monetary ones either. In other words, the two sides are only bargaining over the amount of money, and it is difficult to reconcile the refusals of the Member States without other factors coming into play. For example, Cuba, China, and Pakistan explicitly rejected the proposal - Cuba, which holds the presidency of the G-77, argued that the cuts would require 52 member states to fill the funding gap. Pakistan's representative, Munir Akram, said, "Developing countries should pay for it, but it will be a burden [8]." It can be seen that both sides' positions based on money are very clear and have their reasonable justifications, which has become the most difficult contradiction to mediate in this negotiation.

3.2. Time Lag and the Problem of Financial Disconnects

On top of that, time was an important factor. Representatives of countries that were asked to increase their funding said, "They are asking us to increase our payments at a faster rate than we want. We want our payments to increase more gradually." Moreover, a number of countries disagreed on the timing of the introduction of a new peacekeeping budget payment schedule—the United States requested January 1 to comply with congressional requirements, while the United Kingdom and China requested July 1, which would delay more payments from the two countries [9]. Due to the time lag between when the US made its request and when countries were able to fund it, the large funding gaps caused by the lack of state financing during that period also became a potential impediment to reaching an agreement.

3.3. Impact of Negotiations: US Status in the UN and Ongoing Relations

Due to its large share of funding, the United States has always been a power player in the United Nations and held an absolute voice. The US's position as an unrivaled hegemon has allowed it to utilize and manage the Security Council for its own benefit or to thwart the institution altogether. Mingst, Karen predicted that the US would continue to oscillate between supporting the United Nations and taking actions that would simultaneously undermine its existence [10]. This explains why the US is able to demand funding cuts despite already existing arrears, which is inextricably linked to its deep-rooted foundation and immense power in the UN. By 2000, however, membership in the United Nations had become less important to the American people, which meant that the United States was forced to ask for funding cuts as well.

Nevertheless, even if the US were to reduce its share of funding to the UN from the original 25% to 22%, it would still have the highest proportion of funding of any member state [11]. For this reason, the authors believe that the 3% reduction proposed by the US was an extremely clever move. It

ensured that the US retained more funds for its own interests within the country while at the same time guaranteeing that its investment ratio was higher than that of Japan, the country with the second-highest ratio, thus assuring that it still wielded the most power in the United Nations. While the risks and challenges of this negotiation were great, the benefits to the US of a successful outcome should not be underestimated. The author predicts that the US influence in the UN and the world will increase after this agreement is reached—the fact that other member states have complied with US demands in this matter is a testament to the power of the US. Since then, countries around the world have had to take into account the resources and influence of the United States in their international dealings with the United States; this has undoubtedly been a huge hidden benefit for the United States. However, the downside of this agreement is the delicate relationship with other member states; after all, many countries had raised objections at the beginning, which may have a certain negative impact on their future cooperation with the United States.

4. Suggestions

4.1. Non-Antagonistic Reasons for Opposing Positions

As mentioned above, the opposing positions based on money were unavoidable—the reduction of the US contribution was the natural result of the domestic situation, including the top leadership and the basic public sentiments, while the other member states also demanded only money. Besides, the dozens of opposing countries that the negotiators faced were a huge drain on the commitment to humans and resources. The first step Holbrooke took was to tabulate the member states and their respective contributions, visiting them in turn. The tabular summary did not reduce the number of visits required, yet it did make a significant contribution to minimizing unnecessary work by making the data and explaining progress in a more intuitive and informative manner. It can be seen that a logical and calm approach to difficult situations is often the key to solving problems; negotiators need to constantly consider how to adjust the details in order to maximize efficiency.

On the other hand, Holbrooke continued to dig deeper into the reasons and motives for finding a breakthrough when he got a refused answer from the other side. As expected, the greatest reason for the other member states' reluctance to increase their contributions was not the amount of money but time. This demonstrates that opposing positions do not automatically represent irreconcilable contradictions; despite conflicting benefits, the reasons for their decisions are not the same. This indicates that looking at the causes rather than just the apparent conflict is an essential step toward successful negotiation; this idea is similar to interest-based negotiation, where the negotiators focus on the non-conflictive points underneath the seemingly opposing positions in order to reach mutually beneficial cooperation. This transformation of issues has also been suggested by Fisher, who advised negotiators to convert disagreements between parties on “non-negotiable” issues of principle into issues on which compromise can be reached [12].

At the same time, the case of this U.S.-UN negotiation demonstrates the impact of prioritization of issues on the outcome of negotiations. Several studies have shown that differences between parties on the relative weight of issues under consideration can impede negotiations [13-15]. This suggests that variations in the focus of issues can lead to misunderstandings and hostile behaviors that interfere with the attention given to the substantive issues themselves [16]. In this case, if prioritizing the amount of money failed, understanding the other member states' prioritization of the time factor could lead to collaboration. Agreement implies that each side takes what it wants and makes concessions, so considering what the other side values in the bargaining process and the compromises it can make for the other side is a necessary condition for reaching an agreement.

4.2. Combination of Other Factors and Negotiation Techniques

Another key step in Holbrooke's efforts to bring the partnership together was convincing philanthropist Ted Turner to donate more than \$30 million as a way to make up for the shortfall due to the other countries' delayed payments. This initiative resolved the side effects of the previous

approach and led directly to the conclusion of the cooperation. What is even more important to discuss here is Holbrooke's acumen and attention to the overall picture. Negotiators need to be attentive to other factors in a negotiation and address them in a timely manner. In this case, for example, Holbrooke not only needed to uncover the root cause time but was also responsible for taking into account the additional problems that the solution would bring about and promptly address them. Such consideration and control of the details are equally as valuable as the techniques involved in the negotiation itself.

Furthermore, the approach Holbrooke took to bring in a third party can be seen as another dimension of interest-based negotiation. Ted's help was motivated by a desire to support his own country, and the UN was in need of the funds; the agreement met the interests of both parties, making it a reasonable and optimal choice. As Ted said, he would have been happy to provide the funds to allow Holbrooke and the US government flexibility to contribute to the negotiations. While the UN was prohibited from accepting funds from private donors to pay national dues, in principle, it could accept contributions from governments; the UN did not care where the contributions came from. In other words, the money could be counted as a voluntary contribution from the US to make up the difference [17]. What Holbrooke did was to identify a third party that could be introduced in time to meet the needs of the two original parties when they encountered a bottleneck and reached a win-win situation for all three parties. This is the result of sophisticated negotiation skills, flexibility, and deep experience in negotiation—in real-life cases, the situation is complex and varied. Therefore, negotiators are required to look at the issue holistically instead of limiting themselves to a certain model or formula.

5. Conclusion

Analyzing negotiations between the US and the UN, alongside other studies, confirms the pivotal role of negotiation skills in both the process and outcome. Differences in underlying reasons behind opposing positions are rooted in complex domestic and international dynamics. These reasons are deeply entrenched in each nation's development, which cannot be easily altered in a single negotiation. However, understanding these underlying reasons can be a major breakthrough for successful negotiations. Negotiators must explore and leverage these differences to find points of cooperation where the parties' interests do not conflict. Rather than changing existing factors, successful negotiators understand and utilize them.

As the concept of humanity's common destiny grows stronger, the global connections between countries become increasingly important. Negotiation, an indispensable part of this process, has a profound influence on individual countries and global powers. Successful negotiation blends skill, maneuvering, adaptability, and situational control, symbolizing a country's development and human resource cultivation. This foundation enhances its international position and expands its future prospects.

This case sets a stellar example, showcasing the positive impact of successful negotiation amid domestic and international pressures. It also opens new avenues of thought about negotiation, from international communication to personal transactions. The study demonstrates how negotiation techniques can be skillfully and appropriately applied to various real-world situations, improving outcomes. In an era where international trade and exchange are increasingly emphasized, a higher rate of successful negotiations greatly contributes to the common development and interests of all countries.

The research primarily relies on existing cases and data, supplemented by studies from other scholars, but it lacks primary data investigation and timely feedback. Future research should focus on current international trade communications and organize the content of agreements to obtain more timely information and deduce the latest international situation. Implementing the negotiation techniques discussed here, alongside exploring similar topics, will further facilitate easier and more efficient international dealings on a global scale in the future.

This analysis underscores the significance of negotiation skills in fostering cooperation, stability, and mutual benefit, emphasizing the need for continuous learning and adaptation in the ever-evolving landscape of international relations.

References

- [1] M. Frances. *Processes of international negotiations*. Routledge, 2019.
- [2] Malhotra, Deepak, and M. H. Bazerman. Investigative negotiation. *Harvard business review* 85.9 (2007): 72.
- [3] P. R. Harris and R. T. Moran, *Managing cultural differences: High performance strategies for a new world of business*, Houston, TX: Gulf (1991).
- [4] W. L. Adair, T. Okumura, and J. M. Brett, Negotiation behavior when cultures collide: The United States and Japan. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), (2001) 371–385.
- [5] Malhotra, Deepak, and M. H. Bazerman. *Negotiation Genius: How to Overcome Obstacles and Achieve Brilliant Results at the Bargaining Table and Beyond*. Bantam Books, 2008.
- [6] A. F. Chadwick. The United States in the United Nations. *International Organization* 27.1 (1973): 1–23.
- [7] A. O. Hero. The United States Public and the United Nations. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 1977, 32(4): 17–29.
- [8] E. Olson. US Negotiates a Reduction of Its Dues to Support WHO. *The New York Times*, The New York Times, May 22, 2001, www.nytimes.com/2001/05/22/world/us-negotiates-a-reduction-of-its-dues-to-support-who.html.
- [9] Done Deal. C.B.S. News, C.B.S. Interactive, www.cbsnews.com/news/done-deal-22-12-2000/.
- [10] M. Karen. Troubled waters: The United States-United Nations relationship. *International Peacekeeping*, 2003, 10 (4): 82–93.
- [11] Browne, M. Ann, and L. Blanchfield. *United Nations Regular Budget Contributions: Members Compared, 1990-2010*. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, 2013.
- [12] R. Fisher. Fractionating conflict. In R. Fisher (Ed.), *International conflict and behavioral science: The Craigville papers*. New York: Basic Books, 1964.
- [13] M. G. Bonham. Simulating international disarmament negotiations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1971, 15, 299-315.
- [14] D. Druckman. Position change in cognitive conflict as a function of the cue-criterion relationship and the initial conflict. *Psychonomic Science*, 1970, 20, 91-93.
- [15] D. A. Summers. Conflict, compromise, and belief change in a decision-making task. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1968, 12, 215-221.
- [16] D. Druckman, and R. Mahoney. Processes and consequences of international negotiations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1997, 33(1): 60–87.
- [17] L. Colum. Turner Offers \$35 Million to Help US Pay UN Dues - *The Washington Post*, December 21, 2000, www.washingtonpost.com/archive/politics/2000/12/22/turner-offers-35-million-to-help-us-pay-un-dues/b0357400-8341-4b9e-b0be-2daf8ecc2795/.