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CHAPTER IX

The Twentieth Century: Reputation and ‘Egotiation’

This chapter was written specifically for this thesis in 2013, and was pre-published as Meerts (2013c).
Depending on the circumstances, the negotiator’s character, personal preferences and emotions can take precedence over the interests of the stakeholders and their representatives. In such a situation we might talk about ‘egotiation’ instead of ‘negotiation’, meaning that the ego of the negotiator is an obstacle to effective representation of interests (Meerts, 2010: 28–29). Here we do not mean ego in the Freudian sense, but in the political sense: the self-image and the prestige of the negotiating politician or diplomat and, by extension, of his or her country. In certain situations, protecting self-image and prestige will be seen as more important than the object of negotiation. Protection of the leader’s ‘face’ and of the country represented will take priority over the needs and the interests of the state, or even of the negotiator (Faizullaev, 2006), while it will induce secrecy as ‘representatives will prefer closed-door bargaining if reputational concerns are sufficiently strong’ (Stasavage, 2004: 681).

By analyzing the role of leading personalities, this chapter will first look at seven turning-point conferences in the twentieth century, after which it will briefly profile fourteen leading negotiators who did not take part in these meetings. This cannot and will not provide us with a comprehensive study of ‘egotiation’ in the last century, but it will provide us with some indications of the effects of personality on the processes of international negotiation in recent times (Faizullaev, 2006).

It is postulated that politicians are power-brokers, people who want to gain power and to use it as a tool in controlling others, thereby harvesting profits for themselves and for their party. In order to do this, they need to have a positive self-image, while they strive to be respected by others, either through doing well or through fear. Legitimacy, in whatever form, will make the wielding of power more effective, and a prestigious leader will have no insurmountable problems in governing his or her people. Prestige is therefore indispensable, but prestige will have to be defended against those who want to damage it. This in turn might lead to situations in which upholding prestige becomes more important than defending specific material interests. Prestige can thus be defined as an immaterial interest that can have both positive and negative effects on striving for material profits. Behind the façade of prestige sits the ego of the politician, and we can postulate further that the more powerful the leader, the bigger his or her ego, and the bigger the impact of his ego-state on the negotiation process. This chapter will therefore focus on some of the most powerful negotiators of the twentieth century, trying to discover the ‘egotiation’ effects of their behaviour.

Although ‘egotiation’ has been defined as a phenomenon connected to personality, one should not overlook the dynastic and state dimension of the term. Dynasties and states have a reputation. They have some measure of prestige and defending this prestige is important, as it will help the dynasty or the state to assert its position in the world and
thereby facilitate the defence of its material interests. The dynasty or the state thus has an ‘ego’ as well, including its positive or negative impact on the processes of international negotiation. Thus, for instance the decision of US President George W. Bush in the aftermath of 11 September 2001 to help the Northern Coalition of Tajiks and Uzbeks to drive the Taliban out of Kabul can be seen as a rational action that was aimed at destroying the protectors of al-Qaeda. However, it can also be seen as a show of American force, along the lines of ‘we will not let our reputation as the most powerful country in the world be damaged by a bunch of terrorists’. Furthermore, it can be looked upon as old-fashioned revenge, and finally as an ego-based decision by the president, who felt that his prestige and ‘face’ were at stake. In short, both the American people and the president were outraged, so action had to be taken, particularly as action orientation is a dominant feature of American societal and political culture. This action might, and indeed did, lead to a situation of entrapment that was not in the interest of the United States, nor beneficial for the well-being of non-terrorist segments of the Afghan population. It resulted in ‘an international conflict for the sake of pointless goals – national prestige or the vain glory of a ruling elite’ (Joll, 1982). Perhaps the reaction was not pointless, but the process and outcome were.

The seven conferences are characterized by the limited number of real decision-makers. The wheeling and dealing is done by the most powerful, surrounded by other less important negotiators, as well as their advisers. One of the negotiations that is examined is *de jure* multilateral (Paris in 1919), but *de facto* trilateral. Another (Munich in 1938) is *de jure* a four-party negotiation, but *de facto* bilateral. We then have a true trilateral negotiation (Yalta in 1945) and four bilateral meetings (Vienna in 1961, Beijing and Moscow in 1972, and Geneva in 1985). The chapter will examine why self-image and prestige – the software of negotiation – took precedence over the hardware, and what the consequences of this were for the negotiation processes in which they played a decisive role.

The multilateral case is the Paris Peace Conference at the end of the First World War, which led to the Treaty of Versailles in 1919. Of all the negotiators, this chapter will focus on the main three – Georges Clemenceau of France, Lloyd George of Britain, and Woodrow Wilson of the United States – although it will not completely disregard the others. George Clemenceau was the President of the Paris Peace Conference and all substantial negotiations took place between him and the other two political leaders. Although the Prime Minister of Italy, Vittorio Orlando, was an integral member of the core group of negotiators – the Council of Four – he never played an important role and even left the conference before it was over. The chapter will also ignore people like the Japanese Prime Minister Saionji Kinmochi, the Romanian Prime Minister Ion Bratianu, and the Chinese Prime Minister Lou Tseng-Tsiang, as they were outside the actual decision-making. Although others were very influential as advisers, including John Maynard Keynes for example, they were not the real decision-makers and are therefore also omitted from this discussion. It is interesting to observe, by the way, that most important multilateral conferences of the past two centuries were actually negotiations among a very limited set of actors. This was true for the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815, and Paris in 1919, while today we have a UN Security Council of only five parties.

The bilateral and trilateral cases are: Munich in 1938, with Britain’s Neville Chamberlain, France’s Édouard Daladier, Germany’s Adolf Hitler and Italy’s Benito Mussolini; Yalta in
1945, with Britain’s Winston Churchill, US President Franklin Roosevelt and Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin; Vienna in 1961, between US President John F. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev; Beijing and Moscow in 1972 between US President Richard Nixon and China’s Mao Zedong and the Soviet Union’s Leonid Brezhnev, respectively; and between US President Ronald Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Geneva in 1985. The impact of ‘secondary negotiators’ such as US National Security Adviser and (later) Secretary of State Henry Kissinger and China’s Zhou Enlai will, of course, be taken into account, as their behaviour has probably been even more decisive in reaching an outcome than that of the official decision-makers. While the Paris Conference was selected for examination because it was the most important bilateral conference of the twentieth century, and the one with ample information about personalities, it was also of course the closing conference of the First World War. We could also, like Kalevi Holsti (Holsti, 1991), have selected another multilateral conference, namely San Francisco, where the United Nations were founded, as the League of Nations were created in the aftermath of Versailles in 1919. However, there are far fewer documents available on the personalities, while the San Francisco Conference itself was a mere consequence of much more decisive negotiations, such as those in Yalta. The bilateral and trilateral cases were chosen because of their connection with the Second World War (opening and closure) and with the Cold War (at the start, in the middle and towards the end).

We realize the shortcomings of such a limited number of conferences, all of which more or less centre on Europe, as well as such a select group of leaders from the traditional Great Powers of the world. However, it has nevertheless been extremely difficult to distil the characteristics of each personality from the available records and biographical details of the pivotal people. The emotional side of their behaviour is thoroughly underexposed, let alone their actions, which could be labelled as being the consequence of the projection of their self-image and the defence of their prestige, which run counter to the material interests of their countries and even of themselves. While participants in negotiation seminars will easily recognize the concept of ‘egotiation’, as they have experienced this problem in their own dealings with political leaders, it is extremely difficult to prove it from the existing literature. After all, it is not only about the character and the behaviour of the negotiator, but very much about his or her actions during the negotiation process.

It is from novels that we learn more about the psychological side of the relationship between the leaders and the ensuing bargaining processes. For example, a good example of the psychological dimension can be found in Tolstoy’s famous novel Hadji Murád (Tolstoy, 2003: 58):

The eyes of the two men [the Avar/Chechen rebel leader Hadji Murát and the Russian General Vorontsóv] met, and expressed to each other much that could not have been put forward in words, and that was not at all what the interpreter said. Without words they told each other the whole truth. Vorontsóv’s eyes said that he did not believe a single word Hadji Murád was saying, and that he knew he was and always would be an enemy to everything Russian, and had surrendered only because he was obliged to. Hadji Murád understood this, and yet continued to give assurances of his fidelity. Vorontsóv understood this also, but nevertheless
he spoke to Hadji Murád in the way he considered necessary for the success of the war.

This is a good example of the contrariness of ‘negotiation’, where the material interests of both parties take precedence over their feelings, while keeping their sense of honour intact.

**Closure of the First World War**

The Paris Peace Conference had to create a new order for Europe and thereby for the world (MacMillan, 2001; Sharp, 2008). Between January and June 1919, negotiators from all over the world, excluding those who had been defeated in the First World War, gathered in Paris to settle the war issues and to lay the foundations for a more stable system of international relations than the ‘Balance of Power’ of the nineteenth century. Like at the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815, there was no prepared agenda, nor a procedure upon which all of the interested parties agreed. Although the Paris negotiators were aware of the shortcomings of the Congress of Vienna because of the very disorderly way in which that conference had developed, they nevertheless made the same mistake of incomplete preparation. The Paris Peace Conference was not institutionalized, unlike the League of Nations that it produced, let alone the United Nations that we have today, or the African Union, European Union, Association of South-East Asian Nations, Organization of American States, or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Whatever the differences between these international organizations, with the European Union being far more institutionalized than the African Union, they at least have a fixed set of rules and regulations, thereby protecting the negotiation processes inside their institutions against too much volatility.

The Paris Peace Conference had to do without this, with the consequence of great ups and downs. On 13 January 1919, the representatives of France, Britain, the United States, Italy and Japan formed the ‘Council of Ten’ (also referred to as the ‘Supreme Council’) as it had two representatives from each of the states, namely the government leader as well as the minister of foreign affairs. In March 1919, the negotiations became more difficult and more intense, and the Supreme Council reduced itself to the ‘Council of Four’, consisting of US President Woodrow Wilson, and Prime Ministers Clemenceau of France, Lloyd George of Britain and Orlando of Italy. Prime Minister Orlando did not play an important role, however, and the real negotiations became truly trilateral. The Council met on a daily basis, using English and French as their languages of negotiation and French and English were also decided upon as the languages of the official documents. Not only were the ministers of foreign affairs of the four countries kept at bay, but so were the Japanese and their head of delegation, Marquis Šaionji Kinmochi, a former Japanese prime minister. The rest of the negotiators of other concerned states had to wait until they were invited into the triangle to state their wishes and to try to negotiate them, although they were not allowed in as decision-makers. Therefore, the personalities of the ‘big three’ were the only ones with a decisive impact on the negotiation process (Sharp, 2008).
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The Outer Ring
The most concerned of the other countries, besides those represented in the ‘Supreme Council’, were the countries of the Central Powers that had lost the war: Germany; Austria and Hungary; the Ottoman Empire; and Bulgaria. The most important of these, Germany, was seen as the real evil and therefore kept out of the discussion until the very end. The Germans were in no way involved in the negotiations, and were given a document to sign during the concluding weeks of the conference, with hardly any possibility of changing it. The victors were a little more forthcoming to the other defeated members of the Central Alliance. One of the former allies of the victorious Entente, Bolshevik Russia, was also kept out and had anyway no inclination to join the negotiations with the ‘capitalist’ countries of the West. Poland and Romania, however, profited from the West’s fear of communist Russia, by having their claims rewarded in order to create a bulwark against the emerging USSR. The other successor states of the former Austrian–Hungarian Empire also fared well: Czechoslovakia; and Yugoslavia (that is, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes). Belgium and Greece could take their spoils and so could the British Dominions, South Africa, Australia, and to some extent Canada. China, Ireland, the Arabs and the Zionists were basically ignored, as were others, such as the Latin American countries and Siam (now Thailand) (MacMillan, 2001: 5).

Several of the representatives of these countries in the outer circle, however, were reasonably influential, partly because of the need of the big three to have a second layer of involved states to help to stabilize the whole process. Big powers need middle powers to help control the smaller powers. The middle powers will then ‘borrow’ power from the dominant nations, disciplining the host of small states in the international system. Of the six countries that were allied to the ‘Victorious Three’, Poland was first, as it was after all the only major power in Europe that had been washed from the map more than a century before, but that now had to perform an important function in the post-war system as a buffer between Germany and Russia. Whatever the Allies wanted with Poland, Polish General Josef Pilsudski created his own reality by defeating the Red Army outside Warsaw in August 1920, and thereby creating a large Poland including substantial Ukrainian and other minorities. Romania sent Ion Bratianu to Paris, a chief spokesman for the ideal of a greater Romania. Bratianu managed this by blackmailing the Allies with the Soviet threat, as well as by creating new realities on the ground, as Poland did. He was backed up by the assertive Romanian Queen Marie, who travelled to Paris to court the Big Three. The Czechs, who now controlled the heartland of Austria–Hungary’s industrial potential, could easily take the spoils as well: Hungary’s Slovakia; and Ruthenia. The Czech leaders, Eduard Benes and Thomas Masaryk, managed to build a democratic state in the heart of Europe – quite an exception. The charming and diplomatic Benes, representing the Czech Republic in Paris, was helped enormously by the delays in decision-making, which gave his country the opportunity to annex regions with large Hungarian and Ukrainian minorities (MacMillan, 2001: 240–242). Austria, which was completely dismembered, remained alive as an orphan that was cut off from the ‘German Fatherland’ until the Second World War, when it tried to settle its identity, with two civil wars as a consequence.

Although at odds with each other, the Serbs – represented by Nikolá Pasic – and the Croats – by Ante Trumbic – were overtaken by realities when Prince Alexander of Serbia proclaimed the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, including Bosnia,
Montenegro, Macedonia and Kosovo, and occupying the Banat in the process. Hungary became independent, sent the communist leader Béla Kun to Paris, but lost most of its territory in the wars against Romania in 1919, just after the end of the so-called ‘Great War’. Alexander Stamboliski, the Bulgarian Prime Minister, did what he could in Paris, but Bulgaria was diminished to its core, be it less savagely than in Hungary. The Greeks, who sent Prime Minister Venizelos to Paris, managed to keep the territories that it had conquered during the war, expanding even to Eastern Trace and Smyrna, which were lost when Ataturk drove them out of Turkey a few years later. The Ottoman Empire, which collapsed like Austria–Hungary, successfully regained its lost territories in Anatolia, Kurdistan and Trace after the Turkish war of independence. China, which was represented by Prime Minister Lou Tseng-Tsiang, refused to sign the Treaty of Versailles, as the former German territory of Shandong – occupied by the Japanese – was not returned to the Middle Kingdom. China was the only participating country that did not sign.

Belgium received minor compensations for its enormous losses in lives and goods, and the Dominions remained in the British Empire, but received a higher status and were allowed separate membership of the League of Nations. Some of the Dominions, such as South Africa and Australia, could expand their reach, being enlarged with former German colonies as ‘trust territories’.

Germany, meanwhile, was a special case (MacMillan, 2001: 492–493). It lost its colonies, its fleet, big chunks of its territory, and it had to pay huge reparations. Count Ulrich von Brockdorff-Rantzau led the German delegation at the signing ceremony at Versailles on 29 April 1919. The delegation was kept waiting for several days before it received the terms, and had only a few days to respond. The Diktat was born.

The Inner Ring
There were, of course, others inside the delegations of the Big Three who exerted influence on their leaders, although the overall impression remains that French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau, British Prime Minister David Lloyd George and President of the United States Woodrow Wilson were much more influenced by their own personality and the personality of their co-decision-makers than by their foreign ministers, advisers, or minute-takers, etc. Before turning to the personalities of the main decision-makers, the seven most important players in the inner circle around the Supreme Council will have to be listed in alphabetical order (Duke International Security Conference, 2005: 1–10): Alfred Balfour, member of the British delegation and foreign minister during the Great War, was seen as having a thoughtful demeanour that proved a balance to Lloyd George’s boisterous, charismatic style. Count Macchi di Cellere, the Italian Ambassador in Washington DC, who worked closely with President Wilson, tolerated no disrespect, whether by action or by word, towards his country or its representatives. Edward House was the most important and loyal adviser to US President Wilson, and worked well with Clemenceau and Balfour, but felt that Wilson could not effectively administer negotiations and agree to peace successfully. He strongly discouraged the President’s decision to attend the conference and had hopes of leading the American delegation in Paris himself. John Maynard Keynes was the leading economist of the British Treasury Department, and saw Wilson as the only person with the moral authority to save Europe from another self-destructive war. Robert Lansing was former US Secretary of State to President Wilson,
and also wanted to be head of delegation, making President Wilson and Colonel House suspicious of his motives, which tainted their relations through the rest of the conference. French Foreign Minister Stephan Pichon’s most important asset was his diplomatic skill, as he was skilled at finding points of agreement between negotiating parties and at gaining favourable compromises. Finally, Baron Sidney Sonnino, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Italy, had little belief in the concept of the League of Nations or any other Wilsonian ideals, and had an extremely negative attitude towards the French.

Of the main decision-makers, French Prime Minister Clemenceau, who presided over the conference, will be discussed first. A provincial French medical doctor and shrewd negotiator, he was nicknamed ‘the Tiger’. It was said that ‘he comes from a family of wolves’, which did not mean that he was estranged from his own feelings, as ‘when he heard that the Germans had agreed to an armistice […] he put his head in his hands and wept’ (MacMillan, 2001: 38–39). Clemenceau’s main drive was the interests of France and, above all, his hatred of the Germans, which had been kindled by the Franco–German War over 40 years earlier. This hatred obviously blinded him to solutions that might not later have sparked the resentment of the Germans, which was one of the main inducements of the Second World War. As Machiavelli once said, a statesman should always avoid creating resentment among his adversaries. This obsession with his eastern neighbour made Clemenceau open the Paris Conference on the day of the anniversary of the coronation of Wilhelm II in Versailles and to close it with the formal signing of the treaties in the Hall of Mirrors in Versailles, where the Prussian King had been crowned Emperor of Germany in 1871. His hatred also induced Clemenceau to occupy the Rhineland and the Saarland and to demand enormous reparations, which caused the economic downfall of the democratic Weimar Republic with its unstable coalition governments. He ignored voices in the French government against these measures, including from one of his young assistants in that government, Jean Monnet. The time was not yet ripe for cooperation, just for competition, or, better, domination and oppression.

Clemenceau was politically isolated, so he had to rely on himself and his closest friends. He did, however, have a good relationship with the French military and the French press. His frictions were with parliament. The newly elected Chamber of Deputies of the French National Assembly was hostile towards him, as he kept the parliamentarians out of the peace talks. His main struggle, however, was with France’s President Raymond Poincaré. Clemenceau and Poincaré disliked each other intensely. According to the President, Prime Minister Clemenceau was a ‘Madman […] vain man’ (MacMillan, 2001: 40), as he wrote in his diary. Clemenceau’s relationship with his two direct co-negotiators was not too bad, but was not too good either. Wilson and Lloyd George had much more contact with each other than with Clemenceau. Lloyd George saw the French prime minister as being a ‘disagreeable and rather bad tempered old savage’ (MacMillan, 2001: 43). For his part, Clemenceau mistrusted Lloyd George, seeing him as unreliable, while he regarded Wilson as a naïve man whose ideas about self-determination would produce a powder keg in the new Europe. Although Clemenceau presided over the negotiation sessions with authority, he could turn savage, as he regularly did if the negotiations reached stalemate. He literally created hurting stalemates by shouting and storming out of the negotiation room. Whether this was pure tactic, or indeed a genuine emotional rage, is unknown, but it could have been both.
Lloyd George seemed to love devious methods. ‘He was a politician of formulae rather than principles, [...] quick-witted and voluble – the septuagenarian Clemenceau lamented ‘si je pouvais pisser comme Lloyd George parle’ – his adroitness in debate was sharpened by long practice and by unconcern for self-contradiction’ (Pearton, 1993: 73).

One is tempted to link this to the opinions about British negotiation style: highly effective but quite unreliable, and perhaps therefore so successful in reaching the desired results in the British interests. While training British civil servants for their presidency of the European Union, trainers observed the British diplomatic way of pragmatically dealing with the process of international negotiation, while striving without much scrupule for an outcome that is favourable to the United Kingdom (Hemery and Meerts, 2006). The British prime minister seemed to fit into his English culture perfectly. The question then arises of to what extent his attitude was a personal or a cultural characteristic. As was observed with Clemenceau, the answer is probably both. Lloyd George was not quite aware of the European issues and shared this lack of awareness with the British main negotiator at the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815, Lord Castlereagh. He was careless with appointments, could be quite ruthless in attempts to prevail over others, was of a domineering character, and had a problem in personal bonding. At the same time, however, he could be extraordinarily persuasive and charming – again, the true stereotype of the typical British diplomatist. During the negotiations, Lloyd George tried to balance Wilson and Clemenceau, and when asked whether he thought he had been successful, he answered that he thought he had done well, being seated between ‘Jesus Christ and Napoleon’.

According to ‘Napoleon’ (that is, Clemenceau), Lloyd George was ‘devious and untrustworthy’, ‘shockingly ignorant’, while ‘all arguments were good to him [Lloyd George] when he wishes to win a case and, if necessary, he uses the next day arguments which he had rejected and refuted the previous day’, while to Wilson, Lloyd George simply ‘lacked principle’ (MacMillan, 2001: 41, 43 and 48):

He was a politician of formulae rather than principles. He preferred oral to written agreements. He did not command universal trust, [...] had an unconcern for self-contradiction. He made decisions on grounds of authority to act at once [...] His greatest weakness, namely the lack of detailed background in foreign affairs [...] led him blithely to discuss the problem of Silesia in the belief that he was settling the fate of a province in Asia Minor (Pearton, 1993: 73).

(That villayet was obviously Cilicia in south-eastern Turkey, rather than Silesia, the region in Central Europe.) His short-sightedness did not preclude his far-sightedness, however: ‘after the [signing] ceremony, Lloyd George commented presciently that “we shall have to do the whole thing over again in 25 years at three times the cost”’ (Reynolds, 2007: 30) – he was exactly right. Like President Nixon and Henry Kissinger in their dealings with the Soviets and the People’s Republic of China, Lloyd George did not consult the Foreign Office, which – just like in the cases of Nixon and Kissinger – boomeranged, as serious oversights could not be corrected by the experts. In conclusion, ‘He was universally respected for his boundless energy and strong work ethic, but his bluntness and sharp
tongue endeared him to few people. Nevertheless, he was very popular among the British people and politicians of both parties’ (Duke International Security Conference, 2005: 3).

Finally, we come to Woodrow Wilson, perhaps the most complicated of the three main negotiators (Schulte Nordholt, 1992). He was seen as a hypochondriac professional academic, and as having a hard time understanding the Realpolitik of the epoch. His most important contribution was the (in)famous fourteen points, including the creation of a League of Nations of which the United States was not going to be a member. He was an idealist, who thought of himself as being morally right. According to Clemenceau, ‘talking to Wilson is something like talking to Jesus Christ. In public Wilson was stiff and formal, but with his intimates he was charming and even playful. He was usually in perfect control of himself, but during the Peace Conference he frequently lost control of his temper’ (MacMillan, 2001: 15 and 26):

He became mesmerized by the strength and neatness of the phrases that he devised. [...] He regarded himself as a prophet designated to bring light to a dark world. Yet, if we read again the tremendous sermons that he delivered during 1918, we shall find in them the seeds of the jungle of chaos that today impedes and almost obliterates the processes of rational negotiation. He failed to realize that the public is bored by foreign affairs until a crisis arises; and that then it is guided by feelings rather than by thoughts (Nicolson, 1998: 85 and 87).

Meanwhile,

His spiritual arrogance, the hard but narrow texture of his mind, is well illustrated by his apparent unawareness of political reality coupled with distressing awareness of party reality (and public opinion, and therefore) [...] his sensitiveness to press criticism, and especially to ridicule. As happens with most theocrats, Woodrow Wilson was a solitary and exclusive man (Nicolson, 1933: 199–201).

Lloyd George had his own problems with Wilson. Although he had much more intensive contact with Wilson than with Clemenceau, this was for reasons of interests, not of personality: ‘Lloyd George felt that ultimately, he could always do business with Clemenceau, but Wilson’s insensitivity and dogmatism made him absolutely impossible in negotiations’ (Pearton, 1993: 86).

Wilson’s aim was to avoid another world war, but his concept of world peace did not last and did not work. The idea of self-determination, which was not even clear to Wilson himself, did spark a series of minor conflicts during the interbellum period. Self-determination is not at all equivalent to independence, but to the masses and the politicians who manipulated them, it was interpreted as such. Perception determines reality, and so many conflicts were born. Why independence for some and not for all? Wilson’s own interpretation of self-determination, being the right of peoples to decide on their own form of government, was not concrete enough to preclude any other vision that might be at odds with it. Wilson was far from being straight in the implementation of his vision:
On reaching Paris, President Wilson quickly decided that by ‘diplomacy’ he had not meant ‘negotiation’, but only the results of that negotiation, namely treaties. He decided that the Phrases ‘openly arrived at’ and ‘in the public view’ were relative only and contained nothing that need deter him from conduction of prolonged secret negotiations with Lloyd George and Clemenceau [...] The general public, however, [...] continued to assume that by ‘diplomacy’ was meant both policy and negotiation. This is perhaps the most confusing of all fallacies that we owe to President Wilson (Nicolson, 1998: 85–86).

Finally, we come to the fourth member of the ‘Supreme Council’, the Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Emanuele Orlando. A professor of Law, diplomat and politician, Orlando had striven for Italy to leave the bloc of the Central Powers and join the Entente. In doing so, Italy suffered severe losses, but gained South Tyrol, Trieste and some other minor territories. This was perceived as a great injustice and gave rise to problems with Yugoslavia about Istria. As Orlando did not get what he wanted, and as his government was weakened beyond measure by his failure to get what he wanted, he left the conference in April 1919. Orlando saw himself and Italy as a victim of the Big Three: ‘I am indeed a new Christ [...] and must suffer my passion for the salvation of my country’ (MacMillan, 2001: 306). He allowed Italy’s conservative Foreign Minister Sidney Sonnino to play an important role in Paris and he resigned as prime minister before the signing of the Treaty. Orlando later supported Mussolini’s rise to power and was connected to the Mafia during his entire political career.

As the Germans were left out of the actual negotiation process, there is not much to say about the role of ‘egotiation’ on their part. We do know, however, about their anger as a consequence of humiliation. They obviously perceived the hatred on the side of the entente. ‘Brockdorf-Rantzau [the German chief negotiator] [...] chose to remain seated [...] He began by registering the victor’s intense and passionate hatred for the vanquished’ (Mayer, 1968: 767). The other power to be left out, the Soviet Union, was ‘neither ally nor enemy. [...] This regime was feared not because it ruled just then over a powerful nation, but because it was the carrier of highly contagious ideas’ (Mayer, 1968: 285).

Opening and Closure of the Second World War

To categorize negotiations on the basis of the number of participants is useful, but also difficult. It is useful because the number of participants has a great impact on the flow of the negotiation process: the more actors, the more complexity, but also the more richness. The struggle with complexity is the main issue in multilateral bargaining. How can one manage the chaos? One needs good procedures, rules and regulations, effective chairs, a strong secretariat, and negotiators who are well aware of the organization’s culture to set the boundaries and inner structure of the conference, etc. The management of complexity might be the main skill that negotiators of conference diplomacy have to possess; their advantage will be the choices that they have. Multilateral negotiation does generate many obstacles, but a lot of opportunities as well: multi-party, multi-issue, a multitude of problems as well as solutions, plus partial solutions for the power problem. It is, after all, easier to counterbalance the power of the powerful if many of them are present. Coalitions
will ease the differences in strength and give the weaker parties a tool in playing the strong off against each other. The advantage of bilateral or trilateral bargaining is its transparency and speed. Multilateral negotiations tend to be slow, although there might be more assured outcomes. Bi- or trilateral negotiations could be speedy, but there might be more less-assured outcomes. It is also more difficult to deal with the power problem, but procedures are less of an issue and the directness allows for more personal influence. In bi- or trilateral negotiations, as well as in multilateral negotiation, much remains the same as well: the question of mandates, and the relationship with the constituency, etc.

This chapter postulates that the smaller the circle of negotiators, the greater the impact of power and personality. What, however, about prestige? What about ‘egotiation’? One could expect them to be more of a problem than in multilateral negotiations, because the negotiators are, after all, more directly connected in small forums. The counter-argument would be that the defence of prestige, and thereby the risk of ‘egotiation’, is less if the negotiator is not exposed to many colleagues, let alone to public opinion. This is why secret and back-channel negotiations are often the preferred mode. It is also less because it is much easier for negotiators who operate in small groups to influence each other and thereby to put a limit to the tendency to ‘egotiate’. The downside is groupthink. The risk of groupthink is much bigger than in multilateral negotiation processes. Although the number of parties does influence the people, power structure, flow of the process and the product of their work, it remains difficult to link this fully with maximized-party and minimized-party negotiations. After all, talks between two, three, four or five negotiators are essential for progress in multilateral meetings. While we have to characterize the Paris Peace Conference as multilateral, we also saw that in reality it was very much a trilateral process. However, this trilateral negotiation also had multilateral aspects, as advisers in the Inner Circle were quite involved and influential, actors in the Outer Circle did exert some influence, and the constituency back home – as well as public opinion – was part of the overall flow as well. In other words, bi- and trilateral negotiations have a multilateral dimension and multilateral talks are dependent on bi- and trilateral meetings within them. It seems, however, that the essence of the process of international negotiation can only be handled in groups of up to five actors, which we might label as the ‘core caucus’ of the negotiation.

Munich, 1938

The Munich negotiation process can perhaps be termed the mother of catastrophic negotiation processes. It was seen by Western leaders as a huge mistake: Britain and France selling out Czechoslovakia to Adolf Hitler, and thereby opening the road for German hegemony of Eastern Europe up to the borders of the Soviet Union. This is true, although the question remains of what the alternatives would have been. Adolf Hitler himself was not as happy with the outcome of the Munich conference as one would presume:

[ ] er wollte [ ] alles, was ihm vorschwebte, zu seinem Lebzeiten schaffen. Er hatte keine Zeit. Das Münchener Abkommen, in dem Freund und Feind mit Recht einen märchenhaften Triumph Hitlers sahen, empfand er selbst geradezu als Niederlage: Es war nicht nach seinem Willen gegangen, er hatte aus der Hand Englands und Frankreichs entgegennehmen müssen, was er lieber mit Gewalt genommen hätte,
Hitler wanted to implement his ideas during his lifetime. He was in a hurry and he would have preferred to start the war in 1938 but the Munich Agreement prevented this. Hitler felt restrained by the Munich agreement and was taken by surprise by the peace efforts of British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain:

By the summer of 1938, Hitler was convinced that the Czech problem had to be resolved by war: this had become for him a test of personality. At the same time, across the North Sea, a mirror-image situation was developing: for Chamberlain the search for peace had become almost an ego trip’ (Reynolds, 2007: 41).

Chamberlain’s determination to be successful and to save Britain and the world from disaster had its root in his family history. His father, Joseph, was one of the heroes of liberal politics in the nineteenth century, although he never became prime minster. The son wanted to do better than the father and he was ready to take the necessary risks for that, in competition with his half-brother Austin: ‘As the marginal man in this fiercely proud family, Neville would always be less than human if he did not sense a chance to outdo his father and his brother in the battle for reputation. […] He was always measuring himself against his father and brother’ (Reynolds, 2007: 50). In order not to be hindered in his endeavour concerning Adolf Hitler, he ignored his Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, who resigned because he felt by-passed. Chamberlain’s personal mission took off, and nobody could stop him but reality. He began to over-estimate himself and told his sisters: ‘now I have only to raise a finger and the whole face of Europe is changed’. Acknowledging the publication of H.A.L. Fisher’s new History of Europe in March 1938, he replied: ‘At the present moment I am too busy trying to make the history of Europe to read about it’ (Reynolds, 2007: 49).

Without consulting the British Foreign Office, Chamberlain offered to visit Hitler in his residence ‘the Berghof’ on the Obersalzberg above the town of Berchtesgaden, although the German Foreign Ministry had been fully engaged through its Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop from the very first moment. It was an unprecedented step, to go to the wolf’s lair, and Chamberlain did not even take an interpreter with him. Dr Paul Schmidt, interpreter of the German Foreign Ministry, acted as interpreter. This, of course, could and did lead to miscommunications, as Chamberlain could not check on Schmidt’s words. At first he did not even receive a transcript of the minutes made by Schmidt. The talks lasted for one day and were a mere exchange of opinions and arguments. They nevertheless raised expectations of a peaceful solution, as Hitler showed his readiness to discuss the contentious issues in something that looked like a dialogue. As history showed later, however, this dialogue was not for real; nor were the follow-up talks in Bad Godesberg. This second encounter was anyway much grimmer than the first. This time Chamberlain took his First Secretary Ivone Kirkpatrick, who spoke German fluently. Hitler did make some minor concessions, but in reality the British were eaten on the spot and Hitler got what he wanted on the question of the Sudeten Germans. The
meeting did not give any reason for optimism, and ended in an icy atmosphere (Reynolds, 2007: 75–80).

As a next step, Chamberlain proposed a four-power meeting, with the Italians and the French also present. This was very much welcomed by Italy’s Benito Mussolini (known as the Duce), who feared that a German invasion of Czechoslovakia would further upset the balance of power between the Hitler’s Third Reich and Mussolini’s fascist Italy. Hitler thus invited the Duce, Prime Minister of France Édouard Daladier and Chamberlain to come to Munich. This was the third time in a row on German territory, and the Czechs were not invited. At the end of the meeting, Chamberlain and Hitler held a bilateral meeting about the issue of Anglo–German relations in the future, whose resolution was reluctantly undersigned by Hitler. It stated that ‘We are resolved that the method of consultation shall be the method adopted to deal with any other questions that may concern our two countries, and we are determined to continue our efforts to remove possible sources of differences and thus to contribute to assure the peace of Europe’ (Reynolds, 2007: 95). The meetings were prepared amateurishly and in that sense there is not much of a difference from the Paris Conference discussed earlier in this chapter, or for that matter the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815. There were no briefing papers, no position papers, no planning, no strategy and no profiles of the main negotiators – nothing of the kind. In such a situation, the danger of so-called ‘salami tactics’ being used by the other side is immanent. Without overall planning, it is difficult to trace the trade-offs, and one side might walk off with the biggest part of the cake because it got more in every distributive bargaining, precluding integrative win–win outcomes. ‘In short, Hitler was a much more effective negotiator than Chamberlain, but he never wanted to negotiate, whereas Chamberlain, a less skilled tactician, got what he really wanted – peace not war’ (Reynolds, 2007: 99). In other words, Chamberlain’s need for a settlement was much greater than Hitler’s, and by being the demandeur, he had to concede much more than his opponent. Chamberlain never openly regretted his solo tour, but he was entrapped in his own process: ‘this melancholic and “physically broken man” (p. 434) persisted in his stubborn defiance and legendary self-righteousness to the bitter end’ (Bátongy, 2007).

What about the personality and the position of Adolf Hitler? While Chamberlain had a short-term plan of preventing war, Hitler had a long-term strategy: dominating Europe in his lifetime (Reynolds, 2007: 100). In order to do this he had to swallow Austria and Czechoslovakia in a peaceful way in order to be able to attack Poland and thereby dominate the whole of Eastern Europe up to the Soviet border. The final goal was to conquer Russia, but in order to do so, he had to subdue France first in order to overcome the classic German dilemma of a war on two fronts. Britain, it was thought, would then be so isolated that it would have to accept German hegemony over Europe – actually, it would be more apt to say to accept Hitler as the hegemon. For Hitler, the German people were merely tools in his conquest and the fulfilment of his second aim: the destruction of the Jewish people on the European continent. After the German failure to take Moscow, Hitler’s dream of a pan-European Third Reich dominated by the ‘Germanic race’ withered away, leaving him with his second target: to sweep away the ‘Semitic race’. He thought in terms of peoples, not of states. Actually, he destroyed the German state-system, in order not to be bothered by laws and institutions. Everything should circle around ‘der Führer’, and thus the state had to wither away, like in Marxism, but for reasons of
autocracy, not of equality. He was a criminal, political Darwinist, with a complete lack of empathy – unable to make intimate friends among men and women – who did not allow for much of a compromise. His tool was war, not negotiation. Like Chamberlain, he grossly overestimated himself until the bitter end (Haffner, 2011: 13).

Yalta, 1945
While Munich stood at the beginning of the Second World War, Yalta marked the end. This exclusive trilateral negotiation by US President Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR), Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill can be seen as the real closure negotiation of the Second World War. Although the Potsdam Conference in July and August 1945 was the last wartime summit, it did not change the foundations laid in Yalta in February 1945. The leaders’ personalities played a prominent role:

Of the three, Roosevelt probably had the greatest strengths and the least coherent conception of how to utilize them. Roosevelt was […] jaunty, self-possessed, confident, cheerful and capable of inspiring trust and affection. [However,] he held no well-defined or sophisticated world view […] Roosevelt saw himself as a realistic Wilsonian (Buhite, 1986: 11–12).

Moreover,

The President was a ‘feely’ politician, operating on a blend of intuition and experience, and his approach shaped his views of both Hitler and Stalin. FDR knew Germany well, or at least the Kaiser’s Germany before the First World War. Speaking to [US] senators in January 1939, Roosevelt described the German leader as a ‘wild man’, ‘walking up and down the room for hours on end’, ‘pounding the table and making speeches’. ‘We should call him a “nut”’. The contest between Roosevelt and Hitler became very personal, whereas Churchill’s animus was directed at German militarism and autocracy (Reynolds, 2007: 108–109).

This brings us to Churchill:

Churchill’s world view rose from his concern that a single power, regardless of its ideology, might dominate the European continent. [He was] a man of great courage. […] especially his ability to use the language, stood unequalled among his countrymen […] What he possessed in learning and eloquence, he lacked in patience. He would be terribly impressed with his own performance, and then become bored, refuse to hear responses […] A better negotiator than Roosevelt, he was still surprisingly ill prepared. While voluble and emotional, at the same time he was insufficiently persistent. Churchill also suffered bouts of extreme depression, which tended to immobilize him. Many men of great prominence, whose aggressive behavior allows them to perform brilliantly toward opponents, turn their hostility inward once a foe is vanquished or an issue resolved. A man of massive ego […] ‘Of course I am an egotist’, he said to Clement Attlee. ‘Where do you get if you aren’t?’ He had the egotist concept of leadership (Buhite, 1986: 14–16).
As for Stalin, it has been observed that ‘Joseph V. Stalin […] était un homme parvenu par les moyens les plus pervers au sommet de la puissance et n’y ayant pas trouvé ce qu’il en attendait, un homme totalement désabusé’¹ (Laloy, 1988: 15). Moreover,

Stalin’s style was that of recluse. The author of a psychological portrait of Stalin suggests that he was the quintessential paranoid personality. A vain, power-hungry man with a keen sense of his own inferiority, he harbored intense jealousies and a mean, vindictive spirit, […] mastering the art of manipulating people and laying them off against each other for his own benefit (Buhite, 1986: 17).

In addition, ‘Although Stalin had a sharp mind and a prodigious memory, he had always had an inferiority complex about his lack of formal education; he was also deeply xenophobic’ (Reynolds, 2007: 115). ‘His greatest strength in Yalta lay in the Russian contribution to the war effort and the positioning of the Soviet forces’ (Buhite, 1986: 18). It was much more Roosevelt than Churchill who wanted to keep Stalin on board the alliance, also because Roosevelt still believed at Yalta that he needed the Russian war effort in the Pacific to underpin the American struggle against Japan: ‘Yalta est donc l’effort ultime de Roosevelt pour préserver l’entente avec l’URSS’² (Laloy, 1988: 9).

During the meeting, Stalin had the advantage of being on his home front, while Roosevelt in particular had to travel a long way and suffered increasingly from his weak health. Even Churchill arrived worn out by the long war years:

Summitry requires quick wits and mental stamina. Arriving at Yalta, neither Churchill nor Roosevelt seemed to be at their best. Both he and Roosevelt listened intently to Stalin. Churchill watched the Soviet leader even when his words were being translated. […] Conference diplomacy is about resolving differences through an interlocking set of compromises and trade-offs, in which no party gains everything but all get something and concede something. This is what happened at Yalta. Over the first two days, the Big Three brought most of the diplomatic issues to the table. From Wednesday, February 6, the deals began to be made (Reynolds, 2007: 122–125).

The atmosphere seems to have been amicable, but the Soviet leader’s position precluded many of the decisions that were taken. The facts on the ground were decisive, but this did not mean that emotions were absent:

Of the two leaders [Roosevelt and Churchill], Churchill was more hard-line and often highly emotional. The only point when Roosevelt lost his cool was when

¹ Author’s translation: ‘Joseph V. Stalin […] was] a man who had by the most pernicious means reached the summit of power and, not having found there what he was expecting, was a totally disillusioned man’.

² Author’s translation: ‘Yalta is thus Roosevelt’s ultimate effort to preserve the Entente with the USSR’.
Stalin protested about peace feelers made by the German army in Italy to US emissaries in Bern. [...] He was furious – face flushed, eyes flushing (Reynolds, 2007: 150–151).

Roosevelt’s answer to Stalin was, according to Churchill, ‘about the hottest thing I have ever seen so far in diplomatic intercourse’ (Reynolds, 2007: 151). It worked, because Stalin withdrew his complaint: ‘Stalin was indeed a skilful negotiator, letting the others do the talking and saving his succinct remarks for the right moment. Nevertheless, Churchill’s more bombastic approach should not be underrated: it wore down the other two over France and German reparation’ (Reynolds, 2007: 159). Nevertheless, after Yalta his sometimes undiplomatic behaviour pushed him slowly but truly to the sidelines:

When in July 1954 Churchill sent a message to Moscow, without consulting either the President [Eisenhower] or his own Cabinet, suggesting a bilateral ‘friendly Meeting with no agenda’, he was rebuffed by both Malenkov and Eisenhower. From then onwards, the pressure from colleagues for his resignation was never relaxed (Blake, 1998: 99).

During the Cold War

To negotiate during the Cold War was not an easy task. With the threat of nuclear destruction, both the USSR and the United States became increasingly aware of the necessity to start talking, to create a safety net in case of unintended escalation and the danger of unleashing their nuclear arsenals. While it was feasible during the First and Second World Wars to have a victorious party (not to belittle those wars’ disastrous consequences), a Third World War would certainly end in catastrophe for all of the parties concerned: a lose–lose outcome. Negotiation, then, was the only way out. The first case in this section deals with a very difficult, but serious, attempt to bridge the gap between the two superpowers. It failed. The second and the third cases were already more successful and opened the road to the fourth case, which was indeed a success. Although a very precarious and bumpy process, it laid the foundations for the end of the Cold War half a decade later. With this, the chain of events that started with the Balkan Wars at the beginning of the twentieth Century came to an end with the inner-Yugoslav/Balkan War resulting from the implosion of the Federal Socialist Republic of Yugoslavia – one century from a Balkans to Balkans crisis, with negotiation processes trying to prevent, manage and end the use of violence as an instrument in international relations in and around the European continent.

Vienna, 1961

US President John F. Kennedy and Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev were the egos clashing at the summit meeting in Vienna in 1961. Khrushchev appeared to be the dominant figure in their encounters, being much more experienced than Kennedy. Actually, this took Kennedy by surprise and the Soviet leader exploited his situational advantage in a very skilful way by turning the negotiation into an ideological show of force. Khrushchev, from Ukrainian peasant ancestors and lacking serious formal education, appeared to be a
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ruthless negotiator, confirming the stereotypes about Russian bargaining styles (Meerts, 2009c: 4–8):

Khrushchev retained a huge inferiority complex about his lack of education and culture and was always alert to condescension, real or imagined, at home and abroad. Stalin, too, had such a complex, but Khrushchev was not as good at concealing it. Nor, unlike his patron, could Khrushchev control his explosive temper: within seconds he could shift from good humor to foul-mouthed abuse. At their first meeting in Geneva in 1955, the Soviet leader seemed a frankly ‘obscene figure’ to the elegant, urban Macmillan [the UK Prime Minister], who wondered if ‘this fat, vulgar man, with his pig eyes and his ceaseless flow of talk’ could really be the head of a great country’ (Reynolds, 2007: 169).

Khrushchev’s attitude was one of the reasons for his split with Mao Zedong (Reynolds, 2007: 170), and it gave John F. Kennedy a very hard time.

Kennedy, a believer in negotiation as a tool in international relations, also saw the limits of this instrument. His famous saying that one should never negotiate out of fear, but nevertheless never fear to negotiate, is a case in point. Kennedy had a complicated family background. Like Chamberlain, he had to struggle with a dominant father-figure, Joseph Kennedy, and an elder brother who was meant to be a politician but who died at too young an age, while his other brothers were groomed to play an important role in US politics as well. Given the Irish and Roman Catholic background of the family, there were also aspects of emancipation involved, perhaps not as much as in the case of Khrushchev – after all, Kennedy did attend Harvard Law School – but nevertheless. According to Thomas Mongar, ego structures are of two basic types, namely ‘satellizing’ and deviant. ‘Satellizing’ occurs when a child is intrinsically valued, but Mongar adds:

Alternatively, if the child thinks he has been extrinsically valued, he will protect his omnipotent self-image (and) will attempt to increase his capacity to perform to meet the burden of vastly inflated aspirations. Kennedy’s ‘ego profile’ is almost a perfect representation of the deviant structure. Deflation of aspiration was ruled out because of the neurotic pressures for achievement from the family. The only remaining alternative was a massive effort to inflate his performance capacities, which required a strategy of managing the symptoms of his neurosis and turning his weaknesses into competitive assets (Mongar, 1969: 206–208).

Notwithstanding – or perhaps because of his chronic back problems – Kennedy managed to become US President. Mongar gives us one clear example of ‘egotiation’: ‘Kennedy’s value choice in the Cuban missile crisis […] was conceived as an attempt to restore his self-esteem rather than to correct an implausible disequilibrium in the nuclear balance of power’ (Mongar, 1969: 225). Perhaps Mongar is exaggerating, as there were of course many other variables involved and it is difficult, if not impossible, to measure their relative weight, but his insights are nevertheless useful food for thought.

In May 1961, Bobby Kennedy, John’s younger brother, had a preparatory back-channel meeting with Georgi Bolshakov from the Soviet Embassy in Washington DC, a close friend
of Khrushchev's son-in-law. Events then started to roll, partly managed through official diplomatic channels by US Ambassador to the USSR Llewellyn Thompson and his Soviet counterpart Ambassador Mikhail Menshikov, and partly through the aforementioned back-channel, trying to overcome the two main obstacles: Berlin and Vietnam:

Each leader was going with his own list of priorities and with a confidence that, if he played it tough, the other man would come around. Each had fundamental blind spots about his adversary. The world has moved a long way since the days of Hitler and Chamberlain – communications had been transformed and information was much fuller – yet the psychological barriers to summitry were much the same (Reynolds, 2007: 199).

The summit took place in Vienna from 3–4 June 1961. On the first day, Kennedy and Khrushchev met in the residence of the US Ambassador to Austria, surrounded by their staff. They exchanged ideological arguments about communism and capitalism, a debate in which the Soviet leader was much more versed than the President: "the [US] ambassador was shaken that Kennedy seemed to be taking one hit after another from the Soviet leader. In an effort at rational discussion, the president had ended up on the defensive in an ideological argument, even conceding that the Bay of Pigs had been a misjudgment" (Reynolds, 2007: 203). On the second day, they met at the Soviet Embassy in Vienna. No progress was made and emotions rose, for example with Khrushchev's comparison of the death toll of the USSR and the United States during the Second World War. A face-to-face bilateral meeting – with only interpreters present – did not bring any progress.

Beijing and Moscow, 1972
Approximately ten years later, US President Richard Nixon was preparing for summitry with both Chinese leader Mao Zedong and Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev. 'Nixon entered office and was being pressured by the Congress and the media to turn rapidly to arms control negotiations with the Soviets' (Kissinger, 1994: 716). The Americans had learned from Vienna, and they prepared much more thoroughly through back-channel preparatory talks, in which US Security Adviser Henry Kissinger, played a decisive role, a role in which he himself was perfectly aware. In the run-up to the Moscow meeting, the Americans strengthened their position enormously by creating a 'best alternative to a negotiated agreement', the alternative being talks with Beijing before the Moscow summit was due. It was vital that the back-channel talks with the Chinese would not be leaked to the Soviet Union. Kissinger therefore had to act without consulting the US State Department. He flew to Pakistan and from there, in secret and with only a few security men, to Beijing. As in the case of Chamberlain's flight to Berchtesgaden to meet with Hitler in 1938, Kissinger did not take an interpreter with him. Kissinger conferred with Chinese Prime Minister Zhou Enlai for seventeen hours. He was duly impressed by the cultivated Zhou.

As we now know, Zhou was treated by Mao as his round-the-clock diplomatic factotum, forced at times to grovel even more basely than Gromyko did before

They decided that Nixon would fly to Beijing for a meeting with Mao before his summit in Moscow. The Kissinger mission upset the Russians so much that Nixon’s hand in his negotiations with Brezhnev was substantially strengthened – one of the reasons why the Moscow meeting became a success.

Nixon was an unemotional and tough ‘Real Politiker’. Nevertheless, like any other human being, he has an Achilles’ heel: jealousy. As it was in US interests to make the trip to Beijing known to the Soviets, Kissinger talked to the media extensively, taking the credit for the meeting with Zhou Enlai. President Nixon was furious and decided that he would not allow Kissinger the same media attention in the case of Moscow: ‘Still chafing at Kissinger’s self-promotion, Nixon stressed on numerous occasions during the flight that no one else must be in view when he and his wife descend from Air Force One. Just to make sure, a burly Secret Service agent blocked the aisle after they landed’ (Reynolds, 2007: 243). Nixon negotiated with Zhou Enlai and paid a courtesy visit to Mao Zedong. So-called ‘ping-pong diplomacy’ was born. However, as the US State Department was only involved at the very last moment, while Secretary of State William Rogers was kept out of the talks with Zhou Enlai, Kissinger made two serious mistakes. He agreed to a wording in the final communiqué that was detrimental to Taiwan. He therefore had to renegotiate the communiqué, which could have been avoided if China experts had been involved in the drafting. Nixon was not amused.

Such a mistake was made again in the final joint statement after the Moscow meeting with Brezhnev, a few months after Beijing. Kissinger met Brezhnev in Moscow on 21 April 1972. Again, the US State Department had been left in the cold, but it was drawn in a little when Nixon finally flew to Moscow to talk to Brezhnev. The Soviets managed to slot the term ‘peaceful coexistence’ into the final communiqué, an ideological term that Kissinger did not value, as it meant a continued struggle between communism and capitalism and a final victory of the first made possible by the avoidance of war. The Kremlinologists of the US State Department were not allowed to participate in the drafting and so could not correct the text.

US Secretary of State William Rogers felt that Kissinger was ‘deceitful, egotistical, arrogant, and insulting. Kissinger felt that Rogers was vain, uninformed, unable to keep a secret’ (Reynolds, 2007: 246). Moreover,

Shortly thereafter, we got our first taste of Henry Kissinger’s backchannel diplomacy. […] Kissinger had effectively repudiated our initial […] proposals even before we offered them, telling [Soviet Ambassador to the United States] Dobrynin that if the Soviet Union preferred something more limited, he would be happy to entertain it. Knowing in advance the delegation’s proposals were not backed at the top, the Soviets lost nothing by stalling. Weakness at lower levels is not that serious; those positions can be overruled. But weakness at the top leaves no recourse (Nitze, 1989: 309).
Interestingly enough, Kissinger was not very fond of Rogers either, and perhaps he shared this view with Nixon: ‘Nixon said, Rogers was one of the toughest, most cold-eyed, self-centered, and ambitious men he had ever met’ (Kissinger, 1979: 26). Actually, Kissinger blamed the Nixon administration, and thereby Rogers, for sabotaging back-channel negotiations: ‘in the Nixon administration, the bureaucracy developed great skill at both leaking good news prematurely to gain credit and releasing bad news in a way that focused blame on the President’ (Kissinger, 1979: 25).

Dobrynin himself had a more positive vision than Rogers on back-channel diplomacy, although he saw its limitations:

> There are certain requirements for the confidential channel to be effective. It has to be permanently available, and its immediate participants must possess a certain level of diplomatic and political experience and knowledge. Above all, the channel should never be used by any government for the purpose of misinformation. Of course, a diplomatic game is always being played, but deliberate misinformation is always inadmissible, for sooner or later it is going to be disclosed and the channel will lose all its value (Dobrynin, 1995: 94).

This can be summarized as: secrecy to the outside world, but no cheating to the inside world; which is good for the relationship between the negotiators, and bad for their relationship with their colleagues back home.

Kissinger found Brezhnev to be:

> […] very forceful, extremely nervous, highly unsubtle, quite intelligent but not of the class of the other leaders we have met. Brezhnev, as much as Nixon, wanted to portray himself as a political virtuoso and take political credit for the eventual agreement. For his part, Nixon was struck by Brezhnev’s physical presence and sheer ‘animal magnetism’. […] As] Kissinger put it in his memoirs, ‘Given Nixon’s feelings about who should get the credit, I doubt that he would have agreed if we had proposed [to bring the arms control delegations to Moscow to work in conjunction with the summit]. We shall never know because I did not put forward the idea, not uninfluenced by vanity and the desire to control the final negotiation.’ Time magazine had made [Kissinger] and Nixon joint Men of the Year for 1972, much to the president’s fury. Even Kissinger begged the editors not to do it. If Watergate had not exploded, Kissinger might well have been a casualty of Nixon’s jealousy in the second term (Reynolds, 2007: 250, 268, 272 and 277).

Other personalities were involved, of course, such as President Nikolai Podgorny, Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko on the Soviet side, but they did not play a decisive role.

On 22 May 1972, Nixon landed in Moscow for his summit with Brezhnev. They met alone, with interpreters but without Kissinger. Members of both delegations were to be included later. The atmosphere changed from moment to moment, like a rollercoaster, but in the end the two leaders arrived at a common understanding on matters such as the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) and basic principles governing relations
between the two superpowers. Furthermore, they signed six bilateral agreements. Thus, ‘The Moscow meeting was not seen as a contest between victors and losers, but as an understanding from which both sides gained’ (Reynolds, 2007: 274).

Geneva, 1985
‘Reagan believed that relations with the Soviet Union would improve if he could make them share his fear of nuclear Armageddon’ (Kissinger, 1994: 768). In November 1985, Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev and US President Ronald Reagan met in Geneva at a summit where they insulted each other, but also built a unique chemistry between them, as well as between their teams: ‘The emotional outbursts had exposed each man’s deepest convictions to the other and this would never have happened except at the summit’ (Reynolds, 2007: 393). This negotiation in Geneva foreshadowed the end of the Cold War. Ronald Reagan was a Cold War-monger, but he was averse to nuclear weapons and wanted them out of the international security arena. Mikhail Gorbachev needed an end to the arms race with the Americans, as he needed the money for restructuring the Soviet Union and putting an end to its stagnating economy. Moreover, he feared a new arms race because of Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), the so-called ‘Star Wars Program’. Just because Reagan did not believe in mutual assured destruction (MAD), he wanted to build a missile defence system, and this threatened the credibility of the Soviet potential to retaliate in the case of a US nuclear attack (Reynolds, 2007: 346). Both sides therefore had good reasons to negotiate and they did so in Geneva, starting on 19 November 1985 in Fleur d’Eau, where the Americans hosted the first session. The next day they met on the grounds of the Soviet mission. The two leaders had long face-to-face bilateral fireside talks, keeping their delegations at arm length. Although they had grave problems on content, their personal relationship evolved in such a way that they became tenacious about solving the problems between the two superpowers, if not right away, then at least in the future. They cooperated in forcing their delegations to make headway. For example,

[Reagan] concluded that earlier leaders had not accomplished very much. So he suggested, with Gorbachev nodding in agreement, that the two of them should simply say ‘To hell with the past – we’ll do it our way and get something done.’ When an angry [US Secretary of State George] Schultz interrupted coffee to complain that [Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Georgy] Kornienko […] was blocking agreement on parts of the joint statement, Gorbachev said smilingly to Reagan: ‘Let’s put our foot down.’ Each took his delegation aside. In fact the Soviet Leader leaned harder on his staff to sort things out (Reynolds, 2007: 381).

They both saw summitry as a process, not as a one-time event.

Gorbachev came from humble origins, but contrary to Stalin and Khrushchev, he had enjoyed an advanced education. He had, however, experienced traumatic events in his childhood. His grandfather suffered under the Stalinist purges, although he was a good and loyal communist. His father and elder brother were sent to the Front to fight the Nazis, and his brother never returned. Although Gorbachev was a true believer in Marxism–Leninism, he was pragmatic by nature (Gruyter, 1993). It was this attitude that brought him
close to Reagan, who was a pragmatic politician as well, notwithstanding his seemingly ideological conservative utterances. Reagan, with an optimistic view of life, was a team player. He thereby avoided the ‘egotiation’ mechanisms that bedevilled egotist loners such as Nixon and Kissinger. In an analysis of the speeches of Reagan, Walter Weintraub found that:

As indicated by the high ‘we’ score [in his speeches], Reagan is the consummate team player, the chief spokesman for a group that reached consensus on the issues under discussion. Leaders of revolutionary movements use ‘we’ frequently and it’s clear that Reagan sees himself very much as the head of a conservative crusade. He rarely took credit or blame for his administration’s success and failures (Weintraub, 1986: 294).

The personalities of the leaders set a series of summits in motion, melting away the Cold War. It is important to note that the extraordinary understanding between Reagan and Gorbachev was quite exceptional. Reynolds notes that Reagan himself highlighted the importance of their special chemistry in his memoirs:

In Moscow, Gorbachev told Nancy Reagan that he and her husband had ‘a certain chemistry,’ adding: ‘It’s very rare.’ The president agreed, writing in his memoirs: ‘Looking back now, it’s clear there was a chemistry between Gorbachev and me that produced something very close to friendship.’ […] However[,] most leaders find it difficult to disentangle their country’s national interests from their personal political goals. Yet it is essential to intuit these needs and goals, and it is even more vital to understand the other leader as a political animal, rather than merely a newfound ‘friend.’ The ultimate question, more political than diplomatic, is whether the leader feels that in the last resort he can afford to walk away empty-handed from the summit. Summitry is predicated on the idea that better personal relations can yield diplomatic benefits. This makes most leaders reluctant to have an open row at the summit […] Nevertheless[,] lower-level negotiations between specialists are […] essential; they also allow the leader room to repudiate what has been tentatively agreed (Reynolds, 2007: 396 and 429–431).

In Conclusion

This chapter has observed the roles of political leaders in six negotiations around and during three major – mainly European – conflicts: two ‘hot’ wars in the first half of the twentieth century; and one ‘cold’ war in the second half. It focused on the negotiation behaviour of fifteen world leaders: US Presidents Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, John Kennedy, Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan; Soviet leaders Joseph Stalin, Nikita Khrushchev, Leonid Brezhnev and Michael Gorbachev; British Prime Ministers David Lloyd George, Neville Chamberlain and Winston Churchill; as well as French Prime Minister Georges Clemenceau, the German Führer Adolf Hitler and the Chinese Prime Minister Zhou Enlai.
All of these leaders were strong characters, partly steered by the interests of their countries, and partly directed by their own personality and ego. In all of the cases, their personality weighed heavily on the negotiation process and its outcome. The egos of Wilson, Nixon, Stalin, Chamberlain and Hitler often overruled the interests of their country. Wilson was too idealistic and self-centred, caught in his own inflexible ideas. Nixon was a realist, as well as the victim of his narcissistic self-image and jealousy. Stalin was caught in his suspicion of others and the necessity to survive them. Chamberlain, wanting to do better than his father and his brother, entrapped himself in his dealings with Hitler and turned a blind eye to reality. Hitler decided that he alone would rule Germany and Europe, if not the world, during his lifetime, and was ready to sacrifice 60 million people, as well as his own country, in order to reach his two egotistical aims: the destruction of Bolshevism and Judaism (Haffner, 2011).

Roosevelt, Kennedy, Brezhnev, Churchill and Clemenceau tried to balance their ego-system and the defence of their reputation with the interests of the country that they represented. Roosevelt had problems in being an effective negotiator because of his health, like Kennedy, but in order to make reality manageable, he turned a blind eye to Stalin’s cruelty. Kennedy was driven by his will to succeed in spite of his health, and to outmatch his father and brothers. Although he approached international politics in a rational way, he entrapped himself in the Cuba crisis because of his drive to show that he was a strong leader. Brezhnev was a power politician, but his love of luxury made him sensitive to blackmail. Churchill, also a power-broker, was nevertheless propelled by his own ideas, and had difficulties in listening to other opinions. Clemenceau defended the interests of France in a very skilful way, but his hatred of the Germans led to grave consequences for France’s future.

Reagan, Khrushchev, Gorbachev, Lloyd George and Zhou Enlai gave precedence to the interests of their state over their own ego, although this was often a struggle. After all, becoming a world leader means having the incentives to become it, with one of the main drivers of this inner process being self-esteem and a strong ego-system. Reagan, being a realist on the basis of a strong conservative and anti-communist sentiment, was pragmatic enough to deal with his arch-enemy in a constructive way. As a team player, he allowed credit to go to others than only himself. This spirit also allowed for the chemistry between him and Gorbachev. Gorbachev knew that he had to take certain crisis steps in order to avoid the Soviet Union from falling into oblivion and he thereby endangered his reputation at home. Khrushchev helped to save the world from nuclear disaster, swallowing his pride and prejudice. Lloyd George was a pure example of a British pragmatic politician, unbothered by his own ego or his own principles, if any. Zhou Enlai had the same inclination, which made life difficult for him, given the ideological environment in which he had to operate. It did not earn him too many credits from his boss, the great helmsman Mao Zedong.

Each and every negotiating leader described in the paragraphs above had a strong ego, but the impact of their egos on the negotiation process varied. What did not vary, however, were the strong footprints that they each left on the processes and the outcomes of the bilateral and multilateral negotiations in which they were involved. This stamp was stronger at home than abroad. They all had to defend their positions against critics in their constituencies, particularly the democratic leaders, of course, but also those representing
authoritarian and even totalitarian regimes had to take into account potential rivals. They also had to depend on support at home in order to prevent their downfall. They therefore had to work from a position of strength, and this strength had their ego-system as its backbone. How could they convince others if they were in doubt about themselves? Some, like Chamberlain and Kennedy, did doubt themselves – and perhaps this was the case with Hitler and Stalin as well – so they had to compensate for this by acting in an overconfident way. It should be noted here that the ego question is, of course, not the only indicator for their behaviour. Former UK Minister of Foreign Affairs and neurologist David Owen takes us one step further. He explains their behaviour from the angle of mental and physical health (Owen, 2008).

Alfred van Staden wrote that leadership in modern times – and especially in modern democracies – is an increasingly difficult task to fulfil (Van Staden, 2008), one of the reasons being the growing role of the public and social media. As populations become better educated and have the means to voice their concerns, leaders have a problem in forcing their will – and thereby their ego – on national and international politics. Another reason is globalization and the multi-polar system that is on the rise. This will make leadership increasingly uncertain and will therefore hamper leaders’ effectiveness in negotiation. This is because, on the one hand, it is vital for negotiation to flow unseen by public opinion before they are made and the agreement has been reached, and, on the other hand, because of the competition between more and more leaders with relatively small power asymmetry, which complicates the option of drawing negotiation processes to a successful closure. Finally, it is their own representatives who can limit the grip of the leader on the negotiation process and its outcomes:

[...] the agent is able to weaken the principals’ incentives to control in order to promote the successful accomplishment of the delegated task, in casu negotiating an international agreement. An agent who wants to weaken the control incentives of its principals in order to avoid involuntary defection and a loss of face vis-à-vis its negotiation partners at the international level can strategically make use of the mechanisms that are established by the principals to control the agent during the international negotiations’ (Delreux and Kerremans, 2010: 372).

If these trends can be projected into the future, we can expect political leaders to have less influence on negotiation processes and the ensuing agreements. On the negative side, this will lead to less-effective – or no – outcomes as a consequence, but on the positive side it will limit the impact of the leader’s ego on the bargaining process. It will diminish unpredictability and it will stabilize the process. Yet a perfect equilibrium makes it hard to push for results in crisis situations where strong and powerful leaders are the ones who make the difference, who can break the ‘mutual hurting stalemate’ and work towards the ‘enticing opportunity’, even in ‘a soft, stable self-serving stalemate – from which neither party has an incentive to move, the hallmark of intractable conflict’ (Zartman and Anstey, 2012: 5).