

# Richard Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft:

## An Historical Analysis of the Nixon Administration's Foreign Policy and its Compatibility with Contending International Relations Paradigms and Conflict Mediation Theory

Justin S. Vaughn  
Illinois State University  
[jsvaugh@ilstu.edu](mailto:jsvaugh@ilstu.edu)  
Fall 2001

As Tricia Nixon Cox, the daughter of former President Richard Nixon, was cleaning out her father's private desk following his funeral she came across a notecard stashed away in a small drawer. Printed on the card were ten rules that Nixon had believed were essential to international interaction and negotiation. These rules were intended to serve as guidelines for state leadership when engaging and cooperating with other states. Over time, these guidelines have come to be known as Richard Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft.<sup>[1]</sup>

Nearly thirty years after Nixon's resignation from office, the former president's legacy has crystallized as that of a foreign policy genius and international negotiator *par excellence*. Much can be learned from an analysis of Richard Nixon's international principles and foreign policies, particularly when combined with the luxury of three decades of historical reflection and the current trend of shifting global power. Moreover, the current atmosphere of international conflict and crisis, of which the United States is a primary player, calls for reconsideration of all approaches to international relations and negotiation, particularly those articulated by one of the most renowned diplomats and politicians of the Twentieth Century.

In this paper I will provide comparative analysis between the principles outlined in Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft and the actions taken in the international arena during the Nixon administration. Each commandment will be introduced, detailed, and applied to historical evidence to determine the degree to which Nixon truly relied upon his own philosophy. While a number of states will be discussed, special effort will be made to apply examples of Nixon's foreign policies toward the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, with particular respect to power struggles with the former and endeavors for rapprochement with the latter.

However, imminent critique will not be the only form of analysis applied to Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft. To make this project even more applicable to the discipline of international relations, two additional modes of analysis will be provided. First, each commandment will be identified by the degree to which the guideline does or does not parallel any of the contending paradigms of international relations. Second, the work of Marieke Kleiboer, the renowned international conflict mediation scholar, will be applied to Nixon's framework for international negotiation to determine if her theories of mediation and his theories of negotiation can be reconciled.

The format of this paper will include a discussion of the contending international relations paradigms, providing an operational definition and identification of the fundamental components of each. Following this, a survey of Kleiboer's seminal text *The Multiple Realities of International Mediation* will be provided.<sup>[2]</sup> Particular importance will be assigned to Kleiboer's Four Theoretical Ideal Types of International Mediation and the analytical themes by which each can be measured. This discussion will be followed by the introduction, description, and historical analysis of each commandment. Also included will be analysis regarding the relationship between each commandment and the applicable international relations paradigm, as well as the relationship to Kleiboer's theories. Following this, a conclusion will be offered interpreting the compatibility of Nixon's international performance with the rules he left behind to govern such interaction. Additional evaluation of Nixon's overall diplomatic ideology with respect to international relations paradigms and to Kleiboer's theoretical framework will also be provided. I argue that such examination and comparative analysis can be used both to better understand

Nixon's successes and failures, as well as to demonstrate the applicability of his commandments to contemporary U.S. foreign policy endeavors and crises – in Afghanistan, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and beyond.

### **Contending International Relations Paradigms**

For the purpose of this project, I will adopt Geoffrey Stern's position on contemporary contending international relations paradigms, thus limiting the field to the following general schools: the idealist/utopian, the modern realist, and the Stalinist/Marxist. Admittedly this limitation ignores several other important and pertinent paradigms – including structuralism, revolutionism, and rationalism – but in the interest of brevity and historical relativity, this project will adhere to the aforementioned over-arching and more easily applicable schools. In this section I will introduce these paradigms, referred to by Stern as post-1919 paradigms, thus providing an operative understanding of each and a basic summary of the essential qualities and components of which they are comprised. The purpose of this section is to promote better comprehension of the correlation (or lack thereof) between leading ideologies in international relations and the philosophical character of Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft on an individual and collective basis.

The **idealist/utopian paradigm** represents a departure from state-centric world politics and regards the individual in a global setting as the appropriate unit of study.<sup>[3]</sup> According to Stern, the complex of notions that comprised the idealist/utopian paradigm included the belief that "human nature was fundamentally good and capable of unselfish action, that there was an essential harmony of interests between the states of international society and that the morality or otherwise of foreign policy could be objectively assessed."<sup>[4]</sup> Charles Kegley adds the ideas that "the fundamental concern for the welfare of others makes progress possible" and that based on the progressive view of history held by idealists, "global change and cooperation are not only possible but empirically pervasive."<sup>[5]</sup>

The idealist/utopian paradigm evolved and came into disciplinary vogue following World War I. This was in part due to the support of prominent politicians and scholars, namely American President Woodrow Wilson and scholars Alfred Zimmern and Philip Noel-

Baker.[6] As noted, idealism bases its ideological presumptions and practices on a rather generous view of human nature. In doing so, conventional society and its institutions are condemned for the sins of corrupting human interaction. Idealists also believe that war could be avoided in the future if the causes of war were sufficiently understood and those involved could take away the appropriate knowledge. Due to the belief of the essential 'goodness' in humankind, such adverse behavior had to be produced by the flawed institutions of an international system, such as elitist politics, secret diplomacy, imperialism, armaments, weak and inadequate intergovernmental institutions, and widespread ignorance of world affairs.[7]

Idealism favors the whim and wish of the individual, as opposed to the goals and desires of the state and/or the elites who control state action. Since idealists believe that 'people never want war,' they advocate a democratization of political control and a more learned public able to make informed choices as two of the fundamental ways to reform both international institutions and domestic political structures.[8] Other key ingredients in the idealist/utopian paradigm's recipe for international cooperation include open diplomacy, national self-determination, disarmament, legislation to outlaw war, and new international institutions to encourage cooperation and collective security.[9] Also present is a sincere dedication to international communication and negotiation as diplomatic tools, particularly when compared to the alternative. This disposition is mirrored in the idealist crusade to legally abolish the use of war as a tool of foreign policy, formally attempted in the Kellogg-Briand pact of 1928 and institutionally through the development of collective security organizations and the failed League of Nations.

A clear departure from the idealist/utopian paradigm, the **modern realist paradigm** evolved out of renowned scholar E.H. Carr's critique of the idealist/utopian paradigm's values.[10] Carr's indictment was multi-faceted, and harangued the idealists for too much concern with what "ought" to be and what is desirable and not enough concern with what "is" and what is feasible. Carr felt the idealists were culture-bound intellectuals with little notion of the collective self-interest behind their ideology, that they were far too judgmental of statesmen and assumed that diplomats had almost unlimited ability to interact with other diplomats, and that the idealist position of cooperation as

against conflict, solidarity as against self-interest, and harmony as against discord belied a lack of understanding of either history or human nature.<sup>[11]</sup> In response, a great debate between "realists" (those represented by Carr's arguments) and "utopians" emerged in the pre-World War II years. Following Carr and his contemporaries, the modern realist banner has been taken up by such international relations legends as Hans Morgenthau, Raymond Aron, and Henry Kissinger.<sup>[12]</sup>

The modern realist paradigm is distinct from the classical realist position in that it is able to respond to changes in the international landscape and that its position on human nature was not as bleak as the Hobbesian characterization of the classicists.<sup>[13]</sup> Modern realists do not embrace the justification for authoritarian rule nor do they explicitly endorse violence as an acceptable foreign policy tool.<sup>[14]</sup> As Stern notes, many leading modern realists, including Reinhold Niebuhr and Martin Wight, were pacifists.<sup>[15]</sup> The distinction between modern realists and classical realists is important to make to provide the reader with a more concrete view of the modern realist paradigm and to dispel common misconceptions.

However, modern realism does take a far more cynical view of human nature than the idealist/utopian paradigm and is based on a number of assumptions contrary and often in direct conflict with idealism. These assumptions include, first, that due to the absence of world government and global moral consensus, the environment of international relations is one of anarchy. According to Viotti and Kauppi, "International politics or the international system are said to be anarchic in that there is no central or superordinate authority over states."<sup>[16]</sup> Second, modern realists argue that the state is still the primary actor on the international stage, despite the increasing existence and importance of various non-governmental entities, and that recognition of sovereignty is the basis of the international political process. Third, international relations must be grounded in a self-help mentality. This means that national interest, self-reliance, and even self-assertion are prioritized in the decision-making process. Viotti and Kauppi further define 'self-help' in the following context: "Each state faces a self-help situation in which it is dangerous to place the security of one's own country in the hands of another."<sup>[17]</sup> Fourth, the state is rational in that leadership must make a cost-benefit analysis of

options and favor the most cost-effective way of achieving objectives. Fifth, in a world of power-hungry demagogues and dictators, the politics of not being overpowered is the only feasible course. Sixth, due to the instability of the global community, foreign policy objectives must be prioritized over domestic concerns. And finally, seventh, while ideals are beneficial and significant, foreign politics needs to be tempered by considerations of power. In essence, modern realists would argue that the desirable must be sought within the framework of the possible.[18]

Finally, the **Stalinist/Marxist paradigm**, while possibly the least applicable to the Nixon Doctrine, is of significant importance given the historical evolution of the paradigm and the ideological basis of the Nixon Administration's two most important diplomatic partners/competitors: the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. As the idealist/utopian paradigm was experiencing growing pains and the modern realist paradigm was dominating the discipline in the West, a very different paradigm was emerging in the post-World War II years in the Soviet bloc. Combining recent Soviet history with the fundamental notion of Marxist thought – progress through conflict – a peculiarly Stalinist version of Marx's theory began to govern Soviet foreign policy.[19]

Considerably more militant in nature (stemming from the Soviet Union's defensive posture after decades of alternating international onslaught and isolation as well as the revolutionary sense of alienation and violence inherent in Marxism) than either of the previously mentioned paradigms, the Stalinist/Marxist paradigm placed its emphasis in class solidarity as opposed to state preference or popular support. National boundaries and identities were dismissed as comparatively unimportant. Wars did not stem from rational analysis and national interest as the realists assumed, or from failed interstate communication or secretive foreign policy as the idealist advocated, but rather were the product of competing ideologies. Wars were, in particular, "a function of capitalist imperialism and a consequence of domestic class struggle and would persist until the Communist millennium was achieved – a classless stateless world of altruistic and versatile atheists." [20]

This imperialist distinction borrows heavily from Vladimir Lenin's interpretation of Marx and his view that the inevitable revolution Marx predicted would not happen within a

developed state for a variety of reasons, particularly capitalism's exploitation of foreign workers, and instead would take place on the international stage.<sup>[21]</sup> Given the ideological need for collectivity and singular identity in the authoritarian governments of Leninist and Stalinist Russia, Western ideas of individual liberty and republican democracy could not be tolerated within Soviet borders. Moreover, Marxists saw the expansion of capitalism as perpetually eroding the divisions between sovereign nation-states and replacing the international structure with a world capitalist society split between two classes: the global proletariat and the international bourgeoisies.<sup>[22]</sup> Accordingly, a paradigm of isolation such as the Stalinist/Marxist paradigm was necessary, and the ideological conflict that ensued set the stage for the Nixon administration's foreign policy and, ultimately, Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft.

### **Kleiboer's Ideal Types of International Mediation**

The second basis of external analysis for Richard Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft used in this project stems from the theoretical work of Marieke Kleiboer. Kleiboer's seminal text *The Multiple Realities of International Mediation* marks an interesting and significant addition to the body of literature on international conflict resolution. Although a thorough study and critique of Kleiboer's theories would be a meaningful complement to international negotiation and conflict resolution thought, for the purpose of this project the attention paid to Kleiboer's work will be limited to discussion of her four ideal types of international mediation. These theoretical models are as follows: International Mediation as power brokerage; International Mediation as political problem-solving; International Mediation as domination; and International Mediation as restructuring relationships. Kleiboer also detailed three analytic themes by which to measure the previously noted ideal types: the nature of international politics, the rationale of conflict management, and the essence of international mediation.

Before delving into Kleiboer's ideal types, it is essential to define international mediation. According to Kleiboer, the key features of mediation are "its non-forceful, extra-legal (e.g. not branding parties as either right or wrong), and communicative approach to international politics."<sup>[23]</sup> Another definition of mediation is as "an outside perspective brought in to help find ways to resolve a deadlocked conflict when parties

desire progress but cannot resolve issues themselves."[\[24\]](#) Mediation is increasingly being used as one of the means for dealing with intractable interstate conflict. Canadian involvement in eastern Zaire, the Ecuador-Peru peace process, and the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland are among the more notable successes of conflict resolution through mediation.[\[25\]](#) In addition, Macedonia arguably offers the most complex and multifaceted approach to preventative conflict management. Alice Ackerman argues that despite ethnic problems, "Macedonia continues on the path to democracy and economic transition" and "continues to show the world that inter-ethnic conflict can be satisfactorily managed through the respect of minority and other human rights, dialogue, negotiations, power sharing, compromise, statesmanship, and grassroots action," all fundamental components of Kleiboer's mediation approach.[\[26\]](#) However, despite its growing importance, Kleiboer notes that scholarly consensus on the pertinent questions and answers central to mediation is far from prevalent. The key areas of unresolved debate concern the problems of outcome assessment and process analysis. In other words, "by what standards do or should we measure the success of mediation attempts?" (outcome assessment) and "how can we explain mediation outcomes?"(process analysis).[\[27\]](#)

Kleiboer documents three modes of analysis to be applied to the following ideal types, each of which represents a different set of research questions. Kleiboer refers to these modes of analysis as the Burrell and Morgan framework, noting that they were based on Gibson Burrell and Gareth Morgan's 1979 work *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis*,[\[28\]](#) which offers both Kleiboer's adopted operative definition of 'paradigm' and an approach to develop new theoretical paradigms and comparatively analyze existing frameworks.[\[29\]](#)

The first mode of analysis regards *the nature of international politics*. This analyzes a paradigm in two ways. First, the question is asked, "What sort of actors are there in international politics?" Upon identifying the various states, organizations, individuals, or other types of parties involved, a second set of questions are asked: "How does conflict arise among them?" and "What are the causes of international conflict?"[\[30\]](#) This introduces who is involved in a particular conflict and what the conflict is over; important

facts to be clear when attempting to resolve conflicts.

The second mode of analysis concerns *the rationale of conflict management*. This mode questions the evaluation and management of conflict. In the first part of this mode, the questions are asked, "How is conflict to be evaluated and given this assessment?" and "What are the key functions of conflict management?" Following this, the question must be answered, "Given the causes of conflict (refer back to the first mode of analysis), how feasible is conflict management by means of mediation?"<sup>[31]</sup> This mode distinguishes the manner of conflict at hand and determines if mediation is the appropriate tool for resolution.

The third mode, which is related to *the essence of international mediation*, is perhaps the most complex. This mode is only applied after mediation is determined to be a suitable method for the resolution of a particular conflict. The first step asks, "Given its core functions and feasibility (refer back to the second mode of analysis), what constitutes mediation success?" Following this, the matter of which evaluation criteria are to be taken into account when measuring mediation success must be addressed. Next, the question must be answered, "What is the key factor determining mediation outcomes (e.g., the crucial resource for achieving mediation success)?" The fourth step in this mode of analysis determines who are the most likely mediators of a conflict and questions their motives. Fifth, it must be decided when a mediator should be involved in a conflict. For example, "What is the proper timing of intermediary intervention?" is a typical question to be asked at this stage. Finally, the question is considered, "Why would parties accept third-party intervention and why would they accept a particular mediator?"<sup>[32]</sup> This mode of analysis concerns the role of mediation in a particular conflict, identifying the ultimate objective, as well as the strategy for gaining acceptance for mediation in the resolution process of a particular conflict.

Kleiboer also includes a fourth mode of analysis, the study of international mediation, but given its purely scholarly application it does not directly relate to this project. As such, it will not be included in the remainder of this paper, but merits definition nonetheless. The questions in this mode concern how to construct mediation theory, what methodology to use in this construction, and how to determine the relationship

between people and their environment.[33]

Kleiboer uses each of these modes to measure and define her four ideal types of international mediation, which will be discussed below. The first of Kleiboer's ideal types, **International Mediation as Power Brokerage**, involves conflict between state actors with a strict boundary between the domestic and international political stage. Consciously modeled on a realist basis and quite similar to Stern's modern realist paradigm, Kleiboer supports this type by detailing the argument for why the state is still the most important actor on the international stage. This argument considers the state's ability to wage war, the greater responsibility of the state than all transnational organizations, governmental sovereignty, and the fact that non-state entities only exist at the will of national governments.[34] However, recent global developments, particularly those leading to the United States' current war against terrorism, would challenge this assumption. Kleiboer also associates the nature of international politics in this model with organized anarchy, another tenet of modern realism, albeit slightly modified. While in pursuit of national interests, which Kleiboer argues is the primary justification for all state action, states clash over limited resources and values. This clash is reinforced by the decentralized structure of the international system.[35] This embedded source of conflict results in a continuous struggle for power between states, reinforcing an atmosphere of insecurity with the threat of violence.[36] In other words, the cause of conflict is a system-induced clash of state interests in an anarchical society.[37]

Conflict management is rationalized in this model because these conflicts are a threat to international stability. With respect to mediation feasibility, Kleiboer argues, "Given the anarchic structure of the international system, conflict settlement is the maximum feasible outcome of third-party intervention." [38] The success of mediation attempts is outcome oriented, specifically focused on maintaining the stability of the international system. Mediation is a pragmatic tool to be used in the short term. The great powers are the most likely interventionists, given their power and skills, as well as their heightened stake in maintaining international stability. Acceptance of the mediator's role and suggestions by the primary parties relies on the estimation of the mediator's power to help secure national interests of the conflicting states and the estimation of risks inherent in a

declining relationship with the mediator.[39] This type of international mediation is geared toward protecting the status quo while dealing with conflicts and inequalities in a manner designed to protect the integrity of the system, global stability, and the national interests of the great powers directly or indirectly involved.

Kleiboer's second ideal type, **International Mediation as Political Problem-Solving**, concerns conflicts stemming from foreign policy elites acting on behalf of states and non-state institutions. In this model, "international conflict is a contingent result of psycho-political dynamics of misperceptions." [40] In other words, sometimes elites act in ways that seem to directly oppose their national interest. An example of this would be Saddam Hussein's decision to invade Kuwait despite the fact that it would certainly estrange the Arab states and likely create a military showdown with the West, which it did. This ideal type focuses on the containment of crises, or conflicts that have reached the point where there is a chance of war, and justifies international statecraft under the reasoning that violent conflict has built-in escalation tendencies and poses a severe threat to the international system and humanity in general. Conflict management feasibility is high in such cases because the conflict is not endemic, but rather actor-induced by the actions of elites. As a result, third-party assistance with conflict resolution is possible and often desirable considering it is a peaceful means to a peaceful end.[41]

International mediation as a tool of foreign policy is outcome oriented with the objectives of preventing and containing violence in the international system. Mediation involves policy elites – including political, bureaucratic, and opposition leaders – on a short to medium-term basis for the purpose of eliminating immediate threats of violence and improving diplomatic relations between all contestants. In this ideal type, reliance upon the great powers is not as systemic as in Kleiboer's first ideal type, and mediation efforts are often made by "actors committed to termination of violence in world affairs," using "information, analytical and communication skills, plus a commitment to peace" as resources for resolution.[42] Mediator acceptance is again related to the reputation and skills of the mediator. Mediation leverage may play a role, but is not a necessity.[43]

**International Mediation as Domination**, Kleiboer's third ideal type, is defined as a process intended to resolve conflict between economic classes and their

representatives. In this ideal type the distinction between domestic and international arenas is irrelevant, since the source of the problem stems not from political and governmental concerns per se but from a system-induced clash of economic interests not confined to particular states or organizations, but rather between centers and peripheries, both within and between the states. With the increasing trends of globalization and fragmentation, "global vulnerability to economic, political, and military turbulence has increased markedly."[\[44\]](#) In particular, this trend has created an ever-growing gap between the international haves and have-nots, also known as the Center-Periphery division. This division creates a relationship of dependency and inequality, casting the have-nots as functioning subordinates in the capitalist world system. Moreover, not only do the wealthy industrial hegemony exploit the periphery, but also within nations there are "clienteles social classes" that are instruments of exploitation.[\[45\]](#) The current crisis between radical Islamic fundamentalists and the West, particularly the war between the United States and Osama bin Laden, could fall into this type of conflict.

In such conflicts, international statecraft is essential to make visible and change the exploitative nature of the current capitalist-dominated international system. However, the implication for the feasibility of conflict management in this type of conflict is not encouraging. Conflict resolution, in this case a fundamental change in world economic structure, can only occur through settlement of the conflict (i.e. ending violence in the periphery states and classes). Such a change is impossible by third-party intervention.[\[46\]](#) Considering this, mediation success is a logical impossibility, due to the group dynamic involved and the requisites of mediation. The scope of this conflict is all encompassing; if a state or class is not a victim of inequality, it is a perpetrator. The spatial dimension of the conflict is systemic, and if a mediator were to be assigned they would be representative of the dominant powers and would act to maintain the current system. The process itself would be a contradiction since the mediator is being forced upon parties by the powerful, status quo oriented actors who are responsible for the dependency that caused the conflict and are not interested in reforming the system that perpetuates the injustice.[\[47\]](#) Moreover, mediation in its operative sense could not be engaged because this process would essentially require an assignment of blame and

unilateral concessions on the part of one party.

Finally, Kleiboer's fourth ideal type focuses on **International Mediation as Restructuring Relationships**. This ideal type of conflict resolution focuses on emancipatory struggles based on identity groups. In such a conflict, Kleiboer argues that the distinction between domestic and international politics is artificial.[\[48\]](#) This form of conflict results from an identity group's perception that one or several of their interrelationships is illegitimate. Examples of this type of conflict include the violence in Cyprus between the Greek government and Turkish Cypriots and the dangerous rivalry between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. The neorealist institutions currently governing the international system make a lasting positive peace in such conflicts impossible because they focus on eliminating violence as a threat to international order, not getting to the root of the problem and remedying the tensions between the parties involved.[\[49\]](#) Conflict resolution analysts are split on this issue; some stress the importance of resolving all underlying problems, not merely settling conflicts. Others regard such complete resolution as the rare outcome of a very long process.[\[50\]](#)

Since the goal of such conflict is to achieve emancipation from illegitimate social relationships, there is a significant valuation of international statecraft. Considering the danger of these conflicts elevating to violence and the inherent escalation of violent conflict, international conflict management is vital to engage before a conflict reaches crisis stage. Conflict settlement and resolution are possible through third-party assistance, often by creating mutually acceptable and legitimate relationships between the government and the governed. Mediation as a tool of resolution is both process and outcome oriented since creating a new relationship (outcome) is only part of the strategy. Equally important is enabling maximum participation and power-free communication (process).[\[51\]](#)

International mediation in this ideal type is oriented for the long-term and aims at institutional reform, not merely achieving a cease-fire. The mediation process is primarily localized and is focused on fostering quality relationships in the area of conflict. For this form of conflict, Kleiboer argues that mediation is the only way to secure resolution. Mediators are often neutral parties committed to social changes and a humanistic world

order, and are often accepted only if influential actors in all parties involved approve of the mediator's reputation and skills.[\[52\]](#)

As a whole, Kleiboer provides a comprehensive and complex measuring system for state action on the international stage, as well as increased understanding of the possible motivation behind such actions. Principles such as those advocated in Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft potentially could be applied to Kleiboer's standards if the motivations and historical relevance to parties can be determined.

### **Richard Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft**

The notecard that Tricia Nixon Cox found in her father's desk that day in 1994 contained a printed message and a list of guidelines. It read:

"A President needs a global view, a sense of proportion and a keen sense of the possible. He needs to know how power operates and he must have the will to use it.

If I could carve ten rules into the walls of the Oval Office for my successors in the dangerous years just ahead, they would be these...."[\[53\]](#)

Nixon then listed the rules of international negotiation and interaction that have since become known as the Ten Commandments of Statecraft.[\[54\]](#) This collection of rules was to serve as instructions for state leadership while interacting and cooperating with other states. They range from the attitude and style of negotiation to relations with other states, both adversary and partner.

This section of the paper will introduce each of Nixon's rules for international negotiation. As each is listed, described in its historical context, and comparatively analyzed to determine the consistency of Nixon's actions with his words, they will also be examined and categorized both in terms of international relations paradigms and Kleiboer's framework for conflict resolution and international mediation.

#### **I. Always Be Prepared to Negotiate, but Never Negotiate Without Being Prepared.**

It is of the utmost importance to enter every negotiation, regardless of the level of formality, cognizant of what one hopes to accomplish, what issues are appropriate for compromise and which are not, and what one is willing to give up to gain what one finds

vital.[55] Such an emphasis on bargaining and deal-making reflects the notion of zero-sum politics often associated with international relations. Throughout his political career, Richard Nixon was relentless in preparation for everything – from investigating Alger Hiss as a congressman to immersing himself in Russian politics and culture before visiting the Soviet Union as a Vice President.

Probably the best example of Nixon's preparation for negotiations concerned both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Scheduled for a Moscow summit in the summer of 1972, Nixon was intent on achieving détente and doing so specifically through brokering an arms control agreement known as SALT.[56] To secure such a pact, Nixon needed to send a message to the Soviets that could be sent in only one of two ways: developing an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) to repel missile strikes or developing rapprochement with mainland China, the Soviet's uneasy Marxist ally and historic adversary to the south.[57] Despite cries that attempts to achieve either would destabilize relations with the Soviets, the U.S. Senate approved ABM (by one vote) and Nixon signed the historic agreement establishing an American mission in China four months before the Moscow summit. As Nixon traveled to Moscow that summer he had two strong cards up his sleeve. He now coupled the U.S. arms deployment with an approach to Moscow's deadliest potential enemy. As he left Moscow, Nixon carried with him three accords bearing Communist Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev's signature: the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, a preliminary accord on the limitation of Soviet arms, and a pact outlining the basic principles of the United States-Soviet relationship.[58]

In terms of the relationship of this commandment to the contending paradigms of international relations, there is no clear fit into the ideology of a particular paradigm. This is the case with most, if not all, of Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft. This particular commandment has aspects that fit into the idealist/utopian paradigm and others that fit into the modern realist paradigm. The motivation for this commandment is obviously national interest, a modern realist theme, but the very idea of negotiation indicates a desire to preserve global stability and avert violent conflict, which are more idealist concerns. Naturally, it can also be argued that it is also in the national self-interest to avoid such conflict. This is indicative of a theme that is repeatedly found

throughout Nixon's foreign policy: the use of realist means to achieve idealist ends. As a result, many of his commandments, including this one, can fit into both paradigms, although, overall, this rule would fit most comfortably within the framework of the modern realist.

As far as Kleiboer's ideal types are concerned, this commandment could only fit into her first framework, mediation as power brokerage. This is the case with most of Nixon's commandments, given the state-centric basis of his principles. Only one of Kleiboer's four types is solely dedicated to state-centric international politics. The second framework, mediation as political problem-solving, can involve elite representatives of states, but this type still maintains a significant focus on the individual. An argument could be made for the second model and its applicability to this commandment, since elites are typically involved in the negotiation between powers such as in this example. Nevertheless, the First Commandment of Statecraft is more aptly associated with Kleiboer's first ideal type since it essentially represents the same idea: conflicting states coming to the table to negotiate a resolution to differences for the good of the states involved and the international system at large. While mediation has a more positive and blame-free approach, Nixon's first rule and Kleiboer's first ideal type are similar enough to make a positive comparison.

## **II. Never Be Belligerent, but Always Be Firm.**

In the spring of 1972, President Nixon sensed that the framework for success he had crafted for the upcoming Moscow summit was starting to weaken. The deterioration of the South Vietnamese army threatened to weaken his negotiation position, despite the beginning of ABM deployment and the "triangulation" of diplomacy with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.<sup>[59]</sup> Had Soviet tanks overridden South Vietnam, there would have been no way that Nixon could have gone to Moscow and not lost face. Instead, Nixon ordered the mining of Haiphong Harbor to prevent the shipment of Soviet arms to the North Vietnamese. Nixon's justification for this was that a massive South Vietnamese retreat would signal a weakness of the United States that the Soviets would exploit. This would result not in negotiation but in dictation of terms by the Soviets.

"Impotence," warned Nixon, "is not a positive force in diplomacy."<sup>[60]</sup>

Later that summer, in Moscow, Nixon could afford to be calm. He had already made his point in the mining of Haiphong Harbor. Further rhetorical denunciation of communism would have been belligerent. Communist Party Secretary Brezhnev was not in such a position, appearing considerably more restless and tense than Nixon. Eventually Brezhnev broke and roared accusations of barbarism and references to Soviet missile capability. Nixon coolly replied, "Is that a threat?" repeatedly until Brezhnev returned to his seat. Throughout the summit, Brezhnev demanded the United States agree to the North Vietnamese's terms for an early end to the war. Nixon politely but consistently refused, saying he preferred a just settlement for all sides.<sup>[61]</sup> In the end, Brezhnev lost tremendous face during the entire event – for not calling off the summit, for belying his weakness with belligerence, for resorting to threats when all involved realized the folly – and the result was evident by the unilateral diplomatic victory achieved by the Americans on Soviet soil. According to Humes, "Nixon knew the difference between being firm and being belligerent, and in his negotiation he manifested resolve and avoided empty threats of retaliation."<sup>[62]</sup>

In terms of the affiliation of this rule and a particular international relations paradigm, this advice would correspond with the ideals of the modern realists. In the end the choice of a calm response over a belligerent response is motivated by a desire to improve position in power politics, a fundamental component of realist thought.

As far as Kleiboer's ideal types are concerned, mediation cannot really be applied to this guideline. Nixon is essentially advising a tactic for successful negotiation, not a particular way of achieving conflict resolution, although the two can be related. Kleiboer's first ideal type concerning power brokerage would probably be the most similar to this commandment since that model analyzes state interaction to solve conflicts and Nixon is advocating a particular mentality to adopt to successfully engage in such interaction. In this sense, Nixon's principle could be applied to Kleiboer's model because such a demeanor would assist all involved in the resolution process with discovering a solution to a conflict that was mutually acceptable to the actors, but would not infringe too drastically

upon any of the actor's primary interests since they would maintain a modicum of firmness with respect to their most important issues.

### **III. Always Remember That Covenants Should be Openly Agreed To but Privately Negotiated.**

Richard Nixon quite possibly wrote this rule in response to recurring conflict he (and many other presidents) had with a Congress that was upset with the secretive diplomacy routinely engaged in by the executive branch. Nixon had great respect for Wilsonian idealism, but little support for the argument in favor of allowing the entire world to see the diplomatic activities of states.<sup>[63]</sup> In fact, the wording of this rule is a direct response to an historic quote by Woodrow Wilson, who once pledged "open covenants ... openly arrived at" in Versailles.<sup>[64]</sup>

Given the bureaucratic resentment of open relations with the People's Republic of China, the diplomatic implications of the Soviet Union's knowledge of normalized relations between the Americans and the Chinese, and the fervor of the Cultural Revolution and its purges in China, open diplomacy was not an option to Nixon and his Chinese counterparts. Instead, Nixon embarked on a Metternichian guise of diplomacy, complete with secret envoys, veiled messages passed through the media, and a network of international connections between himself and the Chinese Premier Chou En-lai that included de Gaulle of France, Ceausescu of Romania, and Yahya Kahn of Pakistan.<sup>[65]</sup> After a contingent of American ping-pong players were invited to China and Henry Kissinger took a secret flight to a Chinese military airport, an official invitation was extended to President Nixon from Beijing to visit the People's Republic of China; Nixon quickly accepted. A few months later the historic normalization agreement was signed between the two nations. As sinful as such cloak-and-dagger methods seem to a nation that prides itself on democracy and openness, the Shanghai Communiqué would probably never have been signed any other way. As James Humes wrote, "The diplomatic triumph of the century would have never occurred in the white heat of publicity."<sup>[66]</sup>

In terms of an affiliation with one of the contending international relations paradigms, this rule essentially straddles the line between the modern realist and the idealist/utopian. The rule itself draws directly from the words of Woodrow Wilson, one of

the founding fathers of idealism in international relations, but is pragmatically reconfigured, resulting in a more realist tenor. Accordingly, the rule seems to represent the goal of idealism tempered with the realities of the international political arena. As was discussed, it is often simply impossible to maintain full transparency in diplomacy and achieve meaningful gains. Here again can be found the recurring Nixonian theme of realist means to achieve idealist ends.

In terms of analysis by Kleiboer's ideal types, this commandment can be related to both Kleiboer's first and second philosophies of international mediation. The first type regarding power brokerage relates to the fact that two parties (states) are engaging in a conflict resolution mechanism, in Nixon's case, negotiation, but this maxim could certainly be applied to mediation efforts. Following this, Kleiboer's first framework can easily be applied to the Third Commandment of Statecraft. The second ideal type regarding political problem-solving also comes into play due to the private and secretive atmosphere of international negotiation mandated by this commandment. This lack of transparency, no matter how valid, takes control and efficacy away from everyone involved except for the elite group of policymakers charged with conducting the negotiation or mediation and the select group of elites that are kept informed as the process is being followed.

#### **IV. Never Seek Publicity That Would Destroy the Ability to Get Results.**

While the previous anecdote regarding opening relations with the People's Republic of China could have adequately illustrated this maxim, there is an even more telling tale of Nixon's belief in this rule and of his statesmanship. In 1960, when he was Vice President under Eisenhower and the Republican presidential nominee running against then-Senator John F. Kennedy, the Eisenhower administration had adopted a program, partly at the suggestion of Nixon himself, under which the CIA was providing arms, ammunition, and training for Cubans who had fled the Castro regime and were in exile in the United States. As the presidential debates progressed, the Cuban issue became very high profile. Nixon repeatedly took hits from Kennedy for the Eisenhower administration not being tough enough on Fidel Castro, despite the fact that the planned CIA-sponsored revolution had been in the works for over six months.

Nixon could have responded to Kennedy's charges by announcing his role in the planned invasion, but refused. Nixon later wrote, "That would have been utterly irresponsible: it would have disclosed a secret operation and would have completely destroyed its effectiveness."<sup>[67]</sup> In choosing to maintain his secrecy, Nixon may have cost himself the presidency for eight years, but in doing so revealed both his national loyalty and dedication to international statesmanship.<sup>[68]</sup>

This commandment is difficult to classify in terms of a related international relations paradigm. In Nixon's application, though, it involves sacrifice and secrecy for the good of state gain. Such use is completely in line with the state-centric focus of modern realism. However, the advice to avoid costly publicity could be applied to non-realist ideals. Considering this, I would argue that this maxim was realist in its use and its intent.

In terms of Kleiboer's ideal types, this commandment is similar to the Second Commandment of Statecraft in that it provides useful advice for facilitating international conflict mediation as power brokerage. While Nixon's use of this principle was for the good of the state, the lesson of his experience could be transferred to the mediation process, particularly when emotional or high-stress conflicts are being resolved. However, the ultimate success of mediation relies on acceptability to all involved, not just a few, and the results of such publicity-averse resolutions must gain public approval if they are to last.

#### **V. Never Give Up Unilaterally What Could Be Used as A Bargaining Chip. Make Your Adversaries Give Something for Everything They Get.**

When the 1972 accord between the United States and the People's Republic of China was signed and effectively placed an American liaison office in Beijing, it signified much more than diplomatic niceties and greater access to a strategic partner and competitor. The agreement also signified an almost unheard of political coup by Nixon, who had been told that the United States would have to formally abandon support of Taiwan as well as pull out of Vietnam to have Beijing make such an offer.<sup>[69]</sup> However, through semantics and carefully crafted phrases, the American pledge to recognize "one China" as long as that unity was achieved by "peaceful resolution" allowed the U.S. to maintain defense treaties with Taiwan and side with the Taiwanese Nationalists if the

People's Republic of China was to launch military attack against the island.[\[70\]](#)

Almost immediately the Nixon administration enjoyed better relations with the People's Republic of China than Britain or France, who had already abandoned Taiwan and opened embassies in Beijing, and the Soviet Union, who shared ideology and support for North Vietnam, all while only maintaining a liaison's office, far less formal or official than an embassy. The People's Republic of China constantly pressed for an upgrade to full embassy status, but the upgrade would have offered the United States little or no new benefits, would have cost the relationship with Taiwan, would have satisfied the greatest request of the People's Republic, and would have further alienated the Soviets. Instead of giving full diplomatic status to the Chinese, Nixon let the question dangle while waiting for something in exchange.[\[71\]](#)

As it was, the Nixon administration, as well as the Ford administration, passed before President Jimmy Carter awarded full diplomatic status to the People's Republic of China. Carter, despite the stance of Nixon and Ford, awarded this status as a one-sided concession, as a gift rather than a trade-off. In the end, Carter's plans backfired.[\[72\]](#) Brezhnev rejected signing SALT II, the American-Taiwanese relationship was undermined, and the trade imbalance with the Chinese (Carter's rationalization for his concession was to open up the Chinese market) is one of the worst in the world, at least from a realist perspective.[\[73\]](#)

This commandment provides yet another conundrum when applied to international relations paradigms. While it seeks to transform all negotiation from a zero-sum contest, where one party loses whatever another party gains, to a negotiation process where everyone gains in every deal, the nature of the rule belies the underlying notion that every concession, whether unilateral or multilateral, amounts to a loss for one party and a corresponding gain for another. While such a result is not necessarily the case, the likelihood that something must be given in exchange for receiving diplomatic benefits is very high. Overall, this rule most closely resembles the modern realist paradigm, particularly so because of its focus on power politics and its intent to enhance success in achieving national interest objectives.

This commandment advocates a principle that seems to directly conflict with the spirit

of conflict mediation. Quite often, unilateral concessions are necessary as articles of good faith. Outright refusal to grant points or positions to adversaries without receiving something in return threatens the stability of the mediation process and is not indicative of a desire to resolve conflicts, but rather to exploit the positions and interests of an adversary. Consequently, while this tactic may enhance negotiation prospects, this principle cannot be accurately applied to any of Kleiboer's ideal types. As a result, perhaps the most glaring contradiction between Nixon's principles and those of conflict mediation is revealed; Nixon often was only interested in mediation as a form of power-brokering, a position he was pragmatically forced to adopt, but one that still runs counter to the "spirit" of conflict mediation.

## **VI. Never Let Your Adversary Underestimate What You Would Do in Response to a Challenge. Never Tell Him What You Would Not Do.**

In the 1970s the Soviet Union had nowhere near the levels of economic productivity, missile defense, or nuclear power that the United States enjoyed; however, Russia did possess the ability to scare its superpower rival with its unpredictability. This was an asset the Soviets wielded tremendously well throughout the Cold War. Nixon appreciated this tactic, and consciously attempted to even the scales by embarking on what aides in the National Security Council called the "madman maneuver."<sup>[74]</sup> This included floating the perception that Nixon was "a bit of a crazy man" and "can be something of a loose cannon."<sup>[75]</sup> Unpredictability, to Nixon, was not deliberate ambiguity. It was an unvoiced threat.

After President Johnson announced a cessation of the bombardment of North Vietnam on October 31, 1968, the world assumed that peace negotiations would succeed. After the peace process broke down and Nixon won the presidential election a short time later, he refused to announce whether Johnson's ban on the bombing was still in effect. By 1972, the peace process in Vietnam was still unresolved and the Americans were facing problems with North Vietnamese delaying tactics. Without warning, Nixon ordered a massive bombing campaign from December 18 to December 30 (with the exception of Christmas Day) against military objectives in the Hanoi-Haiphong area. Although the American media scolded Nixon, the North Vietnamese capitulated for fear of what the

unpredictable president would do next. When the South Vietnamese leader, President Nguyen van Thieu, later refused to sign the peace agreement and promised not to abide by any agreement he did not sign, Nixon sent him a note stating that failure to sign the peace treaty would result in utter and irreversible abandonment by the United States, and that any violation of the treaty would garner strong reaction from the American forces. Given Nixon's unpredictability and his recent behavior, Thieu also had no choice but to sign.<sup>[76]</sup>

In terms of international relations paradigms, this guideline represents exclusively modern realist ideology. It is completely in line with power politics, zero-sum competition, and secretive methods of achieving national objectives at the expense of an adversary state. The very idea of an adversary state bears realist implications.

Similar to the Fifth Commandment of Statecraft, this commandment violates the spirit of international conflict mediation. The very premise of this principle is to gain a position of power in international negotiation. Such power-brokering positions are not conducive or even allowable in this form of conflict resolution. Regardless of the type of actors involved, this principle would be logically impossible to reconcile with the values of international mediation. Moreover, a non-involved party acting in such a manner could not be accepted as a mediator due to the threat of unpredictability they would present to already conflicting states or groups.

## **VII. Always Leave Your Adversary a Face-Saving Line of Retreat.**

This rule departs from the traditional role of statecraft as cooperation between states and deals primarily with how to end a violent conflict once it has become clear who the victor is. Nixon practiced this principle religiously in his domestic political life, a rarely reported trait, and made extraordinarily gracious gestures to the Johnson, Kennedy, and Humphrey families, particularly gracious upon consideration of the terrible rivalries and dirty politics that plagued their professional relations.<sup>[77]</sup> This is not to suggest that his employment of this guideline placed magnanimity over national interest – that is hardly the case. A clear illustration of this commandment exists in Nixon's treatment of Egyptian president Anwar Sadat following the Yom Kippur War of 1973, when Egypt and Syria had launched

a war against Israel with the backing of the Soviet Union.

As the war progressed the initial gains made by the Arab forces were reversed and the Israeli army closed in to annihilate the Egyptian Third Army. Although a cease-fire had been called, the Israelis refused to abide by it, arguing that they were provoked and that American cease-fires in Vietnam never took effect as soon as they were agreed upon. Eventually Nixon prevailed upon Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir to prevent Israeli guns from firing, but she still refused to let Egyptian convoys resupply the surrounded troops with food and medical supplies. Nixon threatened the Israelis that if they did not permit resupply of nonmilitary items to the Egyptians, the United States would abandon them and allow Soviet forces to intervene and engage the Israeli army. Sadat offered to directly engage in military talks with the Israelis in exchange for a resupply convoy.<sup>[78]</sup>

After the crisis subsided, Egypt retreated and Sadat was able to maintain leadership in Egypt as Nixon had wished, since he thought Sadat could provide a voice for moderation and restraint in the volatile Middle East.<sup>[79]</sup> In the end, the preservation of the Egyptian army amounted to a face-saving line of retreat for Sadat and left open the possibility of relations between the two states in the future, ultimately resulting in the Egyptian-Israeli accord a few years later.<sup>[80]</sup>

As far as international relations paradigms are concerned, this guideline also fails to fit neatly between one of the contending theories noted earlier. As Humes suggests, this philosophy of helping an adversary out in times of defeat marks a departure from Machiavellian realpolitik, which warned that if you go after a king you had better kill him, to a Confucian sense of fair play in warfare.<sup>[81]</sup> Nonetheless, the motivation for such behavior is still the interest of the state, for your enemy today may be your ally tomorrow and it is best not to burn bridges unnecessarily. Consequently, this rule would have more modern realist tendencies than idealist/utopian or Stalinist/Marxist.

Upon consideration of this commandment and its relation to Kleiboer's ideal types, a significant flaw in her theories is evident. Each of Kleiboer's ideal types relates to a specific role for mediation and a specific group affected by such mediation. However, the groups assigned to the various ideal types are not the only groups that can benefit from their respective uses of mediation. For example, Kleiboer limits international mediation as

restructuring relationships to identity groups seeking emancipatory relief from relationships perceived as illegitimate. However, states can certainly benefit from the restructuring of relationships, as can classes. This commandment provides an example of a catalyst to change in the relationships between states and, consequently, could easily be applied to Kleiboer's fourth ideal type. In this aspect Kleiboer's theories are flawed.

### **VIII. Always Carefully Distinguish Between Friends Who Provide Some Human Rights and Enemies Who Deny All Human Rights.**

Liberal critics often offended Nixon, especially their double standard of criticizing the human rights violations of our allies, while turning a blind eye toward the totalitarian brutalities of our enemies. The case study used to illustrate this rule highlights the reason for following this rule as well as the reason for not implementing such a double standard.

One of the United States' greatest allies in the Middle East during the Nixon administration was Iran (under the Shah). Admittedly this nation was not a democracy, but rather an autocratic regime. Nixon's justification for giving Iran favorable treatment, however, stemmed from the emergence of economic rights, the Shah's enfranchising women with civil rights, Iran's consistent support for American and Western foreign and military policies, and, of course, American reliance on Arab oil and the fairness with which Iran had treated the United States in oil deals. However, in the 1976 presidential campaign Jimmy Carter made human rights a centerpiece and used the American relationship with Iran as the case study on how he was going to change things.[\[82\]](#) Carter, however, never bothered to single out prison torture in Cuba or the brutality of North Korea. Instead Carter applied a double standard for political gain; one that failed to distinguish an ally's position *vis-a-vis* that of a rival.[\[83\]](#)

While Nixon thought it risky to meddle in the internal affairs of any nation, particularly so when coercing our allies already on the move to greater liberty, Carter made clear his encouragement of opposition to the Shah and cast doubt on American commitment to the Iranian government. As a result, upon Carter's election, the Shah quickly began to appease opposition demands. Eventually the Shah left Tehran and was replaced by a former exile, the Ayatollah Khomeini. Soon after, the American Embassy was assaulted, the Iranian hostage crisis began, and a nation that was once a loyal friend and prosperous

beacon to the Arab states became one of the most virulently anti-American nations in the world as it regressed into theocratic terrorism and feudal poverty.<sup>[84]</sup>

In terms of international relations paradigms, this tends to fall into the idealist/utopian paradigm, although a sense of modern realism can be detected. The realist aspect is primarily related to Nixon's hesitancy to intervene in the domestic politics of an ally, bringing to mind the self-help component of the modern realist paradigm. The idealist/utopian dimension of this commandment concerns the notion of collective action, specifically Carter's abandonment of one of our members.

As far as Kleiboer's ideal types of international mediation are concerned, this principle is not applicable to any of the four. The commandment essentially advises leaders not to alienate allies for failings that are equally egregious, if not worse, in our adversaries. However, the notion of allies and adversaries, at least in terms of power-brokering, does not fit into the school of conflict mediation, nor does a comparative analysis of who is better and who is worse at enacting and supporting human rights, or democracy, or free trade, or any other relevant principle.

#### IX. Always Do at Least as Much for Our Friends as Our Adversaries Do for Our Enemies.

To illustrate this point, a return to Nixon's response to the Yom Kippur War is merited. While it is true that Nixon showed compassion to the Egyptians as detailed under the Seventh Commandment of Statecraft, he also provided a great deal of support to the Israelis up until they had the war clearly won and were defying cease-fire agreements. Nearly all of Nixon's top military and diplomatic aids wanted him to restrain from active involvement. If the U.S. did not get involved and the Israelis still won, it would enhance the reputation of the Americans as honest brokers for peace and security, as well as elevate their position over the Soviets who had backed the Syrian and Egyptian invasion.

However, as the situation became more dire for Israel, Nixon ordered support for its armies. As time progressed and the Departments of Defense and State bureaucracies failed to respond to Nixon's directives, his efforts to aid the Israelis became more emphatic, ultimately resulting in a massive airlift that would dwarf the famous Berlin effort following World War II. In the end, Nixon weighed in with all of his might to aid Israel,

doing so against the recommendations of his advisors and cabinet. Even when the Soviet Union threatened military response, Nixon put the nation on nuclear alert instead of backing down and abandoning an ally in time of need. All of this was done because of Nixon's belief that a nation should protect its friends, and should certainly not abandon that responsibility so as to improve relations with one's adversaries at the expense of one's allies.[85]

This commandment is indicative of the idealist/utopian paradigm of international relations due to its focus on collective security as a means of maintaining the stability of the international system. As far as the work of Kleiboer, this maxim can be applied to a non-involved actor determining when and how to become a mediator in a conflict. The terminology of the rule, however, is problematic because of the favoritism it expresses for a mediator's allies or friends, possibly at the expense of the other actor(s) that do not enjoy such a relationship. This difficulty is not a problem when a mediator is intervening in a conflict between two allies or friends, and is less of a problem when intervening between two non-allies. However, given the circumstance that a mediator has a vested interest or objective in helping one actor more than another to favorably resolve conflict, the entire process of mediation is delegitimized.

**X. Never Lose Faith. In Just Cause Faith Can Move Mountains. Faith Without Strength Is Futile, but Strength Without Faith Is Sterile.**

By definition, there is no way of proving a matter of faith. Similarly, there is no way of proving whether Richard Nixon's faith moved anything or changed America or the international system in any meaningful way. Unlike the previous nine commandments, empirical evidence cannot be applied to this rule. However, James Humes, former Nixon advisor and confidant, as well as author of *Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft*, interprets this rule not as a guideline for short-term international activity, but rather as advice for future leaders to never give up their beliefs, regardless of political pressure or conventional wisdom. In this manner, Nixon perfectly executed his Tenth Commandment of Statecraft, perhaps more so than any American politician to date.

Upon starting his political career after service in World War II, Nixon made one of his first speeches as candidate for a congressional race in California to the Pomona Kiwanis

Club at a weekly luncheon. Even though the group was composed of mostly local merchants and the year was only 1946, Nixon delivered a speech titled "The Challenge to Democracy." The speech was a probing analysis of the historical Soviet threat to the values of democracy. In the speech he denounced Soviet imperialism, the denial of human rights inherent in its police state, and the farm collectivization movement that led to the systematic deaths of three million Ukrainians alone. Nixon argued that it was not enough for the United States to be anti-communist, but that the nation must prove the superiority of its ideology and back that up with power until the Soviet system collapsed under the rottenness of its own system. Nixon argued all of this in 1946, when Stalin was still 'Uncle Joe' and Churchill's warning of an iron curtain was still three months away.<sup>[86]</sup> Nixon was a staunch anti-communist before Joe McCarthy was a U.S. Senator and remained so until his dying day. According to Humes, "In his fifty-year career as prophet, politician, and foreign policy elder statesman, Nixon was America's most consistent advocate for holding the line against Soviet expansionism."<sup>[87]</sup> While critics may regard Humes' description as overly generous and argue that such a strong and consistent stance could be problematic as well, Nixon's anti-communist rigor is a testament to his adherence to this commandment.

While the wording of this particular commandment would seem to reflect principles consistent with those related to the idealist/utopian paradigm of international relations, Humes' interpretation of the guideline is not really applicable to any school of international relations thought. The only linkage that could be made is that this rule advocates clinging to deeply held philosophies and beliefs regardless of the climate of public opinion, even to the point of discounting and ignoring public sentiment. Such resolute thinking lends itself to the maintenance of the status quo, structured change at best. This type of conservative dogma is typically associated with realist assumptions; however, it would be more accurate not to apply this final commandment to a paradigm than to resort to a logical stretch. Nonetheless, the interpretation of faith depends on the context and the nature of the faith in question.

Similarly, it is difficult to apply such a vague and elusive principle to any of Kleiboer's frameworks for international mediation of conflict. While faith is an important ingredient

in any type of conflict resolution, particularly with respect to mediation, such undying devotion to dogma or ideology does not lend itself to the successful resolution or mediation of conflict. As a result, this final commandment cannot be successfully compartmentalized into accordance with any of Kleiboer's four ideal types.

### **Conclusions**

What Richard Nixon has left behind is an interesting and practical framework on which to evaluate international negotiation and relations. However, as the global political arena has become more complex following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the focus of American foreign policy has become fuzzy. Nixon's guidelines work in a time and atmosphere of clarity, when a state can tell which other states are adversaries and which are allies. Today, organizations such as Al-Qaeda, the Palestinian Authority, and other non-state but still effective political actors destroy this sense of place on the global stage. The validity of Nixon's set of principles in today's geopolitical realm further suffers from the lack of clarity inherent in the current shifting balance of global power.

Nevertheless, it has been shown that Nixon did indeed heed his own advice while conducting foreign policy. Certainly historical events can be uncovered that would show inconsistency in Nixon's international activities throughout his administration, but as the examples in the previous section have illustrated, Nixon's faithfulness to the ideals he espoused in his Ten Commandments of Statecraft was generally consistent. In terms of ideology, his framework is certainly state-centric and heavily favors power politics. Many of his commandments focus on ways to either gain the upper hand in international negotiation or maintain a veil of secrecy significant enough to prevent losing the upper hand. While it is not surprising that his actions and philosophy take a conservative approach, his emphatic support for ideology, at times over personal political interest, was surprising. Equally confounding was the muddled paradigmatic nature of Nixon's philosophy, specifically with respect to his habitual use and endorsement of realist ends to achieve both realist and idealist goals. This analysis provides a better understanding of the foreign policy of Richard Nixon and the ideological nature of his political actions. The results of this analysis also raise procedural questions regarding the classification of

foreign policy approaches, including whether they should be classified based on their intended objective or their prescribed means of achieving the objectives.

In terms of the mode of analysis featuring the contending paradigms of international relations, it is evident that Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft fall primarily under the rubric of the modern realist paradigm. However, as was noted, Nixon often tempered his realism and conservatism with ideals otherwise associated with the idealist/utopian paradigm. In the end, the overwhelming focus on the state and zero-sum competition moved the commandments well into the modern realist camp.

As far as the correlation between the theoretical frameworks for international mediation of Marieke Kleiboer and the international negotiation framework of Richard Nixon is concerned, it was significantly more difficult to apply the two than expected. The sticking points of this difficulty included the vast difference in importance placed on the state between the authors of the respective models, the inherent contradiction between political negotiation and conflict mediation, and Kleiboer's limitation of certain types of mediation to only certain types of actors. This inability shows that the conflict resolution methods of international negotiation and international mediation cannot be reconciled. The former is too focused on achieving objectives in line with self-interest; the latter is too intent on tempering such objectives in favor of international harmony. A final lesson would be that Kleiboer's models could only work with absolutely neutral mediators where ulterior motives and vested interests would not destabilize the mediation process. In the end, Kleiboer's position states self-interest is not the sole measure of success. Nixon would argue the opposite, but what qualifies as self-interest could range from idealist peace and harmony to realist national security and economic dominance.

Regardless of the relative lack of compatibility between the two diplomatic scholars, both have introduced important additions to the ever-widening discipline of international relations: Nixon's contribution was to promote understanding of Cold War politics and to provide a cogent structure for engaging in international negotiation; Kleiboer's contribution provides an imaginative and formative set of ideal types by which to analyze, measure, and participate in international conflict resolution. Moreover, the current American crisis with terrorism and anti-American sentiment in the Middle East and

elsewhere particularly calls for such an approach to a conflict where victory can only be accomplished when the causes of such violence and disdain can be understood, dialogued, and alleviated. A new time has emerged, one that calls for international relations combining Nixon's sense of power and Kleiboyer's adaptability to new international actors supplementing and supplanting states. To the extent that the United States is also engaging in new conflicts that may necessitate realist paradigms, at least as a part of a foreign policy strategy, there is much to be learned from the continued study of both.

### **Bibliography**

Ackerman, Alice. *Making Peace Prevail: Preventing Violent Conflict in Macedonia*.

Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 2000.

Aitken, Jonathan. *Nixon: A Life*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery, 1993.

Brady, Linda P. *The Politics of Negotiation: America's Dealings with Allies,*

*Adversaries, and Friends*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Bundy, William P. *A Tangled Web: The Making of Foreign Policy in the Nixon*

*Presidency*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1998.

Burchill, Scott, and Andrew Linklater, et al. *Theories of International Relations*. New

York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Burrell, Gibson, and Gareth Morgan. *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational*

*Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. London: Heinemann, 1979.

Carr, E.H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. London: Macmillan, 1939.

Crocker, Chester A., Fen Oster Hampson, and Pamela Aall, eds. *Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1999.

Garrison, Jean A. *Games Advisors Play: Foreign Policy in the Nixon and Carter Administrations*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 1999.

Griffith, William E. *The Washington Papers No. 6: Peking, Moscow, and Beyond: The Sino-Soviet-American Triangle*. Washington, D.C.: The Center For Strategic And International Studies at Georgetown University, 1973.

Humes, James C. *Nixon's Ten Commandments of Statecraft*. New York: Scribner, 1997.

Joiner, Harry M. *American Foreign Policy: The Kissinger Era*. Huntsville, AL: Strode Publishers, 1977.

Kegley, Charles W. *Controversies in International Relations: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.

Kleiboer, Marieke. *The Multiple Realities of International Mediation*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998.

Kriesberg, Louis. *International Conflict Resolution: The U.S.-USSR and the Middle East Cases*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992.

Litwak, Robert S. *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

- Liu, Shia-ling. *U.S. Foreign Policy Toward Communist China in the 1970's: The Misadventures of Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter*. Taipei, Taiwan: Kuang Lu Publishing, 1988.
- Melanson, Richard A. *Reconstructing Consensus: American Foreign Policy since the Vietnam War*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991.
- Padover, Saul K. ed. *Wilson's Ideals*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Public Affairs, 1942.
- Parnet, Herbert S. *Richard Nixon and His America*. New York: Smithmark, 1990.
- Peterson, Susan. *Crisis Bargaining and the State: The Domestic Politics of International Conflict*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1996.
- Ravenal, Earl C. *Policy Papers in International Affairs No. 35: Large-Scale Foreign Policy Change: The Nixon Doctrine as History and Portent*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies at the University of California-Berkeley, 1989.
- Schurmann, Franz. *The Foreign Policies of Richard Nixon: The Grand Design*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of International Studies at the University of California-Berkeley, 1987.
- Starkey, Brigid, Mark A. Boyer, and Jonathan Wilkenfield. *Negotiating a Complex World: An Introduction to International Negotiation*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1999.
- Stern, Geoffrey. *The Structure of International Society: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. London: Pinter, 2000.

- Sutter, Robert G. *The China Quandary: Domestic Determinants of U.S. China Policy, 1972-1982*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1983.
- Szulc, Tad. *The Illusion of Peace: Foreign Policy in the Nixon Years*. New York: Viking Press, 1978.
- Thornton, Richard C. *The Nixon-Kissinger Years: Reshaping America's Foreign Policy*. New York: Paragon House, 1989.
- van der Linden, Frank. *Nixon's Quest for Peace*. New York: Robert B. Luce, 1972.
- Viotti, Paul R. and Mark V. Kauppi. *International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism*. New York: Macmillan, 1993.
- Wapner, Paul, and Lester Edwin J. Ruiz, eds. *Principled World Politics: The Challenge of Normative International Relations*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.
- Williams, Beryl. *Lenin*. Harlow, England: Longman, 2000.
- Wilson, Richard, ed. *The President's Trip to China*. New York: Bantam, 1970.
- Wu, Fu-mei Chiu. *Richard M. Nixon, Communism, and China*. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1978.

[1] Humes, 1997, p. 13.

[2] Kleiboer, Marieke. *The Multiple Realities of International Mediation*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1998.

- [3] Stern, 2000, p. 9.
- [4] Ibid., p. 36.
- [5] Kegley, 1995, p. 4.
- [6] Stern, 2000, pp. 20-21.
- [7] Ibid., p. 20.
- [8] Ibid., pp. 20-21.
- [9] Ibid., p. 20.
- [10] Carr, E.H. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. London: Macmillan, 1939.
- [11] Stern, 2000, p. 23.
- [12] Ibid.
- [13] Ibid., p. 24.
- [14] Ibid.
- [15] Ibid.
- [16] Viotti and Kauppi, 1993, p. 574.
- [17] Ibid., p. 48.
- [18] Stern, 2000, p. 23.
- [19] Ibid., p. 24.
- [20] Ibid., p. 25.
- [21] Williams, 2000, pp. 55-58.
- [22] Burchill and Linklater, 1996, p. 119.
- [23] Kleiboer, 1998, p. 2.
- [24] Starkey, et al., 1999, p. 116.
- [25] Crocker, et al., 1999, pp. 85-106, 405-430, 431-468.
- [26] Ackerman, 2000, p. 7.
- [27] Kleiboer, 1998, p. 3.
- [28] Burrell, Gibson, and Gareth Morgan. *Sociological Paradigms and Organisational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. London: Heinemann, 1979.
- [29] Kleiboer, 1998, p. 32, 35.
- [30] Ibid., p. 33.

- [31] Ibid.
- [32] Ibid.
- [33] Ibid., p. 34.
- [34] Ibid., p. 40.
- [35] Ibid., pp. 40-41.
- [36] Ibid., pp. 41-42.
- [37] Ibid., p. 49.
- [38] Ibid.
- [39] Ibid., pp. 44-48, 49.
- [40] Ibid., p. 58.
- [41] Ibid.
- [42] Ibid.
- [43] Ibid., pp. 48, 50-57, 58.
- [44] Ibid., p. 59.
- [45] Ibid.
- [46] Ibid., pp. 62-64, 68.
- [47] Ibid., pp. 64-65, 68.
- [48] Ibid., p. 77.
- [49] Ibid., pp. 68-69.
- [50] Kriesberg, 1992, p. 9.
- [51] Kleiboer, 1998, p. 77.
- [52] Ibid., pp. 67, 69-77.
- [53] Humes, 1997, p. 13.
- [54] Ibid.
- [55] Brady, 1991, pp. 22-27.
- [56] Litwak, 1984, pp. 93-94.
- [57] Griffith, 1974, pp. 7-10.
- [58] Humes, 1997, p. 38.
- [59] Thornton, 1989, p. 289.

- [60] Humes, 1997, p. 47.
- [61] van der Linden, 1972, 196-197.
- [62] Humes, 1997, p. 49.
- [63] Aitken, 1993, p. 78.
- [64] Stern, 2000, p. 20.
- [65] Humes, 1997, p. 61.
- [66] Ibid., p. 64.
- [67] Ibid., p. 79.
- [68] Ibid., pp. 75-80.
- [69] Ibid., p. 92.
- [70] Wu, 1978, pp. 153-154.
- [71] Humes, 1997, pp. 92-94.
- [72] Liu, 1988, pp. 37-41.
- [73] Humes, 1997, pp. 94-97.
- [74] Ibid., p. 106.
- [75] Ibid.
- [76] Ibid., pp. 105-113.
- [77] Parmet, 1990, pp. 470-471, 492, 496.
- [78] Humes, 1997, pp. 121-125.
- [79] Ibid., p. 125.
- [80] Ibid., pp. 125-126.
- [81] Ibid., p. 122.
- [82] Melanson, 1991, p. 88.
- [83] Humes, 1997, pp. 133-138.
- [84] Ibid., pp. 137-139.
- [85] Bundy, 1998, pp. 444-452.
- [86] Humes, 1997, pp. 159-163.
- [87] Ibid., p. 163.

