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ABSTRACT

International relations cannot easily explain the peaceful decline of a great power of the first order, nor the actions of a rival power to accommodate and, in fact, cushion the impact of its decline. Yet that is exactly what happened in U.S.-Soviet relations. The cold war ended peacefully, and political science began a mad scramble to attempt to understand and explain the events of 1985-1992.

Traditional international relations theory accounts for only part of the change, the decision of the Soviet Union to opt out of the superpower rivalry—the reason why the cold war ended. It cannot explain the eventual peaceful accommodation of the United States to the Soviet condition. To understand how the cold war ended requires the resurrection of an early theory of political psychology, Charles E. Osgood’s Graduation Reciprocation in Tension-Reduction (GRIT) in a multidisciplinary analysis, borrowing from political science, history, and psychology.

The pre-existing enemy image of the Soviet Union held by U.S. President Ronald Reagan conditioned his thinking and information processing regarding the Soviet Union so that virtually every Soviet behavior was interpreted in a
threatening manner, thwarting the evolution of cooperation. Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev initiated a foreign policy toward the United States consistent with Osgood's GRIT theory. Its intent was to penetrate the cognitive barriers to cooperative relations erected by Reagan's enemy image, and to change that very image of the Soviet Union.

The results of this study suggest that a consistent application of a comprehensive GRIT strategy can, over time, redraw the cognitive map of foreign policy decision makers, impacting their policy choices. These findings offer additional insights into the study of international relations, demonstrating the role of elite beliefs in explaining change in international relations. It also supports a conclusion that the practice of foreign policy decision making would benefit from an expansion of empathy—an enhanced capacity to understand international behavior and events from the perspective of adversaries.
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INTRODUCTION

A Journey of a Thousand Miles

Is a danger to be trusting one another.
One would seldom want to do what other wishes.
But unless somebody someday trust somebody,
There'll be nothing left on earth excepting fishes.

—The King and I

Senator Everett Dirksen took the floor of the United States Senate in 1963 to debate the merits of the Limited Test Ban Treaty. It was a treaty which proposed to ban all atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, and which was understood to have merit on arms control and environmental grounds. Recognizing the significance of the Treaty, while acknowledging it left a great deal of work still undone, Senator Dirksen recalled a Chinese proverb: “A journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step.”

More than twenty-five years later another significant political figure stood at the beginning of another very long road. In March of 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev became the general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union were as strained as at any time in the forty years since the end of the Second World
War, with each sides' understanding of the other dominated by feelings of fear and mistrust. In fact, Leon Wofsy commented that in the aftermath of Ronald Reagan's landslide victory in the 1984 presidential election, "...the cold war and the nuclear arms race seemed so embedded in our political life as to be beyond effective challenge and change for the foreseeable future." Gorbachev realized that a perpetuation of that environment of heightened confrontation would destroy the Soviet Union and, therefore, that he needed to find a way to reduce the level of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union.

As he [Gorbachev] himself makes clear, one of his key goals from the outset was to divest the Soviet Union of its external empire, which was both an unsupportable financial burden and a threat to his reform program. The problem was how to manage the divestiture without either plunging Eastern Europe into chaos or creating a powerful new Western threat to Soviet military security. To accomplish this, he would need the cooperation of both the West and the newly emerging Eastern European leadership...

By the end of the 1980s, tensions had indeed been reduced, much to the surprise of most students and practitioners of international politics. It is that transition—specifically, the process that made possible the transition from overwhelming confrontation to nascent cooperation—that I seek to understand. Morton Deutsch describes the gap in understanding I hope to fill.

Other scholars (e.g. Brockner & Rubin, 1985; Kriesberg, Northrup & Thomson, 1989; Osgood, 1962; Patchen, 1987; Pruitt & Rubin, 1986; Smoke, 1977) have discussed the escalation of conflict. Yet it is evident that we are a long way from having the comprehensive understanding of the processes necessary to make constructive suggestions about how to prevent, abort, or de-escalate such conflicts.
This project has been designed to shed new light on two critically important questions: one theoretical, the other substantive. On the one hand, this project seeks to examine, from an international relations theoretical perspective, the origins of cooperation between states in an international political system populated by sovereign states pursuing self interest, lacking any central coordinating or enforcement authority, operating against a backdrop of anarchy. On the other, it seeks to achieve a more complete understanding of the monumental change in the international order that seems to have begun with the revolutions that swept Eastern Europe beginning in 1989 and culminated in the failed coup in Moscow in August of 1991 and the subsequent dismantling of the Soviet Union. In short, this project seeks to understand the mechanism by which Gorbachev began to transition U.S.-Soviet relations from confrontation to cooperation.

This project will begin with a study of the evolution of the theory of cooperation, as dealt with both by the traditional international relations theorists, and the more recent efforts specifically directed toward the development of a theory of cooperation by neorealists, functionalists, and game theorists. In essence, virtually all of that work makes assumptions that the perceptions and preferences of international actors are fixed—a rigidity that limits their explanatory power. Applying the work of Charles E. Osgood, his
theory of Graduated and Reciprocal Initiatives in Tension-reduction (GRIT) introduced in the early 1960s, will allow this project to advance a novel understanding of the nature of cooperation, one cognizant of the impact of history and belief structures, and the critical role of trust, on the choices of international actors.

Armed with that new explanation, the project will examine a specific historical case, the end of the cold war. Relying on its more complex understanding of actor motivation and cooperative initiatives, this project will seek the origins of U.S.-Soviet cooperation in the policies of Mikhail Gorbachev beginning as early as 1985. It is the hypothesis underlying this project that General Secretary Gorbachev engaged the United States with a "GRIT-like" strategy, and that the softening toward the Soviet Union by U.S. leaders, was a response to that strategy.

The implications of this work are potentially quite significant. It is first a contribution to the theory of international relations. A substantial literature exists on the question of cooperation. Traditional international relations theorists of the realist school—scholars such as Hans Morgenthau and E. H. Carr—have described an international political order in which conflict between states is the norm and cooperation is the aberration. States, in this view, are motivated exclusively by the pursuit of power, and power relations between states are conceived as zero-sum in nature in that any absolute gain in the raw
power of one state is viewed as potentially dangerous by the other states in the international system. In the postwar period especially, this view held sway. It seemed obvious, for example, looking at the security rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, that the realist scholars had indeed captured the nature of international politics.

A great deal of intellectual effort has gone into further studies of cooperative phenomena. Theoretical subspecialties in neorealism and game theory have attempted to maintain the core assumptions of realism while explaining the emergence of cooperative arrangements between state actors, and scholars of functionalism, neoliberal institutionalism, and Wilsonian idealism have abandoned the assumptions of realism in their attempt to understand cooperation. These debates remain a significant component of international relations scholarship. Dr. Charles W. Kegley, Jr., then president of the International Studies Association, noted in his 1995 presidential address that the battle of competing paradigms continued to rage, while making his own claim that the realist moment may have passed.4

This work promises new answers to some long-standing debates. It begins with many of the assumptions of realism, especially regarding the motivations of states, but adds a psychological dimension not found in realist scholarship. It will offer an explanation for behavior at the core of a state's substantive area of concern—the so-called high politics of military and security issues—that
neorealists cannot. It also offers an innovation to the game theorists who, by their beginning with assumptions about static actor preferences, are unable to fully capture the dynamic nature of politico-military rivalry.

Osgood's GRIT theory begins with an assumption that the preferences of state actors may be established or reinforced by their historical experience. Applying concepts from psychology to the practice of international politics, Osgood sought to explain how competition, especially military competition between states can become its own legacy, breeding additional mistrust and spiraling the conflict upward, raising the stakes of miscalculation at every turn. In the end, it appears that the only safe and sane course for a political leader is unbridled acquisition of military capability to prepare against any contingency. GRIT attempts to recast what appears to be a hopelessly conflictual relationship into one in which the spiral of competition and mistrust begins to reverse itself and new opportunities for cooperation evolve.

Unfortunately, GRIT has had a relatively short active life span. In the early 1960s the Kennedy administration was aware of Osgood's work and flirted with some initiatives based on the theory. With Kennedy's death in 1963, however, that experiment ended. Intellectually, GRIT suffered a similar fate, its marginalization all but assured by an increasing emphasis in academic circles on the "science" of political science, part of a larger crisis of legitimacy in the social sciences. The end result is that GRIT was consigned to the intellectual
trash heap, occasionally appearing as a footnote to some work on cooperation theory, but rarely actively pursued as an explanatory theory. But it has much to offer, and it is time to apply its wisdom to some of the more pressing contemporary issues in international relations.

Beyond these contributions to theory-building, however, the most significant implication of this research may be the way it impacts on more traditional modes of dealing with conflict between states. U.S. and western policy makers and analysts alike have, in large measure, adopted a realpolitik view of the world, consistent in many ways with the realism of the traditional international relations scholars. Power and military force are seen almost exclusively as the answer to the clash of interests, and attempts at cooperation proceed only clumsily, based on a self-serving notion of quid pro quo. The rhetoric of the Clinton administration notwithstanding, it, too, has turned to military force as the predominant form of exchange regarding Iraq, Somalia, and Bosnia. Across the globe conflicts of interest seem most often resolved by resort to force.

This is not surprising, however, given the limited set of conceptual tools with which analysts can look at the world. There can be no denying that military force has played a role in the relations between many pairs of countries in conflict, with the U.S.-Soviet rivalry perhaps serving as the chief example. Over time, levels of animosity and mistrust rise to the point that conciliatory
acts become unthinkable, and those that do occur are misperceived by the rival state. Relations devolve into situations of managed crisis, continuously threatening to go out of control and erupt in armed conflict. The choices that appear to policy makers are proceed or perish.

Osgood recognized the self-fulfilling nature of many of these rivalries, and he devised a scheme to reduce the level of mistrust between rival states and expand the realm of choice available to policy makers. At the same time, Osgood further recognized the realpolitik nature of these military rivalries. He designed a program that was cognizant of the legitimate security concerns of states involved in these rivalries, and that would protect their security throughout the process. His proposal of a series of unilateral initiatives of a cooperative, conciliatory nature offers the hope of peaceful resolution of seemingly hopeless situations.

This research proposal is critical in the process of making such alternative leadership approaches available to policy makers. The lesson of the end of the cold war, as told by many western analysts and historians, is that containment worked; the U.S. and NATO strategy of confronting the Soviet Union at every turn was victorious, resulting in the collapse of the Soviet Union. That lesson has since been applied to Saddam Hussein, Bosnian Serbs, and Somali warlords, and in each case peaceful accommodation appears to be not at hand. Nor, perhaps, given a more critical examination of the role of
containment, should peaceful resolution be expected. Containment lacked an exit strategy; nowhere in the strategy of containment is there an allowance for a peaceful end of the competition. Just as the United States feared that had it shown weakness it would have been overrun by red hoards, so too should the Soviet Union have feared the West's taking advantage of its decline, setting in motion the thrust and parry of strike, counterstrike, and preemption. The important, and to this point overlooked, question is why they went so quietly.

One answer is that Gorbachev began to lay the groundwork for the peaceful end of the competition by his series of unilateral initiatives toward the west in general and the United States specifically, beginning as early as 1985. He sought ways to induce cooperation. He began to use a strategy very similar to Osgood's GRIT, and with it changed the U.S. perception of the Soviet Union to such a degree that by 1991, the likelihood of a western military reaction to the turmoil in the Soviet Union was discounted in Moscow, and the Soviet Union collapsed quietly. President Bush's nuclear initiatives in September 1991 were perhaps the most visible reaction to the conciliatory actions taken by Gorbachev in the previous years.

This project, then, by recasting the history of the end of the cold war in these terms, may underscore the period of the late 1980s as an historical antecedent to the seemingly intractable ethnic, racial, and religious conflicts that have re-emerged in the aftermath of the cold war. If the Gorbachev policy
of the late 1980s can be shown to have played a significant role in ratcheting down cold war tensions, that policy might well serve as a model for decision-makers facing the new world disorder of the 1990s and beyond.
Notes for the Introduction


CHAPTER 1

Metatheory and the Evolution of Cooperation

*Data data everywhere but not a thought to think.*
—Theodore Roszak

Exploring how the cold war ended may generate insights into managing relationships in a world in which traditional modes of thinking are challenged: a world without clear bipolar divisions, and in which military power is not the sole, or at least the predominant, currency of international exchange. How the cold war ended may prove to be more critical to the formulation of foreign policy in the second half of the 1990s than why it ended.

In the five years since the Soviet Union slipped quietly into the history books, scholars of international relations and practitioners of international politics have been engaged in a monumental effort to understand that most significant event. The end of the cold war has been the subject of books, articles, and conferences too numerous to count. Despite that Herculean effort, a full
understanding of the transition from cold war to post-cold war—and its implications for politics in the post-cold war era—appears not to be at hand.

While much of this work has generated insights into U.S. and Soviet behaviors, no compelling story has emerged to explain the entirety of the transition. Critically absent is an explanation of the willingness of the United States to permit the Soviet Union to set the agenda for the reshaping of the international security environment and the restraint demonstrated by the United States in the face of its rival's unparalleled weakness.

Fundamentally, that gap exists because of the failure to ask the right questions; a failure that results from the limitations of International Relations theory and the corresponding restrictions it imposes on creativity. Most of the current work on the end of the cold war falls into one of two categories: those works that attempt to understand why the cold war ended (i.e. what factors led the Soviet Union to opt out of the competition),¹ and those that attempt to rehabilitate (or challenge) realism based on its ability (or inability) to explain the end of the cold war.²

Through it all however, there remained unanswered a question critical to a more complete understanding of the transition that occurred in international politics from the time Mikhail Gorbachev took office in 1985 until the Soviet Union ceased to exist in December of 1991. The Soviet Union underwent a fundamental transition of its own beginning with Gorbachev's election as
General Secretary. The “evil empire” of Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev was replaced by a declining great power, no longer driven by ideology, seeking to cushion or reverse its decline. In order to make that happen, Gorbachev recognized that the Soviet Union could no longer participate in the enduring rivalry of the cold war with the United States. It was not enough, however, for Gorbachev’s Soviet Union to declare its intention to opt out of the cold war; it needed the cooperation of the United States. But Ronald Reagan continued to apply his understanding of the Soviet Union as an evil empire to Gorbachev’s Soviet Union, thwarting Gorbachev’s efforts to engage the United States in a positive-sum relationship. The critical question to be answered, and the focus of this study, is: Once Gorbachev decided to seek a new relationship with the United States, how did he convince policy makers in the United States to cooperate?

International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War

Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev held their fifth and final official summit in December of 1988. The day after Gorbachev’s inspirational appearance before the United Nations General Assembly—an event that many analysts saw as a breakthrough moment in Gorbachev’s attempt to transform the very nature of relations between the superpowers—President Reagan gave Mr. Gorbachev a
photograph of the two of them walking in the woods at their first summit meeting three years earlier in Geneva. Expressive of the nascent understanding of the true impact of Gorbachev’s new thinking in foreign policy, the inscription on the photograph read, “We have walked a long way together to clear a path for peace.”

In May of 1989 President George Bush—himself beginning to understand the transformation wrought by Gorbachev’s efforts in foreign affairs—proclaimed the end of the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union. The goal of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union would from that day forward be more ambitious than any previous U.S. leader could have thought possible. What the president sought, as he was to repeat many times over the next several weeks, was to move beyond containment and toward some new relationship with the Soviet Union.

In the months and years that followed, the trends that had precipitated the Bush announcement accelerated. One after another the countries of Eastern Europe convulsed with populist energy. The various national Communist parties, including that of the Soviet Union, lost their legally mandated primacy. The revolutions that swept Eastern Europe beginning in 1989 marked for many the point of transition to the new way of thinking and the new world order. The aftershocks of those first tectonic transformations
were the attempted coup in the Soviet Union in August of 1991, the rise of Boris Yeltsin, and the eventual dismantling of the monolith of the Soviet Union.

The early 1990s were a period of great intellectual fomentation for practitioners and theoreticians of international relations. Many of the comfortable assumptions about the nature of the international system and of the requirements of U.S. national security within that system were called into question. Some went so far as to suggest that it may have been a period of paradigm shift—a time when all of the old intellectual structures are replaced with a completely new way of thinking about the world. Realism and *realpolitik* were under attack in a manner not seen in the postwar period.

One might have suspected that as communism waned, U.S. foreign policy would have seized the moment, transitioning to some form of post-containment foreign policy, thereby fulfilling the promise of May. One would have been disappointed. The United States did not attain a new vision in its foreign policy toward the Soviet Union, despite the assurances of then-House Armed Services Committee Chairman Les Aspin (D-Wisconsin) that the early 1990s would see a series of Gorbachev-driven defense budgets. The dramatic changes that occurred in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union unleashed a frenzy of activity in American academe as international relations scholars sought the essence of a new foreign policy toward a changing Soviet Union. But defense decision makers were content to continue their allegiance to the familiar strategies of
containment. By the mid-1990s budgetary concerns forced the new cold warriors to accept a containment strategy at reduced levels of forces. The essence of containment, nevertheless, endured. The Soviet Union remained the target of the U.S. policy of containment until the collapse of that empire in late 1991. But the Soviet Union was not to be the last target of containment, despite the fact that the strategy was devised specifically to counter the Soviet expansionist threat. U.S. policy makers have misunderstood the end of the cold war and the lessons it teaches about containment. As a result, cold war-like thinking guided policy formulation in a host of other circumstances: the Persian Gulf, Bosnia, Russia, and the other follow-on former Soviet republics. The essence of containment appears to be the only arrow in the foreign policy quiver, a situation that bodes ill for a country, like the United States, that finds itself pressed into service around the globe.

There was much to be learned from Soviet foreign policy in the years 1985 to 1991, including the manner in which interactions between U.S. and Soviet foreign policies impacted the policy choices of the American and Soviet leadership. By the end of 1991, pushed to the right by domestic opposition, the pace of New Thinking-driven change in Soviet foreign policy had slowed, and despite the remarkable changes put into place by Gorbachev over the previous six years many of the familiar structures of U.S.-Soviet cold war relations remained in place.
One of the great failings of U.S. foreign policy, especially as it has related to the Soviet Union over the last several decades, has been its tendency to focus on the here and now. Until the attempted coup in the Soviet Union in August 1991, and perhaps even for several months thereafter, U.S. diplomats and politicians fixated—some have argued to a dangerous degree—on Mikhail Gorbachev. As Gorbachev's importance inside the crumbling Soviet Union faded, so too did American interest in the man who many concede was responsible for the single most important event in postwar history. Had the Gorbachev Doctrine continued, perhaps the radical transformation of relations and the lessons learned would have been completed. But politics would not allow that to happen. Mikhail Gorbachev's policies were just beginning to have an effect on the way U.S. policy makers saw the world, but there was insufficient time for the real lessons to be learned.

The Gorbachev moment in international politics ended on December 25, 1991. For six years he had walked a tightrope between the opponents of reform and those, including the governments of the West, who continuously pushed him to accelerate the pace of change. On December 25, Boris Yeltsin shook the rope one last time, and Gorbachev plunged into history. John Dunlop chronicles that last day.

December 25: On Yeltsin's initiative, the Russian parliament votes overwhelmingly to change the name of the republic from RSFSR to Russian (Rossiiskaya) Federation, or simply Russia. Gorbachev hands over the codes controlling 27,000 nuclear weapons to
officials of the Russian Federation. At 7:35 P.M., workers lower
the red hammer-and-sickle flag from atop the Kremlin. At 7:45
P.M., the red, white, and blue Russian tricolor is raised in its
place.®

The Failure of International Relations Theory

A number of theoretical and substantive literatures will inform this inquiry
which attempts to answer the second of a two-part question. The first part,
studies focusing on why the cold war ended, have already received a great deal
of attention. Beginning where those studies end, this work will attempt to
explore how—i.e. the mechanism by which—the cold war ended as it did.

The end of the cold war caught Western policy makers and analysts
completely off guard. Neither Sovietologists nor international relations
specialists were able to anticipate even to the smallest degree the Soviet
repudiation of Marxist-Leninism and the ensuing deideologization of
international politics. Philip Stewart, a noted Sovietologist, wondered how it
was that all of the discipline's theories of Soviet politics failed to predict or
explain the changes evident as early as 1989.® The frenzied debate in the
literature demonstrates that the field of international relations was no more
able to explain these changes.

'If you are a student, switch from political science to history.' Such
was the blunt reply of Robert Conquest, the distinguished Anglo-
American historian of the Soviet Union, when asked to draw
lessons from the abortive coup against Mikhail Gorbachev in August 1991. Conquest is hardly a neutral observer, but he does have a point. The efforts theorists have made to create a 'science' of politics that would forecast the future course of world events have produced strikingly unimpressive results: none of the three general approaches to theory that have evolved since 1945 came anywhere close to anticipating how the cold war would end.\textsuperscript{10}

The specific mystery in the end of the cold war is not so much that it ended, but in how it ended. John Gaddis's essay on the failure of international relations theories to forecast the end of the cold war, for example, is most interested in the fact that the cold war ended peacefully. Theories of international relations and strategies of international political practice all anticipated one of several ends to political confrontations of the type represented by the U.S.-Soviet cold war—none were expected to be peaceful. Either the faltering power or its rival were expected to instigate conflict, and the relatively bloodless reorganization of international politics in the late 1980s remains, therefore, quite shocking. "Two very surprising things happened to the Soviet Union under Gorbachev's stewardship. First, the regime crumbled at quite remarkable speed. In the second place, and even more surprisingly, it did so with relatively little bloodshed. In 1985 it would have been difficult to predict either eventuality."\textsuperscript{11} It is this inability to anticipate how the Cold War would end—and subsequently to understand what transpired during the end game of U.S.-Soviet relations—that is the fatal shortcoming of our theories of international relations.\textsuperscript{12}
Long cycle theories, for example, indicate that great powers, and the Soviet Union in particular, would lash out rather than accept diminished international status. Specific analyses of the prospects of Soviet decline support that more general conclusion. Writing in 1987, Paul Kennedy noted that the Soviet Union was in a classical position of a Great Power in decline. A paranoid, highly militaristic political legacy limited the capacity of the Soviet regime to address the fundamental issues of economic decline, pushing the giant closer to the brink. In the end, Kennedy warned, the decline of the Soviet Union might well have been an event for the United States to fear, rather than embrace.\(^\text{13}\) William Wohlforth has drawn the distinction between the decline of a hegemon and the decline of a challenger, arguing that the Soviet Union, as a declining challenger, posed less of a threat of violence.\(^\text{14}\) But one must also recognize the pace and magnitude of Soviet decline, and the fact that the Soviet Union faced not just the prospect of perpetuation of its second class status, but the very real possibility of its extinction. With the stakes thus much higher, the risk of a Soviet explosion was much greater.

Classical realism, on the other hand, might suggest that seeing its primary rival weakened, the United States would escalate its confrontation, making and consolidating gains at the Soviet Union's expense. This is especially the case if realist scholars are correct in their assumptions that states are concerned with relative gains and fear that a weakened enemy could once again
grow strong, or that a strong ally could become an enemy. In any case, these theories of international relations could not anticipate that the end of the cold war would be a relatively peaceful and cooperative global condominium. And, as chapter 2 will point out, even those theorists who hypothesize in general terms the possibility of an evolution of cooperation are unable to extend those explanations to the case of the Soviet Union and the United States, given the nature of the conflict, the history of animosity, and the legacy of distrust. Evidence of that legacy can be found in the fact that in May of 1989, while President Bush was declaring the end of the cold war, many of his chief advisors continued to question the veracity and commitment of the Soviet leadership in general and Mikhail Gorbachev specifically. In the end, the relatively peaceful end of the cold war, the decline and fall of the Soviet Union, and the accommodation to that reality by the United States, remains, to our theories of international relations, a mystery.

Hindsight does not seem able to correct this failure of theory. Charles Kegley recently attempted to lay out a series of principles to guide explorations into the end of the Cold War. A great deal of his argument is sound, providing valuable assistance for future investigations in this area. In one significant respect, however, Kegley's work confuses two very important and independent avenues of future investigation: why and how the cold war came to an end. More than a semantic distinction, these two questions, properly understood, seek
to discover: first, what factors led the actors—in this case the Soviet Union and/or the United States—to seek to end the cold war; and second, once they had decided to seek cooperation, what strategies did they adopt to achieve that end.

Despite the title of Kegley's piece—"How Did the Cold War Die?"—his focus is almost exclusively on why the cold war ended. Kegley examines the approaches the various international relations theories would take to explain the end of the cold war. He is exploring, in effect, which factors may have led the Gorbachev government to decide to opt out of the superpower competition. That question is certainly significant, and a number of scholars are investigating those issues. But there is a second, perhaps more critical question which Kegley's treatment obscures: the question of how the cold war ended.

Kegley, noting that explanations from what he calls the "realist right" of international relations enjoy a certain widespread acceptance, chooses to focus his analysis on approaches from the realist right perspective. Kegley's obfuscation becomes apparent as he lays out his prescription for what issues future research should address. Confusing cause and effect, Kegley reminds us that reciprocity is a defining force in relationships like that between the Soviet Union and the United States, "...with hostility breeding hostility and cooperation breeding cooperation..." At the same time, he posits that the cold war's cycle of mistrust and confrontation was broken by reciprocity. Who moved first, Gorbachev or Reagan, depends on which paragraph one reads. But it is clear
that his understanding of causation is incomplete. Building on the understanding within the discipline that Yuri Andropov possessed reformist sentiments of his own, Kegley refers to both Andropov and Gorbachev as visionaries. Keeping with his earlier commitment to the notion of reciprocity, Kegley notes that,

Andropov and Gorbachev began to shift their country's course not when Reagan's unrestrained hostility toward the Russians was being most energetically practiced, but only after Reagan himself shifted to a more accommodative course, as reflected in his radical anti-nuclear turnaround. This shift in Washington began to crystallize in 1984, became transparent at the October 1986 Reykjavik Summit, and finally coalesced into Reagan's personal commitment to compromise and conciliation.19

Yuri Andropov died on February 9, 1984, and was incapacitated for some time prior to his death. It is, therefore, highly unlikely that President Reagan's policy shift, which had only just begun in early 1984, could have had any impact on Andropov. More importantly, this illustrates Kegley's confusion of cause and effect—of the question of why the process of warming in U.S.-Soviet relations began, versus how that process was carried out.

The peaceful end of the cold war was an unexpected and unparalleled event. "History contains no precedent for so striking an example of abrupt but amicable collapse. Either the world has been extraordinarily lucky, or linear evolution has pushed the familiar cycles of war, peace and decline into a new and wholly unfamiliar environment. How does one account for—and how might one have anticipated—this development?"20 Unfortunately, those questions are
The Intellectual Limitations of Traditional Social Scientific Inquiry

Political science, stressing the "science," strives for generalizable theories that provide useful explanations across a variety of different cases. The "positivist revolution" in political science, beginning as early as the 1920s and transforming the nature of political science beginning in the immediate postwar years, was a reaction to the diplomatic history tradition which provided a great amount of detail of individual cases, but which was short on generalizable theories of behavior.

In the 1960s political science experienced what David Easton called the "post-behavioral revolution." Post-behavioralists were deconstructionists in the classic sense. Their concern was that behavioralism, in its striving for elegance, parsimony, and value neutrality, limited its scope of discovery—circumscribed the advance of knowledge within small, incremental circles under the shadow of the existing order of society. They believed that behavioralism, as they saw it practiced in the 1960s, helped prop up or perpetuate existing social relations.

Perhaps the deconstructionist take on behavioralism is a bit excessive, but many of the arguments of the post-behavioralists should point the way for
political inquiry. Post-behavioralists claim that the behavioral obsession with generalizable explanations becomes ahistorical and abstract. They are rankled by the glib assurances of the behavioralists that abstraction—and its concurrent loss of detail—is a necessary component of the scientific method which does no injury to the pursuit of knowledge. And the behavioralist charge that the post-behavioral obsession with historical detail violates the scientific method only underscores the basic contradiction between the application of scientific method to issues of politics. William Riker indicates that the more traditional methods of political science can “produce only wisdom and neither science nor knowledge. And while wisdom is certainly useful in the affairs of men, such a result is a failure to live up to the promise in the name of political science.” (Emphasis in original)\(^{24}\)

Wisdom, however, may prove to be of greater intellectual value than “scientific” knowledge. Sheldon Wolin argues:

The methodistic assumption holds that the truth of statements yielded by scientific methods has certain features, such as rigor, precision, and quantifiability. The connection between the statements and their features is intimate so that one is encouraged to believe that when he (sic) is offered statements rigorous, precise, and quantifiable, he is in the presence of truth. On the other hand, an approach to the “facts” consisting of statements which palpably lack precision, quantifiability, or operational value is said to be false, vague, unreliable, or even “mystical.” In actuality, the contrast is not between the true and the false, the reliable and the unreliable, but between truth which is economical, replicable, and easily packaged, and truth which is not. Methodistic truth can be all these things because it is relatively indifferent to context; theoretical truth cannot, because its foundation in tacit political
knowledge shapes it toward what is politically appropriate rather than towards what is scientifically operational.\(^{25}\)

In problems political, context is often critical, and context can vary based on case-specific—some might say idiosyncratic—factors. I will expand on this argument considerably in the next chapter, but there is a substantial literature which suggests that a number of critical components of choice and strategy are heavily dependent on individual differences of historical cases. The vanguard of the post-behavioral revolution argued that the obsession with methodism severely restricted the scope of the growth of knowledge. Dahl worried that such an obsession, "...can turn into an absorbing search for mere trivialities unless it is guided by some sense of the difference between an explanation that would not matter much even if it could be shown to be valid by the most advanced scientific methods now available, and one that would matter a great deal if it should turn out to be a little more or a little less plausible than before."\(^{26}\) Dahl, Easton, and others urged that inquiry be guided by speculation and imagination, because therein lay the key to truly revolutionary political inquiry.

**Idiosyncratic Variables: Elite Beliefs and the End of the Cold War**

These arguments from a methodological debate that began thirty years ago illuminate the failure of the multitude of international relations theories to
foresee the peaceful end of the cold war. Perhaps this failure resulted from an incrementalist approach derivative of obsessive methodism. More specifically, certain types of explanations have been unwelcome under the tent of international relations theory, at least one of which offers to radically improve the understanding of the end of the cold war.

There is substantial evidence that a great deal of the change in the nature of U.S. and Soviet foreign policy originated in the specific policy choices made by a single individual: Mikhail Gorbachev. As Gorbachev came to power, he realized that the future of the Soviet Union was bleak unless it was able to break out of the harmful, conflictive relationship it had with the United States. Borrowing some of the terminology and techniques from the game theory tradition, I argue that Gorbachev recognized the nature of the payoff structure: he realized the United States was playing a form of Deadlock, and he understood that continuing to play would mean a disastrous end for the Soviet Union. He needed to change the game the United States was playing from Deadlock into something that would be much more likely to elicit a reciprocal cooperative response.

Such an emphasis on the role of an individual actor is sure to make mainstream political scientists uncomfortable, especially given the overwhelming influence of behavioralism in the discipline. Applying the behavioral critique examined above, one would expect a flat rejection of any
work that attempted to explain such monumental systemic changes by reference to the attributes of a single actor. Generalizability, elegance, parsimony, and replicability appear to be impossible. James Rosenau and Eileen Crumm, recognize that "the paucity of even embryonic theoretical perspectives on dyadic relationships can be readily illustrated from the literature on U.S.-Russian relations," and bemoan any reliance on the nature of the U.S. and Soviet leadership group to explain changes in the U.S.-Soviet relationship.

Crumm and Rosenau identify three problems that might emerge from a focus on an individual leader as an instrument of change. "At best, such studies integrate the contributions of leaders into a larger context. At worst, the variability-by-leader form of theory presumes that individual variables predominate over all others with the result that the U.S.-Russian relationship is seen to begin afresh with each change in leadership. No less important, the variability-by-leader form of theory tends to presume that only individual variables undergo transformation...neither of these assumptions is tenable..." None of these concerns is valid or applicable to the present inquiry. I will address each of the three concerns separately, beginning with the third.

Crumm and Rosenau argue that many studies with a focus on an individual leader presume that only the individual variables undergo transformation. In this study, that is simply not true. In addition, the consideration of this issue will provide an opportunity to return to the earlier
discussion of the post-behavioral revolution of the 1960s in its 1990s guise as the third debate in international relations.

The intellectual pursuit of an understanding of international relations has long been dominated by the theory of realism. Centered, as it is, on concepts of power, interest, and rationality, with its understanding of the anarchic nature of the international milieu, realism captured the nature of states in conflict in the international order. Robert Keohane testifies to the epistemological dominance of realism: "For over 2000 years, what Hans J. Morgenthau dubbed 'Political Realism' has constituted the principal tradition for the analysis of international relations in Europe and its offshoots in the new world." Realism was especially well formulated to explain the behavior of states during the period of the cold war. The nature of political and military struggle that characterized cold war interstate relations was precisely what realism addressed.

In its more traditional form, however, realism is less successful in dealing with questions of cooperation, especially in areas of politics and national security. Joseph Grieco writes:

For realists, international anarchy fosters competition and conflict among states and inhibits their willingness to cooperate even when they share common interests. Realist theory also argues that international institutions are unable to mitigate anarchy's constraining effects on inter-state cooperation. Realism, then, presents a pessimistic analysis of the prospects for international cooperation and of the capabilities of international institutions.
The end of the cold war, then, would seem to deprive realism of its primacy in international relations, and other methodological traditions have been quick to sign the death certificate.\textsuperscript{32}

International relations is at methodological odds with itself. The major methodological traditions each assert their own exclusive capacity to explain international politics, while at the same time each tradition further splinters. Realists argue with neorealists over such issues as whether states seek power, or whether they are motivated by survival to seek security, and neoliberal institutionalists, collective security theorists, and constructivists vie for the institutionalist crown.\textsuperscript{33}

The existence of so many voices is not necessarily harmful, but their pretenses of exclusivity most certainly damage political inquiry. Perhaps it is natural that a discipline, responding to decades of criticism that it is unable to measure up to the standards of science, judges works in the field based on methodological rigor. However predictable or understandable, the methodological monism prevalent in international relations is artificial at best and intellectually dishonest at worst.

First and foremost, it trades a more complete understanding of events for parsimony. The realist contention that a state's basic motive is survival does little to help understand the choices among various alternative political strategies a given state or individual leader may make. Looking inside that
“black box” not only provides a better understanding of the nature of change in the international system, it also more fully empowers international relations theory. Causation for change in the international system does not run in only one direction—either the system to the unit or vice versa. There are loops and feedbacks. The structure of the international system and the distribution of power and capabilities within it most clearly condition the choices of unit-level actors, but other factors may also impact those choices. In addition, the choices made by individual unit-level actors can have direct or indirect implications for the structure of the system and the distribution of power within it. That reality offers guidance for the structure of inquiry in international politics.

Peter Gourevitch concluded:

The international system is not only a consequence of domestic politics and structures but a cause of them. Economic relations and military pressures constrain an entire range of domestic behaviors, from policy decisions to political forms. International relations and domestic politics are therefore so interrelated that they should be analyzed simultaneously, as wholes.

The case of the end of the cold war, specifically the actions of Mikhail Gorbachev in repudiating the Brezhnev doctrine and permitting the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe to disintegrate, provides evidence as to the artificial nature of the distinction between the methodological traditions and illustrates the multidirectional nature of causation in international politics.

The question to be addressed is why Gorbachev allowed the states of the Soviet Eastern European empire to assert their autonomy and dismantle the
Warsaw Pact. Koslowski and Kratochwil, representing the constructivists, explain it this way:

Maintaining Soviet predominance in Eastern Europe through military intervention was counterproductive because the growth of civil society and organized resistance made such a course of action exceedingly costly and threatened the very continuation of perestroika at home. Seen from this perspective, the concessions that are unexplainable or irrational within the realist framework become deliberate, though risky rational policy moves, even though they ultimately failed.37

The existence of political resistance to forcible maintenance of empire created in the minds of the Soviet leadership—Gorbachev in particular—a situation in which it would have simply been too costly to hold on to Eastern Europe. John Mearsheimer argues the realists' case:

(Gorbachev's) decision to shut down the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe can very well be explained by realism. By the mid-1980s, the Soviet Union was suffering an economic and political crisis at home that made the costs of empire prohibitive, especially since nuclear weapons provided the Soviets with a cheap and effective means of defense. Many empires collapsed and many states broke apart before 1989, and many of them sought to give dire necessity the appearance of virtue.38 (Emphasis added)

The difference, it appears, is slight. The constructivists attempt to peer inside the black box of Gorbachev's decision making to understand the options Gorbachev perceived available at the time and to further understand his ultimate choice. The realists imply that Gorbachev had no options, the outcome ultimately dictated by systemic factors. This example illustrates the implications of methodological choice on the nature of explanation: neither
investigator fully explains the event, while each further perceives that it has, in fact, done so.

The Gorbachev case additionally underscores the multidirectional nature of causation in international politics. The choice of a traditional methodological approach, with its commitment to a single level of analysis, is an intellectual commitment to the notion of unidirectionality of causation. The political scientist selects a level of analysis, locates independent variables within that level, and seeks change in dependent variables. The direction of causation in research so structured is of necessity unitary, and in fact decided prior to the investigation. What the Gorbachev case should demonstrate is exactly the opposite.39

Systemic factors may have led Gorbachev to the question of the disposition of the Eastern European empire. In fact, systemic factors may have played a significant part in Gorbachev's initial realization that radical reform, including its foreign policy aspects in the form of New Thinking, was essential to the survival of the Soviet state. The realization that something must be done, however, in no way directed the decision of what must be done. In 1985 Gorbachev stood at a place where the road diverged into many different paths. The need to cultivate the support of the Soviet people, the differing requirement to cultivate the support of the intelligentsia, the military, and the Party, to balance between the supporters of radical reform and those opposed to all
reform, the requirements of Marxist-Leninist theory, the influence of other states, and other factors all influenced the policy choices of the next four to six years. At the same time, those choices impacted the structure of the international system, or at least the distribution of power and resources within it, as well as the sub-systemic milieu of other states interacting with the Soviet Union during that time. Drawing from Deborah Welch Larson's work on the impact of particular individuals on the beginning of the cold war, this research will demonstrate that international relations were different in 1991 than they would have been had Gorbachev not assumed command of the Soviet Union in March of 1985, or if he had taken a different path. 

Properly understood, then, political analysis should eschew the methodological monism of traditional inquiry, opting instead for a methodologically pluralistic approach, conscious of the dangers inherent in such a strategy.

"The task, as highlighted by the third debate, is neither the discovery of some ahistorical and universal scientific method nor the attainment of some objectively validated truth about world politics. It is rather a matter of promoting a more reflexive intellectual environment in which debate, criticism, and novelty can freely circulate. The international relations scholarly community—like all communities of inquiry—is communicatively constituted, and its success is partially conditioned by its ability to sustain and enhance the quality of argument in the context of deeply entrenched paradigmatic diversity. "The proper attitude for such situations,' suggests Terrence Ball, 'is less one of live and let live than of talking and listening."
The third debate underscores the need to understand, as Crumm and Rosenau seem to understand, that variables at all levels of analysis are subject to change. This project will proceed across levels of analysis, as did the work of Snyder and Diesing and others, not only because that process more clearly mirrors international political interaction, but because building such bridges between levels will aid in a more complete understanding of complex political events. Multidisciplinary studies of human conflict have the potential to provide not only better answers, but more powerful tools for use in future analyses.

The second argument made by Crumm and Rosenau against a focus on an individual leader as a source of change is that such studies tend to presume that individual variables predominate over other variables. Remembering the earlier argument regarding the place of context in political inquiry, it is possible that in some cases individual variables will prove sufficient to explain change. In other cases, they may be necessary but not sufficient, and in others, they may prove completely irrelevant. It may also be the case that the importance one ascribes to the role of individual variables will be dictated to a degree by the nature of the question being investigated. If, for example, one were concerned with explanations of cycles of instability in the international system, individual variables might prove to have less explanatory power than they would were one
concerned with, for example, how states alter their foreign policies in response to cycles of instability in the international system.

Such a conclusion may lack the elegance of more law-like explanations of change, but the nature of political events precludes such elegance. Bruce Russett explains, "If internal and other processes are reasonably uniform, then we might hope to explain large portions of variance with law-like propositions such as those that appear to operate in many areas of physics. Most analysts would now conclude that such uniformity does not exist, and that contextual variation, introduced by the effect of additional variables, will be important." The impact of detail on explanation could be such that individual variables control outcome, and that is more likely in situations that mirror what Koehane called "multiple exit solutions." Consistent with this thinking, Herbert Simon provides perspective on the choice of scientific model for political analysts:

We sometimes, perhaps, experience a mild malaise in that our research does not seem to be taking us in the direction of a few sweeping generalizations that encompass the whole of political behavior. A hope of finding our 'three laws of motion' was probably a major part of the appeal of rational choice theory in its purer forms. But a more careful look at the natural sciences would show us that they, too, get only a little mileage from their general laws. Those laws have to be fleshed out by a myriad of facts, all of which must be harvested by laborious empirical research. Perhaps our aspirations for lawfulness should be modeled upon the complexities of molecular biology—surely a successful science, but hardly a neat one—rather than upon the simplicities of classical mechanics.

In the case under consideration here, the end game of the cold war, it is undoubtedly true that systemic, domestic politics, and individual variables
interacted to cause the change. The argument will be developed here that the
Soviet Union under Mikhail Gorbachev initiated a foreign policy very much like
the policy of Graduated Reciprocation in Tension-reduction (GRIT) described by
Charles E. Osgood in 1962.47 The argument is not that Gorbachev explicitly
offered to initiate GRIT, or even that he was aware of a theory by that name,
although it may be possible to trace previous understanding of such unilateral
processes to a number of Gorbachev's advisors. Rather, the argument is that the
language and behavior of Soviet policy makers, at least since the 27th Party
Congress, were consistent with the language and behavior of a leadership group
engaged in a GRIT-like process. GRIT, understood in this fashion, is a model
that can help to explain both Soviet foreign policy decision making beginning in
1985, and in part U.S. policy in the early 1990s. Systemic variables may have
both motivated Gorbachev to seek change, and circumscribed the options for
change available to him. But the power of Osgood's GRIT theory is in its impact
on systemic variables.

Much systems-level research in political science is based on raw, objective,
measurable levels of resources, arguing that certain levels of capabilities are
associated with certain behaviors. With statistical manipulation, those studies
can achieve "significant" results. But raw numbers are less critical to the choice
of policy and strategy than the perception of those variables by individual
leaders. GRIT offers a way to change the perceptions, hammering away at long-
held images and attributions, to expand the range of choices available to the policy maker. Resource limitation and distribution will continue to play a role in the final outcome, but it will prove impossible to determine what that final outcome may be without an attempt to understand the perceptions of individual policy makers.

Crumm and Rosenau argue, third, that the best use of individual variables is to integrate them into a larger context. To be fair, Crumm and Rosenau do make provisions for the incorporation of certain individual characteristics, the risk-orientation of individual policy makers, for example, although their tone and argument suggest that they would prefer to find a way to exclude all such factors. As I have argued to this point, however, incorporation of these individual variables is essential to complete understanding of political change.

Critics of the emphasis on a single actor might also argue that it is, itself, an overly-simplistic abstraction. An entire branch of political inquiry has arisen around the question of how competing domestic interest groups impact the end product of foreign policy. Nation-states, those analysts argue, "do not possess tolerance; nor do they deceive or threaten. People do these things." And for many of these theorists it is the interaction of those people, each with different power within the decision making block and each with different preference orderings, that negotiate the outcome of foreign policy.
Bruce Bueno de Mesquita recognizes those concerns in *The War Trap*, a work in which he is attempting to ascribe intent to policy choices—the choice to initiate war. He argues that in his case, he is looking at questions of the initiation of war which tend to focus decision making authority in a single person or a small group, justifying in his mind the “as if” principle—dealing with foreign policy choices “as if” they were made by a single actor. He also determines that simplifying assumptions such as the “as if” principle, make the scientific study of important political questions more feasible.

If Bueno de Mesquita is correct that questions of war and peace focus decision making authority in a few hands, then that certainly applies to the Gorbachev case. Gorbachev was involved in a crisis with the ultimate stakes—national survival—and he was enveloped by those issues from the moment he took power. A different explanation of how a single individual assumed control of the bulk of decision-making authority in the Soviet Union and was thereby able to orchestrate the relatively peaceful end of the cold war may be even more plausible.

Questions about the role of domestic coalitions in policy outcomes appear to be much more significant in discussion of democratic or at least pluralistic political systems. In those types of systems, individuals with competing views, tapping domestic regional variation in public opinion, will populate the decision making landscape. In less representative political structures, competing voices
are heard during the process of selecting the leadership. Once those decisions are made, opposition is often weakened, having just lost the selection battle. This is not to say that leaders in authoritarian governments enjoy carte blanche; even in the Soviet Union western analysts are familiar with the "guns vs. butter" debates and the competing viewpoints of the military and economic interest groups. But the process may not be such that the system arrives at some compromise policy. Rather, it appears to be cyclical: the dominant actor holds sway while the policy is resisted and, perhaps eventually, redirected. But for a time, it may be correct to say that a single actor determines the policy choice.

That pattern seems to be very similar to what transpired during the Gorbachev period in the Soviet Union. Many of the political battles between reformists and traditionalists were fought over the appointment of the successor to Leonid Brezhnev. Yuri Andropov was known to have reformist tendencies, and his chief rival, Konstantin Chernenko, was a plodding traditionalist. Andropov was appointed, and showed signs of advancing a modest reform agenda. Taken ill shortly after assuming power, Andropov was quite ineffective until his death in 1984. Konstantin Chernenko followed Andropov, the reformists having already spent their political capital. One year later a weak and ineffective Chernenko died, and the battle of succession began anew.
Gorbachev, known as a disciple of Andropov and a reformer, was challenged by Viktor Grishin, the Moscow party chief, and Grigory Romanoff, a hardline Politburo member. But the party leadership favored a forward-looking "younger Andropov," and Gorbachev was selected unanimously in an overnight meeting following the death of Chernenko. His preeminence bolstered by the clear support of the party leadership, Gorbachev set about consolidating his domestic political position. John Dunlop argues that Gorbachev clearly desired and intended to emerge as "the dominant force in Soviet politics," and he did so by cultivating his supporters and marginalizing or replacing the opposition. The *aparachik* system that served Soviet leaders from the time of the revolution, also served Gorbachev in those first months and years. Studies of the structures of Soviet foreign policy decision-making uncovered Gorbachev's successful attempts to restructure foreign policy personnel and institutions in order to "gain greater personal control of the formation and execution of Soviet policy.

Gorbachev, by virtue of his victory and political maneuvering, was in a position to direct decision making. It is not much of a simplification to hypothesize, therefore, that Gorbachev initiated a package of economic and political reforms and a new foreign policy toward the United States. Many of those same Sovietologists who recognized that Gorbachev had consolidated a great deal of decision making authority also realized that there remained a real
potential for infighting and disruption. Opposition and dissension there surely were, and they were eventually to so weaken Gorbachev politically that compromise became necessary. Eventually, domestic opposition resulted in his removal from power, the dismantling of the Soviet Union, and the essential repudiation of Gorbachev's foreign policy reforms. But from the early part of his tenure in 1985 through some time in 1989, Gorbachev's views held sway and the opposition, while sometimes vocal, was unable to derail Gorbachev's plans.

Sarah Mendelson concurs:

In the case of the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and change in Soviet policy in the late 1980s in general, new thinking and reformist ideas encouraged shifts in policy. They were not, however, sufficient for bringing about policy changes. Ideas about reform would still be circulating in institutes in Novosibirsk, Moscow, and Leningrad with little impact on policy were it not for the strategies implemented by Gorbachev and his advisers.

Cooperation as a Key Operationalization of the End of the Cold War

To this point I have been talking in fairly broad terms about the end game of the cold war. Some might ask exactly what is meant by those terms; in other words, how do we know what we are observing. Kegley indicates that the discipline had yet to define what was meant by the notion of the "death of the cold war," leaving it up to individual researchers to define what they mean by the term. Kegley also offers some candidates for consideration, suggesting the end of the
cold war might be understood, alternatively, as the end of Soviet control of the Union, the end of the military threat to the West, or the breakup of the Eastern European empire. I will choose to define the end of the cold war in terms of levels of cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Cooperation will serve as an operationalization for several reasons. First and foremost, it captures what was occurring in U.S.-Soviet relations. The sociology literature deals extensively with the question of cooperation, and Michael Argyle provides a useful starting point for defining cooperation. In common parlance cooperation may be understood as a joint undertaking for mutual reward—that is, a situation is cooperative if two or more people work together for external rewards. A group of neighbors getting together to build a playground for their children, for example, would be cooperation.

Argyle argues that such a conceptualization is too narrow because it too closely circumscribes the motives of the actors involved. He believes, in other words, that people work together for reasons other than some external reward, and that those activities should be considered cooperative as well. "Cooperation (is) acting together in a coordinated way at work, leisure, or in social relationships, in the pursuit of shared goals, the enjoyment of the joint activity, or simple furthering the relationship." That broadened conception of motivation has important ramifications for understanding the limitations of game theory as will be amplified in chapter two. Game theory is based on the
more constricted view of motivation, measuring payoffs in ordinal terms and assuming that actors, as rational decision makers, seek only to maximize that ordinal payoff. We may come to understand that many of the moves in real world game situations are motivated by something more fully captured by Argyle's conceptualization.

There is also a sizeable political science literature dealing with cooperation. Helen Milner surveyed a great deal of that literature and determined that the political science literature largely makes use of a common definition of cooperation based on the work of Robert Keohane. Cooperation is conceived as a situation in which “actors adjust their behavior to the actual or anticipated preferences of others.” This is accomplished through a process of “policy coordination” in which policies are adjusted to decrease the negative consequences of policy for some other state. The hallmark of cold war relations between the United States and the Soviet Union was near-complete indifference for the negative consequences of policy on the welfare of the other party. In many instances negative consequences for the other state was a goal of policy, or at least viewed as a side benefit; and positive consequences for the other party were at best coincidental to the benefits received by the first party. When actors began to evidence a shift from that mindset, the cold war mentality was crumbling and the physical manifestations of that mentality collapsed.
One can observe those changes beginning to take place in the mid-1980s, and one can track the policy choices based on that new way of thinking. It is my hypothesis that Mikhail Gorbachev developed such a change in mindset, and set out to invest that new way of thinking into Soviet foreign policy. Further, it is my contention that Gorbachev realized that for the new thinking to successfully transform the security situation of the Soviet Union, it had to be mutual—the United States also had to develop a new way of thinking about its foreign policy toward the Soviet Union. Gorbachev attempted to alter the U.S. perspective of the world and the place of the Soviet Union in it.

Applying Osgood's GRIT theory to the most difficult case of the end stages of the U.S.-Soviet security relationship results in a novel understanding of the nature of cooperation, one cognizant of the impact of history and belief structures on the choices and strategies of international actors.

One additional qualifier is appropriate. This work is not an attempt to deify Mikhail Gorbachev. The changes in the international order that have occurred since Mikhail Gorbachev ascended to power in the Soviet Union are stunning. The Soviet Union, the chief political and military rival of the United States, has ceased to exist, altering forever the security environment of the United States. It is correct to suggest, from a Western perspective, that the credit for those changes should go to Mikhail Gorbachev. But it would not be correct to say that those results were what Gorbachev had in mind. He did,
however, set a lot of things in motion. "Whether Gorbachev expected it or not—and that remains a question for historical debate—the withdrawal from Afghanistan was a resounding signal to the subject people of Eastern Europe, who threw off their Moscow-dominated regimes in rapid succession in the fall of 1989."\textsuperscript{63}

It is likely that Gorbachev's intentions were somewhat more modest. Gorbachev was a true believer—a committed Marxist-Leninist.\textsuperscript{64} His goal was to reinvigorate the Soviet economy and to preserve the Soviet Union, fulfilling, as he saw it, the promise of Marxist-Leninism. Motivation aside, however, the tools were the same. Gorbachev understood the link between the external security environment and the continuing and deepening economic and social malaise of the Soviet society. He believed fully that the future of the Soviet Union depended on a permanent change in the nature of international politics. Gorbachev sought to defuse the security dilemma and create a world in which the Soviet Union could survive and prosper, as a Marxist-Leninist state, in coexistence with the United States. The GRIT-like foreign policy strategy begun in 1985 was intended to do just that.
The Phases of Cooperation in U.S.-Soviet Relations

Understood in historical context, there were three phases of cooperation in U.S.-Soviet relations, as indicated below in figure 1.1. Phase 1 begins with the end of World War Two, although some might argue that the period of confrontation began with the Bolshevik Revolution and continued at least through 1985. Noting the collaboration in World War Two, even if generated by the existence of a common enemy, and Stalin’s resurgent xenophobia in the postwar period, I choose 1945 as the starting point. Intellectually, it also makes sense to create a break at World War Two. So much of our thinking in the 1990s is conditioned by postwar experience, and so little is conditioned by pre-war or wartime experience, that we can garner a better understanding of perceptions and conditions by beginning with 1945.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1945-1985</td>
<td>Neither side wanted to cooperate*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1985-1988</td>
<td>Soviets wanted to cooperate; U.S. did not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1988-1992</td>
<td>Both sides wanted to cooperate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Along with the caveats listed below, this period is also exclusive of the years 1963-1964 during which time the first U.S.-Soviet experiment with a GRIT-like approach to relations may have been attempted, cut short by the assassination of U.S. president John F. Kennedy.

Figure 1.1: Phases of U.S.-Soviet Security Cooperation, 1945-1992
Some might argue that the characterization of the period 1945 to 1985 as one in which no cooperation occurred is simplistic and incorrect. I would agree, but that is not the position herein advanced. A great deal of cooperation occurred in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in that period. But the fact remains that competitive behaviors outstripped those that were more cooperative. "The ideas of cooperation and competition contended quite unequally during the cold war. Although there were champions of cooperation—in both countries—the rivalry between the two superpowers dominated their relationship."66

Two other arguments are important here. First, cooperation tended to be in areas outside the central politico-military core of issues. A number of analysts in the international relations field recognize that the economic and military spheres are quite different, and that cooperation is much more likely in the economic sphere than in the military.67 Realist scholars recognize two impediments to cooperation: concerns over cheating and defection, and relative gains considerations—the fear that any gains from cooperation made by your adversary will narrow the power gap between the two states or return to haunt you in the form of a resurgent enemy. Those impediments are magnified in the security arena. Because security issues tend to strike more closely to issues of national survival, the cost of betrayal is much higher. "There is a 'special peril of defection' in the military realm, because the nature of military weaponry
allows for rapid shifts in the balance of power. Such a development could create a window of opportunity for the cheating state to inflict a decisive defeat on the victim state.⁶⁸

In addition, economics is not primarily mixed motive. It is largely understood, in the post-mercantilist age, that trade, for example, at least that not involving Group of 77 countries, provides benefits to both parties. Security issues, however, involve fundamental opposition and mistrust. It is less clear in those circumstances that condominium would benefit both parties.

Still other analysts see the entire cold war period as an example of cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. Perhaps the classic work on this subject is John Gaddis's *The Long Peace*. In it, Gaddis argues that over the course of years certain rules of behavior developed that helped limit conflict between the superpowers. Reinforced by the existence of nuclear weapons on both sides, those rules of behavior, tacitly agreed to by both parties, were responsible for the fact that over the forty-plus years of the cold war, there was no direct military conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union.⁶⁹

While certain rules of behavior may have been understood by each party, the implied prohibition did not extend much beyond direct military confrontation between the two superpowers, and even that boundary was threatened on a number of occasions such as the two Berlin crises and the
Cuban missile crisis. Moreover, the Long Peace was a form of negative peace; the fact that Soviet and American tanks were not firing directly at one another was little comfort to the millions of people who were killed in proxy wars in the periphery, or by tyrannical puppet regimes of one authoritarian bent or another. The overwhelmingly confrontational nature of the superpower relationship allowed these brushfires to burn unchecked on the periphery. The U.S.-Soviet conflict institutionalized neglect of human rights, and, until Gorbachev, perpetuated itself.

In fact, the Long Peace period in U.S.-Soviet relations was cooperative only in the sense that the two powers tacitly agreed to limit their losses. In game theoretical terms, all the payoffs were negative, and cooperation, where it succeeded at all, merely kept the negative payoffs as small as possible. But there was no opportunity to break out of that cycle of negative payoffs because each side believed the other was locked into that negative game. As George Kennan wrote in his Long Telegram, “It is an undeniable privilege of every man to prove himself right in the thesis that the world is his enemy; for if he reiterates it frequently enough and makes it the background of his conduct he is bound eventually to be right.”

Finally, some might rightly note that a number of positive cooperative agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union appeared in the security sphere during the cold war. Again, however, in many instances the it
is a stretch to call them positive. SALT I, for example, permitted nuclear arsenals larger than those held by the superpowers at the time of the agreement and, in fact, approximately at the levels of planned expansion. The ABM Treaty was an attempt to shore up the doctrine of mutually assured destruction, based on a fear that partial defenses would allow one country to survive a ragged retaliatory strike where it may not have been able to survive an all-out first strike, thereby providing additional motivation to strike first, especially in crisis situations. In general, arms control agreements have been reached when the technologies are no longer valued by the signatories to the agreement. Arms control—at least that defined as negotiated agreements between two or more states—does not lead to political change; it follows from it. It must, because the legacy of mistrust and the fear of cheating will prevent meaningful arms control between rivals. Ken Adelman, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, concludes, "Parchment cannot bring peace; neither can arms control. Maybe it can help improve the political climate, but even that is questionable. That depends primarily upon whether Soviet behavior allows the climate to improve."
Evolving Reciprocal Cooperation

U.S.-Soviet relations in the Phase 1 period were quite bleak. The prospects for an evolution of relations with reciprocal cooperation and mutual positive payoff was virtually nil. But Gorbachev, in his own mind, realized the futility of that approach in Phase 2, and sought to change the nature of the relationship.

Many scholars are seeking to understand the transition from Phase 1 to Phase 2. Kenneth Oye has asked the questions this way: "If international relations can approximate both a Hobbesian state of nature and a Lockean civil society, why does cooperation emerge in some cases and not in others?"^72

Properly understood, however, there are really two questions regarding cooperation, each relating to one of the transitions between the phases of cooperation indicated in figure 1.1.

The first question, representative of the transition from Phase 1 to Phase 2, is "What circumstances favor the emergence of cooperation under anarchy?" In other words, the first question asks what factors might lead a nation to seek to initiate a cooperative relationship. It is a problem that has captivated international relations scholars. Regime theory and neoliberal institutionalism arose from explicit concerns with the inability of realism to explain cooperation between states. Game theorists have also taken up the challenge, seeking to understand how cooperation could be a rational choice for nations operating in
an international political system characterized by anarchy and self help. Despite the tremendous intellectual energy expended in pursuit of this understanding, it is fair to say that the international relations community is far from consensus, as the often heated exchanges between adherents of the different schools attest.

There has also been a great deal of work specific to the transition from Phase 1 to Phase 2 in U.S.-Soviet relations. As indicated earlier, Gorbachev understood that the Soviet economy was about to drag the Soviet state into oblivion, and that the demands of a competitive security relationship with the United States and the West inhibited the ability to reform the economy. Sarah Mendelson argues that Gorbachev was heavily influenced by a number of academicians and theorists in the institutes and universities in the Soviet Union, and that his beliefs regarding the need for reform were formulated prior to his taking power in March of 1985. While this remains an interesting question, it is a separate issue from the focus of this research project.

The second question, and the focus of this research, asks "What strategies can states adopt to foster the emergence of cooperation by altering the circumstances they confront?" Oye calls this the "prescriptive" aspect of the problem of cooperation, as opposed to the descriptive aspect captured in the first question. This looks at the transition from Phase 2 to Phase 3; assuming that one state has made the decision to attempt to break out of the competitive
relationship with its opponent, how does it entice the opponent to change its approach.

This issue is critical to the study of cooperation. International politics is not a one-player game. Unilaterally changing the way one plays it risks exploitation and defection with costs potentially as high as national survival. This may also have implications for the first question regarding what factors lead a state to seek to enter into a cooperative relationship with a rival. A significant body of research suggests that the decision to initiate an attempt to achieve cooperation is in part contingent on the belief of a state that its attempt to achieve cooperation will be successful. In other words, if this research demonstrates that Gorbachev's choice of the GRIT-like foreign policy toward the United States helped to achieve a change in the U.S. perception of the Soviet Union and began to facilitate reciprocal cooperation, it might well provide the evidence needed to convince other states involved in conflictive relationships to seek alternatives.

Steve Weber decries this use of GRIT theory in a fairly blistering attack:

"GRIT [is not] a valid theory of domestic politics. It is certainly not a theory of foreign policy or strategic interaction. GRIT by itself does not address the question of when a state is likely to adopt such a strategy; nor can it predict how or why the 'target' will respond (or fail to respond) to initiatives. GRIT is marginally valuable for its attention to real-world psychological and political impediments to cooperation that are by-passed by game theory. But it is basically just a prescriptive agenda for what states should do. GRIT itself does not predict or explain anything. (emphasis in original)"\(^5\)
That assessment simply is not fair or consistent. Certainly the question of what strategies a state can adopt to foster cooperation is formulated in a prescriptive manner, and there is undoubtedly a prescriptive aspect to the answer as states may look to the results of such research to guide policy. But reformulated, the question becomes "What factors influence the reciprocation of cooperative initiatives?" Looking to historical cases through that lens, the research is empirical and descriptive. Weber himself relies heavily on game theoretical explications of the evolution of cooperation. Those studies, like Axelrod's *The Evolution of Cooperation*, test the structure of a cooperative initiative—the rules an actor may adhere to in initiating a policy of cooperation—as an independent variable to determine ultimate payoffs from multiple iterations of the game. In other words, the structure of a cooperative initiative may explain some of the variance in the response of target states. Perhaps GRIT is not neatly packaged so as to be imported easily into a standard 2 X 2 game, but it is one such structure or set of rules that should be tested for its explanatory power.

The international relations community has committed tremendous resources to the study of this second question, the transition from Phase 2 to Phase 3. Laboratory experiments, computer game tournaments, empirical analyses of events data, and theoretical discussions among social psychologists and international relations scholars have all expressed support for the ideas to
be advanced in this project. Much of that evidence will be presented in chapter 2.

But far and away the vast majority of that work fails a crucial test which many of the authors seem not to understand. Their failing is that they ask the easy questions. Be it a commitment to methodological rigor or a simple lack of imagination, much of that work answers questions about a relationship that bears some resemblance to the U.S.-Soviet cold war relationship, but which fails to capture its complexities and nuances. As Dahl warned earlier, there is no understanding of the difference between an explanation that matters little, or matters a great deal.

The task before us requires more. It is simply insufficient to examine an abstraction or simplification of the U.S.-Soviet cold war relationship. Analysts hoping to better their understanding of the end game of the cold war, and by implication to begin to derive a body of theory from which to examine other cases of conflict, its devolution, and the evolution of cooperation, will be required to engage in a detailed examination of the U.S.-Soviet relationship. Borrowing organizing concepts from a number of methodological traditions, most significantly from political psychology and game theory, we may be able to organize the information gleaned from a detailed historical inquiry in a way that points to an innovative understanding of the end of the cold war. Most importantly, this effort, to be successful, cannot begin by asking which
alternatives will be selected out of those suggested by our methodologically-conditioned understanding of the options to be available to policy makers. It must begin by recognizing that the alternatives traditionally assumed to be available are inadequate to explain the behavior of the United States and the Soviet Union in the last half of the 1980s, and by asking what other alternatives might there be. David Easton explained the value of that approach:

If we take seriously the conclusions of the sociologists of knowledge, then our scientific output is very much shaped by the ethical perspectives we hold. In that event, by failing to encourage within the discipline creative speculation about political alternatives in the largest sense, we cannot help but imprison ourselves within the limitations of the ongoing value framework. As that framework begins to lose its relevance for the problems of society, its system maintenance commitments must blind us to the urgent questions emerging even for the immediate future. 

Epistemologists such as Thomas Kuhn and Imre Lakatos might be correct—technically—that the failure of a theory to explain any particular event does not invalidate that theory. But the end of the cold war is different. It is one of few truly critical events in our history; a turning point of enduring significance. As William Wohlfarth explained, “Like the French Revolution or the decline and fall of Rome, the cold war’s end is an event whose importance commands attention but whose complexity frustrates explanation. Few who took up the study of international politics during the cold war will be content with the notion that the waning of that conflict is simply a single observation no more important than hundreds of others.” The failure of international
relations to understand this most critical of events must lead us to search for something better.

Methodological Pluralism: An Explanation that Works

Thomas Schelling argued that high game theory is simply too abstract, missing too much critical information. I will begin by employing a proto-game theory approach, borrowing the game structure and the concept of strategic rationality. That core of game theory is easily extracted and utilized. "...the essential kernel of game theory is easy to grasp, then, even for those with little background in—or tolerance for—mathematics. Game theory is founded on a very simple but powerful way of schematizing conflict..." I will be using game theory as a heuristic, pointing this research in the proper direction.

That direction is the empirical examination of the case at hand: the end of the cold war. Steve Weber has argued that the Axelrod approach is a good place to begin such an examination, confronting the basic structure of the formal model with empirical evidence. "The most powerful possible arguments can be derived from an interactive approach, which can supply the deductive logical framework for empirical generalizations and the empirical correlates of a relationship deduced in formal theory. Axelrod's theory is ripe for such an approach."
The treatment of game theory in chapter 2, and the more general treatment of international relations theory earlier in this chapter, suggests what type of empirical investigation might most effectively generate an understanding of the end of the cold war, i.e. what type of evidence to seek. The empirical investigation will seek to provide evidence in support of the assertions contained therein, and for the explanations that flow from that representation. In chapter three I will begin that investigation by describing the nature of the superpower relationship during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the cold war, uncovering the payoff structure, preference orderings, and relational environment in the game being played by the United States and the Soviet Union, and how those factors led to the end of the cold war and nascent cooperative relations.

The challenge for those studying this behavior is to understand the preference orderings behind it. Care must be taken lest one confuse action and intention. Duncan Snidal warned that explorations of actor preferences risk becoming tautological when an investigator derives intentions from an observation of behavior. One should attempt first to identify preference orderings and then to examine the behavior of the actor. Snidal suggests that preferences are best uncovered by investigating the behavior of the actor in similar situations.\textsuperscript{51} The long history of the cold war provides ample opportunity to identify actor preferences during the postwar period, but for the changing preferences of the actors during the years 1985 through 1989, an unprecedented
occurrence as explained in chapter one, it will be necessary to derive preferences from the writings and statements of the actors themselves. Over time, the GRIT strategy, combining words and deeds, provides its own evidence of the preferences of the initiator state, and in hindsight that evidence is also available.\textsuperscript{82}

Chapter four will begin the analysis of the transition in U.S.-Soviet relations—Phase 2. In Phase 2 U.S.-Soviet relations, the period 1985-1988, the Soviet Union had begun to accept the need to defuse the conflict between itself and the United States. Chapter four will describe the process of change in Soviet thinking, particularly that of Mikhail Gorbachev, and will lay out the procedure Gorbachev adopted in that effort.

Chapter five will begin to explore the transition from Phase 2 to Phase 3, the evolution of U.S. interest in accommodation with the Soviet Union. The demands of domestic politics pushed Gorbachev to the right and resulted in his downfall in late 1991. In the end, those trends limited the U.S. reciprocation of Gorbachev's initiatives, as the U.S. took a wait-and-see approach to devolution of political authority in the Soviet Union and its reconstitution in follow-on political structures. Nonetheless, there is evidence to suggest that by the end of his second term, President Reagan's image of the Soviet Union had begun to change, a product of the Gorbachev assault on traditional modes of thinking.
And while the presidential transition in the United States set back the process, President Bush also seemed to adjust his attitudes toward the Soviet leadership.

The final chapter will also attempt to distill some of the lessons of this period for the study of international relations and, perhaps more critically, for the practice of foreign policy. The Gorbachev experiment had only just begun to bear fruit in terms of changing attitudes and images of the players in the game when political exigencies brought his experiment to a premature conclusion. Seweryn Bialer has argued that the true revolutionary genius of the Gorbachev experiment was its recognition of the security dilemma—of the interactive nature of decision making and the sense of security. He recognized, as Rapoport had earlier hoped game theory would lead decision makers to recognize, the need to “put oneself in the other’s shoes,” and to have empathy for the other player, and to act on the newly discovered understanding. Bialer wrote,

The recognition by Gorbachev of the notion of “mutual” or “common security” is probably the most important example of this more realistic assessment of the role of action-reaction in Soviet-American relations. Yet this is only a beginning. In most cases, American foreign and security policies still seem to the USSR to have a momentum of their own, a momentum that is not greatly influenced by Soviet behavior and is decisive in shaping the U.S. course. Until Soviet (and American) policy-makers recognize the role of their own decisions in shaping the decisions of the other side, Soviet-American foreign- and security-policy behavior will preclude lasting agreements.
Gorbachev recognized, I am prepared to argue, that critical facet of international politics, but he is no longer in power, and those following Gorbachev have abandoned the principles of new thinking. It is doubtful that decision makers in the United States ever truly understood the magnitude of the change Gorbachev brought to the practice of foreign policy, with the risk of many lost opportunities for U.S. foreign policy in the post-cold war world.
Notes for Chapter 1

1. The literature seeking to explain why the cold war ended is based on the assumption, which is likely accurate, that the end of the cold war was marked by the Soviet Union’s decision to opt out of the rivalry. These works typically attempt to determine what factors led the Soviet leadership to move in that direction. The dominant view in the west is that the policy of military preparedness championed by President Ronald Reagan eventually drove the Soviets into retreat and surrender. See, for example, Caspar Weinberger, *Fighting for Peace* (New York: Warner Books, 1990); Richard Perle, “Military Power and the passing Cold War,” in Charles W. Kegley, Jr., ed., *After the Cold War: Questioning the Morality of Nuclear Deterrence* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1991); Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Touchstone, 1994); James A. Baker III, *The Politics of Diplomacy: Revolution, War & Peace, 1989-1992* (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1995). In the end, however, surrender requires two parties—one to offer and one to accept. As Arthur Schlesinger argued President Reagan, “...deserves his share of credit for taking Mikhail Gorbachev seriously, abandoning the zero-sum fallacy he had embraced for so long, and moving the Cold war toward its end. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., “Some Lessons from the Cold War,” *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 16, No. 1 (1992), p. 53. The question that I hope to answer in this volume is what factors caused President Reagan to abandon his long-held suspicions of the Soviet Union and to acquiesce peacefully to their decline.


3. Helen Thomas, United Press International, December 7, 1988, LEXIS-NEXIS.


7. Boris Yeltsin visited Washington, D.C. in June of 1991, shortly after he became the first democratically-elected president of Russia. At a White House ceremony, President Bush welcomed Yeltsin and noted his contributions to reform in the Soviet Union. He continued, though, by clearly stating his continuing commitment to Mikhail Gorbachev, arguing that it was Gorbachev who had made possible the end of the cold war. *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, June 21, 1991, p. 1A, LEXIS-NEXIS.

Other analysts note that proponents of radical reform in the Soviet Union, as well as many supporters of Soviet reform in the West, wonder at the West's unflagging official support for Gorbachev despite his apparent shift to a more repressive, less reform minded policy. See, for example, Tobi T. Gati, "How Moscow's Liberals View Gorbachev," *The Christian Science Monitor*, January 7, 1991, p. 19, LEXIS-NEXIS.

Coit Blacker noted that the U.S. infatuation with Gorbachev outlasted the changing reality of politics within the Soviet Union.

Increasingly, it seems, the (Bush) administration came to believe that between hope and chaos in the USSR stood the embattled figure of Gorbachev and a handful of his supporters—a notion that the politically astute Soviet president did little to discourage. Dealing with Gorbachev was also easier and far more predictable for Washington than trying to negotiate with the collection of political actors eager to displace the Soviet president. So successful did Gorbachev prove to be in linking his own fate to that of U.S.-Soviet relations more generally that when, in December 1991, the leaders of the three Slavic republics of the USSR—Boris Yeltsin of Russia, Leonid Kravchuk of Ukraine, and Stanislau Shushkevich of Byelorussia—announced the creation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (and the effective end of the Soviet Union), the Bush administration seemed momentarily caught off guard and reluctant to embrace the new reality.
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9. Dr. Stewart was a member of my general examination committee in the fall of 1989, and he posed that question in the examination. Further discussions clarified our agreement that the theories in use were simply inadequate to the task of explaining the Gorbachev revolution in Soviet politics. For a discussion of Soviet decision making prior to the arrival of Gorbachev, see Jiri Valenta and William Potter, eds. *Soviet Decisionmaking for National Security* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1984) esp. chapter 11, Steven M. Meyer, "Soviet National Security Decisionmaking: What Do We Know and What Do We Understand," pp. 255-297.


12. William Wohlforth expresses this same sentiment:

   "Any account of the Soviets' withdrawal from the cold war which focuses on the classical issue of great-power decline must confront the most striking feature of the whole story: the absence of war. Realist thinking gives rise to the expectation that precipitous decline and thoroughgoing international change will either cause or result from large-scale war."


Dick Cheney was equally disparaging. *The New York Times*, May 18, 1989, p. 6. This will be developed more fully in chapters 2 and 3.

16. "The literature in the field of international relations is not much more helpful. It is not just that theories of international relations do a poor job of explaining the more recent story of Russian stagnation, Russian reform, and the international transformation or that these theories, more generally, have a very difficult time explaining (let alone predicting) major changes in the international system, irrespective of where and when they occur. It is also because so much of our understanding of the postwar international order, the recent collapse of that order, the nature of the international system in the nineteenth century, and finally the key factors driving international politics all work in the direction of blinding us to these parallels."


18. Ibid., p. 29.


    Systems theories, communication theories, and structural-
functional theories are unpolitical theories shaped by the desire to explain certain forms of non-political phenomena. They offer no significant choice or critical analysis of the quality, direction, or fate of public life. Where they are not alien intrusions, they share the same uncritical—and therefore untheoretical—assumptions of the prevailing political ideology which justifies the present "authoritative allocation of values" in our society.


27. Deadlock is one of several mixed-motive 2x2 games prominent in the game theoretical literature on cooperation. "Deadlock occurs when two parties fail to cooperate because neither really wants to—they just want the other guy to cooperate. Not all failures to come to arms control agreements are the result of prisoner's dilemmas. It may be that neither side truly wants to disarm. Possibly that was the case with the U.S.-Soviet 'moment of hope' in 1955." William Poundstone, *Prisoner's Dilemma: John Von Neumann, Game Theory, and the Puzzle of the Bomb* (New York: Doubleday, 1992) p. 218.


29. Ibid., p. 128.


35. Koslowski and Kratochwil explain the fundamentals of system change:

> Any given international system does not exist because of immutable structures, but rather the very structures are dependent for their reproduction on the practices of the actors. Fundamental change of the international system occurs when actors, through their practices, change the rules and norms constitutive of international interaction. (1994, p. 216)


37. Ibid., p. 218.

38. Mearsheimer, 1994/95, p. 46.

39. Alexander George, for example, argues that the end of the cold war provides a unique opportunity to uncover the multi-directional nature of international relations and foreign policy, thereby enriching international relations theory.

> ...if the remarkable developments in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the transition in East-West relations are properly studied, our theoretical understanding of international relations can be significantly enriched, particularly with regard to the two-way interaction between changes in the international system and changes in domestic systems and politics.


40. Larson argues that the tone, and perhaps the very emergence of a cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union was conditioned by the fact that Harry Truman had been President of the United States in the early postwar period. By the same token I argue that the manner in which the cold
war ended was a result of the particular policy choices made by Gorbachev—choices conditioned by his particular background.


42. Snyder and Diesing succinctly capture the nature of the problem of methodological monism in political science and one form of solution: methodological pluralism:

It has been frequently noted that international relations theory suffers from an excess of fragmentation. Some theories are advanced to account for some sorts of phenomena, others for other kinds. Some theories are said to be useful at one "level of analysis," while others at some other level. In our teaching and research, we are like travelers in a houseboat, shuttling back and forth between separate "islands" of theory, whose relatedness consists only in their being commonly situated somewhere in the great "ocean" of "international behavior." Some theorists take up permanent habitation on one island or other, others continue to shuttle, but few attempt to build bridges, perhaps because the island seem too far apart.

We are attempting in this book to build bridges between three of these islands: systems theory, bargaining theory, and decision-making theory. We choose these three because between them, underdeveloped as they may be, they seem to encompass the central (most significant) aspects of international behavior. If we can achieve some degree of synthesis between these three bodies of theory, we will have fashioned a core, to which, we hope, other kinds of theory might be linked.


See also Charles Lipson, "International Cooperation in Economic and Security Affairs," *World Politics*, vol. 37, no. 1, October 1984, p. 23:
Nor should the centrality of policy choice be masked by an exaggerated distinction between the international political environment (Waltz's Third Image) and the internal structure and actions of state (the Second Image). Although this distinction is a useful clarification, it should not be extended to treat international structure as an analogue of competitive markets, which are a much more profound limitation on actors' choices. Thus, the two images are analytically distinct but need not be treated as mutually exclusive, even in ideal-typical form. The real problem, again, is to integrate choice and structure, to deprecate or conflate distinction. (Emphasis in original)

43. In Albert Eldridge's work on conflict, for example, the case is made that the separate disciplines within the social sciences each can make valuable contributions to the understanding of conflict, but that multidisciplinary research is required to provide us those more powerful tools of analysis.


49. Ibid., p. 28.


56. Mearsheimer, 1994/95, p. 46.

57. Mendelson, 1993, p. 337.

58. Kegley, 1994, p. 26


62. I am keenly aware that the collapse of the Soviet Union is not universally proclaimed as a positive event, but for the time being it is largely understood in those terms in the NATO capitals. I am also keenly aware that the last page of that script has yet to be written, and after a succession of Bosnia- and Chechnya-type events, we may long for the days of the iron hand.

64. A number of historians and biographers attest to Gorbachev's Marxist-Leninist leanings. See, for example, John Dunlop, 1993, pp. 3-16; and Raymond Garthoff, 1994, p. 205.

65. Entire books have been written chronicling the cooperative programs in the U.S.-Soviet relationship in that period. See, for example, Nish Jamgotch, Jr., ed., *Sectors of Mutual Benefit in U.S.-Soviet Relations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1985).


68. Ibid., p. 13.


73. Mendelson, 1993, pp. 327-330.


82. It is a much simpler task to look back over a period of time in which the GRIT strategy was attempted and chronicle each initiative, drawing conclusions from the cumulation of events about the intentions and preferences of the initiator than it would be from a viewpoint contemporaneous with the actions. GRIT was developed as a strategy which, over time, would help the recipient state gain insights into the intentions and preferences of the initiator, but Osgood understood full well that such insights would be in competition with other cognitive prejudices and realizations.


CHAPTER 2

International Relations Theory and Approaches to Cooperation

Thought is the strongest thing we have. Work done by true and profound thought—that is a real force.

—Albert Schweitzer

The “classical tradition” of political inquiry erects an “impermeable wall between interstate and intrastate political arenas.” I have adopted a more flexible, cross-level analysis, as discussed in chapter one, that should more fully expose the interrelationships between events at the end of the cold war. Changes in objective conditions at the system level, and subjective re-evaluations of system level variables, brought Mikhail Gorbachev to the realization that a new approach to relations with the United States was in order, and from 1985 to 1989, Gorbachev set about putting that new type of relationship in place. This is an explanation of how that new policy effected the U.S. perception of system level variables and its understanding of the nature of security in that newly emerging strategic environment.
In this chapter I will locate the present research within the literature of international relations. The game theory and cooperation theory literatures have much to say relevant to this research. Game theory, and especially the vast literature applying game theory to questions of cooperation, provides interesting insights into the way in which political leaders strategize their choices. In addition, the terminology, structure, and methods of game theory help to organize the empirical inquiry into the Gorbachev case. Many of the concepts that form the core of game theoretical analysis will provide a structure upon which to base a discussion of the thought processes at work in that critical period of 1985-1989. The matrix structure of game theory will also help to visualize the sometimes subtle changes in thinking that lie at the heart of the end of the cold war.

As valuable as game theory can be to the study of cooperation and conflict in international relations, care must be taken to avoid drawing too closely analogies between the events of international politics and their abstraction in the game matrix. Subtle differences in the nature of real world conflicts, discernible only through careful empirical examination of the case, can radically alter the game theoretic application. The social psychology literature on cooperation underscores the danger areas in such an analysis, pointing out where detailed historical investigation will clarify inquiry.
Finally, I will lay out the methods to be employed in this research, beginning with the insights gleaned from the analysis of the literature. Using those notions to point the way, I will reintroduce the concepts contained in Osgood's GRIT proposal. Distinguishing GRIT from other strategies found in the literature, it will become clear that GRIT is uniquely capable of explaining the behavior of the Soviet Union and the United States from 1985 through 1991—a period some have argued is the single most critical period in the history of U.S.-Soviet relations, and perhaps in the history of the world.

The Existing Literature and the Understanding of Cooperation

A number of different traditions could well inform this research. Cooperation theory has become one of the true growth industries in the social sciences, touching many of those aforementioned traditions. Charles Kegley noted that the focus of debate in international relations had shifted recently from an emphasis on the causes of the cold war—i.e. the causes of confrontation—to an interest in the causes of its end.² A great deal of this interest in cooperation has lengthy roots, as alluded to in chapter one; the realist/structuralist debate, for example, raging for years, has focussed on just that question. But it seems that even given the long-term interest in cooperation within the discipline, the last five years have witnessed a significant increase in the amount of effort devoted
to the subject of cooperation. An examination of the monthly or quarterly offerings from a number of journals in the social sciences, for example, would leave one with that impression.

This wealth of material, however, does not necessarily represent a wealth of new ideas. There are, in reality, just a relatively few core issues that impact on cooperative behavior in international politics, and a review of the various literatures that deal with aspects of cooperation appear to focus on those basic issues. The following review of the various literatures, across methodological traditions, will highlight those basic conceptions and point this research with ever-increasing specificity to the logic of Charles Osgood’s GRIT.

The Contribution of Traditional Game Theory

Born of abstract mathematics, game theory debuted in John von Neumann’s seminal paper “Theory of Parlor Games” in 1928. Game theory received much wider exposure with the publication in 1944 of the book Theory of Games and Economic Behavior, co-authored by von Neumann and Oskar Morgenstern, and it has been applied widely to analyses of conflict and cooperation in interpersonal and international environments.

Game theorists distinguish between games of skill, games of chance, and games of strategy, the latter being the subject of game theoretical analysis. A
"game," in game theoretic terms, is defined as a "...situation of interdependent decision-making in which outcomes depend on the choices all players make."\(^5\) Unlike gambling or games of chance in which some uncontrollable, unfathomable force will largely dictate the outcome of the game, strategy games are decided by the interaction of the choices made by the players.\(^6\) A widely accepted definition of game theory, then, is that provided by political scientist Barry O'Neill: "Game theory is the section of mathematical decision theory that studies optimal strategy when two or more decision makers make choices that interact and when they use knowledge of this interaction to optimize their choices."\(^7\)

\textit{Two-Player Games}

In this analysis I am predominantly interested in "2x2" games as distinct from multiplayer games. The class of games known as 2x2 games are based on two players, each having only two choices, for a total of four possible outcomes. One may question whether such a simple scheme can capture the nuances and complexities of real world relations between states. Certainly 2x2 games are an abstraction of reality, but they are simplifications that can tell us a great deal about the nature of strategic interaction. As Rapoport said, "The value of game theory is not in the specific solutions it offers in highly simplified and idealized
situations....the prime value of the theory is that it lays bare the different kinds of reasoning that apply in different kinds of conflict."

Independently, I would argue that the assumptions of two players with strictly dichotomous choices is defensible, at least as representative of the U.S.-Soviet cold war relationship, while it may not represent relations between other states at other times. Steven Brams also defends the applicability of 2x2 models to the superpower relationship, noting that the role of n\textsuperscript{th} parties in the superpower relationship was limited.

...institutions like the United Nations, or non-aligned nations that have a manifest interest in preventing East-West conflict—and that normally might be expected to mediate the superpower conflict—have not been significant players in most of the serious clashes between the superpowers since World War II.\textsuperscript{9}

The United States and the Soviet Union dominated the cold war international political landscape. Other states and their behavior fell into one of three categories: behavior that was not salient to the U.S.-Soviet relationship, behavior that was directed by either the Soviet Union or the United States, or the states were the objects of actions taken by the United States or the Soviet Union.

Not all actions taken by states in the international system effected the U.S.-Soviet relationship, although it has been a common claim throughout the cold war that when military action was involved, virtually every interaction was drawn into the larger East-West competition. The superpowers viewed much of
that activity as manipulated or even inspired and supported by the opponent superpower. Many military actions, it seems, whether the United States and the Soviet Union became directly involved or not, were perceived to contain an ideological dimension that connected them to the global confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{10} In those cases, however, these actions fall into the second category: they were perceived as components of the East-West conflict because they were seen as products of superpower manipulation.

In yet other cases, \textsuperscript{n}th parties were little more than tools as the superpower competition was carried out and superpower intentions conveyed by proxy and, in some cases, by example. Even China, possessing considerable superpower potential of its own, was in reality little more than a "card" to be played at the behest of the superpowers.

While there was certainly some consideration in the superpower decision calculus of the opinions of allies and non-aligned states, that was largely in terms of setting preference orderings and determining the payoffs in the 2-player game with the opponent superpower. U.S.-Soviet relations are perhaps best understood not as a single 2\times2 matrix, but rather as a series of 2\times2 matrices within the larger 2-player game. Each matrix in the larger scheme would represent some issue area: for example, one matrix might be Afghanistan. A similar matrix could be imagined for virtually any salient issue that might arise.
Some analysts might object to this focus on governmental actors to the exclusion of the many non-governmental actors. Non-governmental actors clearly pursued transnational interactions throughout the entire period of the cold war, including the years 1985-1989, but the impact of those interactions was at most indirect in the core politico-military issue areas under review here. Non-governmental actors can magnify or diminish the transitional impact of strategies to induce reciprocation in these core issue areas, and that effect would be represented by changes in the payoff structure of the game and the preference orderings of the state actors. Non-governmental actors simply do not possess the authority or power to unilaterally change the security policy of states.

*Dichotomous Choice*

The second assumption of 2x2 games is that each actor has but two options: cooperate or defect. Again, this is an abstraction, and some analysts have taken exception to the notion of simple dichotomous choice. But given the nature of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union during the cold war, it is not as much of a simplification as one might first imagine. Chapter 3 will delve in some detail into the nature of the U.S.-Soviet relationship, but for purposes of this argument, it will suffice to recognize that the United States and
the Soviet Union perceived each other's behavior essentially in black and white terms: actions were judged in terms of whether they had a positive or negative impact on each state's utility and national interests.

This is not to say that the superpowers carefully calculated the impact each policy initiative would have on the opponent. In fact, each state may often have been oblivious to—or at least unconcerned with—the impact of its own policies on the other superpower. Raymond Garthoff argues that one of the failings of U.S. policy was that it was often made without consideration of how it would be perceived in Moscow and, ultimately, what impact it would have on U.S.-Soviet relations. But each superpower carefully watched the behavior of the other, judging it in terms of its perceived impact on its own well being as well as the perceived benefit to the other superpower. Each act, individually and cumulatively, also helped to form the image each state held of the other and, therefore, the understanding of each other's nature as aggressive or defensive.

In any case, objective empirical analysis of the U.S.-Soviet relationship should be able to organize the behavior of the states consistent with the cooperate/defect dichotomy. A single corrective is in order. The notion of defection implies an active response with negative consequences. In some cases, however, the impact of defection in game theoretical terms can result from sins of omission as well as sins of commission. Deploying a new weapons system, for example, may be an active form of defection representing a clear choice in the
game matrix. Failing to dismantle a weapon system—that is, doing nothing—might well place a player in the same box in the game matrix, with the same implications for payoffs. To capture both the active and the more passive types of defection, which become even more important when one is investigating instances of reciprocated and non-reciprocated behavior, I will use the terms cooperative and non-cooperative to describe the behavior of actors in the international system and choices in formal models.

_Beyond Structure: Conceptions of Rationality_

Several other traditional conceptions from the theory of games are valuable to the study of cooperation. First is the focus of game theory on individual decision makers. As developed in chapter one, a more complete understanding of the evolution of cooperation at the end of the cold war requires that we move beyond the notion that systemic factors led to a breakdown of bipolar stability and resulted in the system moving toward some other—perhaps as yet unidentified—equilibrium. The policy choices of individual decision makers influence, in the case of the end of the cold war decisively, the process of system change. As Rapoport explained, “As long as nuclear arsenals exist, our lives depend on what happens in the brains of a few individuals.”
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The second concept used in game theory that can help clarify the development of cooperation in U.S.-Soviet relations is that actors are rational. Obviously the rationality assumption is not unique to game theory among international relations theories, but game theory provides an interesting and helpful addition to traditional understandings of rationality, that of strategic rationality.

The rationality assumption asserts first that actors understand that there are differing consequences to alternative courses of action in a given situation, that they are aware of some preference ordering among those consequences, and that they will choose a course of action which they believe will lead to their preferred consequence. In short, actors are perceived as “rational” if they know what they want, and take actions to achieve those ends. Expressed in this manner, rationality is straightforward and, frankly, not very interesting. Two additional factors, however, complicate this relatively simple picture: competition and perception.

It is not very interesting to express rational choice as an actor simply attempting to achieve its goals. If a situation is competitive, however, with another actor attempting to achieve its goals and, in so doing, impeding the first actor in its goal-seeking behavior, the picture becomes more complex and more interesting. Game theory is therefore based on a notion of strategic rationality, that is to say, game theory “incorporates the realization that the pursuit of
egoistic interest requires consideration of interactions with the choices of other states. Outcomes are determined by the interplay between the choices made and the policies enacted by all of the players in the game. Not all multiplayer games are equally interesting, and I will examine a subset of situations in which more than one actor occupy the system. Simple games of coordination, in which the most preferred outcome of each of the players can be attained simultaneously, fail to capture the competitive aspects of mixed-motive situations. It is mixed-motive games, a situation in which the players have competitive and cooperative interests, and in which the interaction of egoistic choices by the two players can result in negative relative or absolute payoffs, that model conflictive relationships like the cold war.

Considerations of perceptions also complicate the simple picture of rationality. Herbert Simon recognizes a difference between "procedural" and "substantive" rationality. Substantive rationality is based on the actual, objective situation faced by the actor while procedural rationality is based on the actor's perception of the situation it faces. From a political science perspective, substantive rationality is much easier to study. There are events databases and national attribute databases which provide objective assessments of the positions of the states in the international system. Combined with proper statistical techniques, this data can provide some very high confidence levels. If only actors in the international system would base their behavior on that
data, political science would be easy. But individual actors can only respond to what they understand the situation to be—to their perceptions of that objective reality. Objective factors are no more, and possibly even less important in explaining the change in U.S.-Soviet relations at the end of the cold war as are the perceptions of those objective factors in the minds of the key decision makers. The possession, for example, of significant military capability means very little in terms of the behavior of an opponent if that opponent perceives that there is little or no threat that such capability will ever be used. Simon concludes, "If that's true, the rationality principle as it is incorporated in theories of substantive rationality, will provide us with only limited help in understanding political phenomena."

Returning to chapter one, perhaps this perception/reality dichotomy can assist in understanding why a focus on substantive rationality can help inform the question of why the cold war ended—i.e. why there was a breakdown of bipolar stability in the late 1980s—but it is powerless to explore how the cold war ended. To understand the choices made by the individual decision makers we must proceed under the assumption of procedural rationality.

One hesitates to speak in terms of absolutes, especially when dealing with the motivations and intentions of individual human actors, but I am comfortable in asserting that the rationality assumption enjoys a robust empirical validity. This is not to say that every human behaves in a rational manner, but rather
that rationality is a predominant pattern. Thomas Schelling indicated that while the rationality assumption was undoubtedly a simplification, it was a productive one. As testimony to the assumption's empirical validity, Schelling noted that even those recognized as the least "rational" members of society exhibit rational behavior patterns as defined in the game theory context.

Even among the emotionally unbalanced, among the certified "irrationals," there is often observed an intuitive appreciation of the principles of strategy, or at least of particular applications of them. I am told that inmates of mental hospitals often seem to cultivate, deliberately or instinctively, value systems that make them less susceptible to disciplinary threats and more capable of exercising coercion themselves.16

Game theory offers a great deal to the study of conflict. The structure of the 2x2 game provides a simplifying model that maintains the essence of the conflict situation, uncovering the core dilemmas that characterize political conflict. That structure further provides a common point of departure for the evaluation of many cases of political conflict. The concept of strategic rationality, that each player attempts to maximize its own gains taking into consideration the fact that the opponent is attempting to do the same in pursuit of competing ends, underscores much of the uncertainty—the guesswork—that must be a part of decision making in a political conflict. These game components tell us how to conceive of the way decision makers think. But while game theory contains some tremendously useful concepts, as traditionally conceived game theory cannot serve as the sole answer to questions of cooperation.
Adjusting Game Theory: Evolution of an Evolution

Game theoretical approaches to the study of cooperation in general, and specifically as applied to the emergence of cooperation in the U.S.-Soviet relationship between 1985 and 1989, suffer as singular explanations of political behavior. In chapter one I argued that international relations theories often lacked context, and that same shortcoming afflicts game theory. The inadequacies of game theory do not mean that political inquiry must abandon this tool. They do require, however, remedial measures. Anatol Rapoport concurred: "...it is the shortcomings of game theory which force the consideration of the role of ethics, of the dynamics of social structures and of individual psychology in situations of conflict."¹⁹

Introduction to the Prisoner’s Dilemma

Analysts recognize the existence of many different types of 2x2 games, defined by the preference orderings of the players and the payoff matrices. Rapoport and Guyer identify seventy-eight distinct 2x2 games.²⁰ One theme that emerges from the literature on conflict is that most conflicts are mixed-motive. That is to say that in most conflicts, the parties have both competitive and cooperative interests.²¹ These are clearly the most interesting situations as actors each
attempt to develop a strategy to maximize their own gains, whether measured in relative or absolute terms. Mixed-motive conflicts, as a result, have been the subject of a great deal of the social science work on cooperation. The vast majority of the game theoretical treatments of cooperation have focussed on one of a handful of the seventy-eight unique 2x2 games—Prisoner's Dilemma, Chicken, and Deadlock—because these games are believed to capture the mixed-motive nature of conflict. The Prisoner's Dilemma (PD) in particular is conceived as applicable to these conflict of interest situations,\(^{22}\) and is the most commonly applied game theory model to world politics.\(^{23}\) Robert Axelrod referred to the Prisoner's Dilemma as the *E. Coli* of social psychology. 

Arguably the most important work applying game theory to questions of cooperation uses the Prisoner's Dilemma. Axelrod's *The Evolution of Cooperation* has become the starting point for a great deal of the research ongoing in this area. Steve Weber wrote that Axelrod was not the first to suggest the possibility of cooperation arising in a Prisoner's Dilemma, "...but his book is the most elegant exposition of the conditions under which cooperation is possible and the processes by which it may come about."\(^{24}\) 

The prisoner's anecdote used to explain the Prisoner's Dilemma is as follows. Two accomplices in a crime are arrested and held in separate rooms. The district attorney questions each of them; each knows that if neither one informs on the other (if they cooperate with each other), the district attorney
has only enough evidence to convict them of a lesser crime with a three-year sentence. The district attorney offers each of them a deal whereby if either one of them agrees to testify against the other (defects while the other continues to cooperate), that defendant will serve only one year, but the other will surely be convicted of the greater crime and serve a full ten-year sentence. If both defect (if each informs on the other) each will serve five years. The strategic consideration is whether each prisoner should risk being played the sucker (withhold testimony while the other squeals). Axelrod describes the game: "In the Prisoner's Dilemma game, there are two players. Each has two choices, namely cooperate or defect. Each must make the choice without knowing what the other will do. No matter what the other does, defection yields a higher payoff than cooperation. The dilemma is that if both defect, both do worse than if they had cooperated." Figure 2.1 depicts the payoff structure of the Prisoner's Dilemma game, assuming purely ordinal payoffs.
The problem presented by the PD game is that it guarantees a sub-optimal outcome. It is well established that on a single play of the game, the logical choice—or dominant strategy—for each player is non-cooperation, earning the 2,2 payoff. If player A expects player B to choose non-cooperate, player A must also choose non-cooperate to avoid the 1,4 sucker payoff. If, on the other hand, Player A expects player B to play cooperate, player A must choose non-cooperate to earn the 4,1 exploitation payoff. Player B faces an identical decision calculus, driving the game to the 2,2 solution. Axelrod sought to explain why states sometimes chose to cooperate, earning the 3,3 payoff, in violation of the logic of the game.

As initially conceived, PD was a single play game; each player made one choice, simultaneous with (and therefore in ignorance of) the choice of the other.
player, and the score was calculated. No communication between players was permitted, and moves could not be reversed. Axelrod chose to examine a variation of the traditional PD, the iterated Prisoner's Dilemma. In the iterated PD, the cycle of choice is repeated a number of times, each time in ignorance of the opponent's contemporaneous choice, but with knowledge of the previous choices in the game. Such a process altered the dominant strategy in two ways. First, it allowed for the development of a history of play in which communication in the form of signaling became possible. Second, it changed the players' perceptions of the payoff matrix. Future iterations of the game cast a shadow on the current play. That "shadow of the future," as Axelrod called it, led players to calculate that it would be more beneficial in the long term to attempt to achieve mutual cooperation and the 3,3 payoff rather than face a series of mutually non-cooperative 2,2 payoffs. A player might even risk the sucker payoff (1,4) in the current game to send a message regarding beneficial cooperative strategies for future iterations of the game.

To test this hypothesis, Axelrod ran a series of computer tournaments, pitting various strategies for playing the Prisoner's Dilemma game against one another. He solicited strategies from social scientists, mathematicians, game theorists, and members of other disciplines. His finding was that it was indeed possible to achieve mutually cooperative outcomes in the iterated PD despite the fact that in each round of play the dominant strategy was non-cooperate.
The strategy that best produced mutually cooperative results in Axelrod’s studies was tit-for-tat (TFT). A form of reciprocity, TFT “...starts with a cooperative choice, and thereafter does what the other player did on the previous move. This decision rule is probably the most widely known and most discussed rule for playing Prisoner’s Dilemma. It is easily understood and easily programmed. It is known to elicit a good degree of cooperation when played with humans.”

Axelrod’s *Evolution of Cooperation* is the centerpiece of the cooperation theory literature—a culmination of much of the work done before, and a stepping stone for much of the work to follow—and a critical examination of this book can provide an understanding of the state of knowledge in this area, as well as a first step toward understanding the psycho-social dynamic at work at the end of the cold war. Valuable additions to the Axelrod model extend in two basic directions. The first is the attempt to add more complexity to the model, making the model more isomorphic with empirical cases. In this vein I am particularly concerned with the impact of the relational environment—the nature of the relationship between the players in the game on the evolution of cooperation; the role of the individual characteristics of salient leaders; and the impact of perceptual difficulties. The second type of addition to Axelrod examines ways to change the incentive structure of the game.
The Relational Environment

Formal models not only suffer by the complexities they neglect to address, as will be explored in the succeeding sections of this chapter; they also suffer a serious sin of commission regarding the representation of the environment, most profitably understood as the willingness of the players to cooperate. The "environment" in this context can be conditioned by any or all of the various factors addressed in the following sections of this chapter, including perceptions and images, the level of noise, etc. The environment may also be understood as the attitude of the players toward cooperation as expressed in the preference orderings of the players.

Proponents of traditional game theory argue that the environmental representation in formal games is neutral. Steve Weber, for example, writes, "Precisely because it dealt with idealized actors in a generic environment, game theory seemed capable of shedding light on problems of conflict and cooperation across the spectrum of international political, security, and economic issues." The bulk of this research project stands as a repudiation of the generalizability of formal game models, including a direct challenge to the imposition of exogenously-generated preferences. Understanding preferences as a component of environment demonstrates that the treatment of environment in formal
models distorts the conclusions of that work. Simply put, game theory does not contain a neutral or generic environment.

Rapoport’s taxonomy of games lists seventy-eight unique 2x2 games as determined by the payoff structure, but as indicated earlier, students of cooperation theory have focussed on Chicken and Prisoner’s Dilemma. Those dominant models of strategic conflict internalize a value judgement regarding cooperation. First, they assume that each player assigns equal value to the payoffs as the other player in the game. Maoz and Felsenthal point out the fallacy of that assumption:

...the representation of major issues in international relations by symmetrical games may be misleading. While an arms race may well be a collectively harmful process, one of the parties engaged in it can be harmed (with respect to its own utility function) more than another. The appeal of symmetrical games as models of international problems is that they place the burden of responsibility for deficient outcomes equally on all parties involved.

Moreover, these models assume that mutual cooperation is preferred to mutual non-cooperation—mutual cooperation gains the higher payoff. These games are chosen as models of conflict, in fact, precisely because of their “mixed-motive” component—that is, because game theorists make a judgement regarding the nature of strategic conflict in which actors are presumed to seek mutual cooperation but are frightened by the risk of exploitation. Axelrod’s *Evolution of Cooperation* concerns itself, for the most part, with abstract principles of game analysis and the computer tournament. But the pro-
cooperation bias of Axelrod's thinking is nonetheless exposed in a brief example of the nature of PD.

A good example of the fundamental problem of cooperation is the case where two industrial nations have erected trade barriers to each other's exports. Because of the mutual advantages of free trade, both countries would be better off if these barriers were eliminated. But if either country were to unilaterally eliminate its barriers, it would find itself facing terms of trade that hurt its own economy.\textsuperscript{31}

While it may be well and proper in another context for Axelrod to make the argument that free trade is preferable to a system of trade restrictions, it is improper for him to assume that all players of the game would agree. The vitriolic debate in the United States regarding the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement or the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is convincing evidence that not all potential players would be as sanguine as Axelrod regarding the value of free trade. Yet Axelrod and others who employ game theory implicitly make that type of assumption.

The logic of strategic choice in game theory derives from the preference ordering of the payoffs. One should not expect replication of Axelrod's findings regarding TFT, as more recent computer simulations have shown that TFT performs poorly in a less conducive environment—it tends to be exploited. "To the extent that computer simulation results can be generalized to human behavior, these results suggest that the effectiveness of TFT in inducing
cooperation may be restricted to a relatively friendly environment."32 Charles Lipson concurs, "...the situational context is crucial to achieving cooperation in a repeated play PD, and, further...this context is significantly different in economic and security issues."33

If, in some empirical case, the preference orderings are different than what is assumed in the formal model, it seems clear that the model cannot be used to explain or predict behavior in that case. The admonitions in chapter one regarding the futility of seeking general rules to explain the end of the cold war apply no less to game theory. It is simply doubtful that during the cold war, especially during the first Reagan presidency—the age of the "evil empire"—the United States and the Soviet Union believed equally in the value of mutual cooperation. The early Gorbachev period in particular is a time in which cooperation and confrontation were differentially valued by the United States and the Soviet Union.

This analysis also short-circuits Axelrod's explanation for the evolution of cooperation. Axelrod relies on the "shadow of the future," the realization by the players that they have a continuing relationship with their opponent driving them toward the mutual cooperation payoff. If mutual cooperation is not the preferred outcome for one of the players, however, there is no future relationship to shadow, and cooperation should not evolve.
Adding Complexity to Game Theoretical Models

As noted earlier, simplification and abstraction are the inevitable results of attempts to model complex political behavior, and to a point, they serve a purpose. Axelrod himself noted that the model in *The Evolution of Cooperation* eschewed a wide array of potentially relevant details.

...the abstract formulation of the problem of cooperation as a Prisoner's Dilemma puts aside many vital features that make any actual interaction unique. Examples of what is left out by this formal abstraction include the possibility of verbal communication, the direct influence of third parties, the problems of implementing a choice, and the uncertainty about what the other player actually did on the preceding move....It is clear that the list of potentially relevant factors that have been left out could be extended almost indefinitely.\(^\text{34}\)

Rapoport and Orwant described an earlier experiment by Morton Deutsch with a version of an Axelrod-like model.\(^\text{35}\) Deutsch attempted to factor for communication and the personality of the decision makers, two factors that the Axelrod model failed to explicitly address.

Deutsch tested the effect that communication between the players has on the choices of the players in a PD. In the communication run, players were permitted to express their desires to their opponent and to negotiate for a deal. The assumption was that the two, discussing the alternatives in a single play PD, would settle on the cooperative choice. The game results did not support that assumption.
The games were run with different human subjects under three different conditions which were to represent the personalities of the decision makers. The players were instructed as to their own "personality" categorized as either cooperative, individualistic, or competitive. These categories differ as to the level of concern for the opponent's welfare in the game: the individualist considers only its own welfare, the cooperative personality was concerned with its own welfare and that of the opponent, and the competitive personality sought to protect its own interests and to score higher in the game than the opponent.

The results do, in fact, suggest that communication can increase cooperation, but Deutsch noted that the effect is slight in most of the cases and, in large measure, was likely the result of variables not controlled in the study. The data indicated, however, that the personality of the actor, as dictated by the instructions given to be individualistic, cooperative, or competitive, dominated the effects of communication. Cooperative types cooperated regardless of the presence of communication, and competitive types did not trust the message communicated by the opponent and so chose competitive/non-cooperative positions. Individuals were driven by their own personalities—their belief systems. The trusting trusted; the wary did not.

Rapoport and Orwant refer to a variation of this study also conducted by Deutsch. Procedures in the second study were identical to the first, except that there were no instructions as to the "personality" of the participants. The
results suggested that the individual personality, defined in terms of trusting or suspicious, inherent in each of the participants largely controlled the outcome of the study.

Subjects who were trusting when they chose first tended to be trustworthy when they chose second; they expected the same behavior of the other player. Players who were suspicious and untrustworthy expected to be exploited by the other players; these subjects responded to a trusting choice by taking advantage of it.\textsuperscript{36}

Trust, it seems, is a powerful variable explaining the evolution of cooperation.

Other researchers have noted that in international politics it is often not clear whether an opponent’s behavior is an example of cooperative or non-cooperative behavior—certainly not as clear as in Axelrod’s tournament in which those were the only two choices.

...one significant limitation of \textit{Evolution}—and of most investigations, both empirical and theoretical, of the PD—is that virtually throughout the book it is assumed that each player has perfect information about her or his partner’s actions. In classical experiments on the PD, subjects can either monitor one another directly, or there is a one-to-one correspondence between moves and payoffs, allowing flawless inferences.\textsuperscript{37}

Uncertainty in evaluating the other player’s move—“noise,” as it is known in the literature—can confound the application of reciprocal strategies like TFT because one player’s choice of cooperation may be misread as non-cooperation, with significant consequences for payoffs. Bendor, Kramer, and Stout, for example, attempted to understand how noise impacted the evolution of cooperation.
Bendor, Kramer, and Stout borrowed “computer tournaments of strategies playing a binary choice PD game” from Axelrod’s method. They recruited participants and strategies from across disciplines and programmed the strategies to play pairwise in a round robin tournament just as Axelrod had done before them. The difference, however, was that Bendor et al added a small random term—a random variable—in each period of play. That variable altered the choice of one of the players in an iteration of play, simulating the effect of misperceiving the behavior of an actor in international politics. In simple terms, one may conceive of this introduction of noise into the computer play as randomly changing the choice made in an iteration from cooperate to non-cooperate or vice versa.

Bendor et al demonstrated the inadequacy of the TFT strategy in a noisy environment. TFT has been faulted for its “hair trigger provocability,” meaning that it responds to a defection by its opponent on any iteration of the game with an immediate defection of its own. Noise can short circuit an emerging cooperative relationship since TFT mimics the opponent’s previous move. Misperception of a cooperative action as non-cooperative can lead a player using a TFT strategy to make a non-cooperative play on its next move. The first player, believing itself to have played a cooperative move immediately prior to the opponent’s defection, would improperly perceive itself as having been played the sucker, setting up a spiral of defections.
Additional results of this study point to characteristics of successful strategies. A strategy called NICE AND FORGIVING won the Bendor et al computer tournament. Specifically, NICE AND FORGIVING was "generous," which Bendor et al "...loosely define as returning more cooperation that one had received." NICE AND FORGIVING was not as quick to punish a defection as was TFT, and it more readily returned to cooperation after eventually punishing a defection than did TFT. Axelrod and Wu more recently attempted to factor for noise in the iterated PD game. Their conclusions supported those of Bendor et al, that generosity overcomes the negative impact of noise on TFT.

That generosity—the willingness to sacrifice in order to spur the evolution of cooperation—was an important feature of Gorbachev's strategy in the second half of the 1980s. Bendor et al warn, however, that there are risks associated with generous strategies. Opponents may take advantage of that generosity, exploiting the willingness to give more than it receives in return. In a similar vein, Axelrod argued that it is necessary to reciprocate both cooperative and non-cooperative moves, for to practice unconditional cooperation is to invite continued exploitation. Somewhere between the extremes of unilateral capitulation and all-out confrontation lies a balance that can promote cooperation while protecting the interests of the party initiating the cooperative strategy. Discovering that balanced strategy was Gorbachev's task in 1985.
Steven Brams addressed the issue of uncertainty in a different way. He altered the basic PD model to include provisions for the initiation of actions by one player intended to alter the behavior of the opponent. In his model, players took the roles of leader and follower. Brams believed that the shroud of uncertainty could be penetrated. Specifically, he believed that the intelligence capabilities of both superpowers would allow each nation to predict the behavior of the other with some certain degree of probability. Taking into account the known probability of the predictions being true, Brams argued that the leader could discern a best possible course of action which might differ from the dominant strategy of the traditional PD. In other words, player A might be able to use its national intelligence capabilities to determine with a degree of certainty the likely response of player B to an accommodative initiative. Given this leader/follower orientation of the game, stabilized by predictability and communication, Brams asserted that the players would arrive at a solution of mutual utility maximization, which in the PD context would be the 3,3 payoff.43

Brams' analysis fails, however, for a number of reasons. First, there must be a limit to the predictability one can attain in these political conflicts. One can imagine, for example, that the United States and the Soviet Union each identified the other as the most critical intelligence target, yet the cold war intelligence record was dismal. U.S. intelligence estimates of raw physical capability of the opponent were often significantly inaccurate. Richard
Herrmann, among others, described the relatively more difficult task of assessing intent, especially in the ideologized and politicized environment of the U.S.-Soviet cold war relationship. Brams' attempt to derive predictability in that relationship could not succeed.

Brams also suffers Axelrod's optimism. Brams assumes that simply because one player in the game has decided that mutual cooperation is the mutually maximal outcome, the other player would share that conclusion. As argued earlier, the relational environment is often not that benign, and in the U.S.-Soviet cold war case specifically, such an assumption would simply be incorrect. Brams provides no explanation for how a player can change those critical preference orderings of the opponent. GRIT provides that answer.

In real world situations—as opposed to game models and simulations—noise can also take the form of simple uncertainty, a natural result of the need to interpret the behavior of the opponent. Misperception and misinformation, as discussed above, can exacerbate uncertainty. Each of the critical actors in the end of the cold war case held a set of images and beliefs of the other, and those images and beliefs, which are formative elements of the environment as discussed in the previous section, condition the manner in which the actors interpret the information they receive regarding the behavior of the opponent. The greater the uncertainty and the greater the mistrust, the more do actors rely on preconceived notions of the opponent. That, then, becomes self-
perpetuating as every action is accorded the worst possible interpretation, reinforcing the negative stereotype, resulting in a greater risk of harmful misperception. Once again, the evolution of cooperation required an explicit recognition of those prejudices and a policy explicitly directed toward changing them.

The Contribution of Political Psychology

In this analysis, game theory is being used in an attempt to get inside the realist "black box" of decision making. It is beginning to become clear, however, that traditional game theoretical approaches to cooperation have not come very far in that effort, continuing to ignore the often critical, if idiosyncratic, variables which stand between cause and effect. As Robert Jervis charged, "Indeed, it is partly because most international relations scholars have paid no attention to psychology that they have failed to recognize the importance of misperception, let alone deal with it adequately."45 As recently as the late 1980s, Richard Ned Lebow bemoaned the resistance to interdisciplinary work, including his own attempts to meld psychological methods and concepts with the study of political science.46 Political psychologists have, however, devoted considerable attention to such questions, generating a substantial literature on the role of psychological factors in international relations.47 I intend to use those insights to understand
how to search the empirical record of the end of the cold war for profitable adjustments to traditional game theory.

It is useful in this context to conceive of cognitive processes as filters through which information passes during the decision process. Human thought processes and the accumulation and interpretation of knowledge are conditioned by a number of cognitive factors. I will here be concerned with three: belief systems, the role of empathy, and the fundamental attribution error, all of which are critical to the understanding of human cognition that informs Osgood’s development of GRIT.

Belief systems evolve in the construction of various categories of information, developed to impose structure on the complexities of the world. “Any acquisition of knowledge involves categorization and the use of ‘schematas’ that relate new information to prior knowledge.” Belief systems—scripts and schematas—can be as simple as memories that are later used to guide behavior, and they can be as complex as well-developed theories of opponent behavior. “These belief systems are essential; without them, no individual could organize or interpret the enormous amount of information potentially relevant to any problem. Yet these belief systems constrain and condition how and what leaders perceive.”

Schemata can be troubling, then, when they contribute to the distortion and misperception of incoming information, and human cognition often exhibits
that proclivity. Individuals tend to accept feedback (information) that is consistent with their preconceptions (belief systems), and reject data that is not consistent with their preconceptions. Moreover, there is a tendency for individuals to act on information that is consistent with their belief systems. Applied to game theory, this suggests that where, for example, noise has made the determination of the opponent's move ambiguous, a player will tend to interpret the ambiguous move based on preconceptions of the opponent. In the real-world "game" of international politics, as indicated in the previous section of this chapter, one is continuously attempting to interpret the behavior of the opponent in an environment of ambiguity.

The second cognitive factor that impacts on the interpretation of opponent behavior is known as empathy. "Empathy refers to the capacity to understand others' perceptions of their world, their conception of their role in that world, and their definition of interests." At least in part resulting from the influence of belief systems on cognitive processes, leaders often find it difficult to empathize with their opponents. The failure of empathy is more likely and more complete, it seems, the greater the difference between the opponents and the more virulent the history of relations between them.

The failure of empathy results in terribly skewed interpretations of opponent behavior. Osgood sees this lack of empathy as the emergence of a "Neanderthal mentality, consisting of three main components." The first is the
concept of "projection," the belief that other people have views consistent with
one's own. In the case of the cold war U.S.-Soviet relationship, projection
suggests that the Soviet Union must have shared the American understanding
that the United States was a non-aggressive, peace-loving nation. Any Soviet
military build up, therefore, had to be offensively motivated—the only logical
explanation for a continuing build-up that made any sense was the innately
aggressive nature of Soviet policy makers. Since Soviet decision makers knew
that the United States was peaceful, fear could not have been a factor
motivating Soviet behavior.

Second, the Neanderthal mentality contains a "psycho-logic" that results
in "bogey-building." Human beings have a psychological need to conceive of
themselves as "good". "Given also the logical opposition between WE and THEY,
as between FRIEND and ENEMY, psycho-logic dictates that THEY must be bad,
cruel, unfair, and so on." An understanding that the average citizen of the
other country was not very different from the average citizen in the United
States led to the view that the leadership of the other country must have been
evil and that they not only threatened United States, but they enslaved their
own people. The opposition became the evil "bogey" to be feared and resisted.

Finally, the Neanderthal mentality contains a double standard. "Exactly
the same behavior is moral if WE do it but immoral if THEY do it." Different
motivations were attributed to the opposition based on the bogey image. The
Soviet deterrence policy was perceived as aggressive; requests for negotiations were viewed as tricks or public relations ploys; and peace became a tool to weaken the United States. Other studies in the fields of psychology and international politics verify the existence of such double standards. In such a context, it is easy to see why Osgood views the world as heading ever closer to disaster. He concludes:

Now if the opponent is in truth entirely inhuman, there is no choice ultimately in a nuclear age but to kill and be killed. Or, if the opponent is actually much like ourselves, but we and he fail to see this and continue to hew blindly and inflexibly to traditional policies, then eventual nuclear holocaust is equally inevitable.

The final cognitive factor I wish to address is the fundamental attribution error, which is the tendency to focus on dispositional factors rather than situational factors, to explain the undesirable behavior of opponents. In other words, it is the tendency to attribute evil intent to the behavior of others, rather than attempting to understand the circumstances which might have made that behavioral choice strategically rational. This error is codified in the attempts in the traditional game theory studies of the evolution of cooperation to infer intent from the behavior of the opposing player given exogenously-derived preference orderings rather than attempting to discover the true nature of the opponent's preferences.

All three of these cognitive factors impact on and are impacted by each of the others—they tend to reinforce one another in the minds of decision makers.
makers. Beliefs about the nature of the opponent will supply the intent ascribed to behavior by the fundamental attribution error, and, once ascribed, that process will reaffirm the preconceived enemy image. Both errors in judgement are aggravated by the inability to empathize—to understand the world as seen by the opponent—and also further confound the ability to empathize.

History can play a significant role in the development of these cognitive dysfunctions, and in the degree of influence they exercise on the interpretation of information. Robert Axelrod, as we saw, uncovered the role of the “shadow of the future” in inducing cooperation. The past, casting a shadow forward onto contemporary relations, may play a more significant role. In chapter one I argued that the likelihood of achieving cooperation in economics is much greater than the likelihood of achieving cooperation in military issues. And in general, interpersonal characteristics may come to dominate the strategic relationship.

Robert Jervis wrote

I am struck by the fact that IR scholars almost never talk of hatred. But can we really understand international conflict in purely cold-blooded terms? Even if we find notions like “will to power” and “will to dominate” excessively deterministic, pessimistic, and fuzzy, can we entirely dismiss them?...I think it is astounding that most of the political science literature seems to put aside the notion that at least some wars are fueled by passions and that one reason they are so hard to conclude is that people have come to hate each other and to find the notion of compromise repulsive.
Conditioned by the history of interactions between contending parties, the nature of the payoffs, the risk orientation of the actors, and the expectations of opponent behaviors all vary from case to case.

The defenders of generalizable theory argue that the end of the cold war was a unique event, and that, as such, the inability of international relations theory to explain it represents only a single empirical failure that cannot disprove the entirety of international relations theory. They are correct that the cold war was a unique event with a unique history—a history that shaped the choices of decision makers. But that history, and its impact on choice, explain why traditional international relations theories fail. Traditional international relations theories failed to foresee the end of the cold war precisely because they understood only too well the virulence in the relationship, but, like traditional game theory, they failed to allow for one party to perceive the perceptual difficulties and act to change them.

It is essential that explanations of the end of the cold war seek to address the impact of belief systems, the lack of empathy, and the fundamental attribution error on the development of mutually cooperative behaviors. The nature of the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union made it very difficult to break the spiral of conflict, and it underscores the need, outlined in chapter one, to focus attention on the question of how the cold war ended, and the strategies adopted by the Soviet Union to make that possible.
In general, this discussion highlights a critical issue in understanding the evolution of cooperation; the inevitable failure of mechanistic approaches. The work of Axelrod, Bendor, and others is clearly valuable in that it uncovers a great deal of the decision-making logic that pervade situations of strategic conflict. Understanding that logic is a first step, but a requirement of the computer tournament methodology, and of traditional game theory, is that solutions be mechanistic: the rules must be programmable and so must be unambiguous. Ambiguity, however, is an irremovable feature of political conflict, dooming mechanistic approaches to the evolution of cooperation ultimately to failure.

The noise issue is a clear case in point. Mechanistic approaches, such as those found in Bendor et al, permit the program to misperceive an opponent’s choice and respond on the basis of that misperception. It does not, however, allow the “players” to be aware of the problem of misperception. Human subjects, if the rules permit, have the ability to recognize the possibility of misperceiving an opponent’s behavior. Having so recognized a potential flaw in their own decision making, human subjects have the capacity to factor into their decision making the risk that they have misperceived their opponent’s behavior.
Based on that type of "hunch," a human subject might spontaneously decide to be more generous or more forgiving than TFT, strictly applied, would allow.

This distinction underscores a more fundamental difference between mechanistic approaches and the type of explanation I hope to offer for the changing U.S.-Soviet relationship. Axelrod's TFT, Bendor's NICE AND FORGIVING, and every other rule-based approach to the evolution of cooperation are based on a Pavlovian type of simple stimulus-response learning. If player A does something bad, player B hands out punishment. The hope is that player A learns that defection elicits an unpleasant response. The shadow of the future is nothing more than an explanation of how the impact of a single episode of punishment is magnified by the threat of repeated punishment episodes.

This Pavlovian understanding of learning is descriptive of the general game theory approach to the evolution of cooperation. Both are based on a projection of exogenously determined preference orderings—either one's own or ones arbitrarily selected—onto the opponent. It is common for game theorists to assert that what sets game theory apart from simple probability is that one must consider what the other players are thinking. That is true, but it is misleading. Rapoport himself, seeing the U.S. armed services and their support institutions in the 1960s using game theory to improve warfighting capabilities, believed that such applications were an exploitation of game theory.
Rapoport predicted that the efforts of those using game theory as an instrument of national power would backfire. He hoped that the necessary step of putting oneself in the opponents' shoes to discern their goals would force one to reexamine the malevolent image of the opponent constructed to serve the cold war mentality. If economics is "the dismal science," he dubbed game theory "the subversive science."\textsuperscript{61}

But Rapoport oversold the capacity of traditional game theory. Compounding failures of cognition, especially the inability to empathize, game theoretical models require that one must "think like the opponent," but only given that the opponent is defined by preference orderings imposed, not discovered. That the symmetric payoff structure of the PD imposes identical preference orderings on both players is clear. More generally, game theory excludes the consideration of the makeup of an opponent's payoff structure. "By their very nature, game models are silent on the subject of what initially motivates players. Preference orderings at the outset are simply assumed to be exogenously—that is, arbitrarily determined."\textsuperscript{62} Indeed Robert Axelrod, responding specifically to the notion that one may adjust the traditional PD by allowing some additional activity which alters the strategic interaction, argued that in many cases those remedies simply are not available. "There is no way to change the other player's utilities. The utilities already include whatever consideration each player has for the interests of the other."\textsuperscript{63} The ultimate failure of that approach is that it circumscribes the solution set. The possible
outcomes are limited to a narrow range defined by the pre-determined payoff structure. The evolution of cooperation requires more than that.

A critical difference between the approach in this project and that of traditional international relations methodologies is that this work views those preferences and payoffs as empirical questions to be derived by examination of the case, not exogenously determined and imposed on the case. In chapter three I will explore the nature of the U.S.-Soviet relationship at the beginning of Gorbachev’s tenure, specifically to understand how each player evaluated the payoff structure of their “game.”

A second, even more critical difference is that this work explores the possibility of an expanding solution set, limited not by pre-determined structures, but by the creative abilities of the parties involved. Traditional approaches to international relations offer choices from a limited menu. GRIT offers the opportunity to expand the range of choices available to decision makers. By changing the relational environment—idiosyncratic characteristics of cognitive processes—GRIT can render likely what was before considered outside the realm of possibility. Moreover, understanding the impact of GRIT, and initiating study from that perspective, responds at least in part to the admonitions of Robert Dahl and David Easton to guide inquiry with insight and imagination.
Explaining the End of the Cold War

Political conflict is a complex affair buffeted by misperception and misinformation, problems perpetuated by longstanding images and belief structures. The work of Karl Deutsch illuminates this issue. Deutsch applied concepts from the theory of communication to the study of politics. Communication is the transfer of information between parties. The path through which communication occurs is a channel, and the efficiency of a channel refers to the difference between the information as it enters the channel and as it is received.\textsuperscript{64}

In classical communication theory, a discussion of information flows concerns essentially the mechanical components of the communication process. But Deutsch understood the channel concept in broader terms, including interpretation of information by the recipient.

Men and groups of men, like certain simpler devices, include the results of their own actions among the new input signals or "experiences" by which they guide their further action. And, as with all learning processes, they need not merely use this new information for the guidance of their behavior in the light of the preferences, memories, and goals which they have had thus far, but may also use them to learn, that is, to modify this very inner structure of their preferences, goals, and patterns of behavior.\textsuperscript{65}

It is simply insufficient to offer a stimulus/response solution to problems of political conflict for, as indicated above, they will be overwhelmed by the cross currents of political relations. The evolution of cooperation requires solutions
that go deeper into the psyche of decision makers. It requires a paradigm shift—a revolutionary insight—informed by a critical self-evaluation on the part of one party to the conflict, a rigorous exploration of the opponent state's preferences and perceptions, and policies designed to reshape the parties' understanding of the very nature of their relationship. TFT attempts simply to condition behavior to achieve a different payoff; Gorbachev used GRIT to alter the perceptions and preferences of the United States.

The policies of the United States and the Soviet Union during the postwar years were based on various notions of deterrence. Mutually assured destruction (MAD) was deterrence in its most purely Pavlovian guise. Under MAD, each party indicated its willingness to unleash horrific punishment should the other party misbehave. The arms race in its various forms was an effort to put "teeth" into that threat, developing the capacity to punish transgressors. The various perfections of strategy, counterforce targeting and the various warfighting strategies, were all based on the same stimulus/response conception of learning. Those "improvements" were simply attempts to convince the opponent that the threat of punishment remained credible despite technological changes on both sides.

Gorbachev's approach to foreign policy, especially regarding the United States, was truly revolutionary. Once he concluded that the conflictual relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union had to change, he
seemed to realize that such a change would require understanding and changing
the images, attitudes, and perceptions the United States held of the Soviet
Union. Even more revolutionary, however, was not only that Gorbachev sought
to facilitate a change in the U.S. enemy image of the Soviet Union, but that
Gorbachev sought first to understand what that image was and of what it was
constituted. My purpose is to explain just how Gorbachev set about to
accomplish those objectives. Understanding Gorbachev's manipulation of images
and preferences, and his introduction of a deeper, more profound type of
learning to international relations may well hold some critical lessons both for
students of international relations and for the future course of U.S. foreign
policy.

Introduction to Proto-Game Theory

The first step in understanding Gorbachev's role in the end of the cold war is to
develop a workable approach to game theory. As I have argued extensively in
this chapter, game theory holds a great deal of promise for the exploration of
cooperation in general and the end of the cold war in particular. At its heart,
game theory offers insights into conflicts between decision strategies. As
Rapoport argued, "It is naive to suppose that the strategies of diplomacy can be
cast into a two-person game. But the ramifications of game theory bring to light
the purely logical difficulties of dealing with strategy from a supposedly rational point of view."

Game theory is not a panacea for problems of conflict and cooperation, however. As I also argued earlier, game theory, as traditionally conceived, suffers various sins of omission and commission that hinder its ability to explain some critical cases of the evolution of cooperation. What, then, is the proper role for game theory?

Game theory is practiced at varying levels of sophistication. Barry O’Neill argues that there are three levels: high game theory, low game theory, and proto-game theory. As one moves up levels of sophistication from proto-game theory to high game theory, one finds greater levels of abstraction—more formal proofs, mathematical certainty, and scientific rigor—but less connection to the real world. "By moving up the ladder one understands more and more about an abstract entity that is less and less like the real world."

At the highest level of sophistication and abstraction, game theory is dominated by high mathematics, proofs of general theories covering broad classes of games. High game theory resides many levels of abstraction above operational variables. Low game theory, represented by much of the work of Steven Brams, for example, examines specific games or classes of games and their solutions. In Superpower Games, for example, Brams looks at various alternative structures and solutions for Chicken and PD, attempting both to
determine which game best represents the policies of deterrence practiced by the superpowers, and to determine if the policy choices of the superpowers fit a strategic-rational logic.

Proto-game theory eschews attempts at proofs and the use of high mathematics in general. "Proto-game theory is the use of game theory simply for its concepts or formal structure, without the calculation of optimal behavior ("solutions"), or the proof of general theorems." It has enjoyed a great deal of acceptance within the international relations community; Robert Jervis, Snyder and Diesing, and Thomas Schelling, for example, have used a proto-game theory approach in their work. The problem with that work, as I argued above, is that it failed to fully capture the nature of a critical case: the end of the cold war. Understanding that case—how the cold war ended—requires the resurrection of a theory of international politics that enjoyed at best narrow acceptance in the early 1960s, and has been at the fringes of political science ever since.

Introduction to GRIT

For Charles Osgood, GRIT was anything but a purely academic enterprise. Osgood looked at the world of 1962 and feared for its long-term survival. He saw a world of two nuclear-armed superpowers racing for an elusive superiority,
in an atmosphere of heightened tension and mistrust, facing ever-greater risk of nuclear war through inadvertence or miscalculation.

We are close to the point where either of the two major powers in the world today will be capable of wiping out the other in almost less time than it takes to read this paper. We are faced with the potentially lethal combination of armaments against which there is no defense and tensions from which there seems to be no respite. Given a world system of competing sovereign states, this combination makes probable the end of civilization as we know it and at least possible the elimination of life on this planet.\textsuperscript{72}

The central assumption of Osgood's work was that the problems of international relations could be seen as problems of human behavior. Technology, he thought, was neutral and could not, absent manipulation by human actors, pose a threat to survival. "It takes human decisions based upon human fears and hates to debase science this way\textsuperscript{73}—to turn science into weapons of mass destruction and to enact policies vis-a-vis another state that might lead to the use of those weapons. Those same decisions could be reversed, and that was the focus of Osgood's theory. Osgood believed that changing the underlying intellectual commitments of those decision makers would impact on their policy choices.

As a way out of this dangerous dilemma, Osgood developed the GRIT strategy. The centerpiece of the GRIT strategy was a series of unilateral initiatives offered with the intent of creating an atmosphere of trust between the two contending parties, that trust being measured initially in terms of reciprocal initiatives by the other party in the rivalry. Osgood considered the
unilateral nature of the initiatives as vital to the GRIT approach since the only alternative—negotiated agreements—were doomed to failure by the same Neanderthal mentality which perpetuated the rivalry in the first place. Kenneth Adelman, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, came to much the same conclusion. The distrust between the parties to the negotiation, each convinced that the other is merely searching for some advantage, renders such agreements virtually impotent. The result is one of two possible outcomes: Formal agreement is never reached as in the case of the Comprehensive Test Ban negotiations, or agreement is reached but the parties do a technological end-run, exploiting the gaps in the letter of the agreement as was the case with the first Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I). Osgood hoped that states, through the use of unilateral initiatives, could shake the enemy image of the target nation and allow the development of an atmosphere of trust in which negotiated settlements of important issues could have a greater opportunity to succeed.

One of the most crucial points to understanding GRIT and, from my reading of the literature, one of the most frequently misunderstood, is the number of initiates a state should offer in the early stages of the GRIT process. Many analysts have implicitly equated GRIT with the immediately sequential nature of TFT. In other words, these analysts understand GRIT to be a situation in which one state offers a unilateral initiative and then waits for the
other state to reciprocate. Komorita, Hilty, and Parks are typical of this misunderstanding: "If negotiations are deadlocked, the GRIT proposal prescribes that one side should make a small concession and *if it is reciprocated*, another small concession should be made (emphasis added)."  

Such an understanding dooms GRIT to failure. GRIT is proposed for situations of intense distrust between parties, and in that environment the target state is likely to disbelieve the intent to cooperate. Charles Lipson argued that a concession may be interpreted as a sign of weakness and irresolution, tempting the target state to exploit the initiator. Others have gone farther, arguing that the misperceived initiative could actually increase mistrust between the parties. Thomas Schelling explained his concerns:

Concession not only may be construed as capitulation, it may mark a prior commitment as a fraud, and make the adversary skeptical of any new pretense at commitment. One, therefore, needs an "excuse" for accommodating his opponent, preferably a rationalized reinterpretation of the original commitment, one that is persuasive to the adversary himself.

That very concern is what motivated Osgood to stress the need, especially early in the GRIT process, to maintain adequate levels of deterrence, and to tie the initiatives into a publicly-announced, overarching strategy. More critical, however, is the repetition of initiatives, even those not reciprocated, that lies at the heart of the GRIT strategy. Robert Jervis noted that one way to increase the chance of reciprocation of cooperative initiatives was to break a large initiative into a series of smaller steps. It would, according to Jervis, permit

124
more opportunity for the target state to verify the veracity of the initiator, and it would assure the gains from exploitation would be smaller, thereby reducing the incentive to exploit.\textsuperscript{79}

Osgood argues that repetitive initiatives are required to break through the cognitive veil of distrust—the Neanderthal mentality that grips national leaders in conflictive relationships. He conjures the image of a hammer pounding a nail, analogizing the blows to the repetitive initiatives that must begin the GRIT process.

Given the tense atmosphere in which such a strategy would necessarily begin, it is almost certain that our early initiatives would be met with the scornful statement that “it is nothing but a cold war trick!” The fact that our early initiatives would also of necessity be small steps of minor military significance would further contribute to this interpretation. But the genuineness of our intent becomes more and more difficult to deny and rationalize as action follows announced action with the steady impact of a hammered nail. Not only is the opponent’s self-fulfilling prophecy being repeatedly denied, but his bogey man conception of his enemy is being consistently confounded; the machinations of his psycho-logic (ordinarily reinforced by our threatening gestures) must become more and more complex and ludicrous until they fall of their own weight.\textsuperscript{80}

\textit{Support for GRIT}

As indicated earlier in this chapter in the section on the contribution of political psychology, there is substantial support for Osgood’s analysis of the problem: the cognitive factors that perpetuated superpower conflict. A second question of
equal significance, however, is whether there is support for the efficacy of Osgood's prescription. Once again, there exists a literature on GRIT which provides that evidence. C.R. Mitchell reviewed a number of the studies of the GRIT process and concluded:

...the evidence in favor of the success of such programs of tension reducing moves is positive and persuasive, even though it is true that full-blown GRIT strategies have seldom been employed in their entirety. Evidence from both field and laboratory indicates that the use of strategies such as GRIT produces the effects hypothesized by Osgood and Etzioni, whether these be behavioral effects such as an increase in cooperative behavior, or psychological effects such as an increase in trust between the adversaries. Our review of the (admittedly limited) evidence shows clearly that it is rare to come across evidence that runs completely counter to the GRIT propositions, and that what evidence exists tends to confirm the hypothesized influences, at least as far as the direction if not the intensity of the effect is concerned. 

Other than these review pieces, the GRIT literature generally falls into three categories: historical studies, experimental studies, and statistical studies. The historical studies examine specific cases, attempting to draw parallels between the behavior of the subjects and the GRIT process, followed by an evaluation of the impact of the strategy on the thinking and behavior of the subjects. Experimental studies can be games, simulations, or other field or laboratory investigations using a controlled environment and abstraction from real world cases. Statistical studies are based on events data sets and evaluate cooperation over time. All three types of studies lend support to Osgood's proposition.
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The first and most important historical study of GRIT is Amitai Etzioni’s investigation of events of 1963, dubbed “the Kennedy Experiment.” Gordon Shull argues that the 1963 experience was “a virtual text-book case” of the use of a GRIT-like strategy. Etzioni argues, “The Kennedy Experiment can be viewed as a test of a moderate version of the psychological theory that seeks to use symbolic gestures as unilateral initiatives to reduce tension to get at other factors...”

Etzioni describes Kennedy’s experiment, beginning with the President’s June 10, 1963 speech at American University. That speech adhered closely to Osgood’s prescription, outlining the dangers inherent in a continuation of unbridled competition and signaling a change in the U.S. attitude toward relations with the Soviet Union. Further, Kennedy announced the first unilateral initiative, a ban on all atmospheric nuclear testing to last as long as other countries did not test above ground. Nikita Khrushchev responded on June 15 with a speech that embraced the general tenets regarding the U.S.-Soviet relationship as offered by Kennedy five days earlier. Khrushchev also announced suspension of the production of strategic bombers, a response to Kennedy’s ban on atmospheric testing. The next several months saw a series of concessions and counter-concessions by the superpowers, and a rising public sentiment in the United States for increasingly ambitious conciliatory measures.
By late October, with elections looming in the United States, the pace of these efforts began to slacken. The assassination of President Kennedy is seen by some as the end of the experiment, although Etzioni pointed out that the experiment was resumed after the election. In fact, the Soviet press reported that the "policy of mutual example," as they referred to the practice, had the effect of lowering overall defense spending in the United States and the Soviet Union in 1964 and 1965.

When the reduction of military expenditures in the Soviet Union and the United States became known, the White House published a report to the effect that "no agreement on budget reductions exists between our two countries." Yes, as a matter of fact there was no special agreement on this score between the Soviet Union and the USA. But the policy of mutual example operated here, and as a result a definite positive step was taken in the direction of reduced international tension.  

Etzioni's assessment of the Kennedy Experiment was that it achieved moderately good results. He argues that the impact seemed not be in terms of changing Soviet attitudes—perhaps because Kennedy was dealing with a reformist general secretary in Khrushchev who was, himself, ready to change the relationship. Rather, the Kennedy Experiment seemed to impact most clearly on the attitudes of the American public, serving to expand "the range of options the Kennedy administration could take up without running high political risks from a public steeped in cold war psychology."

My assessment is that the Kennedy Experiment certainly provides evidence of the power of unilateral concessions to break through a barrier of
escalating conflictive behavior, and it also illustrates some of the limits of the strategy as first Kennedy, and then Johnson and Khrushchev, succumbed to the realities of domestic political opposition, effectively bringing the experiment to a close, much as Gorbachev was to experience some twenty-plus years later. But it fails to provide evidence supporting the ability of GRIT to change hostile attitudes and enemy images. As argued above, once Kennedy decided to engage in conciliatory policies toward the Soviet Union, he and Khrushchev appeared to be in agreement on the general requirements of policy. Such an assessment certainly helps explain why Khrushchev was willing to so quickly reciprocate Kennedy’s opening move. Osgood’s analysis, as well as most of the previous analysis of game theory, realism, and political psychology in the current work, suggest that such a response would not be so immediately forthcoming. The real test of GRIT is a situation in which only one party has re-evaluated the nature of the relationship and must set about to break through the wall of cognitive dysfunction of its rival.

Deborah Welch Larson explores the role of GRIT in the signing of the Austrian State Treaty in 1955.67 In the early 1950s Austria was another arena in which East and West faced off. The United States and the Soviet Union both had thousands of troops stationed in Austria, and the Soviet Union commanded critical Austrian natural resources and other economic assets. The United States, especially the military, opposed the removal of U.S. troops from Austrian
territory because they feared the Soviet Union would use its position to take over the country, with serious consequences for European stability and U.S. security.

The Khrushchev leadership, on the other hand, in the aftermath of Stalin's death in 1953, sought a summit meeting with the United States. The Soviet Union made a series of concessions to the United States, hoping to improve relations. "Because the Soviets continued to make concessions despite the lack of response from the United States, the Eisenhower administration inferred that the Soviets were 'suckers,' acting from a position of weakness."®

In response, the Soviet Union employed threats and a less conciliatory policy toward Germany and Austria, resulting in a changing U.S. attitude. When, in 1955, the Soviet Union offered to sign the Austrian State Treaty, removing both U.S. and Soviet influence and thereby neutralizing a dangerous point of contention, the United States agreed and finally reciprocated the earlier unilateral Soviet initiatives by acceding to the Soviet request for a summit.

Welch Larson used this case to contrast the impact of GRIT and TFT in inducing reciprocation. She concludes that TFT is an inferior approach because it fails to address the psychological impediments to cooperation: it is Pavlovian in its conception whereas inducing reciprocal cooperation in an atmosphere of extreme distrust and misperception requires a more revolutionary insight.

Could a policy of TFT also make use of public statements, diversification of concessions, and the requirement that
concessions involve costs or risks? In theory, no. TFT is a behavior modification theory that does not concede the need to modify the other player's beliefs or create greater trust. Osgood's GRIT is a cognitive theory of trust development and for that reason seeks to alter one player's expectations about the other player's intentions. 99 (emphasis in original)

Welch Larson could not be more correct in her assessment of the differing conceptions of learning embodied in GRIT and TFT. While her conclusions are supportive of GRIT, however, I am once again skeptical that the case she examined was an example of GRIT in action. The behavior chronicled in her study was, in fact, a fairly standard application of a carrot and stick policy with which the Soviet Union attempted to impact the U.S. cost-benefit analysis. The hardening of Soviet policy toward Germany and Austria in the mid-1950s merely served to demonstrate to the Eisenhower administration that it could not enjoy the exploitation payoff (1,4) in perpetuity. Based on Soviet policy shifts, Eisenhower reexamined what he could reasonably expect to gain given what he knew about his adversary. Neither his image of the adversary, nor his preference orderings in the "game" changed. One significant contribution of this dissertation, then, may be that it is the first true empirical evaluation of a case of Osgood's GRIT proposal in action.

Experimental studies of the entire GRIT strategy and of components of the GRIT package vastly outnumber historical studies, and they provide a great deal of additional support for the GRIT hypotheses. Some early game theory work supported notions of reciprocity. Scodel 90 and Bixenstein and Wilson 91
studied PD games using pre-determined strategies. In each case, one player used a strategy that was predominantly or exclusively non-cooperative. After a number of plays, the strategy changed to predominantly or exclusively cooperative. The results showed a small increase in cooperation, although neither set of researchers found the results significant.

Svenn Lindskold surveyed the vast literature of game theory and cooperation. He was concerned that many researchers were examining pieces of Osgood's argument or concepts of reciprocity without recognizing the interconnectedness of much of that ongoing research. In an effort to distill a coherent body of research, Lindskold attempted to use the points of Osgood's GRIT proposal to organize this apparently disparate literature. He examined each of ten points of the GRIT strategy separately, related them to relevant psychological principles, and applied studies from the experimental literature to each point. In sum, Lindskold found substantial support for each of the ten points. "The various points of the GRIT proposal generally seem to be soundly supported as means to induce trust in one of its various forms and bring about cooperative responses."  

Lindskold has, in addition, conducted a number of studies which support the efficacy of the GRIT strategy. Brian Betz summarized some of those studies.

...it has been found that in the standard two-choice PD game, GRIT (a) elicits cooperation from groups as well as individuals (Lindskold and Collins 1978); (b) elicits cooperation in sequential interaction, where subjects choose after a simulated other and thus can take
advantage of their opponent (Lindskold 1979); and elicits cooperation from competitively motivated subjects as well as cooperatively motivated subjects (Lindskold, Walters, and Koutsourais 1983). Of particular interest to the present study is that GRIT has been proven to be more effective at eliciting cooperation than other strategies including tit-for-tat (Lindskold, Walters, and Koutsourais 1983). Even with the addition of communication to the tit-for-tat strategy, GRIT prompts more cooperation than tit-for-tat (Han and Lindskold 1985).

Betz's own study used a six-choice PD game, which simply allowed the players to choose various degrees of cooperation or non-cooperation. He found that GRIT and TFT performed equally in games in which there was no communication. One might correctly note that Osgood's conception of GRIT included communication, and so GRIT without communication is not GRIT, a critique that also applies to the work of Marc Pilisuk. As Betz noted, Pilisuk found that there was no difference between GRIT and TFT in cooperation-inducement. Betz's study added communication to the model, and GRIT then outperformed TFT substantially.

Joshua Goldstein and John Freeman produced the premier statistical study of the GRIT hypotheses. Goldstein and Freeman extracted thousands of events data-points from the Conflict and Peace Data Bank (COPDAB) and the World Events Interaction Survey (WEIS). The events data-points relate to interactions between the United States, The Soviet Union, and the People's Republic of China, and were scored for "cooperativeness" and graphed onto a time scale. That scale was then divided into one-month time periods, a
cooperation score was calculated for each country in each month and a mathematical relationship derived between the cooperation score for one of the states in one month and another of the states in the next month. In other words, a certain cooperation score for the United States in October of 1966, for example, is associated with a cooperation score for the Soviet Union in November of 1966.

Goldstein and Freeman test TFT, GRIT, and two variations of GRIT, one in which initiatives are extended over a longer period of time (EGRIT) and one in which the initiatives escalate (become more cooperative) over time (PGRIT). Goldstein and Freeman test these various formulations of GRIT and TFT by simulating cooperative initiatives, represented by cooperation scores of the type derived from the events data-points, over time. The results: "The more sustained and (or) graduated kinds of initiatives associated with GRIT, EGRIT, and PGRIT are more likely to elicit cooperation than TFT." In the end, Goldstein and Freeman recommended a variation of GRIT in which initiatives were extended permanently, as in a permanent EGRIT. This "super-GRIT," as they called it, had the potential to replace conflict with cooperation on a sustainable basis.

While Goldstein and Freeman's *Three-Way Street* is the exemplar of this school of research applied to GRIT, the approach appears inherently suspect. First, GRIT is based on addressing cognitive processes; the events data approach
ignores cognitive and perceptual issues. Second, GRIT is a theory of reciprocity which suggests that events are related in some way. Goldstein and Freeman relate events that are near each other chronologically, but they make no attempt to connect the events in any other logical way. Statistical techniques can only demonstrate correlation; they are silent on issues of causation. Yet Goldstein and Freeman attempt to draw conclusions about reciprocity—i.e. about one event causing another—based on correlative techniques. Other researchers using this technique commit the same error. Gerald Schneider, Thomas Widmer, and Dieter Ruloff, also using the COPDAB data set and similar statistical techniques, attempt to pass judgement on the validity of reciprocity in general and GRIT in particular. 

Finally, the distinction in Goldstein and Freeman between the varieties of GRIT is artificial at best. They assume that initiatives in a GRIT proposal must be equally cooperative, so that the escalation of cooperation in PGRIT represents a variation from Osgood's original conception. GRIT, in fact, allows for initiatives of varying intensities. Goldstein and Freeman also assume that in GRIT, initiatives must be offered monthly, permitting the extension of initiatives in EGRIT. Again, Osgood did not specify a schedule for initiatives. Finally, super-GRIT, Goldstein and Freeman's grand contribution to the cooperation literature, is almost identical to Osgood's original description of GRIT in *An Alternative to War or Surrender* (1962).
Critiques of GRIT

A number of researchers have also concluded that GRIT is an ineffective strategy for the inducement of cooperation. Several of those works will be discussed here.

Richard Bitzinger argues that Mikhail Gorbachev was, in fact, pursuing a GRIT-like strategy toward the United States in the late 1980s. He concludes, however, that Gorbachev's efforts simply confounded the pursuit of arms control by demonstrating to the United States the weakness of the Soviet Union, thereby diminishing the incentive for the United States to pursue negotiated arms control agreements. While that argument would certainly find support from other realist scholars as indicated earlier in this chapter, Bitzinger evidences a serious misunderstanding of the GRIT process and of the larger literature on cooperation.

Initially, Bitzinger confuses the general game theoretical concepts found in Axelrod with Osgood's GRIT strategy. Following immediately from a discussion of Axelrod and his conclusions regarding TFT in a PD, Bitzinger criticizes GRIT on the grounds that the relationship between contending parties may be better represented by Deadlock, a situation in which one of the players prefers to avoid cooperation, than by PD. That is, however, a criticism of Axelrod, not a criticism of GRIT. In fact, I have argued that GRIT is the ideal
strategy choice for situations like the cold war in which one side, because of its enemy image of the other player, prefers non-cooperation.

Bitzinger further argues that GRIT could be confounded by misperception or inherent bad faith. In actuality, GRIT is ideally suited for such situations. Of all the approaches studied only GRIT offers the possibility of breaking through that cognitive barrier.

Finally, Bitzinger fails to treat GRIT as a strategy that guides behavior across a number of issue areas over time, with the intent not of directly changing behavior, but of providing revolutionary insight into the nature of the relationship between two parties. Bitzinger, for example, addresses the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing, instituted by Gorbachev in 1986. “In the case of the unilateral nuclear test ban, Gorbachev went to almost comical lengths to encourage cooperation and reciprocation, extending the moratorium four times; yet each time his efforts were rebuffed. GRIT simply did not work here.” It is an error to judge GRIT based on the immediacy of the reciprocation or on the relation of the reciprocal event to the issue area of the initiative. The moratorium on testing was but one piece of a much larger strategy of concessions, and, as I will argue in chapter five, by 1989, Gorbachev's GRIT-like strategy was beginning to change the attitudes of the U.S. leadership.

A second significant critique of GRIT is Bennet Ramberg's *Arms Control Without Negotiation.* While an assessment of GRIT is only a small part of the
Ramberg volume, its key argument has implications for the larger question of the evolution of cooperation. Essentially, the Ramberg volume argues that changes in the environment must precede cooperative behavioral developments.

Ramberg makes a critical error in his assessment of the GRIT strategy. First, like Bitzinger, he seeks evidence of reciprocation immediately and in the issue area of the initiative. Ramberg discusses Gorbachev's moratorium on nuclear testing, indicating that it is an "almost perfect application of GRIT," and concludes that since the United States continued to test throughout the period of the moratorium, GRIT failed. Ramberg, in fact, lists a series of initiatives taken by U.S. and Soviet leaders beginning in the 1960s, proclaiming each a failure of GRIT if it did not result in an immediate, in-kind response. But GRIT is not a single initiative, it is a complete strategy covering many issue areas and extending in time. Conceived as such, GRIT provides a compelling argument for reciprocal cooperation.

Ramberg sees Gorbachev's 1988 United Nations speech as a critical moment in the pursuit of arms control without negotiation, citing a series of cooperative actions between the United States and the Soviet Union in the years that followed, and he uses that event as evidence to support his conclusion that environmental conditions must precede cooperation. In other words, Ramberg wants to make the case that Gorbachev's 1988 speech changed the strategic environment and so made possible the advances in arms control that followed.
Ramberg fails to understand, however, that Gorbachev's 1988 speech and the troop reductions pledged therein did not simply materialize in December of 1988. They were part of a process begun by Gorbachev in 1985, culminating in the pledge to reduce troop strength in Europe. The overwhelmingly positive response to that speech by the United States was also a product of Gorbachev's efforts since 1985. Ramberg was correct that reciprocal cooperation requires a conducive environment, but he failed to realize that in the case of the end of the cold war a GRIT strategy was a critical element in creating that conducive environment.
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CHAPTER 3

Setting the Table: Phase 1 U.S.-Soviet Relations

_The historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence._

--T. S. Eliot

The preface of Ross Stagner's 1967 book on the psychology of international conflict reiterates the simple yet often overlooked argument that serves as the foundation of the analysis in this study:

Nations begin in the minds of men....Conflict between nations also begins with human emotions, desires, ideas, and aspirations. Controversies over tariffs, strategic military outposts, and territorial boundaries arise when men (identified with different nations) seek to gain what is perceived as an advantage for them or for their group.¹

Once dismissed by international relations as “the black box,” it is in the minds of political leaders that answers may be found to some of the more truculent problems of international politics. The U.S.-Soviet rivalry is an example of one such problem.
Structural variables are often cited to explain the beginning of the cold war, giving the cold war an air of inevitability. "Some political scientists and historians have argued that the cold war was bound to occur once Germany was defeated, given the rise of two superpowers and the accompanying bipolar distribution of capabilities in the world." But those explanations ignore two critical factors, both of which are rooted in the cognitive processes of individual decision makers. The first is that capabilities are only part of the threat equation; a perception of hostile intent is essential to the existence of a threat. Second, both capability and intent are filtered through the minds of decision makers. It is those perceptions that control the reaction of one state to another. "In many areas of politics, diplomacy and defense, it is the mutual images of the two countries, rather than their actual behavior, that have had such an extraordinary influence."

Political science has yet to fully integrate the cognitive revolution into the study of international relations. The melding of methodologies suggested in the first two chapters is just such an attempt, advanced as a sort of intellectual compass. It has borrowed from several international relations theories to provide an understanding of the relationship between a number of variables important to the explanation of international political behavior. This new approach has helped to highlight which of the many variables available for study are those most likely to be relevant to an explanation of how the cold war ended,
and it has mapped a direction for the next stage of this research: the empirical investigation of images, behaviors, and perceptions at the end of the cold war.

In this chapter, I will begin to examine the origin of belief systems and their constituent images. I will first explore in general terms the processes leading to the development of belief systems. Mikhail Gorbachev was the architect of change in U.S.-Soviet relations, and the raw material with which he worked was the state of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union—including the cognitive components of the relationship—at that important moment. Those relations were a product of the history of relations between the countries since at least the end of the World War II in 1945. The second section of this chapter will, therefore, lay out a brief narrative of the history of U.S. relations with the Soviet Union—paying special attention to the dominant image of the Soviet Union in the United States—for that history made a significant contribution to the formation of the beliefs and images of decision makers both in the United States and in the Soviet Union.

The critical historical moment in this analysis is the year 1985. The images prevalent in the minds of U.S. policy makers at that time are by far the most important factors in understanding the nature and severity of the challenge facing Mikhail Gorbachev as the new General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This chapter will conclude with a description of Reagan's image of the Soviet Union and his administration's
foreign policy at the outset of the Gorbachev regime, and will include an attempt to hang those images on a rudimentary game theoretic framework. Understanding the mindset of President Reagan and his advisers lays the groundwork for the exploration in chapter four of the scope of the Gorbachev reforms, and is essential to an understanding of the processes at work from 1985 to 1989. Raymond Garthoff concurs.

...it is hard to put ourselves in the Soviet or American mindsets of a decade ago. While our present understanding of the past may benefit from knowing what history has brought about, our contemporary understanding of the political dynamics of that past era is more difficult to recreate. Yet it is essential to do so in order to understand the expectations, aims, and fears of political leaders at the time.⁶

*Life Experiences and the Origins of Beliefs and Images*

Robert Axelrod's shadow of the future notwithstanding, it is to the shadow of the past—to history—that I will first turn in this attempt to uncover meaning in the end of the cold war. Critical to this study's approach to the emergence and evolution of cooperative relations between the United States and the Soviet Union is an understanding of the connection between events in the past and contemporary thinking. Political psychology explicates that link.

The contribution of political psychology is its realization that belief systems, their component images, and related cognitive processes shape the
range of policy options decision makers believe to have available to them at any moment in time. Alexander George identifies this as the crucial nexus between traditional theories of international relations and political psychology.

Other variables not encompassed by this theory—such as domestic structure and politics, ideology, belief systems, images of the opponent, bureaucratic politics, strategic interaction and bargaining—need to be brought into the analytic framework in order to try to predict or explain specific foreign policy decisions and specific outcomes. When one brings these other variables into the equation, then one must draw upon various aspects of political psychology. This, then, is how international relations theory and political psychology intersect.²

The images one state holds of another possess tremendous cognitive import—they help determine the cognitive processes of decision makers. Policy choices are made based on the perceptions policy makers hold of a given situation; their evaluation and understanding of the capabilities and intentions of relevant actors in the international system.

...an actor's behavior depends upon his or her image of the environment. Such images are sometimes referred to as knowledge. We have avoided this term because it implies validity or truth. The young urban black in Detroit, the revolutionary in a developing state, the foreign policy decision maker—each believes that his or her view of social reality is correct. It is, therefore, what each person thinks the world is like that may influence behavior.³

Robert Jervis indicated that there exists overwhelming evidence that decision makers tend to fit new information to images previously held,⁴ and Seweryn Bialer argued that, "It is a well-accepted and tested axiom of social research in international relations that usually the most important determinant of one
state's interpretation of another's specific action is the first state's pre-existing image of the second.\textsuperscript{10}

Imaging is a cognitive necessity; the sheer volume of information flooding decision makers requires the use of such tools to make sense of the world.\textsuperscript{11} But at least in the period under study here, images are eidetic and overwhelm cognitive checks on faulty decision making. Pre-existing images and belief structures, and the cognitive dysfunctions they produce, virtually guarantee that, absent pure serendipity, those perceptions will be at variance with reality. The degree of success or failure of a given policy will often depend to a significant degree on how great is that variance.

Given the amount and ambiguous nature of information in the international arena, images take on even greater significance in decision making.\textsuperscript{12} One of the purposes of this research is to attempt to understand just how Ronald Reagan saw the world of international politics in general, and the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union in particular, by the time that Mikhail Gorbachev ascended to the leadership of the Soviet Union in early 1985, as well as to assess the likelihood that Reagan would succumb to the aforementioned cognitive dysfunctions and faulty, if understandable, judgements. Chapter 5 will examine how President Reagan processed and interpreted the information he received regarding the evolving foreign policy of Mikhail Gorbachev. First, however, it will be helpful to look at the factors that
influence the development of images—how leaders come to believe what they do about the world around them.

The political psychology literature largely consists of three strands of research. The first attempts to uncover methods to determine the belief systems of political actors—to understand exactly what actors think about the world around them. The second, given some understanding of the characteristics of belief systems, attempts to understand how the existence of belief systems affects the decision making process. The third attempts to assess the resiliency of belief systems, the processes by which they evolve or change, and the strategies that might facilitate their evolution. Appearing to be lost in all of this, however, is a more basic discussion of the origin of belief systems. To effect an empirical investigation of the belief system of an actor, we must know in more general terms how the package of beliefs and images an actor brings to the table are formed. That basic knowledge can help to direct the empirical investigation into a particular subject's cognitive development.

Called psychoanalytic theory or political biography, this approach seeks information about the traits that may impact an individual's decision making and cognitive styles in that individual's life experiences. Margaret Hermann noted that by the early 1970s, political psychology had moved away from this approach. Echoing Karl Lewin's concern that the impact of personal history on contemporary thinking and behavior is indirect at best, she suggests that the
focus of political psychology turn toward "...learning the determinants and consequences of having more or less of a trait (e.g., anxiety, self-esteem, authoritarianism). Furthermore, the emphasis is on describing the trait in the subjects at present rather than speculating about how past levels affect present behavior." But that focus, while perhaps more parsimonious than an investigation richer in historical detail, may yet be less informative.

While the study of trait development has not been as systematized or institutionalized as that of other aspects of the psychology of decision making, there is a literature on which to draw. Psychology's knowledge of birth order and its impact on personality traits, for example, has found its way into the study of political decision makers.

Historians and biographers have long sought an understanding of contemporary behavior in the past experiences of their subjects. Biographies of significant historical figures most often begin with a discussion of roots, family, and upbringing, and a number of prominent works of political biography are quite explicit in their application of the psycho-analytical methodology. Jean Edward Smith's biography of General Lucius Clay, for example, is replete with references to the culture and character of Clay's Georgia upbringing and how those factors influenced Clay's behavior in later life.

More explicitly psychological is Leon Trotsky's incomplete biography of Joseph Stalin. Relying heavily on the work of Oso Iremashvili, an early
biographer of Stalin, Trotsky asserts that Stalin's abusive father created the future master of the gulag.

In helpless grief Keke observed Bezo, by mistreating his son, 'drive out of his heart the love of God and people, and fill him with aversion for his own father. Undeserved, frightful beatings made the boy as grim and heartless as was his father.' In bitterness, Joseph began to brood over the eternal mysteries of life. He did not grieve over the premature death of his father; he merely felt freer. Iremashvili infers that when still quite young the boy began to extend his smoldering enmity and thirst for vengeance against his father and all those who had, or could have, any power over him. 'Since youth the carrying out of vengeful plots became for him the goal that dominated all his efforts.'

Alexander and Juliette George take a similar approach in their study of Woodrow Wilson. They suggest that Wilson's approach to a number of issues was related to questions of power and control of others—they cite, for example, Wilson's unwillingness to compromise with political opponents, at least on matters he viewed as important. The need to maintain control, they contend, stemmed from Wilson's competitive and aggressive relationship with his father. For Wilson, they conclude, political power was compensatory—it served to restore Wilson's self esteem, damaged in childhood.

These works of political biography underscore a more general conception regarding the formation of images: In each case an actor's subsequent behavior is related causally to some incident or series of incidents from the actor's past. It is experience from which attitudes and images derive. Albert Eldridge related his findings on the matter:
Basically, images are built up from past experiences. This accumulation of images is usually called learning. It consists of sets of building blocks—beliefs, attitudes, and motivations. For example, when we speak of an actor’s perceptions of a social issue or event, we are referring to a complex and interrelated set of these mental building blocks.¹³

To say that images are based on experience, however, is to merely begin to explore this critical question which, from an analytical perspective, is fraught with difficulties. There is, first, a question of data availability: it is impossible to know all of the events that a given subject may have experienced. Moreover, while an extensive one-on-one psychological analysis performed by a trained professional might help to narrow the range of events regarded as salient to a subject’s particular characteristic or image, such a personal investigation is simply not feasible for the subjects of this study. In fact, such an analysis is likely to prove impossible in most cases of interest to international relations scholars.

That reality need not, however, prevent research into personality and images. A number of scholars have developed techniques to enable them to “assess personality at a distance,” and there are a number of very interesting studies specifically of Ronald Reagan and how his life experiences effected the development of his personality traits and his images of the Soviet Union and the nature of international politics.²⁰

Caution is still required, however, lest such investigations degenerate into exercises in tautology. Decision makers as subjects of such investigations most
often have a public track record, and knowledge of that record make up part of
the analysts' intellectual baggage. Careless researchers could find themselves
"discovering" only those life events that seem to support the analyst's pre-
existing notions of the subject's belief structure.

In addition, there is an apparent circularity of causation in attempts to
derive a subject's traits and characteristics from patterns of behavior, and then
using the derivative understanding of the subject's personality to explain the
subject's behavior. F. I. Greenstein indicates, however, that there is a solution
to that analytical difficulty as well.

The seeming circularity of generating a personality construct from
behavior and using the construct to explain behavior does not in
fact involve a tautology as long as we do not use the same item or
behavior to infer a disposition and then use the inferred
disposition to explain the item of behavior.\textsuperscript{21}

While analysts with a more positivist methodological bent may still decry
these methods, it remains true that quantitative methodologies, while fine for
more sweeping trend analyses, prove less capable of generating insights into
specific individual motivations. "As suggested by Alexander George, 'Qualitative
analysis of a limited number of crucial communications may often yield better
clues to the particular intentions of a particular speaker at one moment in time
than more standardized quantitative methods."\textsuperscript{22}
Psycho-Political Foundations of the Cold War

It has often been argued that to speak of the character or personality of a nation is to commit a fallacy of anthropomorphism—the reification of the state—because nations are not single actors. Rather, they are composed of many people, each with their own ideas and thoughts about the full range of issues that impact on one's life. It is mistaken, therefore, to discuss the "American view" or the "French view", for example, of Russia or the former Soviet Union. At best one could hope to understand the officially-expressed policy of a national government on a given issue, country, or event. Some analysts, however, are more comfortable with the notion of immutable national identities by which individuals define themselves, other actors in the international system, and their relationships with those other actors.

...psychoanalysis understands national identity as part of the individual's larger project of establishing moorings. National identities strive to denote stable, clearly defined sets of meanings, meanings unsullied by annoying ambiguities and ambivalences. They aim at functioning as signifiers untrammeled by the sometime disturbing openness that can otherwise characterize our sense of self. They seek to engender definition, clarity, and closure; moreover, one need only think of the numerous jokes involving different national temperaments to realize that, to a good degree, they succeed in this task.

That notion of national attribute remains specious, however, in light of the original critique above, that individuals within a national populace or leadership group possess their own perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, and
preferences. Caputi's analysis, however, underscores two critical notions: the first, that it is possible at least in some contexts to talk of "national" attributes; and second, and much more important for this analysis, that there is a tendency for human subjects to embrace conceptions of national identity. One must conceive of an interplay between national attributes and personal viewpoints, one in which immersion within widely-held perceptions of an adversary conditions the formation of images and belief structures in the minds of individual decision makers. Robert Jervis explains how the perception of the history of a state conditions thinking about that state.

A third source of concepts, which frequently will be the most directly relevant to a decision-maker's perception of international relations, is international history. As Henry Kissinger points out, one reason why statesmen were so slow to recognize the threat posed by Napoleon was that previous events had accustomed them only to actors who wanted to modify the existing system, not overthrow it. The other side of the coin is even more striking: historical traumas can heavily influence future perceptions. They can either establish a state's image of the other state involved or it can be used as analogies.25

Denied the ability to "reality test" their notions of the Soviet Union (to compare the image with actual practice and behavior of Russian people or the Soviet leadership) the images of the Soviet Union held by many Americans at all levels became fixed.26

It is possible to conceptualize some specific issues around which a more robust national view may form. Where such issues exist, images derived therefrom may help us understand the strategic choices made by national policy.
makers. The fact that such images may fail to mirror reality is central to their role in perpetuating confrontation and preventing cooperation.

U.S.-Soviet Relations After 1945

Antipathy between the United States and the Soviet Union is as old as the Soviet Union itself, and might well find its origins in the one hundred plus years of relations between the United States and pre-revolutionary Russia. John Gaddis sees the relationship in Great Power terms, and cites decades of congeniality between Russia and the United States—a congeniality based on a lack of issues of real conflict between the two, along with a shared suspicion of Great Britain—culminating in the sale of Russian-America (Alaska) to the United States in 1867.27

In the second half of the 1800s, relations began to break down as Russia and the United States each sought to expand its control and influence into Northern Asia. In addition, this period saw the first inkling of an ideological strain between the two countries as the democratic United States began to evince a growing uncomfortableness with the highly autocratic Russia.

But this international realignment was not the only reason Russian-American relations worsened. Even before that happened, the United States had begun to take Russia's internal structure as well as external policies into account in shaping its official attitude toward that country. Ideology began to make a difference; questions began to be raised as to whether a democracy could, or
should, maintain friendly relations with the most autocratic nation in Europe. This preoccupation with Russian internal conditions was, in the long run, a more lasting cause of tension that Far Eastern rivalries because it made reconciliation dependent upon reform.  

Walter LaFeber relates the sentiments of President Theodore Roosevelt regarding the Russians, sentiments that would have well served a staunch anticommunist during the heart of the cold war.

From the 1890s until 1917 the United States tried to contain Russian expansion, usually by supporting Japan which, for its own purposes, also wanted an open Manchuria. President Theodore Roosevelt exemplified American sentiments: the Russians “are utterly insincere and treacherous; they have no conception of the truth...and no regard for others.” As for the Czar, he was “a preposterous little creature.”

With the Bolshevik Revolution in October of 1917, the ideological component of the conflict between the two powers was cemented. The United States and the Soviet Union had radically different—in fact, opposing—views of the core principles of government. Emerging from different philosophical traditions, they had opposing conceptions of human nature and the role and nature of the state.

Enmity dominated U.S.-Soviet relations from the Revolution until the United States entered World War II in 1941. Beginning with the anti-Bolshevik Western military intervention in the Russian Civil War, U.S.-Soviet relations stumbled from confrontation to confrontation for twenty-five years—
non-recognition, debt repayment, a proxy war in Spain, a pact with the devil—Walter LaFeber summarized the relationship.

Possessing drastically different views of how the world should be organized, unable to cooperate during the 1930s against Nazi and Japanese aggression, and nearly full-fledged enemies between 1939 and 1941, the United States and the Soviet Union finally became partners because of a shotgun marriage forced upon them by World War II.  

During the war, animosities were submersed in the face of the common enemy. But those animosities did not disappear; they lurked just beneath the surface, poisoning relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, and thwarting efforts at cooperation in the postwar era.

Undoubtedly the defeat of the common enemy permitted the re-emergence of those long-standing disagreements and ill will, but one cannot ignore the role played by the contemporaneous change in leadership in the United States. Franklin Roosevelt had orchestrated the normalization of U.S.-Soviet relations in 1933, and he generally possessed a more accommodating attitude toward the Soviet Union. Roosevelt and a number of his key advisers, particularly Secretary of State James Byrnes, saw an opportunity to work with the Soviet Union to construct a stable, peaceful postwar order. Even after Roosevelt's death, Byrnes perceived a flickering hope for accommodation with the Soviet Union.

In fact, for a brief moment at the end of 1946 and the beginning of 1947 it looked as if the wartime amity between Washington and Moscow might be restored and the momentum of the cold war...
reversed. Byrnes himself certainly thought he was on the verge of a decisive breakthrough. In a widely publicized speech on January 11, 1947, Byrnes stated: "The development of a sympathetic understanding between the United States and the Soviet Union is the paramount task of statesmanship. Today, I am happy to say I am more confident than at any other time since V.J. Day that we can achieve a just peace by cooperative effort if we persist with firmness in the right as God gives us the power to see the right."

But the light of that hope was faint, and fading. President Harry Truman was much more suspicious of Soviet intentions, and perhaps less risk acceptant where they Soviet Union was concerned, than had been his predecessor. An oft-quoted statement by then-Senator Truman in 1941 is suggestive of the image of the Soviet Union Truman brought with him to the Oval Office. In June of 1941, upon hearing that Germany had attacked the Soviet Union in violation of the 1939 non-aggression pact between the two countries, Truman said, "If we see that Germany is winning, we ought to help Russia, and if Russia is winning, we ought to help Germany, and that way we let them kill as many as possible, although I don't want to see Hitler victorious under any circumstances."  

While it appeared that Truman's image of the Soviet Union was already quite well settled by the time he assumed the presidency, any hope of his adopting a more accommodative approach was squelched at Potsdam. Stephen Garrett relates a particular exchange between Truman and Soviet General Secretary Joseph Stalin regarding the internationalization of European waterways. Stalin was interested only in the implications of the proposal for Soviet control of the Black Sea Straits.
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When Truman insisted on discussing internationalization as a general procedure the Soviet leader impatiently cut short the dialogue and suggested that the Conference turn to more urgent matters. This experience left a deep imprint on Truman's attitude toward Soviet-American relations. It convinced him that Moscow was uninterested in any proposals for mutually beneficial economic cooperation after the war. Indeed, Truman concluded that it was now clear "the Russians were planning world conquest."\(^{35}\)

Truman elevated new players in the decision making process, turning for counsel to anti-Soviet hardliners, and marginalized those, like Byrnes, who had sought accommodation with the Soviet Union. The fear was appeasement; no one wanted to be accused of failing to grasp the lessons of Munich.

Unfortunately, Byrnes' pragmatic attitude appalled many ideologues in Washington. President Truman, his immediate advisers—particularly Fleet Admiral William Leahy, Judge Samuel Rosenman, and the career foreign service officers of the State Department—believed Byrnes was on the threshold of a dangerous appeasement toward Russia. Senator Arthur Vanderberg of Michigan, the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who accompanied Byrnes to the various foreign ministers' conferences, later wrote that his principal task at that time had been to prevent Byrnes from "loitering around Munich." Like many in Washington, Vanderberg believed that the "policy of tolerance, patience and respect" for the Soviet Union that Byrnes and Clay advocated would lead straight to disaster.\(^{36}\)

The Russian leadership was not blind to these new attitudes introduced into the relationship by Truman. Gaddis indicated that they saw in the arrival of the Truman administration "an abrupt shift from policies of cooperation to those of confrontation."\(^{37}\)

This argument should not be understood as an attempt to parcel out blame for the origination of the cold war; that has been an industry unto itself.
Rather, this is an attempt to illustrate how deep-seated and long-standing were anti-Soviet images within the American elite in the immediate postwar period, and how those images resulted first in misinterpretation of Soviet behavior in the period, later foreclosing the opportunity to create a stable peace in the postwar world.38

More important for this analysis is just how widespread and deeply held were those images in the American psyche. As suggested earlier in this chapter, Americans held overwhelmingly negative perceptions of the Soviet Union from its birth in the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. Based as it was on values antithetical to those of religion and individual liberty so cherished in the United States, the Soviet Union was perceived not merely as an enemy of the state, but as a force of evil in the world.

As the Nazi regime took power in Germany in the 1930s, Americans began to liken Bolshevism to Nazism.

Because the outward appearances of the two systems seemed to be more similar to each other than either seemed to be to any previous political system in the world, the real differences between fascist and Communist systems have been obscured. It was, in essence, easier for Americans to recognize their similarities than their differences, and though the intensity and scope of the analogy have varied greatly since the 1930s, the characteristic of similarity has remained constant in the American perception of totalitarian systems.39

By the time World War II broke out in Europe, the American public viewed Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany as nearly equivalent. In the aftermath
of the war, spurred by the increasing anti-Soviet statements by U.S. government officials and by new understandings of Soviet intentions in Europe revealed in documents associated with the Russian-German non-aggression pact of 1939, the accumulated public distaste for totalitarian governments drove the American image of the Soviet Union.

Americans both before and after the Second World War casually and deliberately articulated distorted similarities between Nazi and Communist ideologies, German and Soviet foreign policies, authoritarian controls and trade practices, and Hitler and Stalin. This popular analogy was a potent and pervasive notion that significantly shaped American perception of world events in the cold war. Once Russia was designated the "enemy" by American leaders, Americans transferred their hatred for Hitler's Germany to Stalin's Russia with considerable ease and persuasion.40

This one issue—the image of the Soviet Union held by people in the United States, especially in the postwar period—might well have been accepted widely enough to qualify as a national identity. Like a cartoon, drawn simply but starkly, in firm lines of black and white, the American perception of a Soviet Union—dangerous, threatening, monolithic, and unyielding—reached near consensus proportions. Ralph White, while acknowledging that such a perception is more caricature than it is isomorphic with reality, cites polling data which indicates that "a large majority of the American public have a simplistic Good Guys-Bad Guys picture of the conflict between their country and the USSR. That has been true since approximately 1946."41
In general terms, then, one can understand how a product of this period of American history might develop, as did President Reagan, a severe distrust for the Soviet political system and its leadership. Further investigation of Reagan's personal history will show why, as President, Ronald Reagan was the quintessential cold warrior.

Reagan's Interaction with the Psycho-Political Environment

Ronald Reagan was a product of the confluence of his own history and the American anticommunist experience. The political evolution of his adult life, conditioned by widespread anticommunist sentiment, derived from his early psycho-social development, which itself was a product of his early relationships. As Leslie Gelb said of President Reagan, "[his] ideas about the world flow from his life, from personal history rather than studies. He developed not so much a coherent philosophy, as a set of convictions, lodged in his mind as maxims." Born on February 6, 1911, Ronald Reagan's childhood was hardly noteworthy, yet in it were the seeds of Reagan's later socio-political makeup.

Betty Glad identifies Reagan's cognitive style, and locates its origin in the milieu of the relations between Reagan, his mother, and his father. "His father, Jack, was a periodic alcoholic and a poor provider, erratic in his discipline of his two sons and not really interested in their early accomplishments." From his
mother young Ronald Reagan learned a coping strategy of denial, coupled with a search for outlets in which to seek reinforcement and success.

Reagan, as shall be discussed shortly, evinced cognitive rigidity and black-and-white thinking, which Glad sees as logical outcomes of Reagan's early relationships. Glad explains that the broader psychological literature draws the link she will use in her conclusion about Reagan's cognitive style: that the rejection of ambiguity in one's feelings drives a concurrent rejection of ambiguity in one's perceptions. In the end she concludes:

Reagan, as this analysis of his history suggests, is one of those individuals whose inability to see shades of gray in one object is apparently linked to an inability to recognize ambivalent feelings, of love and hate, toward those who are close to him. The available evidence of his early socialization suggests, as we have seen, that his inability to tolerate ambivalence is linked to his early relationship to a father whom he loved, but whose failings must have caused anger, and a mother whose admonitions to her son did not permit him the open expression of such contradictory feelings.

In addition, as Gelb suggests, Reagan's mother laid the foundation for this dichotomization, with Reagan coming to see himself in all circumstances as the champion of good against the forces of evil. "From his Bible-quoting mother came a kind of fundamentalism. He grew up with a strong sense of right and wrong, with a view of the world as a battleground of good and evil."

As a young man, Reagan was a New Deal Democrat. The traits identified above generated a behavior pattern that help explain Reagan's
personal political shift to the right that began after the war, and his consuming us/them approach toward the Soviet Union. Betty Glad continues:

The propensity to dichotomize, engage in black-and-white thinking, and resist change (which, given their tendencies to go together, I shall sometimes refer to as "black-and-white" thinking) is learned at an early age. Such individuals, Frenkel-Brunswik suggests, come from homes where parents stressed rigid and superficial obedience. As children, they were required to submit to authority and to distinguish virtue from vice in every social situation. As this good-and-bad-thought orientation is exposed to a wider realm of experience, it is generalized into complete identification with a reinforcing in-group and utter rejection of a scapegoated out-group.48

Reagan possessed a psychological predisposition to seek acceptance via in-group/out-group scapegoating. His experience in Hollywood, coupled with the deeply-held anticommunist American national identity previously documented, resulted in Reagan's shift to the political Right and his increasingly outspoken anti-Sovietism. Cognitive need drove Reagan's search for a scapegoat; rampant anti-communism provided him an easy target.

Reagan began his acting career in 1937, signing a seven-year deal with Warner Bros.49 His career began well, and while not a star of the first order, Reagan had steady work, met with a certain amount of critical acclaim, and was seen as a young actor with significant star potential. His career was only slightly side-tracked by the outbreak of the war. Reagan served in a filmmaking unit, acting in training films and making morale boosters for soldiers and for the home front from 1942 through September of 1945.
In addition to his professional success, Reagan's personal life was positive as well. Reagan entered into a successful and emotionally supportive relationship with Jane Wyman; they were married in 1940. Reagan saw his future as very bright.

Following the war, however, disappointments began that were to shape Ronald Reagan's social and political future. He found it difficult to find work in the immediate aftermath of the war, and when he did find work, the movies and roles were second class. As he became more despondent, he became more difficult, clashing with studio executives, resulting eventually in the cancellation of his contract with Warner Bros., and his landing increasingly smaller roles in increasingly lower quality movies.

At the same time, Jane Wyman was finding great success in Hollywood, winning an Academy Award in 1947. She and Reagan grew apart, and Wyman announced to the press in December of 1947 that she was filing for divorce. It appeared to Ronald Reagan that his personal and professional failures were complete.

At the most basic level, he dealt with these failures by resorting to the ego defensive measures developed early in his life, deepening and thickening the psychic ramparts that kept him from disturbing feelings and ideas....Reagan did not simply withdraw from the world. Indeed, it is likely that it was this very detachment which enabled him to engage in the searching behavior which would open up new avenues to happiness and success.
As his mother had taught him, Reagan denied the pain and sought alternative outlets to success—success defined for Reagan in part as identification with those wielding power in his environment. Reagan began joining organizations in Hollywood—asserting himself in the Hollywood political community—including taking a position with the Screen Actors Guild (SAG), an organization of which he became president a short time later.

Fears of communism and communist infiltration permeated American society as the American anticommunist national identity took hold. Hollywood, as the premier architect of cultural identity in the United States, received special scrutiny. Reagan sided with the anticommunists in Hollywood and Washington, adapting "...to the political climate in ways which aided his rise to power in SAG and continued to act in ways which would place him at the center of power in the Hollywood political community."\(^{51}\)

Reagan identified with the anticommunist impulse, and vigorously pursued an anticommunist agenda. Reagan, in part at least, blamed his own professional failings on a larger communist conspiracy, and might well have found some incentive toward his anticommunist agenda in those feelings of victimization.\(^{52}\) It was, however, a confluence of factors—Reagan's psycho-social needs and the opportunity to exploit the anticommunist national identity provided by the larger social-political environment—that made Ronald Reagan the hard-line anticommunist crusader of his days as a spokesperson for General
Electric, as an outspoken supporter of Barry Goldwater, and as the quintessential cold war president. Betty Glad concluded:

Reagan's turn to the political right, in short, was an adaptation to a personal and professional crisis. Anti-communism served certain ego defensive and social adjustment needs for him at a time when his personal and private life had bottomed out. His anticommunist crusade in the late forties not only enabled him to find new ways of making it on the Hollywood scene, it did not require any basic changes in either his personality or his basic worldviews. The communists in Hollywood and the federal government provided safe targets against which he could displace his anger and explain what had happened to him. His views brought him the approval of powerful figures in his environment, and were then reinforced by broader political trends, and the opinions of close friends and family members.53

Once he began to pursue his anticommunist agenda, however, he embraced it with a great passion. In part belief, in part need, and reinforced by those he admired and trusted, anti-communism became, for Reagan, a defining personal characteristic and, later, the centerpiece of his foreign policy.

**Ronald Reagan and the Soviet Union**

As indicated at the beginning of this chapter, the mindset of Ronald Reagan is a critical factor in understanding the evolution of cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union at the end stage of the cold war. Reagan's view of the Soviet Union—what he thought about it—and his cognitive style—how he thought about the Soviet Union, how he processed information,
and how he made decisions—were in this case the barriers to cooperation that Gorbachev would have to breach if he were to transition U.S.-Soviet relations away from confrontation and toward cooperation.

These "cold warrior" assessments of Ronald Reagan are consistent with the picture of Reagan that emerges from Margaret Hermann’s psychological profile of the President, which also indicate that Reagan’s cognitive style remained consistent from his early years through the years of his presidency. In particular, Reagan’s cognitive style is nearly identical to the Neanderthal mentality described by Charles Osgood as the barrier to cooperation to be overcome by Gradual and Reciprocated Initiatives in Tension-reduction (GRIT). It, therefore establishes the parallel between Osgood’s GRIT theory, espoused in the early 1960s, and international politics of the mid-1980s. Chapter 2 identified three salient cognitive shortcomings:

♦ The perceptual impact of belief systems
♦ Lack of empathy
♦ The fundamental attribution error.

The purpose of the final section of this chapter, then, is to take the analyses of the previous sections of this chapter regarding the origin of cognitive styles and the personal history of Ronald Reagan, and derive an understanding
of Reagan's personality, his cognitive style, and his image of the Soviet Union showing the similarities with the general traits listed above. In the end, this chapter will describe the foreign policy advanced by Reagan vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, and the meaning of that foreign policy in game theoretic terms.

Reagan as "Neanderthal Mentality"

The first component of the Neanderthal Mentality is the perceptual impact of belief systems, which suggests that images or pre-existing belief structures condition the manner in which one analyzes new data, interprets a new situation, or in general thinks about another actor. President Reagan exhibited this trait to a significant degree.

Some might argue that the focus on Reagan is too narrow and ignores the nature of decision making in large, complex organizations. Decisions in a modern White House, these critics might argue, are likely to be a product of a give and take between a president and a number of his/her advisers, decisions then being more a coalition notion than a representation of any one actor's view of foreign policy. While that might be true in theory, other analysts point to a relationship between political position and influence. Margaret Hermann, for example, has found that the higher a person is in the foreign policy hierarchy, the greater will be the likelihood of that person's characteristics impacting
policy. "...the personality characteristics of heads of state (i.e. prime ministers, presidents, dictators) are expected to have more impact on foreign policy than the characteristics of foreign ministers, and, in turn, the characteristics of foreign ministers are expected to have more impact than the characteristics of assistants to the foreign ministers." Even if the theory of position and influence does not hold true, the notion of coalition decision making simply does not obtain in the case of Ronald Reagan and his policy toward the Soviet Union.

Initially, as Betty Glad notes, citing a number of different analysts on this point, Reagan surrounded himself with a foreign policy team that shared his world view and his image of the Soviet Union. While Keith Shimko disagrees, his study of Reagan and four top foreign policy advisers shows that the advisers fell into two camps—Caspar Weinberger and Richard Perle on one side, and Richard Burns and George Schultz on the other. The difference between the two groups lay in their view of the role of ideology—in how “diabolical” is the Soviet Union. Both groups, according to Shimko, shared an assessment of the Soviet Union as an expansionist menace and a military threat. The Perle and Weinberger camp, viewing the Soviet Union as more diabolical, more closely shared Reagan’s views, but the degree of menace Shultz and Burns saw from the Soviet Union suggests that their counsel would not stray in any significant degree from the images that Reagan himself held of the Soviet Union. Moreover, on critical issues of U.S.-Soviet relations like arms control, Shimko
has written elsewhere that Richard Perle exercised more influence than any other adviser.

Because of his pessimistic assessment of the superpower relationship and his occasionally Machiavellian political tactics, Perle earned the nickname "the Prince of Darkness." For the same reasons, he also earned a place in the Reagan administration. Given his arms control expertise, the absence of any high-level strategic thinkers in the administration, and his bureaucratic skills, Perle ended up having more impact in arms control than any other official in the U.S. government.  

Given that Perle and Reagan were significantly like-minded regarding the Soviet Union, the chances were slim that he would have challenged Reagan's pre-existing image.

Reagan's leadership style further reinforced the notion of his control of decision making, and it is here that the impact of his pre-existing belief system becomes clear. It has been well documented that as president Reagan did not want or receive a great deal of detailed policy analysis from his staff and advisers. "According to his aides, he relies primarily on staff memos, which generally are not detailed analyses. The staff also sends him letters that tend to support his beliefs." On its own that suggests an avenue for greater staff control, but coupled with a decision making style that Gelb earlier described as anecdotal rather than analytical, a picture emerges of decisions dependent in large measure on the images Reagan brought to the table. Gelb, reporting on interviews with Reagan aides, concluded:
Says a senior White House aide: "The President is not terribly interested in the process, and for a long time I wasn't sure he knew what I did. He's comfortable letting advisers come to him and tell him the issues and options, and then he'll use his anecdotes." These are the maxims—some of his aides call them "parables"—that seem to be central to the way the President's mind works. Often, it is not the logic of an argument that he remembers or calls upon but a circumstance or story that connects the issue at hand to his set of basic principles. And these anecdotes, his staff says, are often the last word on a matter; the staff is expected to go forth and carry out the boss's wishes.\(^59\)

These anecdotes are components of Reagan's belief system—Betty Glad referred to them as Reagan's "stereotypes"—which conditioned Reagan's interpretation of data and events regarding the Soviet Union. Reagan had very little cognitive alternative to his parables. Henry Kissinger relates that Reagan "...knew next to no history, and the little he did know he tailored to support his firmly held preconceptions. He treated biblical references to Armageddon as operational predictions. Many of the historical anecdotes he was so fond of recounting had no basis in fact, as facts are generally understood."\(^60\) Reagan, according to Margaret Hermann, "...tends to stereotype things in his environment more than other heads of nations. People, ideas, and objects are fit into neat categories, thereby reducing the complexities involved in dealing with political problems and issues."\(^61\) He has been referred to as a cognitive ideologue and a top-down information manager who asks, "What do my beliefs tell me about this situation."\(^62\) Reagan's belief system, then, effected significantly his interpretation of data and events—a reality which not only
presents implications for the strategic interaction between himself and his Soviet counterpart, but which also indicates that Reagan is the proper focus for a study of his administration's foreign policy.

The second cognitive barrier outlined earlier is a lack of empathy—an inability to understand the perspective of an opponent. In general terms, Ronald Reagan, like most cold war presidents, evinced this trait. Raymond Garthoff testified to the consistency of this failure. "...on both sides there was a serious gap, even inability, to perceive the viewpoint and interests of the other. This gap grew, rather than lessened, with time and experience. As a consequence, trust—which was never very great—declined."63

More specifically, Osgood described this lack of empathy as resulting in certain behavior traits, the first of which was projection. Projection describes a situation in which an actor not only fails to see the perspective of its opponent, but it ascribes its own perspective to the opponent—i.e., the actor believes that its opponent perceives things exactly as does the actor. Once again, Reagan and his administration scored high on this measure, often ignoring arguably legitimate Soviet concerns with U.S. behavior. Garthoff continues:

Rather than recognizing a differing perception, judging it to be a valid alternative perception, or misperception, both sides typically ascribe a different and usually malevolent purpose to each other. This tendency has, for example, characterized the assessments each has made of the military programs of the other, as well as many of its political moves.64
As a result the enemy comes to be seen increasingly as an active threat. The in-group/out-group scapegoating that Betty Glad ascribed to Reagan's early years, remained a prominent feature of his presidency. "To Reagan the world is divided into 'we' and 'them.' Actions in the international system take on a black-white character—for us or for them/against us."65

Finally, Osgood posits a double standard, explained in part by the fundamental attribution error. The double standard describes behavior in which an actor perceives behavior it carries out differently than it would perceive that same behavior carried out by its adversary. The fundamental attribution error explains that these differing perceptions arise from an actor's focus on dispositional factors to explain an opponent's behavior. Again, there is a vast literature on this subject. Garthoff argues that there are three schools of thought in U.S. policy, the Essentialist, Mechanistic, and Interactionist. The Essentialist focuses on dispositional factors, i.e. it looks at what the Soviet Union is, not what it does.66 Reagan was an Essentialist. He assumed the Soviet Union to be ideologically driven to expansion, and he judged Soviet behavior in those terms, while he saw similar behavior on the part of the United States in status quo terms. As an example, Garthoff describes the perception of superpower policies in the Third World.

The United States, under all administrations in the 1970s and 1980s, has sought to encourage or to impose greater restraint on Soviet behavior in the third world. Yet few here have recognized that the Soviet Union also seeks greater American restraint and
reciprocity—and that it has a basis for seeing a lack of American restraint.\textsuperscript{67}

Ronald Reagan exhibited all these characteristics of the Neanderthal Mentality in his relations with the Soviet Union. Betty Glad offered this compelling conclusion regarding Reagan's cognitive style and his behavior toward the Soviet Union.

This study suggests that for Ronald Reagan the communists provide some emotional services. As the following analysis of his ideology will show, he has maintained a highly salient in-group-out-group stereotyping, which has remained quite constant over the years and has not been sensitive to changes in Soviet leadership and demonstrable domestic or foreign policy shifts. In his cognitive "style" he shows the dichotomizing, the black-and-white thinking, and some of the rigidity that Frenkel-Brunswik has described. Moreover, the quality of the rhetoric he employs and the policies he recommends for dealing with the enemy, when viewed against his own difficulty in expressing a well-modulated anger to intimates who may distress him, suggests that there is some projection and displacement of his own emotions on this "out-group."\textsuperscript{68}

There is a final issue related to this Neanderthal Mentality that requires examination: its persistence, even in the face of a great deal of evidence to the contrary. The nature of this cognitive style is that it tends to result in stereotyping of situations and the exclusion or manipulation of information in an attempt to conform said information to, and to protect, pre-existing assumptions and images. Even a real, significant change in behavior on the part of an adversary cannot be expected to change the underlying relationship, as such behavior will have attributed to it the most malevolent of intentions. Fred
Iklé explains, writing in 1993, after so much of the cold war mental baggage was assumed to have been stripped away, how the patterns of the old ways of thinking, reinforced by forty years of mutual mistrust on the part of the Soviet Union and the United States, continued to lurk. The Neanderthal Mentality is strong and resists change.

The basic transformation of the U.S.-Russian relationship that is so essential to our security cannot be completed within a year or two. Seventy years of Bolshevism and forty years of cold war have left a hazardous legacy in both East and West—a spiritual, intellectual, and material pollution that will require purposeful effort over many years to be rendered harmless. The old poisons could become virulent again, like an infectious disease that has lain dormant for a long time.  

Reagan’s Foreign Policy and Its Game Structure

The actual substance of President Reagan’s foreign policy is much less important to the analysis in this study than are the assumptions and images that underpin it. The substance of Reagan’s foreign policy may have been the final blow, providing the motivation for Mikhail Gorbachev to seek accommodation with the West as part of his drive to reform the Soviet Union. But it was the assumptions and images held by the president—the Neanderthal Mentality—that conditioned the American response to the Gorbachev initiatives and determined the strategy required for Gorbachev to be effective. As such, the following discussion of Reagan’s foreign policy will be offered in general terms,
and tailored to underscore the critical conclusions of the previous section of this chapter.

Reagan's foreign policy vis-a-vis the Soviet Union was the product of two factors. First was Reagan's understanding (what many have called his misunderstanding\textsuperscript{70}) of Soviet ideology. Garthoff describes the origin of the belief and the derivative expectation for Soviet behavior.

American perceptions of a Soviet drive for world domination are rooted in the U.S. image of the ideological expectations of the Soviets for the future. The United States sees a relentless, inexorable Soviet drive for world communism under the leadership and control of Moscow, and military means as the most—some would say only—successful instrumentality and therefore the key.\textsuperscript{71}

The second factor determining the direction of Reagan's foreign policy was his belief that any attempt at accommodation with the Soviet Union was in reality a show of weakness which the Soviet Union would exploit. The working analogy for Reagan was Munich; he saw accommodation as appeasement, and an open invitation for Soviet treachery. That type of weakness, he believed, had been a feature of U.S. foreign policy for at least a decade, made manifest in the continuing desire for détente. In President Reagan's farewell address in 1989, he reminded the public of his longstanding opposition to détente.

The détente of the 1970s was based not on actions but promises. They'd promise to treat their own people and the people of the world better, but the gulag was still the gulag, and the state was still expansionist, and they still waged proxy wars in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.\textsuperscript{72}
It was that message that had provided the momentum in his 1976 campaign for the Republican nomination for president, and that had helped him narrowly miss taking the nomination from incumbent Gerald Ford.

The weakness and exploitation he feared in 1976, Reagan believed, only worsened through the four years of President Carter’s administration. Carter was seen as particularly unwilling to stand up to Soviet expansion, and continued to make deals with the Soviet Union—deals which, like SALT II, Reagan saw as advantageous to the Soviet Union and on which Reagan believed the Soviet Union would cheat. In January of 1981, after another campaign which featured a blunt anti-détente, anticommunist theme, Ronald Reagan assumed the presidency, determined to reverse what he saw as the foreign policy failures of the previous administration.

Ronald Reagan entered office proposing to reverse what he saw as an unfavorable trend of U.S.-Soviet relations and to stand up to the Russians. His first administration tried to translate into policy the basic ideas its members brought into office. These ideas have remained unchanged despite pressures that inevitably affect every president. The foreign policies of the Reagan administration, like his presidential campaign, have continued to display some characteristics of an ideological crusade.73

After the long, dark night of fear and retreat, Reagan believed, a new morning had dawned.74

When one examines Reagan’s foreign policy, especially the foreign policy of his first term as president, one is immediately aware of the change in tone from previous administrations. No longer were criticisms of the Soviet Union
blunted by the language of diplomacy, nor was behavior accommodating or ambiguous.

Most commentators have been struck by the extremely negative portrayal of the Soviet Union voiced by Reagan throughout his political career and early in his administration. Not since the height of the cold war had the Soviet Union been described as an evil empire, or cited as the locus of evil in the modern world. Seyom Brown writes, "The Soviets are assumed by the Reaganites to be truly impressed by little in international relations, other than who has the military capability and the will to use it." And Leroy Miller argues that "the Reagan administration has considered the Soviet Union a morally questionable, militarily menacing giant on the brink of economic and political collapse."

Policy was openly confrontational. Cori Dauber has argued that the process of procuring weapons has a communicative function in terms of a nation proclaiming its will to defend its interest. Simple possession of weapons being essentially a passive enterprise, it expresses capability, but fails to express will. As an active enterprise in a critical psychological arena, procurement of weapons systems communicates a strong will. President Reagan multiplied the communicative impact of his military buildup, making it clear that the intended target was the Soviet Union. In a globally-televised speech to the National Press Club in November of 1981, Reagan explained the link between past Soviet behavior and his proposed military expansion.

Our response to this relentless buildup of Soviet military power has been restrained but firm. We have made decisions to strengthen all three legs of the strategic triad: sea-, land-, and air-based. We have proposed a defense program in the United States for the next five years which will remedy the neglect of the past
decade and restore the eroding balance on which our security depends.⁷⁷

Openly confronting the Soviet Union was the critical first principle of Reagan's foreign policy. The Soviet Union, Reagan believed, responded to weakness with aggression. Soviet policy was to probe the West, finding and exploiting any indication of weakness. On the other hand, Reagan believed that faced with strength, the Soviet Union would back down. Acting to reverse the more cooperative approach of the Carter administration, Reagan sought to force the Soviet Union to stare down the barrel of the American gun.

President Reagan did initially take us into a confrontation with the Soviet Union. But he did so intentionally, deliberately, and in slow motion. Moving to confront the adversary in this way, Reagan followed a plan that he had thought through over many years. There were, of course, major glitches, detours, and reversals, but he never changed his basic outlook.⁷⁸

Negotiated agreements with the Soviet Union over the previous five-to-ten years had inevitably produced, in Reagan's mind, only victories for the Soviet Union, but that was because the United States had been negotiating from a position of weakness, and the Soviet Union had no incentive to make concessions. Reagan believed that the United States must first achieve a position of superiority vis-a-vis the Soviet Union, then it could take the Soviet Union to the bargaining table, and force it to make concessions. "He believed, according to Richard Allen, Reagan's first National Security Adviser, "the proper strategy to be one of clearly gaining the upper hand, and then negotiating from
a position of strength." In 1978, after a meeting with European business and political leaders, Reagan reported that he saw three schools of thought on dealing with the Soviet Union; accommodationists who simply hoped to get along with the Russians on their terms; those who hoped cooperative behavior would moderate Soviet ambitions; and those who wanted to forge a defense and foreign policy program to challenge and counter the Soviet threat. The Reagan presidency clearly pursued the third approach.

Reagan was aware of the concerns of many analysts that his confrontational approach to the Soviet Union moved the world closer to the brink of war; he just did not believe them. In his farewell address in 1989, he acknowledged those early concerns, and relayed how he saw the judgement of history.

Back in 1980, when I was running for president, it was all so different. Some pundits said our programs would result in catastrophe. Our views on foreign affairs would cause war, our plans for the economy would cause inflation to soar and bring about economic collapse....[they] were wrong. The fact is, what they called “radical” was really “right”; what they called “dangerous” was just “desperately needed.”

Reagan, in fact, believed that, for all the evil he attributed to the Soviet Union, they would not risk their own annihilation. The risk for the United States was in weakness. Showing weakness would embolden the Soviet leadership, fostering Soviet expansionism and continuously threaten to erode U.S. national interests until such time as the balance of power so favored the
Soviet Union that it could issue a final ultimatum to which the United States would have little choice but to accede. A program of strength, on the other hand, would convince the Soviet Union that the correlation of forces was not, and would never be, in its favor. In fact Reagan believed that while the Carter administration had ceded military superiority to the Soviet Union, the Soviet economy faced significant difficulties which would force the Soviet leadership to make some critical choices.

Presidents Nixon, Ford, and Carter had all assumed that the Soviet Union was economically inferior to the United States. Nevertheless, they still took the view that the Soviet economy was capable of satisfying the many demands—domestic and foreign, civil and military—that were placed upon it. The incoming Reagan administration challenged this assumption. In its view, by the late 1970s, the USSR was facing a critical economic situation that made it extremely difficult for the Soviet leadership to carry out its multiple tasks.82

To exploit this economic weakness, Reagan sought to end the military free ride provided by previous administrations (the total cost of Reagan's five-year defense program for 1982-1986 was estimated at $1.5 trillion).83 Addressing the Soviet military advantage through expanded procurements, in addition to restoring superiority to the United States and communicating the resurgence of American will to the Soviet Union, would hasten the moment of economic truth for the Soviet Union. "Competitive Strategies" entered the defense strategy lexicon as the U.S. military sought to exploit its technological advantages while "obsolesce-ing" previous Soviet investments.
The key new feature of American foreign policy under Reagan was the commitment to roll back Soviet gains. "Rejecting the Brezhnev doctrine on the irreversibility of communist gains, Reagan's strategy expressed the conviction that communism could be defeated, not merely contained."  

The major shift in U.S. policy was made formal in late 1982 and early 1983, through the adoption of NSDD-75, still today a secret document. The United States would no longer be content merely to shape and influence Soviet behavior, but would set out to change the Soviet system itself, and literally "roll back" Soviet advances and conquests outside its borders. The objective was to find weak points in the Soviet structure, to aggravate the weaknesses, and to undermine the system. This represented a sea change in U.S. policy.  

A simple game structure may help to draw together the many facets of Reagan's thinking about the Soviet Union and his expectations regarding policy outcomes. First, despite the complexity of the international system and the number of issues involved, it may all be abstracted, as was argued in chapter 2, into a 2 X 2 game. Such a structure would also be representative of Reagan's perception of the situation. Betty Glad explained that according to President Reagan, "...the world is divided into two camps, with all morality on one side, all evil on the other, with two possible outcomes—to win or to lose. There is no political middle ground that states can play in such a world." Figure 3.1 represents Reagan's views in a simple game structure.

For Reagan, the choices on the U.S. side of the matrix were fairly clear, representing the continuation of the policies of the Carter administration.
(cooperate) and the Reagan foreign policy, including the defense buildup, a more active global role for the United States, and restrictions on the flow of western technology to the Soviet Union (non-cooperate). On the Soviet side of the matrix, the analogies are not quite so simple. In challenging the Soviet Union, Reagan saw himself as limiting the Soviet leadership to only two options in response. The first—the non-cooperative play—was to attempt to answer the American challenge by continuing and increasing levels of arms procurement, military expenditures, and support for pro-Soviet governments and political movements worldwide. The cooperative play would be to turn inward and cede military superiority to the United States.

---

**Figure 3.1: The Game Structure of Reagan's Soviet Policy, 1985**

---
Under those assumptions, the preferred play for the United States was always non-cooperate. Cooperation meant continuation of the status quo, and whatever move the Soviet Union chose, the bulk of the gains, measured in relative or in absolute terms, would accrue to the Soviet Union. Playing the non-cooperative option, however, was comparatively and absolutely beneficial to the United States. Were the Soviet Union to choose their cooperative play and cede international primacy to the United States, the payoff would be obvious. Were they to choose non-cooperate and attempt to respond to the U.S. challenge, however, Reagan believed that the United States was much better positioned to play that game and would ultimately wrest international primacy from the Soviet Union. Hence the payoff structure of figure 3.1.

There are several other important factors determining that payoff structure. First, Reagan believed that he had a moral obligation to challenge the Soviet Union. Reagan saw the Soviet Union as anti-democratic and anti-religious. He labeled the Soviet Union an evil empire that threatened the central principles and interests of the United States, “a direct moral challenge from which all his predecessors would have recoiled.” Anti-communism...became a counter-ideology that chastised communism as a “god doomed to fail,” and itself became an ideological force displaying the same fanaticism and Manichean certainty as the philosophy it sought to combat. Because both ideological movements saw its adversary as a malevolent enemy, there was no room for compromise or coexistence. The cold war became, for the believers of both faiths, a zero-sum game.
Reagan faced a simple choice: winning or losing in a game played against the greatest manifestation of evil in the modern age.

The second factor that influenced Reagan's perception of the game was his view of the Soviet economy. As indicated earlier in this chapter, Reagan believed that the Soviet economy was at the brink. By challenging the Soviet Union militarily he could force the Soviet leadership to make one of two choices, either one of which was a win for the United States.

[T]he administration identified...weak-points that might be exploited in a period of Soviet economic decline. The first and most important perhaps was the weight of military spending borne by the smaller, stagnating Soviet economy. In this respect the principle means of extending Soviet power in the world (according to many analysts the only means) was seen as being its main Achilles Heel as well. The U.S. strategy was thus clear: to raise U.S. military spending on the assumption that this would either force the U.S.S.R. to follow suit—thus increasing its already crippling military burden—or to do nothing and fall behind in the arms race. Either way the United States would benefit.89

Reagan also had the luxury of knowing which move the Soviet leadership would make on every iteration of the game! Their ideological motivation drove the Soviet Union to non-cooperation on every play, and they lied and cheated, meaning that even were they to demonstrate some willingness to cooperate, Reagan believed it was merely a ploy intended to induce the United States to make some concession, so that the Soviet Union could exploit it for their own advantage.
Exploring the personal, professional, and political development of Ronald Reagan, one comes easily to two conclusions. First, he saw the Soviet Union as a real and substantial threat to the peace and freedom of the United States, and second, he did not believe or trust in any view or evidence inconsistent with the first conclusion. That was the hand dealt to Mikhail Gorbachev—not only to change fundamentally the aging monolith of the Soviet Union, but also to convince Ronald Reagan, the most unlikely of partners, to join him. Chapter 4 will explore the strategy Gorbachev adopted to do just that.
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CHAPTER 4

Gorbachev's Use of GRIT: Phase 2 U.S.-Soviet Relations

And slowly answered Arthur from the barge:
"The old order changeth, yielding place to new..."

--Alfred, Lord Tennyson

As the decade of the 1990s dawned, it cast its light upon a world that was fundamentally different than the one that existed a mere five years before. "The millennium is here," opined Newsweek in August of 1989, and, indeed, there were signs that it might have arrived. Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev was beginning to be accepted as a partner in international politics, rather than an adversary. The Soviet buffer zone in Eastern Europe was virtually independent, and had become, for all practical purposes, a buffer zone for the West against the Soviet Union. The division of Europe was healed, and perhaps most significantly, the seemingly endless upward spiral of arms acquisition that had characterized the nuclear arms race appeared to have been blunted and reversed.
To understand the magnitude of the change observed in 1990, one had only to look back at the situation in 1985. Arnold Horelick commented simply that the U.S.-Soviet relationship in that period at the beginning of Reagan's second term “was frozen in a posture of almost unrelieved hostility and acrimony.” To understand how such a stunning transformation occurred in such a short period of time, and occurred so peacefully, one must begin by examining the foreign policy initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985. Mikhail Gorbachev advanced an integrated three-pronged program of reform for the Soviet Union. Perestroika (restructuring) and glasnost (openness) were aimed at correcting the economic and social ills of Soviet domestic society. New thinking was the plan and program of re-evaluation and reform in foreign policy.

Gorbachev came to power in the Soviet Union convinced that the continued confrontation, the mutual non-cooperation payoff, in U.S.-Soviet relations would result in the demise of the Soviet Union. The driving force in U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union in that period was the conviction that the U.S. lead in high technology and its superior economic capacity would allow the United States to continue to confront the Soviet Union militarily, bankrupting the Soviet Union, and thereby destroying it as a great power. Figure 4.1 provides a model of the payoff structure as understood by Mikhail Gorbachev in that period.
The X,-X payoff represents the differential payoffs to the two players. These values should be understood as cumulative, over multiple iterations of the game, with the Soviet -X payoff approaching a baseline value representing the threshold of survival for the Soviet state. Unlike previous uses of iterated games in which payoffs and preferences remained constant throughout iterations of the game, the -X payoff gets larger in a negative direction with each play of the game, representing the increasingly smaller margin with which the Soviet Union was operating. Also unlike the traditional ordinal conception of gam theory in which the differences in desireability between the payoffs was equal, the -X payoff becomes less desireable for the Soviet Union with each
iteration of the game, meaning that Soviet risk acceptance increases—the Soviet Union became more willing to risk exploitation for the possible payoff of changing the game structure.

Returning to the analysis of chapter one, figure 4.1 also presents a picture of why (as opposed to how) the cold war ended. Faced with a continuing series of -X payoffs, and given the perceived relative immediacy of the Soviet economic threshold, Gorbachev decided he had no option but to risk the (1,4) sucker payoff by unilaterally attempting to engage the United States in a cooperation-building foreign policy. Clearly this relationship is not an example of Prisoner's Dilemma. In a Prisoner's Dilemma, as indicated in chapter 2, the players share a preference for cooperation; there is simply an inability to understand how to arrive at that outcome. Here, the goals of the players were much different. "Ending the cold war is clearly the goal of the Soviet Union, along with perestroika and glasnost, the crucial struggle for radical reconstruction of Soviet society. The same goal is not willingly embraced by a frustrated Reagan administration and the habitual hawks who see the cold war as the sine qua non of U.S. global power."

As a result, Gorbachev also had the "luxury" of knowing how his opponent was going to play on every iteration of the game. By 1985 the Reagan foreign policy was clear and firmly in place. Reagan planned to play non-cooperate in every iteration, challenging the Soviet Union at every turn, and his behavior,
being consistent with that approach, provided convincing evidence of that commitment. And while the traditional logic of game theory suggests the rational move for Gorbachev to have been non-cooperate, the dynamic of the situation forced Gorbachev to apply a different logic. Even if the sucker payoff had been demonstrably more harmful to Soviet interests in the short term relative to a mutual non-cooperate (mutual deterrence) outcome, the shadow of the future obtained here. Gorbachev weighed the benefit of cooperation in the future against the perceived inevitability of the ultimate negative payoff; hence Gorbachev's new thinking in foreign policy.

New Thinking and the Psychology of Conflict

"As one Soviet analyst has felicitously put it, there is a need to 'transform a situation of mutual deterrence into a situation of mutual restraint.'" But continually playing the sucker also threatened disaster for Gorbachev's Soviet Union. He needed to alter the payoff structure by changing Reagan's preferences. He needed to convince Reagan that it was in the best interest of the United States to move to a situation of mutual cooperation. It required a changing of the game.

That challenge was made even more difficult for Gorbachev by Reagan's personal animosities toward the Soviet Union and the legacy of the cold war.
How Gorbachev was to go about effecting change in Reagan’s belief system was a matter of considerable complexity, and was the core motivation behind the new thinking.

**Assault on the Enemy Image**

Reagan presented a two-fold barrier to Gorbachev’s successful transformation of the U.S.-Soviet relationship. First, Reagan’s image of the Soviet Union conditioned him to expect Gorbachev to play non-cooperate on every iteration of the game. Second, Reagan’s cognitive style operated to screen out or misinterpret evidence contrary to the aforementioned image. In other words, even were Gorbachev to have made a cooperative play, Reagan would have perceived it as non-cooperative, thereby short-circuiting any learning Reagan might be expected to do. Reagan’s image also contained a significant level of mistrust of the Soviet Union and its leaders, and that mistrust provided him an intellectually consistent rationalization for his cognitive dysfunctions, making the barrier faced by Gorbachev nearly insurmountable. Fortunately, Gorbachev possessed an understanding of the critical role played by psychology and imaging in the foreign policy decision making process.

Gorbachev’s 1987 book entitled *Perestroika* was subtitled *New Thinking for Our Country and the World*. Embodied in the concept of new thinking, and
in Gorbachev’s thinking about international issues, was the realization that the
old ways of thinking, while comfortable and familiar, circumscribed the range
of options decision makers perceived to be available to them. In other words, old
thinking led decision makers to believe that only certain things were possible,
and Gorbachev knew that the challenges of life in the 1980s—especially the
complications borne of nuclear weapons—were beyond the capacity of those
options to solve. New thinking was meant to raze the cognitive walls that
precluded new and creative solutions to the intractable problems of governance
in the 1980s. “The greatest difficulty in our restructuring effort,” wrote
Gorbachev,

lies in our thinking, which has been molded over the past years. Everyone, from General Secretary to worker, has to alter this
thinking. And this is understandable, for many of us were formed
as individuals and lived in conditions when the old order existed.
We have to overcome our own conservatism.®

Specifically, Gorbachev blamed the failure to adequately address the
problems brought to the fore by nuclear weapons on the prevalence of the older
style of thinking. Alexander Dallin commented on the importance of the concept
for Gorbachev’s foreign policy.

Even before replacing Chernenko, Mikhail Gorbachev had used the
new phrase [new thinking in foreign policy]. On his visit to Britain
in December 1984 he stressed the implications of nuclear weapons
for the survival of mankind. “The nuclear age (he concluded)
inescapably dictates a new political thinking.” He again called for
new thinking in his sweeping arms control proposal of January 15,
1986. “What is required (he declared) are new and bold
approaches, fresh political thinking and a heightened sense of
responsibility for the destinies of the peoples." Thereafter the term and the argument would recur with some frequency—at the Twenty-Seventh Party Congress and on many occasions thereafter.\(^6\)

More specifically, Gorbachev bemoaned the character of what has been described as Reagan's neanderthal mentality regarding foreign policy.

Sometimes we are not only disappointed but have serious misgivings when in the United States our country is treated as an aggressor, an "empire of evil." All manner of tall stories and falsehoods are spread about us, distrust and hostility are shown toward our people, all kinds of limitations imposed and, simply uncivilized attitudes are assumed toward us. This is impermissible shortsightedness.\(^7\)

He also took special umbrage that, several years after the inauguration of the new thinking in foreign policy and the restructuring within the Soviet Union, Reagan continued to mistrust the Soviet Union, and to evaluate it as a threat.\(^8\) As a result, Gorbachev, from the earliest days of his tenure as General Secretary, recognized and sought solutions to the psychologically-based barriers to cooperation.\(^9\)

First and foremost, Gorbachev understood that the entire enterprise of enhancing cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union depended upon reducing the rampant mutual mistrust between the United State and the Soviet Union. His 1986 New Year's address to the United States openly addressed the importance of trust.

We can hardly succeed in attaining that goal [of eliminating the threat of war hanging over humanity] unless we begin saving up, bit by bit, the most precious capital there is—trust among nations.
and peoples. And it is absolutely essential to start mending the existing deficit of trust in Soviet-American relations.\textsuperscript{10}

As a component of psychological milieu, mistrust permits the perpetuation of pre-existing images of an opponent as an enemy. The Soviet leadership under Gorbachev understood full well the devastating impact on relations between themselves and Ronald Reagan wrought by Reagan's enemy image of the Soviet Union. Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze expressed the regime's continuing concerns in mid-1988.

The "image of the enemy" in all its dimensions impedes the restructuring of international relations on the principles of morality and civilization, the development of a productive dialogue, and an accurate consideration of interests. Having set out to lessen confrontation, we say to capitalist countries: "Let us be honest opponents, but not enemies. If you are ready to settle our disputes peacefully, we can even be partners."\textsuperscript{11}

An article appearing in \textit{Pravda} in late 1986 commented explicitly on the "psychological reworking" conducted in the West, conditioning the perception of the Soviet Union as an "evil empire." It went on to underscore that the task of Soviet foreign policy and diplomacy was to break through that psychological barrier.

In our nuclear age a similar way of thinking, which creates for advocates of the arms race illusory conceptions of their own security, in actuality not only does not create security, but with each new turn brings us closer to war. A question arises: both how to smash in people's consciousness the stereotype of the old thinking and how to turn them toward the new thinking.\textsuperscript{12}
Gorbachev adviser Alexander Yakovlev summarized Soviet thinking on the issue of the enemy image and the barrier it presented to the transition to a new relationship among nations.

Essentially, as I have already said, there has developed in the long decades of our relations an institution of resistance, including in the field of information. Its constituent parts have been tried out quite passably. This is especially true of political-psychological attitudes: attunement to a definite wave of expectations, statements, mutual assessments, etc. It is time to give up this institution. We need an institution for constructive interaction between our countries, which must with time displace the former. This also presupposes, among other things, a very conscious and critical attitude to the now customary cliches and symbols. We need, in other words, to tune the minds of men in both countries to the new thinking, based on mutual respect and trust. Otherwise the exigencies of life, the efforts of political figures and good initiatives—all these may sooner or later press against a wall of an intellectual and psychological non-perception.13

By 1989 political psychologists in the West noted that Gorbachev's rhetoric demonstrated that it had been considerably influenced by the concepts of political psychology.14

Specifically, Gorbachev took aim at the belief structure and pre-existing images held by Ronald Reagan that aided in the continuation of the cold war. That concept of the enemy image loomed large in Gorbachev's explanation of new thinking. Coit Blacker noted that, "A second element of Gorbachev's strategy was the determination to deprive the West, and particularly the United States, of the ability to portray the Soviet Union as a dangerous and growing threat to international peace and security."15 "The enemy image must be given
up,' Gorbachev said at a meeting in the Kremlin with a visiting delegation of U.S. Congressmen. In *Perestroika* Gorbachev addressed the enemy image of the United States head on. "We certainly do not need an enemy image of America, neither for domestic nor for foreign policy interests. An imaginary or real enemy is needed only if one is bent on maintaining tension, on confrontation with far-reaching and, I might add, unpredictable consequences. Ours is a different orientation." More generally, he indicated that both the United States and the Soviet Union had been guilty of holding enemy images of each other, and that such images represented a real danger to peace in the nuclear age. He called for the elimination of "any presence of chauvinism in our countries." The notion of image continued to receive considerable emphasis in Soviet statements about new thinking. It was, in fact, the theoretical underpinning of Gorbachev's new foreign policy, and the basis for action.

Even more striking was the openly stated Soviet policy of "deideologization" of its foreign policy and its view of international relations. This was accompanied by a concerted, well-orchestrated Soviet campaign to change the invidious, hostile image of the Soviet Union held in the West into that of a reliable partner ready to cooperate in dealing with all global problems. It should also be noted that under Gorbachev's rule Soviet leaders and writers tried to alter the Soviet public's fear that the United States and NATO posed threats to Soviet security. On occasion they even admitted that unwise Soviet behavior in the past had reinforced the negative Western image of the Soviet Union and that previous Soviet leaders had deliberately exaggerated the image of a hostile West.
Resolving the Security Dilemma

A second cognitive construct undercuts the efforts of international actors to forge cooperative relations with their adversaries. The security dilemma, based on competing conceptions of security, is a product of the psycho-logic—Osgood's neanderthal mentality—described at the end of chapter 3. The term describes a situation in which the efforts taken by one state to address its perceived security requirements—fielding a new weapon system, expanding the number of persons under arms, or changing doctrine, for example—are interpreted by another state as a threat to its security. As a result the second state takes steps to address these newly-perceived security threats, actions which the first state perceives a threatening to its interests, leaving it in an equivalent security deficit as before its first attempt to address its security needs. Spiraling tension and diminished security is often the result.

Aggressive intent in not a requirement to trigger the security dilemma since even apparently unambiguously defensive actions can be misinterpreted. The impact of the security dilemma will tend to be greater the more deeply nations dislike or distrust one another. In the U.S.-Soviet cold war case, the levels of mistrust and the legacy of confrontation, coupled with the components of the neanderthal mentality evident in the U.S. leadership, virtually
guaranteed that attempts to ensure one's security through unilateral means would fail.

Gorbachev, in fact, began his analysis of the security situation by recognizing that the Soviet leadership had, for decades, suffered the same type of neanderthal mentality—specifically the lack of empathy—as attributed to Ronald Reagan. The Soviet leadership had sought unilaterally to bolster its security, and ignored the impact of its actions on American perceptions of its own security. Unilateral Soviet efforts, according to Gorbachev, provoked the United States, thereby diminishing Soviet security. As a concrete example, Gorbachev argued that the 1983 U.S. decision to pursue the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) was a product of this security dilemma dynamic. Gorbachev's recognition of the security dilemma was perhaps the single most important aspect of his own reinterpretation of Soviet foreign policy. Gorbachev argued that the cycle of military expansion and insecurity had to be addressed.

This strategy has not come under review and it is now agreed that what may have worked in the years before 1945 is irrelevant to Soviet needs in the last part of the twentieth century. Furthermore, according to Soviet writers, this approach contained an inherent flaw, namely, that by continuing to accumulate weapons and "exploit contradiction" the U.S.S.R. inevitably made others feel insecure who then responded with their own measures and that in turn impelled Moscow to build more weapons and exploit new contradictions. According to Gorbachev, this never-ending cycle, which historians such as Sir Herbert Butterfield called the security-power dilemma, had to be broken.
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Gorbachev found at least four inadequate assumptions related to the security dilemma in the long-standing Soviet conception of security: that security could be achieved unilaterally; that it relied on an offensive doctrine; that it was dependent on achieving parity; and that it relied exclusively on military means. Each of these deserves attention.

Gorbachev told Tom Brokaw in a nationally-televised U.S. interview that he had come to the realization that pursuing security unilaterally was futile, and representatives of the military lent their support to this analysis. Defense Minister Yazov wrote, "The military-economic and military-technical potential of the sides is now such that no efforts on the part of one side in pursuit of superiority in the military sphere can be successful—the other side will not allow it." As a result, a cornerstone of Gorbachev's new thinking in foreign policy was the notion of mutual security. Motivated by concerns over the security dilemma, Gorbachev chose fundamentally to alter the Soviet conception of security, and to seek security in concert with the United States.

The idea behind the concept of "common security" is as simple as it is revolutionary. It proclaims that U.S. reactions to perceptions of military insecurity endanger Soviet military security and consequently do not serve Soviet interests. Soviet reactions to perceptions of military insecurity have the same negative implications for U.S. interests. Therefore, each side must seriously consider the probable impact of its defense policy on the other side—any buildup of military power will likely initiate an arms-race cycle that in the end will not increase the security of either side.
Second, Gorbachev sought to change the long-standing dominance of offense in Soviet military doctrine. There are two aspects of Soviet military doctrine, the political and the military-technical. The latter "...embraces (in Soviet terms) the entire scope of military science on the 'laws of armed combat' and the military art—military strategy, the operational art, and tactics. This is the area most often thought of in the West as 'military doctrine.'"30 The political aspect of Soviet military doctrine had always been characterized as defensive. But as a result of the near total physical devastation wrought by the Nazi invasion of Russia in 1941, at the military-technical level, Soviet doctrine stressed the offensive. Wars would be fought when necessary, but not on Soviet soil.

Gorbachev, however, questioned the value of an offensive orientation. First, he clearly recognized that an offensive posture, especially regarding conventional forces in Europe, merely set in motion the security dilemma.31 Chris Donnelly, a British Army Soviet specialist, reported on Gorbachev's thinking. "It appears to us, at an early reading, that Gorbachev recognizes that an offensive forward posture is counterproductive (because of NATO reactions and buildup) and is floating the idea to the military of an alternative doctrine. He is asking if it is necessary to fight a defensive war by planning to launch a surprise attack."31 As a result, the military-technical aspect of Soviet military doctrine changed. For the first time, defense dominance was applied to Soviet
operational doctrine,\textsuperscript{32} and the Soviet General Staff lent its support.\textsuperscript{33} Former U.S. Marine Corps General Bernard Trainor concluded:

Evidence of the apparent Soviet turnaround is seen by contrasting the standard Soviet military text on "Tactics," published in January 1987, with guidance given Soviet officers by [Defense Minister] Yazov in October in a book called "In Defense of Socialism and Peace." The earlier publication sets forth the traditional Soviet doctrine: "The offense is the main form of battle." The second changes this: "Soviet military doctrine considers the defense as the main form of military operations."\textsuperscript{34}

Third, Gorbachev believed that a commitment to achieving parity invoked the security dilemma at even higher levels of defense expenditures. In response, Gorbachev offered the notion of reasonable sufficiency. The assumptions of the new approach centered on a mutually assured destruction (MAD) conception of nuclear deterrence. There was a threshold amount of nuclear capability that would be sufficient to destroy the planet and which was, therefore, sufficient to provide reasonable deterrent protection for the Soviet Union. Acquisition of capability beyond that point, which both the United States and the Soviet Union had surpassed, was meaningless in terms of deterrence, but continued to drive the military budgets of both countries higher, and exacerbated tensions between the two countries.\textsuperscript{35} Concepts of reasonable sufficiency also found their way into Soviet discussions of conventional weaponry, as Gorbachev sought an ideological justification for smaller forces and a reduced role for the military. Rather than attempting to match the West tank for tank and warhead for warhead, the concept of reasonable sufficiency argued for a re-evaluation of the military
requirements for defense, and an acquisition and deployment strategy that would match the new requirements. Reasonable sufficiency also played a role in the assault on Reagan's neanderthal mentality by providing a logic that would help create a perception of the rationality and veracity of Gorbachev's commitments to a smaller military while at the same time stressing that the Soviet Union would retain a reasonable capacity to defend itself in a non-offensive, non-threatening manner.

Fourth, as a result of these realizations of the futility and danger of seeking security through traditional means, Gorbachev rejected outright the pursuit of security through military means. Major General Yu. V. Lebedev explained that superiority was impossible and that because of the inherent impossibility of superiority in military terms, and the dangers inherent in its pursuit, both sides must eschew military answers to security problems, finding those solutions in political practices. "...the only way out of the developing position is a decisive turn from military-technological to political means of ensuring national and international security."36 Gorbachev rejected war as an instrument of policy, refusing to distinguish between conventional and nuclear war.37 "Today's world," commented Soviet military analyst Yuri Silchenko, "has become too small and fragile for wars and politics of force."38 War in the industrial age, the Soviet leadership believed, would be devastating at virtually any level of intensity. The price of war was simply too high. Conventional war
in Europe, for example, even if it were to remain limited and non-nuclear, would destroy all of European society.

On a European continent saturated with nuclear power stations, chemical plants, and enormous fuel dumps, even a nonnuclear war would result in the de facto death of all civilization there. Moreover, this applies most of all to Western Europe, where the population density and the degree of urbanization are greater than in Eastern Europe, while its territory is smaller. The very nature of highly industrialized society acts as a factor to deter war here. In addition, it is impossible to imagine how a war in Europe could be kept at a nonnuclear level. A radioactive wasteland would be the only probable outcome of a nuclear war, however “limited” it might have been designed to be.39

Further, it was unlikely, as Gorbachev understood it, that any such conflict would remain limited. The debate over nuclear strategy between proponents of warfighting and proponents of MAD meant little as Gorbachev concluded (much as the computer Joshua learned in the movie War Games) that war at any level would escalate beyond rational control, leading ultimately to extinction. Gorbachev, speaking to the British parliament in 1984, prior to his becoming General Secretary, explained that in a world saturated with nuclear weapons, a belief in the rational control of conflict was dangerous folly.

When we speak about war and peace, we must bear in mind that the nature of present-day armaments, and first of all nuclear ones, has changed the traditional notion of these problems. Mankind is now on the threshold of a new stage in the scientific and technological revolution which is bound to tell on the further development of military technology. Those who engage in phrase mongering about “limited”, “lightning”, or “protracted” nuclear wars evidently remain prisoners of the outdated stereotypes characteristic of the time when a war was a great evil but, as distinct from today, did not threaten all humankind with
annihilation. The nuclear age inevitably dictates new political thinking.\textsuperscript{40}

It was precisely because Gorbachev had such an apocalyptic view of war in the nuclear age that he orchestrated the deideologization of Soviet foreign policy—a fundamental reinterpretation of seventy years of Leninism. The old way of thinking in foreign policy, based on competition, generated a legacy of hatred, fear, and mistrust, which in turn led to the traditional defense and foreign policy behaviors—offensive operational plans, the elusive striving for military superiority, and spiraling arms races. Those behaviors, in the prevailing atmosphere of fear and mistrust, only served to further entrench the old way of thinking, driving the United States and the Soviet Union toward confrontation, and away from cooperation. Alexander Yakovlev explained how new thinking emerged.

It is axiomatic for us that we want normal relations with the United States. Nobody has gained from confrontation. This is in the best eventuality. In the modern world, with account for its interdependence, its military, political, ecological and all other realities, we simply cannot, and have no right to, permit ourselves to further engage in muscle-flexing. The unreasonable childishness passes, the imperative of reason is inevitable, and this is the quintessence of new thinking.\textsuperscript{41}

It only takes one nation to make war; but it takes two to make peace. For forty years the United States and the Soviet Union prepared for war, practiced confrontation, and eschewed cooperation. Mikhail Gorbachev became the leader of the Soviet Union in March of 1985, already convinced of the errors of the
previous forty years. He began the struggle within the Soviet power structure to redirect Soviet policy along the lines of the new thinking. He recognized, as argued above, that the old way of thinking prevailed in the West, and that regardless of changes in Soviet thinking and behavior, absent a change in the thinking of Ronald Reagan, confrontation, exploitation, and insecurity would remain the essence of U.S.-Soviet relations.

New thinking was more than a fundamental reorientation of Soviet foreign policy; it was more than a fundamental reinterpretation of the Leninist ideology of the class struggle. It was all that, but it was also a mechanism for breaking the barriers to clear thinking erected by the neanderthal mentality. It was a strategy for breeding cooperation from the seeds of hatred, fear, and mistrust.

_Gorbachev’s New Thinking as GRIT_

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke often of his desire to be understood. From the earliest days of his tenure as general secretary, Gorbachev battled those who heard his words, but who failed to grasp his meanings. Gorbachev possessed a new vision of the world, based on a fundamentally different conception of the relationship between individuals and their governments, between nations, and between social systems. In Gorbachev’s mind, the reality of life in the modern
world had changed; and he may have been one of the first to perceive it. The security dilemma amounted to mutual annihilation in the nuclear age, and the answer, as expressed in the new thinking, was in seeking cooperative avenues to security. Gorbachev seemed to understand this requirement by the time he became general secretary in 1985. His task was to reveal that truth to his chief rival, the United States, and it was in that realm that he sought most sincerely to be understood.

Much of the work on the topic of cooperation carried out in political science and international relations has underscored the value of communications to the task of promoting cooperation. "Communication," concluded one study, "particularly in conjunction with the option to withdraw, greatly increases cooperation and substantially reduces defection among groups." Communication can reassure actors of the intent of their opponents, and it can help allay fear that an opponent may, in the language of game theory, defect, or choose to exploit the conciliatory actions of an opponent.

Just as communication plays a role in experimental studies of the evolution of cooperation, so, too, did it play a role in Gorbachev's attempts to elicit cooperation from Ronald Reagan in the mid- to late 1980s. But the noise, misperception, and mistrust abundantly documented in the preceding chapter, worked to drown out or short-circuit Gorbachev's attempt to communicate his vision of a new world to the U.S. leader. The efficiency of the communication
channel, in Deutsch's terms, was quite low. As a result, as Steve Weber indicated, when one moved from the game matrix to the realities of foreign policy, the challenges became more difficult and more complex.

But strategy in international politics is different (than in game theory). Strategy is the combination of political, military, and diplomatic measures a state employs to promote desired outcomes in its interactions with other states. States face a difficult challenge in developing a strategy that will elicit cooperation from a rival state.

Gorbachev's goal, to use Deutsch's terminology, was to make progress toward the formation of a security community composed of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. A security community is a form of political community in which integration—defined by the efficiency of the communication channels between parties—had advanced so as to make war improbable. Between nation-states, the lack of shared history reduced the efficiency of communication. Many analysts have found, in fact, that national boundaries are good indicators of communicative boundaries. "For studies of international political communication, the role of national boundaries is particularly important in setting the framework within which actors make decisions. Typically, communications boundaries are conterminous with national boundaries." In this case under study here, the end game of the cold war, the history of antagonism between the parties had raised the barriers even higher—lowering the efficiency of the communication channel.
The policy embarked upon by Mikhail Gorbachev beginning in 1985 bears a remarkable resemblance to the GRIT process described by Charles Osgood, for at its core, GRIT is a strategy for making communications work in an atmosphere in which communication and understanding are most severely challenged. Osgood said of his proposal,

[GRIT] could be viewed as a "peace offensive." In a way, it is an application of the Golden Rule on an international scale—but a Golden Rule with built-in safeguards. It is perhaps best viewed as a kind of international (rather than interpersonal) communicating and learning situation, where what is learned—hopefully and gradually—is increased mutual understanding and trust.48

The question of whether Gorbachev's GRIT-like approach was successful will be explored in the final chapter of this study. The remainder of this chapter will focus on the similarities between the GRIT strategy proposed by Charles Osgood and the new thinking in foreign policy enacted by Mikhail Gorbachev. This analysis will begin with a description of GRIT as explained by Osgood in 1962, and will be followed by a survey of Gorbachev's policy beginning early in 1985, indicating how Gorbachev seemed to follow Osgood's plan as if it were a road map—it appears that at virtually every step of the process as explained by Osgood, one can identify a corresponding action by the Gorbachev-led Soviet Union.
Critical Components of a GRIT strategy

At its core, GRIT is an attempt to meld words and deeds in such a way as to serially confront the Neanderthal mentality of a target state. Cognitive dysfunctions of the type identified with the Neanderthal mentality operate to avoid the tension felt as one's pre-existing belief system is forced to deal with evidence of a contrary nature. The easiest method of coping and the most common form of dysfunction—that identified as operating in the case of Ronald Reagan's relations with the Soviet Union in the 1980s—is to misinterpret or dismiss the contrary evidence. Osgood hoped that GRIT, by presenting a stream of evidence to confront the pre-existing image of an uncontrollable aggressor, would eventually overwhelm the defense of the belief system, leading to an acceptance of a new image of the adversary. The critical components of the GRIT process are found in figure 4.2, and will be discussed below.

Step 1: Critical Self-Evaluation and Planning
Step 2: Public Announcement of Initiation of Strategy
Step 3: Unilateral Initiatives and Re-evaluation

Figure 4.2: The Critical Components of the GRIT Process
Step one of the GRIT process is a requirement that one of the parties to a conflictive rivalry conduct a significant and probing self-evaluation, culminating in an intellectual commitment to seek an escape from the spiral of conflict and distrust. Such an evaluation of self is the fundamental first step of the GRIT process, helping a state to understand and develop a comprehensive, secure approach. This step is critical because GRIT requires a total commitment and a comprehensive, consistent application. Osgood explained that GRIT "...is not a collection of isolated acts, to be tried on like the bonnets in a lady's wardrobe as the occasion permits. Rather, it is an overall policy and as such it demands a complete analysis and reorientation of thinking about international relations." If it were to proceed in an ad hoc manner, it would be subject to derailment by domestic opposition—an opposition that Osgood was certain to arise. Moreover, if it even appeared to be ad hoc, its persuasive power would be reduced.

In step 2, the initiator of the GRIT process was to make a general announcement of its new approach to relations with its rival, explaining the logic behind the reappraisal, and explaining its forthcoming strategy to engage its rival in de-escalatory relations. That general statement is critical for a number of reasons. First, it is the most unambiguous statement possible of a nation's commitment to the new approach; it may be mistrusted, but it is difficult to misinterpret. Second, it provides a context within which to view the
policy initiatives that follow—a context that may help reduce the degree to which early initiatives may be misinterpreted. And third, it reinforces the comprehensive nature of the policy, decreasing the amount of time and number of initiatives that will be required to begin to undermine the target state's enemy image of the initiator.

Step 3 and, as indicated earlier, the centerpiece of Osgood's GRIT proposal, is a series of unilateral initiatives of a conciliatory or accommodative nature. These unilateral initiatives were described by Osgood in his 1962 work as having twelve characteristics. Later works streamlined those to ten grouped into three categories: Rules for Maintaining Security; Rules for Inducing Reciprocation; and Rules for Demonstrating the Genuineness of Initiatives and Reciprocations. Each will be examined below.

Given Osgood's understanding of the image that the Soviets and Americans held of each other, it is not surprising that he exhibited a concern for maintaining security during the GRIT process. In simplest terms, the Rules for Maintaining Security require maintenance of both conventional and nuclear deterrence—especially in the early stages of the process.

Osgood warned that the target state may view early initiatives with distrust—part of the double standard of its world view. The target would be suspicious that the initiative was not actually a concession—a unilateral weakening—but was rather a deception. If convinced that it was a unilateral
weakening, the target state might seek to take advantage of the situation, playing the unilateral defection move in the parlance of the game theorists. The target country must be made to understand that the penalties for adventurism or attack would remain swift and sure despite the commitment to peace through GRIT. Also in this section of rules is the argument that the initiatives should be diversified "both as to sphere of action and as to geographical locus of application." It is argued that this would prevent a serious weakening in any one area, thereby preventing a loss of security through the GRIT process. It might also serve to reinforce the psychological impact on the enemy image of the target state.

Essentially, there appears to be little difference between Rules for Demonstrating Genuineness and Rules for Inducing Reciprocation. In fact, inducing reciprocation is one of the effects to be expected if a party is successful in demonstrating the genuineness of its commitment to this process. As such, these rules will be discussed together.

The basic thrust of this section of Osgood's argument has to do with convincing the target state that their enemy image of the initiator-state is incorrect. "Unilateral initiatives must be designed and communicated so as to emphasize a sincere intent to reduce tensions." There are several key components to such an attempt. First, it is important that the initiatives be presented as components of the larger strategy, not as single, uncoordinated
acts. Second, each unilateral initiative must be made public—it must be announced—and identified as a part of the overarching strategy to reduce tensions to maximize the communicative impact of the act. Third, included in the announcement should be a specific invitation to reciprocate, which would indicate to the target state the action it should take if it wanted maximum, unambiguous communication of its intent to join in the forging of cooperative relations. Together, these acts would create a yardstick against which both initiatives and reciprocations could be measured. Osgood does not say how many iterations of the process must occur before one can call it a failure. He says only that once a nation decides to give GRIT a try, it must continue the process, moving forward with additional initiatives, until it is sure that reciprocation is not forthcoming.

The remainder of this chapter will explore, step by step, Gorbachev's new thinking in foreign policy as an example of a GRIT-like process. I have seen no evidence that Gorbachev had knowledge of Charles Osgood or GRIT specifically, though concepts of political psychology had become relatively mainstream in political science by the mid-1980s, suggesting that it would not be unexpected that Gorbachev and his political advisers might formulate a similar approach. It should also be noted that the Soviet Union acknowledged a previous experience with GRIT-like processes.
Several analysts have argued that President Kennedy, beginning with a speech at American University, made use of a GRIT-type approach leading to the Hot-line agreement and the 1963 agreement on nuclear testing. Osgood and Etzioni claim that the experiment died with the President in November 1963, but others have argued that the experiment continued in both the United States and the Soviet Union through several additional defense budget cycles. The result was lower levels defense expenditures. The Soviet Union also acknowledged continuation of the policy, referring to the budget reductions and the process which had made them possible: the policy of "mutual example":

When the reduction of military expenditures in the Soviet Union and the United States became known, the White House published a report to the effect that "no agreement on budget reductions exists between our two countries." Yes, as a matter of fact there was no special agreement on this score between the Soviet Union and the USA. But the policy of mutual example operated here, and as a result a definite positive step was taken in the direction of reduced international tension.

Whatever its origins, Gorbachev's new thinking in foreign policy was remarkably consistent in its conceptualization and its operationalization with the proposed policy Osgood called GRIT.

*Step One: Self Evaluation as the Beginning of New Thinking*

By the mid-1990s it had become axiomatic in the West that Gorbachev's efforts to reform the Soviet Union in the 1980s, including his reforms of foreign policy,
were the result of an acute, unprecedented crisis in the Soviet economy and the implications of that crisis for Soviet power and position within the international system. In the mid-to-late 1980s, however, Gorbachev's rationale, as well as his sincerity, remained a question in the West. Western skeptics of new thinking were known to ask rhetorically why the Soviet Union would have embarked on such a course, arguing by implication that there were no identifiable reasons for a policy change and, therefore, reason to doubt the sincerity of the Soviet commitment to the professed new policy. To the contrary, however, as is now much better understood, there was ample reason for the Soviet Union to seek a less confrontational foreign policy.

In retrospect, able to view Gorbachev's reforms in an objective light, Western analysts are better able to recognize the process of reevaluation and self-criticism that opened Gorbachev's restructuring of Soviet society. Gorbachev's attempts to explain that restructuring was the result of a serious consideration of the problems facing the Soviet Union were at one time assumed to be propaganda intended to fool the West into believing in a less threatening Soviet Union. With a more objective understanding, however, Gorbachev may be accepted at face value when he said of Soviet reform efforts:

The first stage, to speak in general terms, is a stage of contemplation, analysis, strict self-criticism and self-realization of Soviet society. Not armchair analysis, not scientific study only, but involving the people. This is the fundamental, basic distinguishing feature of the entire process of perestroika.
Stripped of suspicions over Soviet motives and fears of being duped and exploited, we are free to understand the logic of the process of perestroika, beginning, as Eduard Shevardnadze indicated, with a review of past performance. "Naturally," Shevardnadze said, "we must take up the past as certainly the setting of the course in the future starts from a thorough analysis of the distance covered." Gorbachev agreed.

How did it begin? We decided to carry out an impartial, critical political and socio-economic analysis of the society we live in. It led us to the conclusion that we need a profound restructuring of society, in all its spheres. We saw that although much had been done and achieved, a good deal had been overlooked, and not all the people's expectations had been met. Blunders, mistakes, and deformations had occurred along our socialist path. To overcome them it is necessary to reach a new level of democratization, openness, and glasnost and to follow this path.

Gorbachev became General Secretary in March of 1985, and the preliminary introduction of the reform program was made at the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum. Even conservative Politburo member Yegor Ligachev recognized the significance of that achievement.

The party's merit is that it realized the urgency of making a sharp turn in the development of the country and found the only proper way to accomplish this: acceleration and renovation. By April 1985, forces which had properly addressed the situation in the economy and the society had developed in the Central Committee—the leading party nucleus—and which formulated the idea of the acceleration of our development, an idea which was comprehensively and profoundly developed at the 27th Party congress.
That program of reform, even in its early stages, called in a highly detailed manner for a thoroughgoing overhaul of Soviet society. Due to the breadth of its analysis and its detail, the preparation of the program for the April 1985 Plenum required a significant and time-consuming reevaluation of all of the key tenets of Soviet life. Gorbachev, in his 1987 book *Perestroika*, reported on the comprehensive scope of that study.

The concept of restructuring with all the problems involved had been evolving gradually. Way back before the April plenary meeting a group of Party and state leaders had begun a comprehensive analysis of the state of the economy. Their analysis then became the basis for the documents of perestroika. Using the recommendations of scientists and experts, our entire potential, all the best that social thought had created, we elaborated the basic ideas and drafted a policy which we subsequently began to implement.

Much of the research that led to perestroika predated Gorbachev’s ascension to the position of General Secretary. Gorbachev told of his beliefs regarding the need to update Soviet society, related in conversations between himself and Yuri Andropov during the final years of Brezhnev’s reign. Andropov and Gorbachev shared a perspective on the need for reform, and early in Andropov’s limited tenure as General Secretary, some of those reformist tendencies appeared. “The academic and policy discussions most relevant to Gorbachev’s new thinking on security and global interdependence were being conducted during the Brezhnev period and the following years, and their
incorporation into Soviet foreign policy in the mid-1980s owed much to work which had been done earlier."

Gorbachev's own thinking was in synch with the conclusions of those early studies, and Gorbachev became General Secretary already convinced of the need for reform. He was convinced that without significant changes in the economic structure and increases in productivity, efficiency, and output, the Soviet Union would not enter the twenty-first century as a great power. The stakes were nothing less than the survival of the Soviet state.

Later, near the end of the 1980s, when conservative forces in the Soviet polity began to assert themselves, charges were leveled that Gorbachev had entered into the reform process without a fully developed plan, and that perestroika was at that point adrift and should be abandoned, or at least curtailed. In response to those charges, Gorbachev re-asserted that thorough study and planning had gone into the introduction of perestroika.

At the April 1985 plenary session of the Central Committee we began a thoroughgoing analysis and principled assessment of the situation in which our society found itself in the mid-1980s. It was then that the task was set of accelerating the development of society as the antithesis of stagnation. But I will say more—the April plenary session itself could be held only on the basis of an enormous amount of preliminary work in the preceding years. The appearance of restructuring sentiments in society was preceded by a certain period of analytical reflections and moral assessments. All this was prepared and ripened in the Party, in the sphere of science and culture and in broad circles of the public.
The changes that took place in Soviet society were deeply rooted in a comprehensive reevaluation of Soviet history, the manner in which the Soviet Union fulfilled the promise of the Leninist revolution, and an assessment of the nature of the world in the late 1980s and the place of the Soviet Union in it. This self criticism was the first stage of perestroika, much as it is the first stage of GRIT. From these self-criticisms certain truths emerged which one may point to as the catalysts for the changes that occurred in the Soviet Union in the forms known as perestroika and the new thinking. As Gorbachev himself concluded in a 1988 interview with the German news magazine Der Spiegel,

> When, on beginning restructuring, we took an impartial look at the world around us, we saw a strange situation. It had changed, different realities had emerged, but relations between the states continued to be built on the same principles as immediately after the war, during the cold war period. The same stereotypes persisted. Thus, here too the need for restructuring was visible, although in the context of international relations we use a different concept: the new thinking.

The reality of GRIT—or of GRIT-like processes—as Gorbachev found out in the implementation of reforms in the Soviet Union, is that it is a terribly complex undertaking. Although a great deal of study and planning occurred prior to the April 1985 plenum, and though Gorbachev came to that plenum with a detailed plan in hand, it served only as a basis for beginning the process of restructuring. Continuing study, re-evaluation, and revision were necessary as the Soviet Union moved through the processes of restructuring and new thinking.
The Communist party first took up the issues of restructuring at the April 1985 party plenum, addressing stagnation, exploitation, and insecurity in the Soviet domestic environment and in the international community. Throughout the remainder of 1985, the party apparatus revised, re-thought, and refined the work of the April plenum. "And it is certainly not by chance," asserted Gorbachev, "that after the April plenary meeting the first move the new leadership of the Soviet Union made was to discuss these matters at an important conference of the CPSU Central Committee in June 1985. It was not the sort of discussion we had been accustomed to for many years. A lot of criticism was made—bitter but passionate."70

Politics and economics, domestic and international, are relatively unpredictable enterprises. The interplay between Gorbachev's reform efforts and the vicissitudes of politics and economics required continuous re-evaluation of the progress made and revisions of the steps planned ahead, always within the parameters established at the April 1985 plenum. This, too, is critical to the understanding and success of GRIT. Over time, Osgood believed, initiating GRIT as part of an overall strategy—tying each action within the strategy to an overarching vision—would enhance the ability of GRIT to tear down the enemy image. Tied more closely to one another within a larger vision, each action would reinforce the impact of the others, and the chance of a stray event undercutting GRIT's impact would be reduced.
From the April 1985 plenum to the 27th party congress in February of 1986, the Soviet leadership developed such a comprehensive strategy, setting that period apart from those that went before. Gorbachev had made this one of his more important tasks, and one which he was able to accomplish through the efforts of the 27th party congress.

The 27th CPSU Congress provided a detailed interpretation of the philosophy of peaceful coexistence as we move from the old to the new century and validated the concept of an all-embracing system of peace and international security. Our initiatives in the disarmament sphere and other concrete steps in the international arena are now no longer improvisation, not simply a reaction to given Western political moves and actions as often happened before. They were give a firm, long-term scientific basis.

Step Two: Gorbachev Announces the New Approach

The second step of the GRIT process is to fully and publicly announce one's intentions to initiate such a strategy. Just as the planning portion of the GRIT process proved to be evolutionary and multi-faceted in its execution, so, too, did Gorbachev find it necessary to repeatedly express his commitment to the new thinking. “Since the April plenary meeting,” Gorbachev reported in his statement on the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution,

We have made our vision of progress towards a safe world and durable peace sufficiently clear to everyone. Our intentions and our will are recorded in the decisions taken by the highest political forum of the party—the 27th congress—as well as in the new edition of the CPSU Programme, in the programme for nuclear
disarmament set forth in the statement of January 15, 1986, in the Delhi Declaration, in other documents, and in official pronouncements by the Soviet Union's leaders.\textsuperscript{73}

Osgood spoke metaphorically of GRIT as a hammer, with each of the unilateral initiatives being a blow, driving home a nail, penetrating the cognitive barrier of the Neanderthal mentality. Gorbachev's repetitive public affirmations of his reform program served as a rhetorical version of that hammer.

The opening salvo of Gorbachev's rhetorical peace offensive was his statement of January 15, 1986. "The statement made on January 15, 1986. That was the starting point when the arms of the clock began ticking toward a nuclear-free world."\textsuperscript{74} Dimitri Simes characterized the public relations flair exhibited by Gorbachev in announcing the arms control proposals.

The 1986 Soviet arms control offensive started on January 15 with the unveiling of a major new negotiating package. The proposal was typical of Gorbachev's approach: it included new ideas and was presented with dramatic flair. Only three hours after Gorbachev's letter to Reagan outlining his proposals was delivered to Secretary of State Schultz, the general secretary's detailed statement about the initiative was read on Soviet television and distributed by Tass.\textsuperscript{75}

Gorbachev began by putting the statement in the proper lofty perspective—announcing that 1986 would be no less than "a turning point in the history of the Soviet state," and that the Soviet Union was committing all of its efforts and resources to the endeavor.\textsuperscript{76} Moving to address explicitly the sphere of foreign policy, Gorbachev continued:
At the very start of the new year the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government have adopted a decision on a number of major foreign policy measures that are of a fundamental nature. They are designed to promote to a maximum degree of improvement of the international situation. They are prompted by the need to overcome the negative confrontational tendencies that have been growing in recent years and to clear the ways towards curbing the nuclear arms race on earth and preventing it in outer space, towards an overall reduction of the war danger and towards confidence-building as an integral part of relations among states....The Soviet Union proposes that a step-by-step, consistent process of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons be completed within the next fifteen years, before the end of this century.

He went on in some detail, laying out a schedule of interim reduction goals, and dealing across the board with weapons of mass destruction, conventional weapons, and confidence-building measures. More importantly, Gorbachev recognized the radical appearance of these new proposals—an appearance that resulted in part because of traditional modes of thinking about such issues. It was argued earlier in this chapter that Gorbachev's new thinking was intended in large measure to counter those cognitive barriers to the development of trust and more cooperative relations. In this speech he addressed directly those who would dismiss Soviet reform as propaganda.

There is no shortage today of statements professing commitment to peace. What is in short supply are concrete actions to strengthen foundations of peace. All too often peaceful words conceal war preparations and power politics. Moreover, some statements made from high rostrums are in fact intended to eliminate any trace of that new "spirit of Geneva" which is having a salutary effect on international relations today. It is not only a matter of statements. There are also actions clearly designed to incite animosity and mistrust, to revive confrontation, the
antithesis of détente. We reject such a way of acting and thinking. We want 1986 to be not just a peaceful year, but one that will enable us to reach the end of the 20th century under the sign of peace and nuclear disarmament.\textsuperscript{78}

Moreover, Gorbachev's proposal appeared more mindlessly utopian when one looked at the professed end-stage: zero nuclear weapons in fifteen years. But Gorbachev understood that he could not get there in one fell swoop, which is why his program contained numerous first and interim stages. He believed that by taking small steps first, the bigger steps would appear closer and less utopian—just as hypothesized for GRIT, accomplishing the small steps would expand the range of policy options deemed possible. In early 1988, looking back on two years of efforts along the lines he outlined in the January 15 address, Gorbachev noted that taking a series of small steps had built momentum, pushing the peace process forward.

It is enough to compare the way people felt in the early eighties with their mood today to realize that before the eyes of the Europeans and of the entire world community transition is in progress from the phase of hope to the phase of action, to the first practical steps in the field of nuclear disarmament....If we look at the state of things from this standpoint, we can see that by the common efforts of European nations, the United States, and Canada, groundwork has been laid for the future. We value every bit of experience coming from East and West and believe that it is this kind of material that the common European home is being built with.\textsuperscript{79}

The January 15 statement laid out the intellectual foundation of the new strategy. It discussed the nature of the problem facing the world and the particular difficulties in U.S.-Soviet relations, spelled out a number of steps
which the Soviet Union and the United States could take to move toward a higher level of trust and a lower level of armament, indicated a number of specific policies that the Soviet Union pledged to adopt unilaterally, as a show of good faith, and invited the United States to reciprocate those unilateral initiatives. In form and substance, the statement paralleled the example speech announcing the initiation of a GRIT strategy included in Osgood's work.

The sentiments expressed in the January 15, 1986 address were reenforced through a number of other statements and reports. Gorbachev's televised New Year's address to the American people—part of an agreement for reciprocal appearances by Gorbachev and President Reagan before each other's publics—was more of an oratorical photo-op. Yet it had persuasive power in that it was addressed directly to an American audience, and it touched on many of the same issues as were to be dealt with in greater detail in the January 15 address.

The 27th party congress extended the work of the April 1985 plenum. The new thinking in foreign policy, introduced at the plenary meeting, "was presented in detail at the 27th congress." The system of principles of the new foreign policy thinking was elaborated in the materials of the 27th CPSU congress and subsequent Central Committee plenums and in the speeches and works of M.S. Gorbachev."
Gorbachev's Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th party congress was impressive in its detail. Policy recommendations were grouped into four spheres: military, political, economic, and humanitarian. While some were clearly more general statements about the preferred state of the world, there were also a great number of specific policies and de-escalatory initiatives, toward which the Soviet Union pledged itself. In addition, the political report laid out in great detail the Leninist foundation of new thinking, stressing the break from the flawed and outdated Leninist interpretations of the Brezhnev period. Yegor Ligachev testified,

The comprehensive study of the situation in the contemporary world was a major achievement of social thinking. The congress substantiated the need for a new style of political thinking in the nuclear-space age; it brought to light the dialectics of the competition between the two systems and the growing interdependence within the global community; it drafted a program for the formulation of a comprehensive system of international security and provided a clear answer to the most crucial problem of our time, that of war and peace. The most important conclusions of the 27th congress were summed up in an integral concept of the accelerated socioeconomic development of our country, which will determine future party activities for a historically lengthy period. It synthesizes the profound theoretical elaborations covering essentially all aspects of our social activities.

This is a critical issue for understanding the sincerity of the Soviet commitment to new thinking. Recasting Leninist thought on the nature of the global struggle between Communism and capitalism—eschewing the notion of the inevitability of conflict between the two system—represented a monumental
break from all that had gone before in Soviet appraisals of relations with the United States. This removal of ideology from assessments of international relations was a most powerful symbol of new thinking.84

By the time of the 27th congress, Western media and the public were already beginning to be intrigued by the Gorbachev phenomenon, prompting the New York Times to call the congress “a landmark meeting of the Soviet Communist party.”85 As a detailed statement of Soviet goals and intentions, received publicly in the West, the Political Report of the 27th party congress was a clear announcement of Gorbachev's new thinking.

But these were not the only attempts to explain the new Soviet approach to foreign policy. Gorbachev continued to lay out his vision before the United States and the world. His 1987 book, Perestroika, was the clearest and most detailed outline of the goals and intentions of the Soviet Union both domestically and in foreign policy, and the clearest example of Osgood's prescribed announcement of GRIT carried out by Gorbachev in the era of reform.

Gorbachev believed that defusing Reagan's Neanderthal mentality depended only in part on his ability to effect Reagan directly through the new thinking. He recognized as well that he would have to penetrate the collective anti-Sovietism of the American body politic. Early in Gorbachev's tenure as general secretary, Soviet social commentators identified the creation and
persistence of anti-Soviet attitudes among Western publics as a barrier to success in new thinking.

Just think millions and millions of people in the West have hammered into their heads the idea that the Soviet Union is the enemy, "better dead than Red," and that if you want to live in peace, you must prepare for war. Psychologically such stereotypic thinking induces an atmosphere of fear and distrust in the population, impeding mutual understanding between peoples. The dismantling of such stereotypes is an indispensable condition for the creation of a new way of thinking, which must not be based on artificially inflamed emotions and prejudices.®®

In chapter three, it was argued that in part anti-Sovietism flourished because of a lack of opportunity for the American public to "reality check" their enemy image of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev's book is an attempt to address directly those constituencies, and confront those images. "In writing this book it has been my desire to address directly the peoples of the USSR, the United States, indeed every country. I have met government and other leaders of many states and representatives of their public, but the purpose of this book is to talk without intermediaries to the citizens of the whole world..."®® Of course, in speaking to the people, Gorbachev would gain the government's ear as well.

*Perestroika* has been characterized as the most powerful criticism of the Soviet system in seventy years. "The book is [Gorbachev's] vision of the world he hopes to create for his own country and the rest of mankind, including the United States. The general secretary of the Soviet Communist party has drawn a sketch for both a new and better Russia and for a new and better world."®® It
traced the evolution of Gorbachev’s thinking about the place of the Soviet Union in the modern world, giving credibility to the publicly-declared commitment to general human values and an entirely new relationship between the Soviet Union and the countries of the West. It laid out a series of measures against which Soviet performance could be compared as Gorbachev attempted to transition Soviet behavior and reduce the threat the Soviet Union presented to the United States. Those measures included specific initiatives which the Soviet Union pledged to enact, and specific invitations for the United States to reciprocate.

Osgood recognized that only by telling an adversary, in specific terms, of one’s intention to opt out of a confrontational relationship, could one hope that a longstanding enemy would properly interpret one’s accommodationist behavior. “Actions, like words (only less so),” Charles Osgood wrote, “are potentially ambiguous and open to various interpretations; by prior announcement and clarification we help to reduce the range of interpretation and emphasize that which we intend.” The announcement was a promise; whether one lived up to it could be measured by progress on the specifics policy proposals. Gorbachev also seemed to realize that a promise was a necessary preliminary step, and he set out to fulfill his promise to change behavior and transform the U.S.-Soviet relationship.
Step 3: The Critical Initiatives

In order to fulfill the promise to recast relations between longstanding adversaries, Osgood recognized one critical factor: the synchronization of words and deeds. The power of the announcement of a new vision would come together with the power of the changing behavior—the initiatives. Combined, their force was greater than their sum, each reinforcing the other as they confronted the Neanderthal mentality of the target state.

Gorbachev, too, recognized, as did Osgood, the need to match words and deeds, for words alone would not achieve the desired results in terms of forging cooperation from the West. At the 27th Party congress, and many times after, Gorbachev also expressed an understanding of the requirement to match words and deeds. “We are very well aware,” Gorbachev indicated to the February 1988 Central Committee plenum, “that diplomatic courtesies and propaganda will not convince the West...” If actions were not to follow the statements of the new thinking, the entire enterprise would be lost.

Therefore we are constantly faced with the question: What everyone of us can do for the shaping of stable, mutually-advantageous demilitarized relations between the USSR and the United States not for the sake of others, but for the sake of ourselves, for the sake of our children and grandchildren. And answering this question, let us get down to business. In the beginning was the word. But if the word were not followed by deeds, there would be neither human history nor civilization.
The goal of Soviet policy, then, became the melding of words and deeds. According to Ligachev, "All party activities after the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum marked, essentially, a firm assertion of the close ties between ideology and life and the unity between words and actions." Those ties became clear through the concrete actions taken by the Gorbachev leadership in the form of its unilateral initiatives.

_Glasnost as a GRIT Initiative_

To this point the discussion of Gorbachev's reforms as an example of GRIT has focused exclusively on new thinking, the foreign policy—especially the military—aspects of Gorbachev's three-pronged reform effort. Osgood, however, argued that GRIT should not be limited to the military sphere, but rather should be multifaceted, containing initiatives across a number of spheres. The key would be to identify the areas which held the greatest interest for the target state—those spheres which held great symbolic importance for the target, and which the target believed were emblematic of the evil character of the initiator state.

With Ronald Reagan, identification of such trigger issues outside the military sphere was quite simple. Reagan had a long history of highly vocal criticism of the Soviet record on democracy, human rights, and religious
freedom. The Soviet emphasis on the state at the expense of the individual—the secrecy, the single-party elections, the public's fear of official reprisals, and the lack of individual civil, political, and religious rights—was for Reagan the starting point of his assessment of the Soviet Union as an "evil empire." Indicative of the importance placed by Reagan on these state character issues was his clash with Gorbachev over human rights during the Spring 1988 Moscow summit. At a pre-summit speech in Helsinki, Reagan blasted the Soviet leadership for failing to recognize and guarantee the human rights of its citizens. At the opening meeting of the summit, Reagan continued, expressing to Gorbachev that "...human rights has 'pride of place' on his agenda because of the importance the American people attach to the subject and because it weighs significantly in the way Americans look at other societies." The following day, in a speech at a 13th century Russian orthodox monastery, "the President called for the Soviet government to permit closed churches to be reopened. Americans, he said, 'feel it keenly when religious freedom is denied to anyone anywhere.'"

It was never truly understood by either President Reagan or President George Bush that Gorbachev's domestic reform efforts responded directly to those concerns. Neither administration was able to conceive of a democratization of socialism—Communism was by definition tyrannical—and so they never appreciated the depth of sentiment expressed by Gorbachev when he said, for example, as he did in his speech on the 70th anniversary of the
Bolshevik revolution, "The task is to cultivate in people a taste for independence and responsibility in their approach to production and social matters of any scale, to develop self-government of the people, to be exercised by the people and for the people." Or, as he continued later in that address, "The economic reform and perestroika in general actively advance to the forefront the human being. Social justice requires that we should give more attention to a person's individual abilities, and reward morally and materially those who work better and more, setting others an example." 

These concepts, Gorbachev argued, which appeared to be the epitome of American values, retained their Marxist-Leninist legitimacy. Marxist-Leninism is an adaptive, flexible philosophy. In Lenin's hands it was molded to the realities of the moment, always preserving the purity of the workers' state. Over time, in the hands of others, bureaucratization, cultism, and stagnation resulted. Throughout the last 70 years our party and people have been inspired by the ideas of socialism and have been building it. But by virtue of both external and internal factors, we were unable to realize sufficiently fully the Leninist principles of the new social system. This was seriously hampered by the personality cult, the administrative decree system of management which grew up in the thirties, bureaucratic, dogmatic, and voluntarist distortions, tyranny, and in the late seventies and early eighties lack of initiative and retarding phenomena leading to stagnation. These phenomena and what is left of them in our times must recede irreversibly into the past.

Perestroika and glasnost were founded on the return to the Leninist principle of universal human values. The focus of Soviet government and
society was shifted from the state to the preeminence of the individual. "But no matter from what positions we approach defining the ways of developing our economy, culture, and social and spiritual life, the decisive factor will always be man himself, his political and intellectual makeup, his skill, his patriotism and internationalism, his creative ability, his civic stance and activeness."¹⁰¹

Concrete efforts in this sphere were numerous. Aside from the overall opening up of society known as glasnost, Gorbachev's Soviet Union permitted many critical changes that had previously been unthinkable. Noted dissidents were rehabilitated; Gorbachev, for example, "...ended the bitter exile in Gorky of Andrei Sakharov, which had become a cause celebre in the West and troubled many Soviet intellectuals as well."¹⁰² There was a revolution in religious life; "The Gorbachev revolution has ended the 60-year isolation of religion from Soviet society."¹⁰³ Efforts began to de-collectivize large portions of Soviet agriculture, with a concomitant rehabilitation of Nikolai Bukharin.¹⁰⁴ There was even tentative experimentation with the concept of the rule of law, which "would also destroy the legal foundations of authoritarianism in the Soviet Union, and it would sharply limit the powers of the Communist party."¹⁰⁵ As a result of these and many other concrete reforms, civil society was reactivated across the board. Not only did the government make these many commitments to new levels of freedom and participation, the citizenry responded enthusiastically. Matthew Evangelista reported:
The re-emergence of Soviet civil society became evident in 1985, the first year of Gorbachev's tenure in office, and a growing movement of informal groups was quite active by 1987. By the end of the decade, hundreds of self-defined political parties were in existence and were competing for influence in a functioning legislature. Vibrant print and broadcast media raised the quality and diversity of political discourse and contributed to an informed and attentive citizenry. All of these developments stemmed from Gorbachev's policy of glasnost, which gave voice to the range of political views encompassed by Soviet society and allowed groups access to information as a tool for organizing their political activity. Glasnost gradually diminished the degree of secrecy enshrouding all aspects of Soviet life, including security policy, as indeed its architects intended.106

There was one other interesting aspect of glasnost. Gorbachev had decided that just as there was a gulf in trust between the Soviet Union and the states of the West, there was a similar gulf between the government of the Soviet Union and the people. The Russian people had come to distrust their government, a situation that threatened Gorbachev's efforts to revitalize Soviet society and the Soviet economy. To address those issues of trust—domestic and international—Gorbachev promised to speak the truth, and that meant, on many occasions, that Gorbachev was forced to admit to errors committed by the Soviet government. In facing history, Gorbachev fired another shot at the American Neanderthal mentality. Michael Mandelbaum, commenting on the admission by the Soviet Union to a massacre of Polish army officers in the Katyn Forest during World War Two, stated that such admissions served a number of purposes for Gorbachev, at least one of which is supportive of GRIT. "It serves
to blacken Stalin's reputation further. It also serves to show the world that the Soviets really have broken with the past.\textsuperscript{107}

None of this is meant to say that the sole intent of glasnost was to impress the United States; that was consequence of glasnost, but not the reason for it. Restructuring in the Soviet Union required a new sense of mission on the part of the people and the intelligentsia—those constituencies had to be enthusiastic supporters of the reform program if it were to succeed. Gorbachev understood that, and glasnost was intended in part to revitalize those critical constituencies. The architects of Soviet reform argued that the requirements of democracy ran deeper even than that.

Democratization is, in our view, the sole path towards developing new levels of Man's social resources. It is sometimes alleged that we regard it merely as a utilitarian means of imparting the necessary dynamism to the economy. Even if this were really so, I myself fail to understand what is wrong with this. All the same, this interpretation is one-sided. Democratization, in the socialist sense, is the creation of an unfailing mechanism, a mechanism whereby every man influences the life of society....Genuine democracy, as we understand it, represents a system of relations in which Man and the collective themselves create the wealth in all its aspects, material and spiritual aspects alike; disposing of this wealth themselves; distributing it themselves.\textsuperscript{108}

Whatever its design, the efforts to open Soviet society did strike at the critical state character issues that helped forge the American anti-Soviet perspective. And though it remained the case that Reagan never appreciated the magnitude of the change in this sphere, he was forced on occasion to recognize Soviet movement on human rights.\textsuperscript{109}
The Moratorium on Nuclear Testing

The Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing stands as the first in a long series of concrete, unilateral foreign policy initiatives in the Soviet GRIT strategy. Initiated in July of 1985 and renewed, also unilaterally, in January, March, and August of 1986, it is perhaps more properly conceived as a series of initiatives. In toto, the moratorium lasted for nineteen months while the Soviet Union waited for any indication of U.S. reciprocation.

The April 1985 plenum addressed only briefly the notions of reform in foreign policy—those concepts were to be more fully developed in the January 1986 statement on disarmament and at the 27th party congress in February of 1986. The initiative on testing, announced some six months prior to those critical events, did not enjoy the benefits of the theoretical and substantive developments of the six months that included the January statement and the congress. Nonetheless it displayed a nascent understanding of the foreign policy themes which came to dominate Soviet discussions of new thinking in the years that followed.

Gorbachev's statement introducing the moratorium began by addressing the larger issues of war, peace, and human development in terms he would expand upon in his later explorations of the theoretical bases of new thinking. It expressed the importance of the moratorium, as it related substantively to the
process of controlling the arms acquisition spiral, and as a symbol of a new way of conducting relations among states in the international system. The announcement also exhibited a rhetorical flourish which harkened back to the language used by Osgood in the sample introduction to GRIT contained in his 1962 book.

In an effort to help end the dangerous competition in the build-up of nuclear arsenals and wishing to set a good example, the Soviet Union has decided that it will unilaterally discontinue all nuclear explosions, starting from 6 August 1985. We call on the Government of the United States to cease its nuclear explosions starting from the same date, which is observed throughout the world as the anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy. Our moratorium is declared until 1 January 1986. It will, however, remain in effect beyond that date if the United States, for its part, refrains from setting off nuclear explosions.  

The structure of the moratorium was also fully consistent with Osgood's theories of initiatives in the GRIT process. It was unilateral in nature, being imposed without any conditions or negotiations. It was pre-announced and carried out as scheduled, despite the cold reception by the United States. The statement contained a request for a specific form of reciprocation by the United States—a moratorium on U.S. nuclear tests to run as long as the Soviet moratorium continued. And the proposal looked ahead; the statement sought to have the United States join in efforts to fashion an agreement for a comprehensive global ban on nuclear testing.

As indicated earlier in this chapter, Gorbachev realized that talk alone was cheap, and that concrete actions would be required to effect real change in
U.S.-Soviet relations. The moratorium was offered in just such a spirit, as Gorbachev was later to report. "Being an action rather than just a proposal, the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions bore out the seriousness and sincerity of our nuclear disarmament program and our appeals for a new policy—a policy of realism, peace, and cooperation." Other Soviet commentators spoke of the way in which the Soviet Union, through the initiation of the moratorium, had taken a proactive stance to tear down the old way of thinking—the Neanderthal mentality—and to forge a new relationship among states, one based on trust.

The psychology of the new way of thinking must develop on the basis of creative, productive ideas. The new way of thinking must be creative, not reactive, in nature. By "reactive" is meant that way of thinking which is based on the principle of one side answering (reacting to) the actions of the other. The reactive character of this thinking creates an exclusive circle in the confrontation of the sides, and is insufficiently productive and offers little prospect for achieving progress in halting the arms race. Counterposed to this is the creative (constructive) way of thinking, based on ideas which are global in scale and positive in nature. A fine example of the creative way of thinking is the Soviet Union's announcement of a moratorium on nuclear explosions.

The reaction of the Reagan White House to the Soviet initiative was decidedly negative. As an example of the types of cognitive misfirings that were discussed earlier in this work, it is instructive to explore how Reagan perceived the Soviet moratorium on testing. In chapter 3 it was indicated that Khrushchev was involved in an attempt—similar to Gorbachev's, though less encompassing—to recast relations between the United States and the Soviet
Union. Dulles and Eisenhower understood Khrushchev was attempting to forge more cordial relations, but they chose to continue to pressure Khrushchev in an attempt to make greater gains at his expense. In the test moratorium case, however, the situation was different. It was very early in the process of Gorbachev's reforms, and there was as of that time no connection in Reagan's mind between Gorbachev's professed desire to remake international relations—a profession which, at that time, Reagan would have disbelieved in any case—and the moratorium. Goldstein and Freeman reported, in fact, that their research showed the Reagan administration to "perceive the Soviet initiative more as a hostile pressure tactic than as a cooperative concession; they immediately and vigorously rejected the moratorium."¹¹⁴ Judging from the tone of the administration's rejection, it seems likely that for Reagan, opposition to the moratorium was equivalent to opposition to a comprehensive test ban.

The American rejection was based on its concerns regarding the trustworthiness and veracity of its Soviet adversary. From the signing in 1963 of the Limited Test Ban Treaty, negotiations on a comprehensive test ban had been ongoing in some form. The Reagan administration was the first American administration in twenty years to refuse to participate in those negotiations. Reagan believed, first, that testing was critical to maintaining the reliability of the nuclear stockpile, and, second, that the Soviet Union would find ways to cheat on any test ban agreement. The United States, which would adhere to the
agreement as a matter of principle, would then find itself with an increasingly unreliable nuclear deterrent, while the Soviet Union would be maintaining its stockpile reliability through covert testing. Deterrence would be shattered, and the United States would face grave risks.

Moreover, Reagan ran for the presidency on a platform that rejected the détente of the 1970s. As he saw it, détente, at best, codified Soviet-American parity in nuclear capability, and at worst, had locked the United States into an inferior position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. The answer, as Reagan had promised to carry out, was massive military expenditures and strategic modernization. Modernization required testing, meaning that even if a test ban were mutually verifiable, it would have been rejected by the Reagan administration.

The Reagan administration's rejection of the Soviet initiative took many forms. Matthew Evangelista argued that Reagan "administration efforts to justify rejection of a comprehensive test ban had an onion-like quality to them; as one layer of rationale becomes discredited, another appears in its place." At the rhetorical level, Reagan argued that the moratorium was not really a concession because the Soviet Union had completed a series of tests just prior to the announcement of the moratorium. Gorbachev responded that the moratorium actually interrupted a series of tests, requiring that the test program remain unfinished. Data compiled by the National Resources
Defense Council demonstrated that the Soviet Union had averaged more than twenty-five tests each year for the seven years preceding the moratorium, but had only conducted nine tests in the seven months of 1985 prior to the moratorium.\textsuperscript{117} Those numbers suggest that Gorbachev was telling the truth. Moreover, Reagan's argument became less credible with each extension of the moratorium which resulted, by the time it ended in early 1987, in the Soviet Union foregoing up to thirty nuclear tests explosions.

Gorbachev's persistence in the face of escalating U.S. provocation was truly remarkable given U.S.-Soviet relations in the mid-1980s. Within two weeks of the initiation of the moratorium, the United States conducted a nuclear test; within the first twelve months, the United States conducted more than eighteen nuclear tests, a number of them, Gorbachev charged, unannounced.\textsuperscript{118} The week of August 19-25 witnessed a series of provocations, including pledges to continue antisatellite and Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) research and testing—threats that struck at the heart of Soviet security concerns.\textsuperscript{119}

Recognizing the American uneasiness over the verification of testing restrictions, the Soviet Union offered additional initiatives to quell those fears. Breaking with the longstanding Soviet concern—some would say obsession—with secrecy, Gorbachev brought glasnost to foreign policy. The Soviet Union allowed seismological monitoring of their tests by the United States while seeking reciprocal treatment from Washington.\textsuperscript{120} Yet, as Evangelista pointed out, the
more concessions made by Gorbachev, the more creative the Reagan administration became in thinking up reasons to reject the Soviet initiative.

On the issue of verification, the Soviets attempted to resolve the administration's doubts by agreeing to install seismic monitoring devices near Soviet test sites. An official at a U.S. nuclear weapons laboratory countered with the claim that the Soviets could cheat by testing in outer space. "They could go beyond Mars, in which case we'd have to go beyond Mars to measure it."^121

The question of negotiations on tests was put off by disagreement over the desired pace of the cessation of testing, with the Soviets seeking an immediate ban and the U.S. preferring a more incremental approach. The Soviet Union demonstrated flexibility on that issue as well.^122

In the end, though, the United States steadfastly refused to join the moratorium, and in February of 1987, the Soviet Union conducted its first nuclear test explosion in nineteen months. Some have argued that the inability to engage the United States in the moratorium proves the effort was a failure. Such thinking represents an exceedingly narrow view of Gorbachev's intentions, as well as a fundamental misunderstanding of GRIT.

Over the nineteen months the moratorium was active, there were some signs that the political situation between the United States and the Soviet Union was evolving, a situation that will be examined in more detail in chapter 5. The moratorium laid the groundwork for future initiatives, and had begun the Reagan administration's cognitive journey from unrelieved hostility to emerging, if grudging, cooperation.
Moreover, on the specific issue of testing, the experience was quite instructive, and it began a dialogue that moved forward U.S. and Soviet mutual understanding of the testing issue. Gorbachev himself agreed.

I do not think our moratorium was unproductive. World public opinion learned that nuclear tests could be ended and it learned who was opposed to this. It’s true that an historic chance to halt the arms race was missed then, but the political lessons of all this have not been wasted. Now that an agreement has been reached to start full-scale, stage-by-stage negotiations on nuclear testing by December 1, we can congratulate ourselves and everyone for having gotten the matter off the ground.¹²³

By January of 1988, U.S. testing experts had visited the Soviet test site at Semipalatinsk, and Soviet experts had inspected the U.S. test facility in Nevada. Soviet commentators stressed that these reciprocal site inspections were a first step toward real limitations in testing, and TASS reported a perception of “a certain psychological shift in relations between the two countries. Mutual trust, which is so necessary for conducting arms control talks, is strengthening.”¹²⁴

The test moratorium was the earliest of the unilateral initiatives in Gorbachev’s GRIT-like strategy, but from it emerged perhaps the greatest contribution to the practice of Gorbachev’s new thinking. While concepts like reasonable sufficiency and mutual security possessed great substantive power, it was the shattering of secrecy—the introduction of glasnost into foreign policy in the form of on-site inspections—that was to have the greatest symbolic effect over the ensuing two years. It was that which helped Reagan begin to believe
that the other changes were sincere. By pulling back the iron curtain and allowing the West repeatedly to peer in, Gorbachev slowly undercut Reagan's enemy image of the Soviet Union.

_Glasnost in Foreign Policy: A Legacy of On-Site Inspections_

The year 1987 was critical to Gorbachev's new thinking. Having spelled out the substance of the program in increasingly greater detail throughout 1986, 1987 saw the Soviet Union turn in earnest toward the task of convincing the United States of the depth and sincerity of the changes in the U.S.-Soviet relationship sought by the Soviet Union. To accomplish these tasks Gorbachev turned, in part, to the application of glasnost to foreign policy. If the United States harbored suspicions about an issue, Gorbachev seemed to say throughout 1987, let them see for themselves. On-site verification became the hallmark of new thinking in 1987. Gorbachev testified to the expanding openness in international politics, created at his hand, and the power that openness possessed to change the very nature of international relations.

In the present-day reality there already exist "bricks" from which one can start building the future system of security. The sphere of the reasonable, responsible, and rational organization of international affairs is expanding before our very eyes, albeit timidly. Previously unknown standards of openness, of glasnost, of the scope and depth of mutual monitoring and verification of compliance with adopted obligations are being established. An American inspection team visits an area where exercises of Soviet
troops are held, a group of U.S. congressmen inspects the Krasnoyarsk radar station, American scientists install and adjust their instruments in the area of the Soviet nuclear testing range. Soviet and American observers are present at each other's military exercises. Annual plans of military activity are published in accordance with accords within the framework of the Helsinki process.125

One case in particular, the Krasnoyarsk radar facility, is indicative of Gorbachev's commitment to introduce glasnost to foreign policy. This case is critical because the issues surrounding the Krasnoyarsk facility were some of the most important issues in U.S.-Soviet relations in the mid- to late 1980s. The critical issues at the core of decisions about Krasnoyarsk revolved around the 1972 treaty limiting antiballistic missile (ABM) systems and subsystems. Department of Defense officials, for example, stated that the Krasnoyarsk facility "was the world's largest and most powerful phased-array radar, using the most modern technology, and is therefore at the heart of ABM Treaty compliance."126 The United States and the Soviet Union in this time period both had an interest in maintaining the integrity of the ABM Treaty regime, but on different grounds.

The United States was deeply involved in research and development of its SDI program, initiated by President Reagan in March of 1983. As the U.S. program advanced toward testing various component designs in the late 1980s, the U.S. government began to argue for what became known as a liberal
interpretation of the ABM Treaty— which was an interpretation that would permit the United States to continue its design and testing of SDI components.

The Soviet leadership, for its part, was uncertain as to the viability of SDI. "To be frank," answered Foreign Minister Shevardnadze at a November 1987 press conference in Washington, "I am not sure that the SDI program is a realistic program. I am not a specialist in that area, but I have contacts with my friends, colleagues, scientists. Very many major scientists and specialists are expressing serious doubts as regards the practicability of that program." Yet they feared a breakthrough on a full SDI system, or some more limited anti-missile capability, that might have altered significantly the strategic equation. At a minimum, the Gorbachev leadership feared being forced to spend significant sums of money on new offensive systems and countermeasures, or to forgo potential savings in these areas, to offset any defensive capabilities the U.S. might have developed. The continuing integrity of the ABM Treaty regime was of critical importance to Gorbachev's program of arms control. Adherence to a strict interpretation of the ABM Treaty for a period of ten years, Foreign Minister Shevardnadze reported, by eliminating the need to compensate for accrued defensive capabilities, would make possible a fifty percent reduction in offensive strategic arms. Were the ABM Treaty regime to be undermined, especially by U.S. pursuit of the SDI program, Gorbachev warned, the prospects for arms control were bleak.
More dangerous, the Soviet leadership thought, if less likely, would have been the U.S. development of a more robust defensive system, enhancing U.S. nuclear warfighting capabilities and undercutting deterrence. Far from being defensive in nature, SDI, along with some ominous developments in U.S. strategic missile deployments, appeared to be part of an attempt by the United States to develop a first strike capability. The Soviet Union sought U.S. agreement to limit its SDI program and to commit to a strict interpretation of the ABM Treaty for a period of ten years.

There was yet another significant cross-current to this issue. President Reagan and many, especially conservative, members of Congress believed that the Soviet Union was actively pursuing development of its own ABM capability—a belief that was shaken neither by vehement Soviet denials nor by a CIA report that indicated the chances of the Soviet Union deploying its own Star Wars system were less than ten percent. Further, because he believed the Soviet Union was never limited in its behavior by treaty obligations, Reagan saw the ABM Treaty as a one-sided restriction on U.S. SDI research and development, while the Soviet Union ignored the treaty and worked covertly on an anti-missile system of its own. The more obvious the perceived violation of the treaty, the greater the pressure Reagan brought to bear on the Soviet leadership.
The United States first became aware of the Soviet radar at Krasnoyarsk as a result of satellite reconnaissance in early 1983. The Reagan administration was concerned that the Krasnoyarsk facility was being constructed as a battle management platform for an ABM system.

The U.S. Department of Defense has argued that the radar was located at Krasnoyarsk rather than at a permitted location on the coast in order to pass along more complete information on the trajectories of incoming warheads to radars that would guide ABM interceptors—in other words, it is exactly the kind of installation the ABM Treaty was designed to prohibit.131

Were that the case, the Krasnoyarsk radar would have posed a clear threat to the 1972 ABM Treaty regime, with dire consequences for strategic deterrence and stability. At a minimum, Reagan charged, the site was an early warning radar that, because of its location, was a technical violation of the ABM Treaty. The ABM Treaty permits early-warning radars to be located only on the perimeters of the United States and the Soviet Union, and oriented outward. This treaty provision was based on a concern similar to that expressed by President Reagan regarding the facility at Krasnoyarsk: siting those facilities in the interior of the country enhances the capacity to field a battle-management capability and, thus, an ABM system. Krasnoyarsk is in Siberia, and the radar was located well inside the periphery of the Soviet Union in violation of the ABM Treaty.

The Soviet Union first responded by denying that the Krasnoyarsk facility had any military function whatsoever, asserting instead that it was a part of a
space tracking system. In addition, the Soviet Union lodged two complaints against the United States, arguing that American radar facilities being upgraded in Great Britain and Greenland were themselves violations of the ABM Treaty. Gorbachev offered to suspend work on the Krasnoyarsk facility if the United States would suspend work on their two disputed radar sites. The U.S. rejected that initiative and continued to make the Krasnoyarsk facility a key stumbling block to improved relations.\textsuperscript{132}

As 1987 progressed, Reagan and Gorbachev moved toward a December summit and the signing of the treaty on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range nuclear forces (INF). Their progress, however, continued to be held hostage to Reagan's characterization of the Soviet Union as being in violation of standing arms control agreements, in particular, the ABM Treaty. Moreover, just beyond the signing of the INF Treaty loomed the requirement of ratification by the U.S. Senate. The continuing concerns of Senate conservatives over Krasnoyarsk required Gorbachev to take steps to eliminate this stumbling block on the path to the INF Treaty, which was itself a critical step in Gorbachev's program of new thinking. As Dr. Peter Zimmerman of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace argued, if the dispute over ABM compliance were not resolved, "the new INF Treaty and the earlier ABM Treaty are likely to be shattered, spelling the end of arms control for years to come."\textsuperscript{133}
Believing that the United States would continue to reject conditional initiatives, the Soviet Union attempted a more unilateral approach, opening up the facility to a delegation of members of the U.S. House of Representatives plus staffers and electronics specialists. The delegation was already in the Soviet Union to participate in the monitoring and measurement of a Soviet nuclear test. The decision to open the facility to inspection was politically significant, as Jim Moody, one of the Congresspersons who inspected the facility, wrote,

The most important point is political. By permitting the U.S. delegation to visit the Krasnoyarsk facility, the Soviets have signaled a willingness to raise the profile of this issue and, possibly, to seek its resolution through negotiation. More than ever before, they seem to understand that arms control will grind to a halt unless both sides are confident that treaty commitments are being observed.134

The U.S. delegation was granted unprecedented access to the facility. Time magazine reported that a Pentagon official, upon hearing details of the inspection, exclaimed, “It's unbelievable. We'd never allow something like that to happen here.”135 The inspection included a lengthy helicopter overflight of the facility, and four hours to prowl, with minimal supervision, through the bowels of the radar. The delegation took more than one thousand still photographs, two video tapes, and an audio recording, along with numerous pages of sketches and notes, none of which was reviewed by Soviet officials. The delegation reported that Soviet officials on site were exceedingly helpful and forthcoming, answering questions without hesitation. The committee report, cited in the Soviet press
concluded, "We witnessed displays of openness that could only be called impressive." The delegation cited the unprecedented openness as evidence of Soviet willingness to deal with the political dimensions of this issue, and of the broader Soviet commitment to seek political and not military solutions to security problems.

The findings of the delegation, while interesting and symbolically important, failed to settle the technical questions regarding the radar and whether it was in violation of the ABM Treaty. Jim Moody discussed three possible conclusions regarding the facility and related the evidence gathered during the inspection to those conclusions.

The first possible conclusion was that the Reagan administration was correct; that the Krasnoyarsk radar was intended for ABM battle management. The delegation concluded, however, that it was unlikely that the facility could serve that function. The frequency of the radar was too low; the projected computational speed too slow; and it appeared that the facility would not be hardened to withstand overpressure and other blast effect or electro-magnetic pulse (EMP). These were cited as shortcomings which severely limited the efficacy of the facility in a battle management role. It should be noted, however, that the accuracy and importance of those conclusions have been questioned by the Pentagon and by other private sources.
The second possibility is that, as the Soviet Union asserted, the facility was a space track radar, permitted under the ABM Treaty. Again, this was unlikely. First, the facility was oriented improperly, facing northeast. As such it would have been able only to track objects in polar—north-south—orbits. Moreover, the delegation noted, the frequency of the radar was also ill-suited to the task of space tracking.

Finally, Moody argued, "There is a third possibility. Krasnoyarsk may be an 'early warning' radar. Judging from location alone, the radar seems best suited for this role....While less important than a battle-management radar in a military sense, an early warning radar at Krasnoyarsk may constitute a technical violation of the ABM Treaty when fully developed." While some of the same issues that argued against the facility functioning in a battle-management role also argued, to an extent, against its function as an early warning radar, the delegation concluded that this was the most likely explanation.

Others have argued that were the facility an early warning radar, not only would it still be a violation of the ABM Treaty, but the reason it would be a violation—that it was located hundreds of miles inland—limited is utility in an early warning role; the deeper in the interior an early warning radar is situated, the closer a missile would be to the target before it was detected. This fact only served to heighten the incredulity of Reagan and others who suspected the worst
of Soviet intentions. The Union of Concerned Scientists conducted a study, however, the results of which lent credence to the conclusion that Krasnoyarsk was an early warning radar, if a misplaced one. They concluded that the siting of the facility was the result of the harsh conditions found further north near the treaty-compliant periphery of Siberia.

A recent study by the Union of Concerned Scientists argues that Krasnoyarsk, if completed, would fill an important gap in the early-warning system for the USSR, giving notice of missiles fired by U.S. submarines in the northern Pacific. The Kremlin seems to have tried earlier to plug this gap by erecting two radars close to its borders, as permitted by the treaty, only to give up the effort because construction on Siberian permafrost proved too difficult. Krasnoyarsk, far inland—on firm soil and close to a railroad—would fill the gap.

In the end, the inspection of Krasnoyarsk led the delegation to conclude that the radar, when completed, would most likely be a technical violation of the ABM Treaty, but that it posed little or no military threat to the United States. The evidence was, however, somewhat ambiguous and, in a climate of distrust, it failed to penetrate the Neanderthal mentality in the Reagan White House. The Reagan administration, undoubtedly never truly convinced that the radar at Krasnoyarsk was relatively benign, and being less concerned, in any case, with the realities of the military threat than with the politics of treaty compliance, continued to press the issue. Within weeks the House and Senate both passed resolutions agreeing with the administration’s assessment that the radar was a violation of the ABM Treaty—though Reagan never directed that
the facility be designated a “material breech” within the context of the treaty, a designation that would have set in motion procedures for withdrawal from the treaty regime.

Like the test moratorium before it, the decision to open the Krasnoyarsk radar to U.S. inspection was a classic case of a GRIT initiative: it was preannounced and carried out despite skepticism in the United States; it responded to an issue of concern and importance to the United States; it was completely unilateral and unconditional; and it contained a request for a reciprocal inspection of the U.S. radar facility at Thule, Greenland.

Also like the test moratorium before it, it appeared that this second major Soviet unilateral initiative had failed. The United States continued to press its claim that the Soviet Union was in violation of the ABM Treaty, and it rejected the Soviet request for a reciprocal inspection of the facility at Thule. In the aftermath of the visit, in fact, the immediate conditions facing Gorbachev remained essentially the same as they had been prior to the inspection: Gorbachev faced Western hostility toward arms control and suspicion of Soviet motives, with a summit meeting looming ever closer. He responded, as was his general approach in this time period, with yet another unilateral initiative, again very much along the lines of a GRIT initiative.

With a view to strengthening the atmosphere of trust and ending all talk alleging that the Soviet Union is violating the ABM Treaty by erecting the Krasnoyarsk radar station, Gorbachev told Shultz that the USSR will unilaterally institute a year’s moratorium on
all work under way there. Naturally, we expect a similar step with respect to the American radar station in Scotland.\(^{142}\) (Flyingdales Moor in Scotland was the location of the second of two radar facilities—along with the one at Thule, Greenland—the United States was upgrading.)

While it is fair to say that the Krasnoyarsk initiative failed to alter the immediate predicament faced by Gorbachev, it is nonetheless inaccurate to label the initiative a failure. It was part of a multi-faceted process—one must remember that Osgood predicted that individual unilateral initiatives, especially early in the GRIT process, would be rejected. What mattered more was the cumulative impact that a series of initiatives would have on the development of trust between adversaries.

One specific change as a result of the Krasnoyarsk initiative was the evolving perception that civilian leaders in Moscow were wrestling control of foreign policy decision making from the military. Attempts to offer the initiatives would have been prevented, Western diplomats asserted, had the military had its way.\(^{143}\) Moreover, there was a perception that this change was of a more permanent, structural nature, as the more conservative military leadership was replaced by a younger, “reform-friendly” cadre in the aftermath of the Mattias Rust incident.\(^{144}\)

Beyond that effect, however, the pattern of glasnost in foreign policy represented by the Krasnoyarsk initiative was beginning to forge an evolution in the nature of relations. Russian political commentator Stanislav Kondrashov

276
indicated that Reagan's immediate rejection of the findings of the Congressional delegation regarding Krasnoyarsk was expected, but that the fundamental dynamic of the U.S.-Soviet relationship was beginning to change.

The Reagan administration hastened to dispute the conclusions reached by the Congressmen after their inspection of the Krasnoyarsk radar station. An official White House spokesman said that the radar station "continued" to be considered "a violation of the ABM Treaty." But on what grounds? The old ones will no longer do. And somehow, they didn't get around to mentioning new ones. Naturally, it would be unrealistic to expect these positions to be surrendered instantaneously. The fruits of our greatly increased openness in foreign policy and military policy matters will not ripen immediately. But they are ripening—in the climate that was once again apparent to the world a few days ago both in Kazakhstan and in Siberia. That climate will also gradually influence (and is already influencing) the Washington climate—by inspiring reasonable people there and moving them to respond with trust to the obvious acts of trust that are coming forth in ever greater numbers from the Soviet side.145

The Krasnoyarsk initiative was only one of a series of applications of glasnost to foreign policy employed by Gorbachev in 1987. "Semipalatinsk, Krasnoyarsk, and Shikhany," writes the Soviet military journal Krasnaya Zvezda, "are received everywhere as synonyms of the notions of good will and new political thinking."146 Those are the names of sensitive Soviet military facilities in nuclear testing, ABM systems, and chemical weapons, thrown open to American inspectors. The Soviet Union, again in the spirit of both openness and GRIT, offered to allow a group of U.S. military and political personnel to inspect the chemical weapons facility at Shikhany. It was explicitly offered as
a method for building trust, and reciprocation was specified and requested as a means of assessing the American willingness to engage in the peace process. Instances of the United States and the Soviet Union monitoring each other's military exercises began in 1987, and U.S. charges that the Soviet Union had violated the ABM Treaty by moving tracking radars from an approved missile test facility to an electronics plant in the city of Gomel, were addressed by inviting U.S. inspectors to see that the radars had been dismantled, not moved. In short, as Foreign Minister Shevardnadze noted, this new type of openness—the inspection of sensitive facilities—was becoming a newly-accepted way of life.

All of this activity—all of this openness—moved in the same direction, confronting the enemy image of the Soviet Union held by Ronald Reagan. They were, in the words of Mikhail Gorbachev, used to open this section of the chapter, the bricks from which one could begin to build the future system of security. The INF Treaty one of the critical early structures of that system.

The Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty

Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) had long been an issue in U.S.-Soviet and NATO-Warsaw Pact relations. The issue as it developed in the mid-1980s, however, stemmed from a Soviet decision in the early 1970s to upgrade and
expand its arsenal of intermediate-range systems with newer, faster, more accurate SS-11 and SS-20 missiles.

The story of developments in the INF arena has been well-documented. The deployment of SS-20s brought to a head a number of U.S. and NATO concerns, leading the West to set in motion plans to deploy U.S. INF weapons in Europe. The United States, with NATO's consent, planned to deploy in Germany and the Netherlands ground launched cruise missiles (GLCMs) and Pershing II intermediate-range ballistic missiles (IRBMs). Balancing the fear of decoupling in Western European governments—the concern that the United States would disengage from a NATO-Warsaw Pact conflict in Europe rather than risk strategic-level nuclear war with the Soviet Union—with the increasing peace activism of, especially European, publics, NATO embarked upon what was known as a dual-track approach. The United States was to move ahead with plans to deploy INF systems in Europe while simultaneously pursuing bilateral U.S.-Soviet negotiations on reducing or eliminating intermediate-range nuclear forces.

INF negotiations took place in two stages. The first began in Geneva on November 30, 1981, and ended when the Soviet Union walked out of the negotiations on November 23, 1983. The atmosphere in this time period was one of distrust in which each side was attempting to “win” the negotiation, or, at

279
least, to capture the public relations high ground. What they were not attempting to do was reach a reasonable compromise.

The American negotiating position was known as the zero option—later as double zero—to signify that under the plan the Soviet Union would reduce to zero the number of its INF systems, and the United States would suspend the planned deployment of INF weapons to Europe, leaving it with zero as well. Ironically, double-zero was the basic structure of the agreement championed by Mikhail Gorbachev in 1986 and 1987. In 1981, however, double-zero was an intentional non-starter.

Administration officials, among them Secretary of State Alexander Haig after he left office, have said that the proposal for reductions to zero of both U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range nuclear forces was made for publicity—to take the high ground in propaganda—with no real expectation that the Soviet Union would ever agree.151

Important players in the U.S. government—the Pentagon, for example, with Reagan in agreement—were committed to the deployment of INF weapons in Europe. In fact, “Most American and NATO officials,” according to former ambassador Jonathan Dean, “were unwilling to accept any outcome that did not entail some deployment of U.S. INF.”152 The Soviet Union, for its part, was intent on preventing any U.S. INF deployment, but was not willing to exchange the components of its INF force, already deployed, for American weapons that did not yet exist.
Given the fundamental lack of common ground and the prevalence of the old way of thinking, the negotiations proceeded haltingly, with the United States moving inexorably toward deployment. On November 23, 1983, the first U.S. INF missiles were deployed in Europe, and the Soviet Union responded in part by walking out of the ongoing treaty negotiations. Talks remained suspended for fourteen months. In late 1984 Reagan and Soviet Foreign Minister Andre Gromyko announced plans to resume negotiations across a broad range of nuclear weapons issues. On March 11, 1985, these new comprehensive negotiations, the Nuclear and Space Talks (NST), of which INF was a component, opened in Geneva.

Just days before the opening of NST, Konstantin Chernenko, the sixth General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, died. On the same day that the arms talks resumed in Geneva, Mikhail Gorbachev was named General Secretary of the Soviet Union. Gorbachev convened a new era in global politics, and his decision to initiate a GRIT-like strategy in foreign policy continued to find concrete expression in the negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear forces. Osgood had warned that in an environment of distrust in which the Neanderthal mentality—what Gorbachev called the "old way of thinking"—prevailed on both sides, negotiations were seen in competitive terms, much as during the first phase of the INF negotiations. The desire on the part
of both parties to win the negotiation makes reaching agreement virtually impossible.\textsuperscript{153}

Gorbachev shared that concern. His coming to the negotiations in the spirit of new thinking represented a rejection of competition and the evolution of cooperation, as Gorbachev himself expressed in his statement following the signing of the INF Treaty. "I know that with the signing of the treaty on intermediate and shorter range missiles, some politicians and journalists are already speculating as to who won. I reject this approach. It is a throwback to old thinking. Common sense has won. Reason has won."\textsuperscript{154} Gorbachev understood the need to move away from established positions to jump-start the negotiating process—as the \textit{Chicago Tribune} military affairs writer conveyed with a baseball analogy, "...to steal second base, you have to take your foot off first. To get to second base of an arms deal on nuclear weapons in Europe, Gorbachev has offered to dismantle all 100 SS-20s, he's offered on-site inspections, and he's allowed some Congressmen and their technical experts to visit the contentious ballistic missile radar at Krasnoyarsk."\textsuperscript{155}

The November 1985 summit at Geneva saw Gorbachev's early attempt to engage Reagan on various arms control issues, while Reagan simply attempted to avoid being cornered into any type of substantive agreement. The leaders did agree, however, to hold two additional summit meetings—the first in Washington and the second in Moscow. In general, the Geneva summit resulted
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in some good feelings between the participants—Reagan commented that he believed, based on the discussions, that Gorbachev was someone with whom he could work—but no substantive agreements.\textsuperscript{156}

Gorbachev worried that were a second summit to be held and it, too, failed to produce a substantive agreement, skepticism of arms control would grow and the prospects of agreement would diminish. Gorbachev's concerns were heightened in the months following the Geneva summit as the United States continued to resist Soviet arms control overtures. "The hopes for major change in the world situation, which we all entertained, began to evaporate shortly after the Geneva meeting."\textsuperscript{157} Gorbachev, therefore, requested that he and Reagan meet at an interim summit—a working meeting that Gorbachev hoped would give some momentum to the arms control process. The United States agree, and the meeting was scheduled for October 1986 at Reykjavik.

At the meeting at Reykjavik, Gorbachev wanted to make historic strides, and he entered the discussions with a great hope for real, substantive achievements, if he could break through Reagan's defenses and truly engage him in the process.

Gorbachev proposed the Reykjavik working summit because its risks and costs were less risky for him than a ceremonial visit to the United States, but he was still taking something of a gamble. He still needed to break the logjam and start new movement in the arms negotiations, and he correctly saw that the only was to do that was by engaging President Reagan personally. As Gorbachev and his advisers saw it, Reykjavik would be an interim summit but
one where they would present a package with enough contingent concessions and new approaches to attract Reagan's interest.  

With the advent of the NST, arms control had become a package deal—discussions took place across a range of arms control issues. Reykjavik was no different in that regard, and Gorbachev’s negotiating strategy included initiatives in a number of substantive arms control arenas.

Gorbachev came to Reykjavik with an agenda, and he was energized by his expectations. He took the initiative, making an impressive presentation of the Soviet position, including a number of new proposals which represented concessions to previously held American positions. Reagan, however, was uninspired, and brought nothing new to the table, merely rehashing old positions. In fact, “all the major concessions at Reykjavik,” Zhores Medvedev wrote, “were made by Gorbachev.” So uninterested in agreement was the Reagan administration that Kenneth Adelman, Reagan’s Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and an acknowledged opponent of arms control, recounted, “Never mind that we came [to Reykjavik] with nothing to offer and had offered nothing, we merely sat there while the Soviets unwrapped their gifts.”

Working group meetings, however, made some progress. Shultz, Shevardnadze, Ambassador Paul Nitze, and Soviet Marshall Sergi Akhromeyev and their teams engaged in a marathon negotiating session. Akhromeyev had been given authority by Gorbachev to make additional concessions, and with
that the negotiations moved forward. In the end, agreement appeared to be at hand in many areas of that broad range of substantive arenas; Gorbachev was hopeful, only to be disappointed. Despite numerous Soviet concessions to American negotiating positions, Reagan refused to accept any limitation on SDI research and the working summit ended without agreement.

The proposed deal, however, collapsed over the terms of observance of the ABM Treaty. Gorbachev, clearly at the edge of his mandate from Moscow, continued to insist on limiting ABM research to the laboratory, and Reagan would not agree in effect to gutting SDI. Reagan finally literally broke up the meeting over this issue, leaving up in the air what, if any, elements of newfound agreement on many aspects of the arms issue could be salvaged and whether there could be any partial agreement.162

Reykjavik was not a complete failure. The Soviet side had made a number of initiatives and concessions that had removed some of the barriers to an agreement on INF weapons, and Gorbachev was committed to continue to push forward on the momentum of Reykjavik.

In the area of intermediate-range forces, agreement was blocked by three contentious issues: verification; third party (British and French) INF weapons; and linkage to the broader arms control package. As will be seen below, on each of these critical issues Gorbachev offered a series of concessions to the original American position, some at Reykjavik, some later. It was these unilateral initiatives, at the hand of Mikhail Gorbachev, that eventually made the INF Treaty a reality. “The success of the INF talks probably resulted more from the emergence of a conciliation-minded Soviet leadership than from a particular
Western negotiating approach. Whether the treaty also marks a true turning point in East/West relations is largely dependent on whether this conciliatory Soviet attitude persists.\textsuperscript{163}

**Verification**

As indicated earlier, Reagan's Neanderthal mentality included a profound distrust of the Soviet Union, which was manifest, in part, in Reagan's assumption that the Soviet Union could be expected to cheat on any arms control agreement. That mentality formed the psycho-political milieu of the INF Treaty negotiations.

The talks were carried out largely in an atmosphere of mutual distrust, typified by the Reagan administration's charges, catalogued from 1984 on in annual reports to Congress, that the Soviet Union was cheating on already existing arms control commitments and by the intensely anti-American tone of the Soviet diplomatic and media campaign on INF issues until late in the negotiations. U.S. mistrust found concrete expression at the negotiating table in the U.S. insistence on including a highly detailed verification regime in the Treaty which went far beyond the traditional reliance on National Technical Means (NTM).\textsuperscript{164}

The traditional—i.e. old thinking—Soviet approach to verification rested on two pillars that were in opposition to the U.S. desire for more extensive verification. First, the Soviet Union chose to seek agreement on the substance of arms control prior to any discussion of verification, a tactic that permitted Soviet negotiators to attempt to trade off concessions on verification for
concessions on substantive issues. At the Geneva summit, however, Gorbachev pledged to abandon this Soviet predilection and agreed, instead, to the preferred American approach of hashing out verification issues simultaneous with substantive discussions. The post-Geneva negotiations on INF weapons saw the Soviet delegation put that pledge into practice. Given the frustrations caused to U.S. negotiators and public officials by the old approach, Gorbachev's concessions on this issue were symbolically important for the larger goal of enhancing the U.S.-Soviet relationship.

The second long-standing Soviet tenet of verification was the commitment to verification by National Technical Means and the rejection of on-site verification. NTM consists of such things as satellite imaging and peripheral listening posts, distinct from the hands-on inspection of facilities that constitute on-site verification. The Soviet obsession with secrecy was its own reason to reject the notion of foreign inspectors prowling through sensitive installations. That same obsession with secrecy also reinforced the American distrust and fear of the Soviet Union.

Once again, Gorbachev pinpointed the psychological barrier to better U.S.-Soviet relations, and he made concessions to directly address those issues of greatest psychological impact. Yevgeny Primakov relates Gorbachev's counsel to Soviet negotiators at the Geneva summit. "M.S. Gorbachev told Soviet experts: We must modify our attitude toward verification. After all, persistent
proposals to carry it out only by national means are antagonizing a very large number of people in the West." By January of the following year, Gorbachev had signaled the shift in Soviet verification policy.

Soviet policy shifted from a commitment to disarm first and inspect later to taking a leadership role in new modes of verification, and the scope of the change was truly a statement on the Soviet commitment to new thinking and arms control. "The distance covered by cooperative measures in arms control from the days of SALT to the INF Treaty," Alan Sherr assessed, "is truly remarkable." Demonstrating further their commitment to glasnost in foreign policy, the Soviet Union provided up front a great deal of information related to the number and specifications of intermediate-range weapons, disclosures which were essential to verification of limits on those systems. Moreover, the verification measures contained in the treaty were, as both Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State Schultz agreed, "radical" and "far beyond anything attempted before." Even President Reagan recognized how far Gorbachev had come on verification. "This agreement contains the most stringent verification regime in history, including provisions for inspection teams actually residing in each other's territory, and several other forms of outside inspections as well...It also embodies another important principle—the need for glasnost, a greater openness in military programs and forces." Given the closed nature of the Soviet society, these measures were concessions of
tremendous magnitude. So much so that Raymond Garthoff, discussing the verification provisions of the treaty, called them "historic." "It represented a real breakthrough after decades of Soviet refusal to countenance intrusive independent presence on its territory and to yield so much military secrecy."172

Third Party INF Weapons

British and French holdings of nuclear weapons were insignificant measured against the almost 50,000 warheads in the possession of the United States and the Soviet Union. Those British and French nuclear systems relevant to the INF treaty negotiations consisted of approximately 560 warheads, predominantly based on submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs). Yet to the governments of Great Britain and France, these nuclear forces were critical. Independent nuclear forces were seen by these governments as insurance against the uncertainty of an American nuclear response to an exclusively European Soviet military gambit. These nuclear weapons also carried a certain significance for the threat they posed to the Soviet Union, though that threat was a different type than the threat posed by the proposed U.S. deployment of, especially, Pershing IIs. Pershing IIs were extremely accurate, capable of destroying even hardened command and control installations and decapitating the Soviet leadership with very little warning. British and French nuclear
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forces in the mid-1980s, lacking that accuracy, were threatening only to soft targets. Whereas Pershing IIs represented a risk of a short-warning first strike, British and French nuclear forces were purely of a retaliatory nature. Together, though, they represented for the Soviet Union a potential loss of up to 55 million people and 35 percent of productive capacity.\(^{173}\) The Soviet Union, then, had obvious incentives to seek to eliminate those systems.

The British and French governments consistently refused to sanction inclusion of their nuclear forces in U.S.-Soviet negotiations, and the United States supported that position, steadfastly resisting Soviet efforts to put French and British nuclear weapons on the table, and refusing also to accede to Soviet demands for compensation for French and British nuclear weapons in any negotiated framework.

Gorbachev broke this particular stalemate at Reykjavik where he acceded fully to the American position and exempted French and British forces from the INF discussion. "The substantive richness of the Reykjavik INF provisions was remarkable. But also of importance was what was not included....[There was no Soviet insistence on] any form of compensation for British and French nuclear systems."\(^{174}\) Despite the obvious risks, which Gorbachev acknowledged, he conceded this issue to the United States.

And what makes our new proposal different from our Geneva proposals is that we now left completely aside the nuclear potentials of France and Britain. You understand, of course, that this was a very large concession on our part. Indeed, those two
countries are allies of the USA, and they have nuclear potentials which continue to be built up and upgraded. And all of their military activities are closely coordinated within NATO. We know this for certain. Nevertheless, we removed that obstacle to agreement.  

**Linkage**

The final and most difficult hurdle was the linkage among various components of the nuclear talks. The Nuclear and Space Talks that began in March of 1985 brought together negotiations on a number of facets of arms control: INF, strategic offensive weapons, the militarization of space, and strategic defense. That package fit well with Gorbachev's vision of arms control as articulated in his January 1986 statement on arms control. Negotiations proceeded on that basis.

At Reykjavik, substantial progress toward agreement was made, but faltered ultimately on the issue of strategic defense. Gorbachev had significant strategic rationale to oppose an expanded U.S. SDI program, rationale that would become increasingly salient were the Soviet arsenal to grow smaller. The clash over the U.S. pursuit of SDI and the integrity of the ABM Treaty regime brought the summit to a close without agreement.

The fear that led Gorbachev to propose the Reykjavik meeting—that the failure of the scheduled Washington summit to produce an agreement would
doom the process of arms control and threaten the success of new thinking and, by implication, Gorbachev’s entire reform program—remained after Reykjavik. The United States made it clear in the months that followed that it was unwilling to agree to additional limits on its SDI program, and Gorbachev began to consider forgoing the Washington summit entirely.

In the end, Gorbachev understood the reality that he faced: to achieve any agreement he would have to pursue limitations on INF systems separate from attempts to enforce a strict interpretation of the ABM Treaty. Yevgeny Primakov relates the logic underlying Gorbachev’s decision.

As is well-known, in Reykjavik we linked in a single package the reduction of all types of nuclear weapons and the problem of not putting these weapons in space. Then the problem of intermediate-range missiles was removed from the package when it became clear that this was the most realistic way out of the deadlock into which the United States’ resistance had driven the entire process of arms reduction.¹⁷⁶

Gorbachev also believed that the linkage of an INF agreement to questions of space weapons and the ABM Treaty was the last real barrier to an INF treaty. He decided to “cover the last trump cards that the enemies of disarmament had kept in their hands,” and on March 1, 1987 announced the decision “to treat the issue of INF forces in Europe separately, apart from other problems of nuclear arsenals.”¹⁷⁷ This decision not only opened the way for final agreement on an INF treaty to be signed at the December summit in Washington, it reinforced his efforts to destroy the enemy image of the Soviet
Union, and "enhanced the image of flexibility and movement in foreign policy—an image that compared strikingly with the appearance of ineptitude on the U.S. side."178

The INF Treaty was signed in Washington on December 8, 1987. The core of the treaty was a relatively simple commitment on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union to "over the following three years, destroy all of its intermediate- and shorter-range land based missiles and their launchers."179 All land based systems worldwide with a range between 500 and 5,500 kilometers were included, and the agreement truly was historic as the first to call for the complete elimination of an entire class of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons.

The INF Treaty has rightly received a great deal of attention. Beyond its substantive impact on nuclear arsenals and modes of verification, the INF Treaty had great psycho-political implications. It proved to the West that "the Soviet Union was now serious about arms reduction...and was ready to apply glasnost to military security. Above all it showed that new thinking about security was real."180

The asymmetrical treaty obligations, for example, represented a significant change in the nature of disarmament negotiations. Under the INF Treaty, there were approximately 8,000 Treaty Limited Items (TLI); that is, individual components scheduled for elimination under the terms of the treaty. Approximately three-fourths of the TLI were Soviet; the Soviet Union had
agreed to destroy 1,846 missiles to 846 for the Unite States. That established, according to Ruekert, "an important precedent for asymmetrical arms control reductions by requiring the Soviet Union to destroy more than twice as many INF missile systems as the United States and to destroy them at a faster rate to reach parity as soon as possible in the elimination process." As a result, as Marshall Akhromeyev was to write later, the INF Treaty, by breaking with the longstanding principle of numeric parity in reductions, demonstrated for the first time the Soviet commitment to reasonable sufficiency.

But in the end, the INF Treaty is less significant than the process of reaching agreement had been. Gorbachev made concession after concession to the American position, eventually becoming an advocate of that position, and then meeting opposition from Reagan. The concessions were tools of Gorbachev's GRIT-like strategy, and the treaty was the proof that the strategy was beginning to have an impact in overcoming Reagan's enemy image. Gorbachev called the treaty "the weightiest result of the new political thinking so far." It demonstrated, Gorbachev noted on another occasion, "that the new thinking is not only capturing people's minds but has already begun to influence policy."
Troop Reductions and the 1988 U.N. Speech

The geographic locus of conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union was the center of Europe. Two heavily armed forces stood in some places just several hundred yards apart. Nearly 4.5 million NATO and Warsaw Pact troops, 75,000 tanks, and thousands of artillery pieces, fixed-wing and rotary combat aircraft, and armored personnel carriers comprised the conventional forces that faced each other across those few hundred yards of German soil. They were also the subject of negotiations on reducing conventional forces in Europe.

Prospects for negotiated reductions in these forces were bleak. There existed a most extensive experience in this regard, the Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction (MBFR) talks. But after nearly twenty years of futility, there were few expectations of reaching agreement. Even assuming the will to reach agreement, which may well have been absent in the MBFR context, the number of weapon systems, many with overlapping capabilities, and the number of states involved added immense complexity to the negotiating process.

Throughout the 1980s negotiations continued in a number of forums, though common wisdom held that there was very little chance that any sort of agreement on limitations of conventional forces would be reached. Even as the atmosphere of superpower relations began to warm, feelings of mistrust
remained strong enough to prevent optimism. New thinking contained a commitment to realign Soviet military doctrine from emphasizing offensive operations to emphasizing defense. NATO military experts, however, even approaching the end of 1988, saw little change in the configuration of Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces that would demonstrate such a defensive emphasis. "The analysts emphasize that, except for the type of military maneuvers, they see no changes in Soviet force structure, deployments, manpower or weapons systems—a point strongly made by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher last week when she warned about the Soviet threat possibly continuing after Gorbachev." Manfred Wörner, upon becoming the Secretary General of NATO in August of 1988, indicated that the Soviet Union had "yet to match friendly words with the sort of deeds which would make him rest easier." Soviet divisions in the central front region in particular remained very heavy, highly mobile units possessing ample capability to carry out a full-scale, short warning assault against NATO.

In addition, the Warsaw Pact enjoyed, by most measures, a considerable numeric advantage over NATO in most critical force components: main battle tanks, artillery pieces, and armored personnel carriers, for example. NATO's offset was its ability to employ carrier-based air assets, but because those units were not organic to NATO, calculations of the force balance remained subjective. On a force component by component basis, there were significant, clear Warsaw
Pact advantages. That fact made it even more unlikely that NATO would be willing to agree to anything like equal reductions of forces.

Gorbachev's agenda, however, required a standing down of European forces and a general relaxation of tension. As he had demonstrated so many times before in the previous three years, Gorbachev sought answers to these intractable problems in the use of unilateral initiatives. On December 7, 1988, President Gorbachev addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations. He had once again played his trump card. “By 1988,” Gorbachev later recounted, “we had fully developed both the conceptual basis and the policies of our new political thinking. I outlined these in a speech to the United Nations.” He touted the GRIT-like formula that had brought the world so far in three short years, and announced a series of unilateral conventional force reductions—agreements reached between Moscow and members of the Warsaw Pact—to “withdraw and disband six Soviet armored divisions from the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary by 1991, and of a number of additional measures aimed at reducing our offensive military potential.” The language of the initiative was the language of GRIT:

The Soviet leadership has decided to demonstrate once again its readiness to reinforce this healthy process not only by words, but also by deeds. Today, I can report to you that the Soviet Union has taken a decision to reduce its armed forces. Within the next two years their numerical strength will be reduced by 500,000 men. The numbers of conventional armaments will also be substantially reduced. This will be done unilaterally, without relation to the talks on the mandate of the Vienna meeting.
He went on to specify, in addition to the six armored divisions from East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary, offensive force structure components that would be withdrawn. Bridging equipment and assault landing troops, essential to carrying out an offensive operation in Europe given the large number of rivers that would have to be crossed, were specifically identified by Gorbachev as units to be withdrawn. Gorbachev also pledged a general thinning out of armored capability in the divisions to remain in Eastern Europe.

The Western reaction to Gorbachev's address was mixed. On the one hand, there was a general positive response to the address as a whole. The address contained a great deal more than just the announced unilateral conventional force cuts, although as Ray Garthoff pointed out, much of that important message was under-appreciated, lost in the excitement and attention over the more tangible reductions.190

But the sense of euphoria, even over the reductions, was incomplete. There were two sources of concern in the West. The first was whether Gorbachev would act on these promises. Gorbachev had hoped that he had proven to the West, through his behavior over the previous three years, that he could be taken at his word. He planned the address, listing, one after another, the concrete accomplishments of his administration, to marshal that evidence. "And we could substantiate our ideas through facts, showing the real progress achieved in the past few years. It was clear that people would believe us only
if we translated our intentions into deeds." And while Garthoff has argued that at the time of the speech, there was a general perception that Gorbachev was talking "with 'deeds, not words' and was serious," it is unclear that the evidence supports that conclusion. President Reagan, for example, commented, "I can only say that if it is carried out speedily and in full, history will regard it as important, significant."

The second concern related to the impact of the announced reductions on Warsaw Pact military capability, and is most instructive as it underscores the continuing skepticism regarding Soviet intentions. These concerns took three forms. The first, an extension of longstanding Western skepticism regarding Gorbachev's broader intentions in foreign policy, argued that the conventional force reductions were simply a tactical maneuver related to budgetary requirements. *Time* magazine, which just a few years later named Gorbachev the man of the decade, warned that "Gorbachev's gambit is also fraught with potential dangers for the U.S." It went on:

Skepticism, of course, is probably warranted and certainly prudent. Gorbachev's vision has a boldness born of necessity: he was able to gift wrap his clamorous need to shift Soviet investment toward consumer needs and present it as a package of breathtaking diplomacy. Like the politician that he is, Gorbachev seeks to protect his power by producing triumphs on the world stage and the payoffs of perestroika at home. Offering a modest troop cut that would trim unnecessary flab from the armed forces neatly serves both goals.
The second form of this concern over the military impact of the reductions was that the Soviet intention was exactly opposite that stated in Gorbachev's address. The Soviet forces, according to this theory, were bloated and dull. The force reductions were based on a desire to increase the efficiency and ability of Soviet conventional forces, resulting, as Ambassador Dean explained the argument, "in leaner, more dangerous Soviet ground forces, with greater attack capability, presenting an even greater threat to NATO."

The third form of the concern was the mainstream response to Gorbachev's address. In essence, it expressed the fear that the reductions would weaken Western resolve to maintain high levels of military readiness, especially in Europe, while leaving the Warsaw Pact with a substantial residual military advantage over NATO. Secretary of State Shultz took care to remind the media that the Warsaw Pact had a significantly larger force than NATO, and that even if the announced reductions were carried out, they would leave "a very significant asymmetry." Simon Lunn, the deputy secretary general of NATO, was much more direct. "This is about the scale of Soviet reductions that everybody in NATO worried about. It's more than symbolic, but it's not enough. It's just what we didn't need."

The reality, however, was that the Soviet Union had planned to significantly step down its ability to fight an offensive war in Europe, consistent with the reorientation of doctrine directed by Gorbachev's new thinking.
Additional statements by Gorbachev and other Soviet leaders over the next several weeks clarified for Western analysts the full impact of the proposed cuts.

Western experts said the new details indicated that the planned withdrawal would be militarily significant. "It is important that four of the tank divisions are coming out of East Germany and not out of rear units," said James A. Thompson of the Rand Corporation. Philip A. Karber, an expert on conventional forces at the BDM corporation, said the new disclosures showed that Mr. Gorbachev's plan would lead to "militarily significant reductions" that would greatly reduce the threat of surprise attack. "He's doing it exactly the way we would have wanted him to do it."198

Beginning in 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev made a serious, sustained effort to alter the international environment and create a positive future for both the United States and the Soviet Union. He reassessed Soviet policy, developed a new way of thinking, announced it to the world, promised to make changes in policy, carried out those changes, and asked the United States to join them in their momentous effort. The depth of the intellectual commitment and the scope of the changes that occurred lent credence to the claim that the Soviet Union was honestly seeking that new relationship. The approach mirrored at every step a GRIT process, suggesting a real commitment to change.

There can be no doubt that the world at the end of 1988 was vastly different than the world of 1985. There was a great deal of evidence that Mikhail Gorbachev had changed the way the Soviet Union did business, both at home and in international affairs. But the real question remained: had
President Reagan also changed, or was he just an old cold warrior, taking advantage of a weak and desperate opponent?
Notes for Chapter 4


All this undermines the “enemy image” and, consequently, the ideological foundations of anti-Soviet and imperialist policy. Things that served the reactionaries so well over the last few decades are being destroyed. That is why the “right wing” is unhappy about the innovative and peace-loving policy of the USSR. That is why they want to halt the momentum of disarmament, which is picking up speed. We must see all this and take appropriate measures in our ideological work and propaganda.

9. Gorbachev cited an example of the type of solutions, based in the psychology of conflict, he felt were going to be necessary.

Suffice it to recall that the joint efforts of the Europeans, the
United States and Canada produced the Helsinki Final Act. If there is a need for a specific and vivid example of new thinking and political psychology in approaching the problems of peace, cooperation and international trust, that historic document could in many ways serve as such an example.


I have quoted this material extensively to demonstrate how the language of political psychology had permeated Soviet political discourse.


When, more astonishingly, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev hailed the overthrow of "habitual stereotypes stemming from enemy images" in a Kremlin speech welcoming Ronald Reagan, political psychologists felt certain their dialogues were paying off bigger than they had dared hope. "The whole idea that enmity is a psychological concept has worked its was in important ways into Gorbachev's speeches."


18. Ibid., p. 218.


33. Ibid., pp. 96-97.


49. Ibid., p. 111.

50. Ibid., p. 92.


53. Ibid., p. 83.


61. Gorbachev, Perestroika, 1987, p. 27.


69. Gorbachev, Der Spiegel interview, 1988, p. 8.


77. Ibid., p. 1

78. Ibid., p. 10.


89. Osgood, 1962, p. 100.


92. Gorbachev, "Revolutionary Restructuring...," 1988, p. 57.
If one is to single out the key aspect of what the party has now taken from the guidelines of the restructuring process, it is opening up the humanistic content of socialism. Its essence is examined in an all-round and profound manner in the report by Comrade Gorbachev. It is precisely real humanism which serves man and elevates him and is the highest criterion of the social effectiveness of society. The humanistic vision of socialism is represented, first and foremost, by the ethics of an active, transforming attitude towards life.


102. Nicholas Daniloff, "Can We Trust the Soviet Union?" The New York Times, September 29, 1987, p. 35. See also, for publication of Solzhenitsyn's work in


109. At the Spring 1988 Moscow summit, for example, Reagan began his assaults on the Soviet human rights record with a grudging admission that there had been some improvement in that area, indicating immediately afterward that there was a great deal left to be done. See, for example, Facts on File World News Digest, "Reagan, Gorbachev Hold Moscow Summit; Meetings are Amiable, but Rights Issue Causes Ripples," June 3, 1988, p. 393+, Lexis-Nexis.


129. Mikhail Gorbachev, Press Conference in Reykjavik, October 12, 1986, in Towards a Nuclear Free World (Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing
House) 1987, p. 194.


139. See, for example, "After Congressional Visit, Krasnoyarsk Radar Still Generates Controversy, Defense Electronics, November 1987, p. 25, Lexis-Nexis.


144. For a discussion of Gorbachev's use of Rust's landing in Red Square to remake the upper levels of the officer corps, see Jeremy R. Azrael, The Soviet Civilian Leadership and the Military High Command (Santa Monica, Calif: RAND Corporation) R-3521-AF, June 1987, 48 pp.


During 1982, the U.S. zero-option proposal came increasingly under fire in the West as the perception grew that it was unrealistic to expect the Soviets to give up deployed INF missiles for merely planned U.S. deployments. Criticism became more vocal and widespread that the zero option was nothing more than a tactical position which was undermining the arms control track of the NATO 1979 decision by making a negotiated agreement with the Soviets impossible.

152. Dean, 1989, p. 11.


159. Ibid., 1994, p. 288.


180. Ibid., p. 328.
183. Gorbachev, Mikhail, "In a Friendly Atmosphere," speech at a dinner honoring Erich Honecker, 1988, p. 39.
188. Ibid., p. 460.


195. Dean, 1989, p. 56. Dean does not subscribe to this theory; he merely relates it for the sake of clarity prior to denying it.


CHAPTER 5

Reagan Responds: The Beginning of Phase 3 and Lessons of the Gorbachev Experiment with GRIT

But a historical explanation is not a justification. Nero, too, was a product of his epoch. Yet after he perished his statues were smashed and his name was scraped off everything. The vengeance of history is more terrible that the vengeance of the most powerful General Secretary. I venture to think that this is consoling.

—Leon Trotsky

Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, by the end of Ronald Reagan’s second term as President of the United States, had a feeling of a controlled utopia about them. Reagan and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev had developed a personal relationship that seemed even warmer and friendlier than the political relationship between their countries. It was not the millennium, but after what truly was a short three years, relative to the forty-plus years of antagonism that preceded them, the evolution of cooperative sentiments was amazing.
Yet it was not the millennium. The path onto which Gorbachev’s new thinking had directed superpower relations was not to be without pitfalls, nor was the decision to choose that path irreversible. Continuing success would require a continuing management of the relationship. But the rules of American politics, followed by the realities of Soviet politics, stepped in, and the time for Gorbachev’s GRIT experiment expired.

What is left is to attempt to assess, in the cold light of history’s morning after, the accomplishments of Gorbachev’s experiment with GRIT, as well as its shortcomings. The first section of this chapter, then, will attempt to assess the change in Reagan’s thinking about Mikhail Gorbachev, as well as the continuities in this thought process over the three-and-one-half years he and Gorbachev shared the world stage. There will also be an attempt to show how, in the eighteen months following Reagan’s departure from the scene, there was a retrenchment within the new American leadership that posed a new challenge to Gorbachev’s GRIT strategy. Following that, the chapter will synthesize the lessons of Gorbachev’s GRIT strategy in terms of a prescribed technique and identification of conditions conducive to success. It will conclude by culling the information in this study relevant to the study of Gorbachev’s attempt to remake U.S.-Soviet relations, for the study of international relations, and for the practice of politics among nations.
The Softening of the Reagan Hard Line

Reagan and Gorbachev met in Moscow, their fourth summit meeting, at the end of May, 1988. At one point Reagan and Gorbachev were walking among crowds and reporters in Red Square when Reagan was asked if he still believed that the Soviet Union was an evil empire. Gorbachev recalled that Reagan answered simply, "No," though Gorbachev went on to attribute great significance to that simple admission. It meant, Gorbachev noted in his memoirs, "that Reagan had finally convinced himself that he had been right to believe, back in Reykjavik, that you could 'do business' with the changing Soviet Union."1 Other sources reported that Reagan's response was not simply, "No," but that he added, "I was talking about another time, another era."2 What could have brought Reagan to such a completely new understanding of his Soviet adversary? What had changed?

Historical and political analyses of the experience of the Reagan administration in relations with Gorbachev's Soviet Union began, by the mid-1990s, to seek to understand what had become by the end of the 1980s such an obvious warming. On what grounds could one understand the apparent complete about-face performed by President Reagan, who had seemed, in the early 1980s, to be the essence of the cold warrior?
One approach was to soften those earlier judgements of Ronald Reagan. This form of revisionism consisted of the claim that while Reagan seemed, in the early 1980s, to possess a simple, one-dimensional view of the Soviet adversary, he was not inflexible, but was open to changing those interpretations. Henry Kissinger argued, for example,

In this sense, and despite all of his ideological fervor, Reagan's views on the essence of international conflict remained strictly American-utopian. Since he did not believe in irreconcilable national interests, he could discern no insoluble conflicts between nations. Once Soviet leaders had changed their ideological views, the world would be spared the sorts of disputes which had characterized classical diplomacy. And he saw no intermediate stages between permanent conflict and lasting reconciliation.  

But the recognition that Reagan could, under some conditions, change his mind conveyed nothing about what those conditions might have been or how they could be brought into being. At best Reagan's flexibility, newly recognized by Kissinger, represents only the first step in understanding the evolution of cooperation in U.S.-Soviet relations and must be seen in retrospect as an obvious and trivial point.

The fact that Ronald Reagan's view of the Soviet Union changed--that he was eventually willing to accept and trust that the Communist leadership had become less of a threat--is the evidence that supports that type of assertion. But it leaves us fully in the dark as to the mechanism for the change.

President Reagan's image of the Soviet Union, in fact, was in large measure based his understanding of Soviet ideology. That understanding
underscored his belief that the Soviet system and its leaders were incapable of fundamental change—that the threat posed by the Soviet Union was unending, even given personnel changes in the leadership group, and that vigilance was the only answer. Keith Shimko's study of Reagan's image of the Soviet Union is quite revealing.

Prior to 1985, there was nothing in my analysis of Reagan's views that suggested that leadership changes could result in significant policy change. If anything, he stressed the immutability of Soviet objectives derived from ideology: “all of us need to be better informed about the unchanging realities of the Soviet system. We are in a long-term twilight struggle with an implacable foe of freedom.” He cautioned that “we cannot assume that their ideology and purpose will change; this implies enduring competition” (italics added by Shimko).

Reagan's psychological style further reduced the hope for his swift recognition of a changing Soviet Union. People defend their images and preconceived notions from assault by contrary data through a number of cognitive strategies. Reagan's cognitive style was consistent with that general model, leading him to dismiss evidence inconsistent with his pre-existing image of the Soviet Union. Betty Glad concluded:

The rigidity with which particular categorizations of reality are held once formed, moreover, is apt to get in the way of learning. Reagan, it seems, has been so locked into an early, simple, cold war view of the Russians that he has difficulty taking into account the internal changes in that country since World War II, the cleavages between various communist nations and movements, the changes in the political and technological structures of the world which make confrontation for the United States an even riskier business than it has ever been before.
Why, given this belief system, was Reagan able to accept in 1988 that the Gorbachev leadership had become less threatening—a notion rejected out of hand for the previous three years? Why was Gorbachev perceived, in the end, so differently from previous General Secretaries of the Soviet Union, leaders who had all been assumed to be untrustworthy and unremittingly expansionist by virtue of the fact that they were products of the Soviet system? In short, the truly significant question, and the one for which this project has attempted to marshal an answer, is what factors caused the image and attitude of the Soviet Union held by Ronald Reagan to change, thereby paving the way for the beginning of a policy of cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union?

To return to the original formulation of this issue from the first chapter, this study sought to answer how, not why, the cold war ended. It began by assuming that Gorbachev had decided to remake U.S.-Soviet relations, and it sought to understand the mechanism through which, given the Neanderthal mentality of the Reagan White House, that change could be forged. Figure 5.1 is the game-theoretic representation of that change, indicating that by 1988, Reagan saw much greater payoffs from cooperating with Soviet initiatives. The game, as Reagan saw it, had evolved into a form of Prisoner's Dilemma.
What was found was that through the application of a carefully structured GRIT-like strategy, grounded in a comprehensive reassessment of Soviet foreign policy and wedded to the overall policy of new thinking, Gorbachev was able to penetrate the cognitive barriers of Reagan's Neanderthal mentality. Robert Conquest concluded, "More generally, in the Gorbachevite glasnost, the destruction of the Stalinist myth (and eventually of the Leninist one) came not in single refutations, but in a massive, continual hammering in of the facts over months and years. This is how mental climates are changed." Reagan eventually realized that relations with the Soviet Union were not zero-
sum in nature, and that there existed opportunities for mutually beneficial cooperation.

Previous efforts to change behavior relied on negotiation or applications of punishment and reward—the carrot and stick approach so popular among modern policy makers—and had only marginal effect. The options for change were limited by the choices policy makers believed to have available to them, but in an atmosphere of hostility and distrust, those choices were severely restricted. Relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, throughout their history together, oscillated from the extremely dangerous to the moderately improved and back again. Through it all the primary currency of the relationship was threat, and the motivation was competition. Raymond Garthoff characterized the limited movement between détente and confrontation:

What has varied and what periodically has been at issue is the relative weight to be placed, on the one hand, on containment achieved by building positions of counterposing power, and on the other, on cooperation, pursued by seeking common ground for mutual efforts to reduce tension and accommodate the differing interests of the two sides. There have been varied judgments in both countries about whether objective circumstances permit the latter approach or require the former, and therefore, about whether détente or confrontation is desirable or feasible.7

Osgood’s GRIT strategy offered a way out of the vicissitudinous nature of this competitive type of relationship. It is not simply the action-reaction of Axelrod’s TIT-FOR-TAT, wherein the players of the game simply sum the costs
and benefits with an eye toward the enhanced material benefits of future cooperation. GRIT splits wide open the simple 2x2 matrix of game theory, providing an expanding list of policy choices from which players may choose.

More than that, GRIT unleashes the potential of the human mind. Most of the previous attempts to change behavior were just that, simple behavior modification. Successes were nothing more than policy adaptation, defined by Ernst Haas as a change of course "in a mechanistic or cybernetic fashion, with little or no reassessment of basic beliefs and goals." This kind of carrot and stick approach relies on simple stimulus-response learning, as Tom Milburn and Dan Christie explained:

Learning theorists, who have studied motivation and behavioral change in at least forty different species of animals, typically equate rewarding with instrumental learning. Reinforcement or reinforcing stimuli (reward) are defined as events that follow a particular behavior and increase the frequency of the behavior. Reinforcement of behavior makes the behavior more likely to occur in the future—that is, the probability of behavior increases.

GRIT, by enhancing levels of trust, expands the realm of creativity in foreign policy making, offering the participants the opportunity to move beyond the game to a new definition of their relationship—to evolve the images and perceptions that underlay the opponent's foreign policy. Axelrod's groundbreaking work on the evolution of cooperation discussed mechanisms whereby actors who want to cooperate could be brought together with other actors who also wished to cooperate. This study is different: it is about forging
cooperation when, at the outset, one of the actors prefers exploitation. And this
does not refer to exploitation within the limited confines of a game, but
exploitation in extremis, in which the total destruction or complete,
unconditional surrender of the opponent is the goal. Osgood's work—and by
extension, this study—is about altering strategic-level goals and promoting, in
place of stimulus-response learning, revolutionary insights.

Anatol Rapoport testified to the critical role of trust to this larger
endeavor. "At times we must learn the meaning of trust, or else both we and our
opponents will inevitably lose....At times we must be able to convince the other
that he ought to play according to certain rules or even that he ought to play a
different game." 10 That Reagan came full circle on the INF Treaty proves the
effect of GRIT. Fearing the double zero concept because he was certain Soviet
cheating would leave the United States in a disadvantaged position in Europe,
he nevertheless proposed it in 1981, certain also that the Soviet Union would
reject it. By 1987, his fears of Soviet duplicity beginning to be allayed, he
embraced the double zero proposal brought to the table by Mikhail Gorbachev.

As Alex George attested, the changes in Soviet society and foreign policy
initiated by Gorbachev "had a benign effect on the Western image of the Soviet
Union and encouraged new possibilities for significant cooperation." He went
on to argue that Gorbachev's deideologization of Soviet foreign policy toward the
United States was having a corresponding effect in terms of the deideologization
of U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{11} The very rationale for Reagan's hard-line policy toward the Soviet Union was being undercut.\textsuperscript{12} Reagan himself, as represented in his December 1988 address to the United Nations, began to recognize the magnitude of the change wrought by Mikhail Gorbachev, and the implications those changes might portend for U.S. foreign policy.

For the first time, the differences between East and West—fundamental differences over important questions dealing with the worth of the individual and whether governments shall control people or people control governments—for the first time these differences have shown signs of easing. Easing to the point where there are not just troop withdrawals from places like Afghanistan but also talk in the East of reform and greater freedom of press, of assembly, and of religion.\textsuperscript{13}

From the evidence, it appears, the fact that a transformation had begun in U.S. thinking about the Soviet Union is undeniable, but that transformation was by no means complete by the end of 1988.

\textbf{Continuing Resistance}

There might be a tendency among some students of U.S.-Soviet relations to see the possible options for the relationship in terms of a simple choice of friend or enemy. Osgood recognized the tendency to dichotomize in that manner, and certainly the references to 2 X 2 game matrices in this and other studies may help to reenforce that image. Yet such a simple view would ill serve the attempt to assess the impact of Gorbachev's GRIT strategy.
"Relationships may be characterized," wrote Dan Christie, "as varying on a continuum, say from enmity to friendship." To argue that Reagan was influenced to alter his enemy image of the Soviet Union by Gorbachev's actions is not meant to imply that Reagan developed an unqualified affection for the Soviet Union or its leadership. It would also not be correct to argue that because there was evidence of Reagan's continuing suspicions of Soviet motives or intentions, Gorbachev's efforts to engage Reagan had failed. Rather, Reagan's feelings about the Soviet Union moved on that aforementioned spectrum toward a position of greater willingness to cooperate and greater trust.

It is important to remember in this context that, as Osgood understood, the target of the GRIT process would not respond positively at first. The Neanderthal mentality would foster rejection of the initiative, as Gorbachev's experience with Reagan demonstrated. "Much of the Western world was skeptical of Gorbachev. His early attempts to forge close links to the West and to decrease the world's nuclear arsenals were so novel for a Kremlin leader that they were often regarded, in Washington and other world capitals, as cheap tricks." Over time, Reagan did, however, begin to trust in Gorbachev.

Yet Reagan also continued to harbor grave concerns about Gorbachev and the Soviet State. He continued until the end of his tenure to hammer away at Gorbachev for his performance on human rights, captive nations, arms control, and Soviet involvement in Eastern Europe and regional conflicts. In the end,
Reagan remained concerned about a Soviet threat to U.S. interests, demonstrating powerful evidence of residual distrust of Gorbachev and the Soviet Union. Reagan accused Gorbachev of failing to live up to his word—making grand promises, but failing to go through with the corresponding action. Ray Garthoff pointed out how even at the very end, after Gorbachev's address to the United Nations in December of 1988, Reagan remained equivocal in his thinking about Gorbachev.16

Reagan was clearly battling his own enemy image of the Soviet Union, an image that was buttressed by his staff and advisers. Gorbachev identified George Shultz as one of the key figures in the Reagan White House who understood most clearly the opportunities and responsibilities presented by new thinking. “[Shultz] genuinely wanted to sustain the dialogue. His position seemed to influence the American administration in general, President Reagan in particular. I realized, maybe for the first time, that I was dealing with a serious man of sound political judgement.”17 Yet Shultz exhibited his own serious doubts about Gorbachev and the reform effort, warning in late 1987 that new thinking offered nothing to suggest “that the end of the adversarial struggle is at hand.”18 Shultz concluded in 1988 that the competitive aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations were a permanent condition. “I find it difficult to believe that our relations with the Soviet Union will ever be ‘normal’ in the sense that we have normal relations with most other countries....It seems unlikely that the
U.S.-Soviet relationship will ever lose what always has been and is today a strongly wary and at times adversarial element."

More to the point, Shultz, like Reagan, never came to understand that Gorbachev sought not just better relations played under the old rules, but a new set of rules, eschewing competition and embracing a positive sum orientation to payoffs. As Kissinger later wrote, "Inevitably, veterans of the cold war had difficulty recognizing just how much deeper Gorbachev's approach went than that of previous periods of coexistence." Moreover, Shultz and Reagan never developed empathy for the Soviet Union—never attempted to see things from the Soviet perspective. On the issue of SDI, for example, Reagan and Shultz knew SDI was a defensive system, so they simply could not fathom how Gorbachev could oppose it, ignoring in the process their own concerns that the Soviet Union might have been developing strategic defenses. They remained prisoners of their Neanderthal mentality.

Shultz's autobiographical treatment of his years as Secretary of State provides considerable evidence of his inability to fully reconceptualize U.S.-Soviet relations. Most telling was his statement to Reagan just three weeks before the December 1987 summit in Washington. "We are...the psychologically superior party, and we need to stay that way: we can continue to afford to let [Gorbachev be] the innovator as long as he keeps innovating in our direction."
GRIT should not be expected to have an immediate impact, and that the degree of warming as a result of GRIT should be expected to grow over time with continuation of the GRIT strategy. But these statements by Shultz are fairly late in the process, and they suggest that the transformation of U.S. attitudes was not complete. Moreover, there was an element of the U.S. political elite that was never swayed by Gorbachev's efforts. Richard Pipes, for example, an adviser to President Reagan early in his first term and later a professor of history at Harvard, continued to reject notions of a peaceful, trustworthy Soviet Union. In October of 1989 he wrote:

...world stability and peace are nowhere as close as much of world opinion would like to believe. The Kremlin's professions of peaceful intent, and certain steps carefully calculated to mollify the West, do not alter the fact that the Soviet military activities at home and abroad under Mr. Gorbachev have proceeded pretty much as they did under Leonid I. Brezhnev. The "new thinking" in international relations has shown more style than substance. In fact, the soft-line policy has enabled Moscow to spread its influence and power abroad more effectively than when it had pursued an overtly hard line.²²

Some of the Reagan team did not recognize the changes in Soviet intentions, even well after the coup against Gorbachev and the dismantling of the Soviet Union. Reagan's secretary of defense, Caspar Weinberger, for example, made the argument in late 1994 that all Gorbachev had done was to change his rhetoric and to make apparent, not real, changes in policy.²³

It should not be surprising, therefore, that Reagan's response to the Soviet initiatives never fully satisfied Gorbachev. Reagan's responses were
tempered by caution on the one hand, and on the other, by the desire to squeeze Gorbachev for ever greater concessions. In addition, Reagan sought to “test” Gorbachev, escalating his demands in an effort to force Gorbachev to prove the sincerity of his commitment to new thinking and better relations. In fact, the notion of “testing Gorbachev at his word” became quite popular in the late 1980s. Michael Armacost, Under Secretary of State for Policy and a key adviser to Reagan and Shultz on U.S.-Soviet relations, especially on regional issues, produced a document in this time period entitled “U.S.-Soviet Relations: Testing Gorbachev’s ‘New Thinking’” in which he suggested a number of demands that could be made of Gorbachev with the intent of judging him based on his performance on those issues. This behavior on the part of the Reagan White House further demonstrated the continuing U.S. antipathy toward the Soviet Union. To advocate testing Gorbachev was to suggest that Gorbachev could not me trusted to speak the truth; experimentation was required to determine if he were lying.

One must be careful in evaluating this issue to not be taken in by Soviet statements regarding the responsiveness of the United States to Soviet initiatives. To be sure, the United States gave ground on certain issues in the late 1980s, eventually agreeing, for example, to include 72 German Pershing 1A missiles and their American-owned warheads in the INF framework. Members of the Soviet politico-military elite—e.g. Akhromeyev, Ligachev, and
Shevardnadze—testified before the Supreme Soviet as to the importance of U.S. concessions in arriving at the INF Treaty. But this commentary on U.S. flexibility was out of proportion with the degree of movement demonstrated. Gorbachev's leadership cadre was in a position by 1988 of defending Gorbachev against charges that he was giving away the store in relations with the United States and getting very little in return, and these types of statements might have been intended to undermine that perception, as well as to sell the treaty to the Supreme Soviet.

This, then, points to perhaps the greatest failing of Reagan's presidency, at least as it relates to the Soviet Union. Reagan and his administration never recognized the domestic political battle in which Gorbachev was engaged, or, perhaps more to the point, the role the United States played in that struggle. Some analysts went so far as to argue that there was no power struggle in the Kremlin; that the idea of hawks and doves in the Soviet leadership group was a myth, perpetuated by the Soviet Union to wrest concessions from the United States. But the events of August 1991 demonstrated, beyond a doubt, the magnitude of the political struggle undertaken by Gorbachev.

Gorbachev found himself being pulled in opposite directions. Conservatives believed he had gone too far in repudiating Stalin, stressing universal human values over class struggle, unleashing populism, and making foreign policy concessions to the West. They urged Gorbachev to limit the scope
and pace of reform and to show greater concern for the party. Radical reformers, on the other hand, believed in a total repudiation of Marxist-Leninist doctrine, full democracy—meaning the end of Communist party dominance—and the immediate introduction of markets, a form of "shock therapy" for Soviet society. The radical reformers were even willing to support a devolution of Soviet central authority to the republics—perhaps the final straw leading to the coup of August 19, 1991. The Union Treaty, scheduled to be signed August 20, would have codified in Soviet law a significant degree of that devolution.

Gorbachev certainly attempted to insulate himself from many of these pressures, especially from the conservative side. He replaced large numbers of the Soviet leadership group and high-ranking military with personnel more acceptant of his reform program and more closely allied with him personally. Despite that effort, Gorbachev noted an increase in the strength of conservative opposition. "Some people are already starting to show nostalgia for 'the good old days,' and you hear talk about the country needing 'a firm hand.' Such sentiments are not only showing up in the sphere of emotions and feelings, they are also taking on definite philosophical and even political outlines."\(^{28}\) In the end, it was a number of these people that Gorbachev had raised up to positions of authority who turned against him, leading the August coup.

The political leadership of the United States and the other Western powers added to the pressure. Reagan consistently pushed Gorbachev to
concede more, and to do so more quickly. The more desperate Gorbachev became, the more the Reagan administration felt it had the upper hand, and the more it squeezed Gorbachev.

This response was not lost on the Soviet Union. They were keenly aware of the failure of U.S. foreign policy to accommodate to the new Soviet thinking on foreign policy. Although he recognized that there had been some level of response from the United States—some minimal reciprocation of specific initiatives, for example—Gorbachev continued to be disappointed by negative behavior and harsh rhetoric from the United States. Gorbachev had warned at the outset of his reform program that the Soviet Union could not display unilateral restraint indefinitely, and the former Soviet chief of staff of the Armed Forces, Marshall Akhromeyev, looking at the range of Gorbachev-driven concessions in the arms control field and the limited U.S. reciprocation, commented ominously, "Our unilateral steps in this direction are not infinite."

Reagan found himself in the White House at the moment when the Soviet leadership under Mikhail Gorbachev awakened to the desperate nature of their situation. In the mid-1980s the nature of the U.S.-Soviet relationship underwent a fundamental change: the rules changed at the hand of Mikhail Gorbachev. The delayed and, ultimately incomplete, American recognition of that change, a delay born of the cognitive misfirings of the President, conditioned the progress of events in the Soviet Union. Ultimately, Gorbachev
failed in his goal to reform the Soviet Union while keeping it whole and strong, and the resultant dismemberment of the Soviet Union sewed the seeds of the political and social instability that wracked Eastern Europe and the former Soviet republics into the second half of the 1990s.

Historical counterfactuals are admittedly speculative, but one is forced to wonder at what might have come of Soviet reform efforts, and U.S.-Soviet cooperation, had the United States recognized earlier and responded more enthusiastically to the changes wrought by Mikhail Gorbachev. The failing, however, is not all of Ronald Reagan's doing. His presidency ended before Gorbachev's GRIT had fully impacted on him. Those who came after share in the responsibility.

An Alternative Hypothesis Considered: Reagan Was Right

Some analysts might tell a different story regarding the end of the cold war. In the first place, they might argue, Reagan's image of the Soviet Union was correct: the Soviet Union was an evil empire—expansionist externally and repressive internally. Moreover, these analysts might continue, Reagan was not won over by Mikhail Gorbachev; he was, rather, a prophet. He understood the Soviet weaknesses, he structured a policy to exploit those weaknesses, and he
simply pocketed the concessions made by a desperate Gorbachev. I will address each of these arguments in turn.

First, regarding the validity of Reagan's image of the Soviet Union, I would agree that caution is required. We must take care to understand that not all seemingly "mistaken" decisions are the result of cognitive dysfunctions or distortions. In other words, some "mistaken" judgments may be perfectly rational given the totality of the information available to the decision maker, the varying clarity of the information within that totality, and the goals and objectives of the decision makers. Robert Jervis warned, for example, that especially in international politics, much of the information to which decision makers are exposed is so completely ambiguous as to defy judgement as to the accuracy of various competing interpretations. Moreover, as Jervis pointed out, what may appear to an outside observer as misperception may in fact simply be a rejection of information that had been properly perceived. Such a rejection may be based, as Jervis argued, on the fact that most other information reaching the policy maker was contradictory.  

It may also be the case that the information and message, properly understood, would lead toward an undesirable or unwanted policy outcome and was rejected on those grounds. Matthew Evangelista, in his study of arms control negotiations in the 1950s, found that President Dwight Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles understood full well the scope of
accommodation that the Soviet leadership under Nikita Khrushchev was attempting to achieve. Eisenhower and Dulles chose to eschew reciprocating Khrushchev's efforts, opting instead to follow the recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to press for greater gains against an adversary who appeared to be on the ropes.  

Reagan's views of the Soviet Union as he became president in the early 1980s may well have been correct. Richard Herrmann correctly warned that, due to the ambiguous nature of the behavioral evidence and the difficulty with direct observation of an actor's intent, conclusions regarding whether the Soviet Union was aggressive or defensive are non-falsifiable. Nevertheless, an examination of Soviet behavior under Stalin, Khrushchev, and Brezhnev might reasonably lead one to conclude that the Soviet Union was a danger to U.S. vital interests. Some might even find understandable Reagan's hyperbolic formulation of the Soviet Union as an "evil empire."

It became much more difficult to apply those conclusions to Gorbachev's Soviet Union. The evidence accumulated between 1985 and 1991, while still open to interpretation, nonetheless appeared much more clearly to support the conclusion that Gorbachev's Soviet Union was not an expansionist power and that, in fact, Gorbachev had opted to abandon the cold war.

Reagan, however, failed to recognize the different nature of the new Soviet leadership; his image of the Soviet Union remained that of an evil
empire—until Gorbachev convinced Reagan that a new era had dawned in the Soviet Union. Reagan and his advisors believed that the Soviet system was, by its nature, evil, and that anyone who emerged from that system to a position of leadership would also be, of necessity, evil. Whether Reagan was right prior to 1985, he was wrong after March 1985, until Gorbachev’s GRIT strategy began to penetrate Reagan’s enemy image.

Second, regarding the validity of Reagan’s rollback strategy, one must again recognize that there were two distinct time periods in Soviet national life that were spanned by the Reagan presidency. The policies that may have been appropriate for dealing with the earlier (pre-1985) Soviet Union were inappropriate for dealing with the Soviet Union of Mikhail Gorbachev. The underlying question in a somewhat popular formulation is how to parcel out credit for the end of the cold war. In mid-1994, Ben Wattenberg hosted a discussion among foreign policy and defense experts entitled “Did Reagan Win the Cold War?” He introduced the discussion asking the following question: The cold war may be over, but the fight over who should get the credit for winning it has just begun. Was it Ronald Reagan’s hard line that pushed the Soviets over the edge? Was it Mikhail Gorbachev’s perestroika that paved the way for Russian democracy? Or did the Soviet system, after competing for 45 years with the West, just run out of gas?35

Many analysts seem to believe that one must make a choice among these options—that the alternative explanations posited here are exclusive. That is not the case.
It must be understood, first, that the behaviors under discussion here occurred sequentially for the most part, not simultaneously. Reagan's rollback strategy began before Gorbachev became General Secretary, as did the economic disaster in the Soviet Union. Both the economic difficulties and the specter of continuing competition with the United States may well have motivated Gorbachev to seek reform domestically and in international affairs. Those two factors should also be understood as mutually reinforcing, together making Gorbachev's motivation to seek relief greater than either would have done so on its own.

The evidence presented here suggests, as hypothesized in the first chapter, that it was a combination of these and other factors that lead to the new international order that emerged in the late 1980s. But only one of these factors, the efforts of Mikhail Gorbachev to remake U.S.-Soviet relations, was both necessary and sufficient to explain the change in Reagan's relations with the Soviet Union.

A link was forged in Soviet thinking about economic restructuring, between the required domestic changes and the international environment, a link confirmed by Gorbachev. The incentive provided by the need to address domestic economic problems, especially in conjunction with the specter of continuing competition with the United States, might have been sufficient to motivate Soviet new thinking in foreign policy, but it was not sufficient to quell
the fears of the defense establishment in the West which viewed new thinking as a tool for the Soviets to gain breathing space in the short term while they strengthened themselves and prepared to launch a new series of expansionist offensives around the globe.37

But the reassessments of the 27th Party Congress went beyond the notion of breathing space.38 Foreign policy and military and security issues were subjected to the same reassessment as domestic relations,39 and the success of new thinking was as critical to Gorbachev as the success of perestroika. Both required that Gorbachev convince the United States to play along. It was Gorbachev's GRIT policy, exposing the fallacious nature of the enemy image, that began to change Reagan's thinking.

Gorbachev's motivation may also have been a more critical issue in the mid- to late 1980s, as the West was struggling to assess the sincerity of Gorbachev's professed commitment to new thinking and to formulate a policy response. The record of Gorbachev's relationship with the United States under Reagan, in particular the record of unilateral initiatives only partially chronicled here, suggested strongly the veracity of Gorbachev's commitment to new thinking in its most expansive formulation. Moreover, it is less important for this analysis to understand why Gorbachev adopted the policy of new thinking than that he did.
The third issue is whether GRIT worked in this case, or if U.S.-Soviet relations at the end of the cold war were simply an example of surrender. Again, many of those who credit Reagan with ending the cold war argue that the United States under Reagan underwent no fundamental reinterpretation of the Soviet Union as a result of Gorbachev's efforts from 1985 through 1988, and that Reagan never reciprocated Gorbachev's initiatives. That seems to be a rather unsophisticated interpretation of the evidence.

Initially, one must realize that any attempt to address and penetrate deeply-held preconceptions of an enemy is a long-term process. Reagan's image of the Soviet Union was eidetic; it resisted change as Reagan's cognitive style worked to preserve his pre-existing image of the Soviet Union in the face of conflicting evidence. Nonetheless, this work documented clearly that Reagan began to accept the validity of some of that evidence, recognizing that the Soviet Union could, on some level, be trusted, and that the Soviet Union had, in fact, adopted a more positive-sum, cooperative approach in its military and foreign policies. One must be careful not to view this issue as a black-or-white proposition—that Reagan either loved or hated the Soviet Union. The image of the Soviet Union was a spectrum; in 1985 Reagan was very close to one polar extreme, and by 1988 he had begun to move toward a more centrist position, providing evidence, in the view of this research, of the efficacy of GRIT in changing longstanding negative images.
Altering the enemy image is only part of the process of generating reciprocation at the policy level; Reagan remained cautious in his dealings with the Soviet Union, and never responded proportionally to Gorbachev's initiatives. But it would be incorrect to claim that Gorbachev's efforts failed to generate any level of policy reciprocation. The most important evidence of such reciprocation was the eventual signing of the INF Treaty. Reagan's commitment to the deployment half of NATO's dual-track approach to INF weapons was, from his first days in office and consistently over time, much greater than his commitment to the arms control portion of the plan. Reagan and his advisors believed that the deployment of U.S. ground-launched cruise missiles and Pershing IIs in Europe served American strategic and tactical needs regardless of the Soviet decision to deploy or remove SS-20s. If the Soviet Union under Gorbachev had simply "gone belly up", as many analysts contend, there would have been little or no incentive for Reagan to agree to mutual elimination of the systems. In a classic power-politics situation, Reagan would have held fast on the question of U.S. INF weapons, especially since, as most commentators have recognized, the military implications of the INF Treaty were quite modest; it's more significant impact being politico-symbolic. The reality is that Gorbachev, through the application of GRIT, was able to overcome Reagan's zero-sum anti-communist counter-ideology, leading Reagan to accept that there was a benefit to the INF Treaty in 1988 that in the early 1980s, he did not believe existed.
George Bush: Starting Over

On May 12, 1989, President George Bush formally announced the death of the policy of containment and the birth of a new type of foreign policy toward the Soviet Union. He declared that it was time to move "beyond containment" and toward a new relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union. Beyond his bold pronouncement, however, there was little of substantive change. Bush's attitude toward the Soviet Union, his image of it, and the foreign policy he advanced, were rooted in the containment policies of administrations past. Bush believed, in fact, that President Reagan "had become overly enthusiastic about his new relationship with Gorbachev in the last year or so of his administration."

In the May 12 speech, Bush began by arguing that the architects of containment had been correct, and that "...the Soviet Union, denied the easy course of expansionism, would turn inward and address the contradictions of its inefficient, repressive and inhuman system." This tacit acceptance of containment implied acceptance of the entire package—the image, attitude, and behavior toward the Soviet Union that had characterized the previous forty years. Bush believed in the innate expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union, just as he believed in the inherent inferiority of Soviet society in its political, social, and economic manifestations. The May 12 speech served as an explicit
announcement to the Soviet Union and the world that Bush’s hard-line campaign rhetoric of peace through strength still obtained, despite pre-campaign assurances to Gorbachev that Bush’s “get tough” rhetoric was simply a campaign ploy and not indicative of Bush’s foreign policy intentions as president.43 Bush’s speeches to the NATO summit and in Mainz, Germany, three weeks later, promised a continuation of the hard-line approach. “To those who are impatient with our measured pace in arms reductions, I respectfully suggest that history teaches us a lesson—that unity and strength are the catalyst and prerequisite to arms control.’’44 Bush addressed the Soviet Union not as an equal with legitimate security concerns, but as a child in need of education and direction. “Our goal is to convince [the Soviet Union], step by step, that their definition of security is obsolete, that their deepest fears are unfounded.”45 Coming four years after Gorbachev introduced a new conception of security, Bush’s approach represented a considerable retrenchment.

Bush continued the policy of testing Gorbachev, ignoring four years of Gorbachev’s concrete efforts prove to the West the sincerity of new thinking.46 Jerry Hough commented on the early Bush statements on U.S.-Soviet relations:

Yet nowhere did the President indicate the Gorbachev’s policy over the past four years—a period as long as the life of an American administration—was enough for any American response. Instead he demanded that, as a precondition for supportive U.S. policies, the Soviets offer further proof of the permanency of Gorbachev’s reforms—evidence that is not likely to be seen for years or even decades.47
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Bush admitted that Gorbachev had committed verbally to a new form of behavior—he even suggested that Gorbachev had taken concrete steps along the lines suggested by his verbal commitments—but Bush worried over the permanency of the change, suggesting that a history of broken promises by Soviet leaders cast doubt on Gorbachev's pledge. "A new relationship cannot simply be declared by Moscow, or bestowed by others. It must be earned because promises are never enough. The Soviet Union has promised a more cooperative relationship before, only to reverse course and return to militarism."

Gorbachev continued to advance his agenda in the face of this apparent rejection of previous commitments to seek accommodation. He attempted to engage President Bush in the same manner he engaged President Reagan, through the use of unilateral initiatives, including a pledge to destroy a small but significant number of short-range nuclear weapons in Europe. Secretary of State James Baker, upon being informed by Gorbachev of this new initiative, snapped that the offer was politically motivated, a charge that Gorbachev denied. In fact, the Bush administration reacted with irritation to a whole series of Gorbachev initiatives in the early months of 1989, suggesting that for Bush, all aspects of the U.S.-Soviet relationship, even public relations, remained a zero-sum game.

One of the surprises of the Bush administration is the irritation and uncertainty with which it has answered the initiatives of Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader. The more the Kremlin leader appears to be responding to Washington's demands, the
more annoyed the White House seems to become. When Mr. Gorbachev announced that he would withdraw 500 nuclear weapons from Eastern Europe, Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney's response was, “He has got so many rat holes over there in Eastern Europe that 500 is a pittance.” When Mr. Gorbachev said he would halt all weapons deliveries to Nicaragua, the White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater dismissed it as a “public relations gambit” perpetrated by a phony, a “drugstore cowboy.” Administration officials say that Mr. Gorbachev has promised much more than he has delivered, but that he is getting a free ride from the press because reporters want a dramatic figure to cover, which they are not finding in the White House. Mr. Gorbachev, officials complain, is getting credit for style rather than substance.

This is not meant to imply that Bush was completely impotent in these first months of his administration, but he was clearly much more concerned with style than substance. The administration outlined specific initiatives in its post-containment policy—offers of troop reductions, inclusion of troops and combat aircraft in conventional weapons talks, open skies, etc. To have read that as evidence of a change of heart, however, would have been to have misread it.

It can be argued that the Bush initiatives were competitive reactions to the perceived advantage in public relations gained by Gorbachev. As the above commentary indicates, Bush bristled at the idea that Gorbachev received acclaim for his initiatives. In the weeks prior to the NATO summit, Bush was being upstaged by Gorbachev's initiatives, particularly those related to SNF and conventional forces. The fallout from these proposals, and from the negative response of the Bush administration, created a crisis of disunity in the NATO alliance and threatened the success of an upcoming NATO summit. Bush took
these steps to bring the alliance together as well as to grab the public relations spotlight from Gorbachev, not because he believed that they represented equitable negotiating positions. It is instructive to realize that the formula for cuts proposed by Bush at the NATO summit featured highly asymmetrical reductions, with the Soviet Union bearing the brunt of the drawdown—in troops alone Bush's proposal called for a reduction of 30,000 U.S. troops from Western Europe while requiring a Soviet reduction of some 325,000 troops.

A series of meetings between Baker and Shevardnadze, and, finally, a pair of Bush-Gorbachev summits, in combination with Gorbachev's continuing application of unilateralism, produced a breakthrough. Bush began to seek a real dialogue with Gorbachev, a reversal of policy which momentarily left his administration in a state of confusion. It was at the second summit, in Washington in the Summer of 1990, that Gorbachev recognized that his relationship with Bush had taken on a new form. "Now, having reached a qualitatively new level in Soviet-American relations," Gorbachev later remembered, "we had to make further headway along the chosen road, taking a more stable and predictable course and leaving behind the ups-and-downs in the relations between our nations, when every warming was followed by a freeze."

International relations continued to evolve, and there remained fits and starts as Bush continued to press Gorbachev for deeper cuts, an expanded scope
of internal reform, and a faster pace to it all, and Gorbachev, facing an increasingly activist opposition at home began to react against some of the more radical uprisings, particularly in the Baltic republics. The Soviet Union was beginning to show signs of coming apart. But the groundwork laid by Gorbachev's four years of engagement with Reagan, and his continuing effort to engage President Bush, resulted in the emergence of a working partnership between the Presidents of the Soviet Union and the United States.

By the end of 1990, however, the presidents appeared to be swept along by the current of events more than they were in control of those events. Ray Garthoff noted that:

During the first half of the 1980s, Reagan's political stance was the dominating factor in the relationship between the two countries. In most of the second half of the decade, Gorbachev's initiatives were of primary importance. By the early 1990s, however, events rather than the choices of leaders had come to control the relationship.\(^5^3\)

And so it appeared to be the case. The initiatives of the two presidents, especially Gorbachev, had dramatic consequences for the future of the Soviet leader. Ordinary people in Eastern Europe, no doubt given the impetus by glasnost in the Eastern bloc and Gorbachev's repudiation of the Brezhnev doctrine in late 1989, began to take charge of their own futures. Populism raged; Eastern Europe began to convulse with democratic energies as the people threw off the mantle of Communist rule; the Berlin Wall crumbled and the two Germanies became one. And in the Soviet Union, popular sentiment, reflected
in the results of a nationwide election in early 1991, was driving the process of forming a new Union of autonomous states with limited central administrative authority in Moscow. Gorbachev, buffeted from the right and the left, lost his ability to maneuver.

On August 19, 1991, Gorbachev and his family were imprisoned for three days at his vacation home in Crimea while a committee of his closest associates attempted to undo the reform efforts of the previous six years. Although the coup attempt was defeated and Gorbachev returned to power, his political fate, as well as the fate of the Soviet Union, was sealed. It might be more accurate to say that the GRIT process had ended perhaps a year earlier as the pace of events overran process and Gorbachev's authority and autonomy became more restricted at the hands of the forces of reaction. But within months of the coup, on December 25, 1991, the Soviet Union ceased to be. The world as it had been known for more than forty-five years came to an end, and thus, finally, ended Gorbachev's experiment with GRIT.

At the end of 1991, as he was preparing to step down, Gorbachev reflected on his accomplishments in six years as General Secretary and President of the Soviet Union. "Time and again I reached the same conclusion: we were still only at the beginning of the road we had chosen in March 1985."
Conclusions

The end of the cold war was unanticipated, and the manner in which it ended was surprising for both analysts and practitioners of international politics. This study resurrected a very early theory of political psychology, GRIT, and applied it to this critical case study in international relations. The results are not only a richer understanding of the events surrounding the peaceful decline of the Soviet Union and the end of the era of the cold war. This study also provides insights into the study of international relations, the practice of foreign policy in the post cold war era, and for the successful structure and application of GRIT.

Lessons for the Study of International Relations

This study began with the hypothesis that individual human beings in positions of decision making authority can exercise a decisive influence on the course of international political events. The evidence herein presented provides considerable support for that proposition, which in turn holds great significance for the study of international relations.

Traditional views of political science held that research was best carried out at a single level of analysis. By the mid-1990s that assumption had begun
to change. Political scientists began to embrace the notion that explanations of international political behavior required the analyst to transcend traditional commitments to a single methodology and an exclusive level of analysis. For the case examined here, the end of the cold war, it was demonstrated conclusively that a combination of systemic analysis and elite beliefs was appropriate.

Yet there remained, despite the acknowledgment that the inclusion of domestic-level variables could be fruitful, a desire to limit the inclusion of domestic-level variables to those traditionally considered within the discipline of political science. Jennifer Sterling-Folker's study in March 1997 recommended the melding of systemic and domestic variables, but defined domestic variables as "...political parties, public opinion, media, bureaucratic politics, legislative and executive branch relations, political culture, interest groups, types of governments and politics, and weak-state strong-state dichotomies."65

Understanding change and choice in international behavior requires more, as this study demonstrates. Psychology provides various concepts that help target research within the elites belief focus.

Psychology provides some rudimentary tools for a political science approach focusing on elites and their mindsets. Psychology points to attitudes, affects, socialization, perceptions, and, above all, personality as sources of behavior. In a friendly raid of another social science discipline, the elite beliefs approach appropriates these tools of psychology.66
It was, in particular, the perspectives of psychology that helped to explain the nature of the resistance Reagan exhibited to Gorbachev's new thinking. Psychological theories also formed the basis of understanding necessary for the development of GRIT theory, and it certainly aided in the formation of individual GRIT strategies. Multidisciplinary analysis, combining history and psychology with political science, enriches and deepens the analyst's understanding of events, lending itself to explanations that are more thorough and, in the end, perhaps more isomorphic with decision making reality.

International relations also suffers from a rigidity that the focus on GRIT has helped to expose. In two distinct fields, game theory and political psychology, analyses proceed from certain fixed assumptions regarding what have traditionally been considered independent variables. In game theory, preference orderings and payoffs are fixed; players are defined by their preferences, which then are held constant throughout the course of the game. In political psychology, the subject's pre-existing image of the world is held to be constant.

As Erwin Hargrove writes in *The Power of the Modern Presidency*, "Each President will have a world view derived from his personal history and experience that will not likely change once he enters the White House. For better or worse, his pre-existing world view is the intellectual capital on which he will draw as president, and most of the expert advice and intelligence he receives will be filtered through that world view."
These rigidities limit the explanatory power of the respective theories, as the analysis in this study demonstrated. In this analysis, the independent variable is the policy choice of Mikhail Gorbachev, and the dependent variable is Reagan's image of the Soviet Union, understood in part through a game matrix. By treating Reagan's pre-existing images as the dependent variable, allowing it to vary with Gorbachev's application of GRIT, it explains the progressive warming of Reagan toward the Soviet Union. These changes in beliefs occur inside what political science has called "the black box," the minds of individual leaders. GRIT opens that box, allowing the analyst to test and manipulate what is happening inside.

GRIT offers a novel manner in which to conceptualize some of the traditional questions and methods of international relations theory. In so doing, it has made for a greater understanding of a critical case, the end game of the cold war.

This study has also lent additional credence to the concerns expressed in the first chapter that political science has chosen to emphasize scientific rigor at the expense of relevance. In the end, it was the relatively inelegant historical fact-finding that lead to the conclusions expressed here; conclusions that may well be of greater relevance and importance to the understanding of this significant case than those generated by more elegant, scientifically rigorous methods. John Gaddis offered his thoughts on these methods. "One might as
well have relied upon stargazers, readers of entrails, and other 'pre-scientific' methods for all the good our 'scientific' methods did; clearly our theories were not up to the task of anticipating the most significant event in world politics since the end of World War II.\textsuperscript{58}

\textbf{Lessons for the Conduct of Foreign Policy in the Post Cold War World}

The distinction between how and why the cold war ended, presented at the beginning of this study, contains nuances critical to the formulation of foreign policy in the mid-1990s and beyond. The parallel question, introduced later in this work, was to determine who deserved the "credit" for ending the cold war, Reagan or Gorbachev. Those who tend to focus on the issue of why the cold war ended tend to credit Reagan for his hard-line approach to the Soviet Union. As Charles Kegley indicated, that has become the dominant conception among Western policy makers. Such a conception is dangerously simplistic and short-sighted given the complex problems facing American diplomacy in the 1990s.

Accepting that Reagan bludgeoned the Soviet Union into submission implies the acceptance of Reagan's foreign policy approach—unrelenting confrontation. Reagan rejected forty years of containment as too lenient. He sought to increase \textit{military} and economic pressure—to go on the offensive—in
challenging Soviet interests. Reagan’s commitment to rollback permitted only unconditional surrender.

“Winning the cold war” is a highly contentious formula because it can be interpreted as a moral justification for all of Reagan’s defense and foreign policies—for example, military intervention in Nicaragua under the Reagan Doctrine, a strategy which envisaged possibly fighting and winning a nuclear war, and unprecedented peacetime military budgets. The notion of “victory” also appears to vindicate the policies of seeking military superiority and “negotiating from strength,” which could be disastrous as precedents.59

The interplay between Reagan and Gorbachev, however, softened that position. To understand how the cold war ended is to recognize that rollback as a strategy is too rigid to permit an adversary to end the conflict; unconditional surrender is not a viable option in most instances, especially in the absence of military victory on the field of battle. It also sows the seeds of discontent—the lesson of Versailles—and undermines efforts to “win the peace.”

American foreign policy in the 1990s nevertheless exploited the myth of the Reagan victory in the cold war. Policy in a number of crises, the Persian Gulf, Somalia, and Bosnia, for example, evidenced a bluntness and a lack of sophistication reminiscent of Reagan’s early approach to the Soviet Union. Presidents Bush and Bill Clinton sought to impose American will through an unrelenting application of force in the form of economic sanctions, political pressure, and, ultimately, military force. Receiving much less emphasis,
however, were attempts to understand or accommodate the viewpoint of the parties chosen as the adversary.

As a result, as of this writing, the assessment of these three instances of U.S. policy is that policy based on bluster and firepower is not conducive to peaceful accommodation. In the Persian Gulf, military victory was won, but Saddam Hussein remained a thorn in the side of the West, the American-Arab coalition was crumbling, and the war claimed a terrible price in human life. Somalia ended in tragedy, and the conditions for stable self-governance remained elusive. Finally, in Bosnia, as of 1997, a tenuous and heavily guarded peace was in place, but most commentators did not believe that the long-term prospects for peace were encouraging. The legacy of Reagan's attempt to roll back the Soviet Union appears to be failure, bloodshed, and instability.

What was missing? Ronald Reagan, at least from 1981 through 1985, exhibited zero empathy for the Soviet Union. The subtleties of interpreting Soviet intentions were completely abandoned as Reagan substituted a mythology of ideologically-driven Soviet expansionism for attempts rationally to understand Soviet behavior. The Reagan experience, interpreted from the perspective that Reagan won the cold war, led 1990s policy makers to choose levers of influence in a given situation based on what would influence them. Thus George Bush asserted that Saddam Hussein would certainly understand that he could not succeed given the combined military might of the Gulf coalition.
aligned against him, and so would never risk military confrontation in Kuwait. Similarly, several years later, President Clinton surmised that the Bosnian Serbs, fearful of NATO's military force, would never risk military confrontation over Bosnia-Herzegovina.

The Reagan lesson included the notion that the threat of force is the pre-eminent—perhaps sole—currency of international relations. Bluster replaced reason under the assumption that louder saber-rattling would succeed where more subtle saber-rattling failed. Threat led to mobilization of forces, demonstration of will, and, ultimately, application of military force. In the Gulf, the agent was the U.S. 7 Corps and assorted coalition units; in the Balkans, the agent was a newly rearmed Croatian defense force.

Force is important, but if it is the only arrow in the foreign policy quiver, it will be employed whether appropriate or not. Foreign policy decision making evolved in the 1990s to a point where the discussion is no longer about whether force or threat of force is an appropriate lever in a given situation, but rather how to structure that threat to make it most frightening, assuming that America's adversaries are frightened by the same things that frighten American policy makers.

Hasty and inappropriate resort to force is not the only result of a lack of empathy. It infects the entire practice of policy formulation. It is difficult to understand how, for example, if operating from a position of knowledge of the
history, culture, and beliefs of the parties, the Dayton Accords could have supported the notion of a multi-ethnic state. That is an American construction that has no foundation in the Balkans, and its emphasis at Dayton may yet prove to be a tragic error.

Attempts to be empathetic—to understand, as Gorbachev attempted to do with the United States—how an actor might perceive not only U.S. actions, but also the situation that led to crisis in the first place, would expand the range of possible policy options. It would permit the United States to structure policies that are more complex, more subtle, and more effective.

Lessons for the Successful Application of GRIT

Osgood wrote *An Alternative to War Or Surrender*, detailing the GRIT process, in 1962. His description of the world, specifically of the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, bore an amazing resemblance to those same relations in 1985. The general outlines of the cold war were relatively constant over time; the basic rules remained unchanged. Deterrence was the centerpiece of the relationship, though by 1985 the concept of deterrence through MAD had been supplanted by deterrence through warfighting, a doctrinal shift with severe implications for weapons development and acquisition. The arms race continued unabated and military expenditures
increased at rapid rates. Psycho-politically 1962 resembled 1985 as well. The Soviet Union and the United States distrusted one another based on a mutual perception that the relationship was zero-sum, and the price of flagging vigilance was national survival.

**GRIT** was designed to address situations of intense hostility and distrust. What emerged from this study is that GRIT is more appropriate for situations in which conflicts of interest are more perceptually-based than real. If, for example, the conflict between East and West were based on some physical resource scarcity, GRIT may not have been an appropriate policy option. But situations of real, insoluble clashes of interest appear relatively rare. And as Gorbachev's experience with Reagan demonstrated, problems will often appear incapable of solution because the perceptual environment limits the range of apparent potential solutions. GRIT introduces flexibility and creativity, making apparently intractable problems less so.

In the U.S.-Soviet case, accommodation appeared impossible because of the zero-sum orientation of the two leadership groups—in the language of the realists, both parties were concerned with absolute gains. Once Gorbachev recognized that such an orientation would be disastrous for the Soviet Union, he set out to undercut the American zero-sum orientation by striking at its foundation, the perception of Soviet ideological rigidity. Gorbachev conceived, structured, and announced a new foreign policy free of the ideological component.
that drove American perceptions, and demonstrated that new orientation through unilateral initiatives. Reagan eventually began to see Gorbachev's Soviet Union in a less ideological light, and movement began on practical policy issues.

Gorbachev's GRIT experiment demonstrated, however, that the GRIT experience is a highly personal one. What Osgood could not have recognized, dealing, as he did, with a prospective, hypothetical case, was how overwhelmingly important to the GRIT process were the characters of specific individuals. Osgood hypothesized correctly regarding the impact of contrary information on pre-existing belief structures, but could not have understood that it was personal, face-to-face interactions, albeit facilitated by changes at the level of policy, that made for the transformation of relations, at least in the short term. It was a combination of GRIT and summitry that moved Reagan and Bush.

One could also posit that individual characteristics impact receptivity to the GRIT process. Risk averse leaders, for example, might be expected to resist reciprocation of initiatives for a longer time period than risk-acceptant leaders. One could further hypothesize about a host of other traits. Examination of such hypotheses would require comparative analyses across a number of cases, exploring how the targets of GRIT processes react to the policy. The limited
practical experience with GRIT, however, does not provide the necessary empirical base for such a study.

GRIT effect may also have limited transitivity. As the most efficient use of GRIT may be to target an individual rather than a collective, changes in leadership can be expected to set back the GRIT process, as the Reagan-to-Bush transition demonstrated. At the same time, Osgood posited that there would be some collateral impact on actors other than the specific target—that impact possibly being weaker than the impact on the target, and also being subject to the intervening variables of personal traits. This limited transitivity may explain how George Bush was, at first, reluctant to accommodate Soviet change, not having previously been an explicit target of Gorbachev's policy. As a result of the collateral conditioning he received as a member of Reagan's administration, however, he was engaged relatively more quickly than was Reagan once he became the target of the combination of GRIT and summity.

Finally, Gorbachev's experience with GRIT underscores a difficulty that Osgood failed to anticipate: how long to wait for reciprocation. Osgood's only comment on this issue was that the GRIT process should continue, in the absence of a response from the target state, "until it becomes perfectly clear from their inaction that they prefer war to peace." The blithe ambiguity of that formulation belies the importance and the difficulty of making that assessment correctly. Osgood clearly expected that for GRIT to work, it was to be
maintained in the face of exploitation and rejection through several rounds of initiatives. Yet in the mock GRIT exercise related in Osgood’s book, fewer than eleven months passed between the President’s announcement of the policy and his “smiling” departure for a month-long vacation, secure in the knowledge that the GRIT process has been reciprocated and institutionalized. Gorbachev continued for more than three years with very little concrete, positive response from the Reagan administration. The results of this study suggest that in real-world conflict situations, GRIT may require a much longer incubation period and a much more patient initiator. Perseverance may prove to be a critical personal trait.

These results also suggest a certain responsibility on the part of the target of a GRIT strategy. GRIT was designed for nations in conflict; it is likely that, as Gorbachev discovered, there will be domestic opposition to the decision to initiate and persevere in a GRIT policy. Had the Reagan administration transcended the zero-sum, competitive mentality that afflicted its decision making, it could have responded much earlier in the process, and in a much more positive manner, to Gorbachev’s initiatives. As it was, Reagan continued to squeeze concessions out of Gorbachev, even as his cognitive commitments began to change. A more positive response from the Reagan White House, more fully acknowledging the scope of change underway in Moscow, would have provided significant ammunition against Gorbachev’s hard-line opposition. More
concretely, had Washington been more forthcoming with economic assistance and the elimination of trade restrictions, Gorbachev may have been able to cushion the impact of perestroika on his population, preserving his own legitimacy and insulating him from attacks from both radical reformers and conservatives.

In general, states must be more cognitive of the types of foreign policy choices that may be made under conditions of enduring rivalry. Gorbachev was in a very difficult position, and it is unclear that an earlier, more positive U.S. response would have saved him from the August 1991 coup. But decision makers must recognize that there is a risk involved in failing to respond to this type of initiative.

Osgood also underplayed the role of interpretational bias on the efficacy of the GRIT process. In Osgood's story, each nation's behavior is unambiguous and properly perceived. Gorbachev discovered that some of his initiatives, which he considered unambiguous concessions to the American position, were seen in the Reagan White House as provocations, and the Bush White House was merely irritated by a number of Gorbachev's initiatives during the first few months of Bush's tenure as president. In Clausewitz, the "fog of war" refers to the uncertainty and chaos that makes highly improbable linear projections of cause and effect on the battlefield. There is a fog that confounds decision
making in GRIT as well. This variance between intent and perception contains obvious negative implications for the early success of the GRIT process.

As the initiator of the GRIT process attempts to determine how long to continue in the face of rejection, they must weigh the risk that the next initiative will result in a breakthrough, against the growing risk of continuous exploitation. The game theory literature recognizes that a strategy of unconditional cooperation results, inevitably, in exploitation. Axelrod’s conception, the shadow of the future, plays a critical role in the success of the GRIT process. In other words, if the target perceives that the initiator will play cooperate on each iteration of the game, regardless of the play of the target, the target will play non-cooperate in each iteration, enjoying the exploitation payoff.

Gorbachev flirted with that outcome as well. “Suddenly,” the Washington Post reported early in 1989, “the world has grown accustomed to the surprises, the unilateral legerdemain, that always seem to come popping out of Mikhail Gorbachev’s trilby.” So conditioned was this perception that when Gorbachev did speak without offering significant unilateral initiatives, he was met with immediate disappointment, prompting a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesperson to chide the West: “You’ve become pampered.” Georgi Arbotov, a key adviser to Gorbachev, warned almost two years earlier that the conservative response to Gorbachev—demanding that he concede more—overlooked “the risks of distrust”; the risk that the opportunity to change relations would fade and
relations would return to the competitive, zero-sum state that characterized them prior to the initiation of GRIT. Stephen Sestanovich describes how Gorbachev's policy began to run the ultimate risk of failure.

Gorbachev's is a foreign policy of concessions: To maintain the momentum of change and innovation, he's prepared to meet the demands of his adversaries—offering one new formula after another, often without receiving offsetting concessions from the other side....Gorbachev's calculation is that by seeming to change the rules of the game, he puts pressure on the other side to reciprocate. But other governments are bound to ask the obvious question: Why reciprocate, rather than simply wait for another concession? Why not add new demands? There's a dawning sense that Gorbachev may be a man who can be had: on arms control, Afghanistan, and other issues. The pliability and weakness of his foreign policy presents the United States with some awkward choices; above all, between helping and exploiting our concession-prone adversary.68

In the end, there is no formula to solve this problem, and continuous exploitation will remain a risk. The GRIT process requires constant assessment and reevaluation. The character of the initiator, and the personal ties forged to the target, may help inform the decision to advance the next initiative. But as with so many choices political, instinct will play a decisive role.

In reading Osgood's book, one is struck by the elegance of his theory and the simplicity of his proposal. This study has found that Osgood's assessment of GRIT may have been overly optimistic, but that GRIT can still be a powerful tool of diplomacy. It certainly deserves a place in the foreign policy quiver.

Jesse Jackson made the case for the right when he expressed his view that Reagan, by getting Gorbachev to make the INF deal, confounded a foreign
policy elite in the United States who thought Reagan was not educated nor sophisticated enough handle Gorbachev.

Kissinger types bitterly argued that it was absurd to expect a guy like Reagan could do anything with Gorbachev, who had about 597 volumes of Lenin, whole libraries of history and economics. And yet Reagan, not knowing any of that stuff Kissinger had learned, not knowing any Russian except maybe vodka, sits down and get an historic deal out of Gorbachev. He made history that all these little wannabe Kissingers in the future will spend their working lives analyzing.66

Yet we understand from this study that Reagan in 1985, while not necessarily under-educated or under-sophisticated, was too rigid to make an agreement with the Soviet Union. Gorbachev, through GRIT, introduced flexibility to Reagan’s foreign policy position, moving Reagan away from the rollback strategy, and getting Reagan to accede to—and, in fact, to help cushion—the relatively peaceful decline of the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev stated that during the Reykjavik meeting, he “called the U.S. President’s attention to the fact that he seemed to be abandoning his brainchild, the zero option, which at one time he was offering us with such insistence.”67

The power of GRIT and new thinking was not its ability to get Gorbachev to agree to arms reductions on Reagan’s terms. The power of GRIT and new thinking was it’s ability to get Reagan to agree to arms reductions on any terms.
Notes for Chapter 5

1. Mikhail Gorbachev, *Memoirs* (New York: Doubleday) 1996, p. 457. I assume that Gorbachev meant to refer to the Geneva meeting in November of 1985, at which time Reagan made reference to his belief, having for the first time met the new Soviet General Secretary, that Gorbachev was someone with whom he could do business, and not the June 1987 meeting at Reykjavik.
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27. See, for example, William C. Green, “Are There Hawks and Doves in the Soviet Leadership,” Strategic Review, Winter 1987, pp. 31-42.


"After Stalin's death in 1953 the Soviet leaders carried out unilateral reductions in conventional forces that they would have preferred to institute as a part of a reciprocal agreement. In this sense they preferred unilateral 'cooperation' over mutual deflection. By contrast, the declassified documentary evidence presented here indicates that the U.S. preferred mutual deflection over mutual cooperation, and was happy to see the USSR undertake unilateral..."
restraint. It was the U.S. rather than the USSR that was playing Deadlock in the 1950s.”


37. The vehemence with which these sentiments were held varied from the almost paranoid to the more centrist observations of Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney who wrote in early 1990 that although the Soviet Union appeared to be changing in ways that reduced the threat to U.S. interests, the changes were largely rhetorical or, at least, not difficult to reverse. In recognition of this, Cheney urged caution in responding to Soviet initiatives. See Richard Cheney, *Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense to Congress, Fiscal Year 1991* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1990), p. iv.


42. Bush, Speech given at Texas A&M University, 1989, p. 4.


45. Ibid., p. 5.


52. Gorbachev, 1996, p. 536.

53. Garthoff, 1994, p. 3.

54. Gorbachev, 1996, p. 672.


57. Ibid., p. 25.
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