

Staff

THE ART OF SUCCESSFUL NEGOTIATION  
IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

A Staff Presentation Delivered  
at the Naval War College  
on 1 December 1953

by  
The Honorable Edward S. Crocker

Gentlemen:

When I was asked to give a talk on the subject I am about to discuss and when I studied carefully the title which was assigned: "The Art of Successful Negotiation on the International Level," I could not but be struck by the childlike and simple faith that inspired the request. That negotiation may well be an art, rather than a science, is an assumption with which I have no wish to quarrel; but if there exists anyone anywhere who feels qualified to reveal the secrets of successful negotiation, I shall be only too delighted to yield the platform to him.

Successful negotiation is, of course, the obvious goal of any negotiator; after all, we can hardly picture anyone undertaking such a task for any other purpose than to benefit himself or his country, if we are speaking about negotiation at the international level. Of course there are occasions when a country or group of countries may be forced into negotiations when the hopes for success--measured by the yardstick of material gain or profit--may be very slim indeed.

Such is almost invariably the case when a country has been defeated in a war and is forced to send representatives to a place of the victor's choosing to negotiate for peace, or when defeated military commanders are forced to accept terms imposed by the winning side for the achievement of an armistice. There are many such examples. Nevertheless, even under the most adverse circumstances one is hard put to it to find an example where there does not remain, even to the side suffering from the most abject defeat, a measure of resources, or of moral strength or other circumstances, that cannot be used for bargaining purposes. In such cases there is obviously an imbalance in which one side holds a preponderance of trading advantage over the other; this makes the task more difficult, to be sure, but account must nevertheless be taken of the resources remaining to the weaker side. Indeed, the very fact that there is any meeting between representatives of both sides at all is prima facie evidence that agreement is at least desirable, if not necessary. The dictionary states that "to negotiate is to hold intercourse or treat with a view to coming to terms on some matter," such as a treaty; or "to procure, induce or arrange for, by negotiation, as to negotiate for peace." If the winning side foresaw no advantage in negotiation, there would of course be no meeting, no negotiation, and it would proceed quite simply to impose its will upon the other side by force. But the use of force itself cannot be employed forever;

it is too great a burden; it is a drain upon manpower, finances, economy and national resources and there comes a time when the advantages initially gained by the use of force become less apparent, and sometimes the continuation of the employment of force becomes intolerable.

It is at this point that the defeated side begins to acquire certain advantages which must inevitably be taken into account--advantages, to be sure, not of their own making, and perhaps to which one might argue they are not entitled; but they are none the less real for that. The simplest example of this may be found in the onus which devolves upon the military victor in seeing that the vanquished are fed, housed, clothed, and governed; these conditions are of course problems which the world has had to face only in comparatively recent years; they are the natural consequences of total war. Things were far simpler in the days when wars were fought between professional groups of fighting men and the issues decided strictly on the fields of battle where the outcome was fairly clear-cut and the winner was acknowledged as such, not only by both sides to the conflict but also by the rest of the world, in its capacity as bystanders. But since modern war today involves the personal well-being and the personal safety of every individual, whether at home or in the front line, the responsibility of mankind to itself and to the existence of its fellow-man renders decisions gained by war less well defined and often leaves issues still unresolved.

In short, the use of military force as an instrument of national policy to achieve national purposes has come to have greatly different implications from those which existed before the present era of Total War. The question now arises whether in the broadest sense the use of military force today is either justified or is indeed to anyone's national advantage excepting as a defensive measure for the purpose of survival. This is not a doctrine of pacificism; it is not a plea for defensive tactics. We all know that defense never won a war and that no country which is not prepared to fight is worthy of existence. Nevertheless, let us consider carefully the fact that at least the military phases of wars are not started by defenders but by aggressors.

To return, however, to my earlier statement that all the advantages--or perhaps I should say all the bargaining assets--are not always and entirely on the side of the victor. We have seen the impracticability of undertaking the permanent occupation of a defeated nation; we have seen the advantages of ridding oneself of this burden at the earliest possible moment. This knowledge, which has been acquired at the cost of such inestimable suffering by the winning side, has not been lost on the losers; therefore, in a sense, and because they have little left to lose, the latter do not have to be so careful nor so skillful in peace negotiations to achieve ends which are in their own self-interest as do the winners, who may be led to impose unsound terms by the temptation of gaining short-lived

benefits. Such temptations are almost always present, in all sorts of negotiations. They are not restricted to agreements having to do with the temporary or permanent cessation of hostilities; they are ever with us, especially on the international level.

One of the most difficult tasks confronting any negotiator is the exercise of true wisdom in assessing his principal's--P A L, that is--his principal's own self-interest. In so doing he may find himself in direct conflict--and often does--with public opinion of his own country inflamed with passion, bitter with defeat or intoxicated with victory. If one is not dealing with matters of peace or war, such public opinion may be swept away by matters of false pride or perhaps misconceptions of what constitutes national honor and the like; considerations that with the passage of time sometimes prove less germane to the problems to be dealt with than seemed to be the case when the terms of agreement were under discussion.

Self-interest is, of course, the only proper yardstick by which a negotiator should be motivated; but self-interest should not be confused with selfish interest, which is in fact its own greatest enemy. Self-interest is only served by an intelligent understanding of the other fellow's point of view and of his self-interest. That is why it is so important for every country to know his neighbor, for every people to

understand all other peoples so far as it is possible. From my experience of living in north, central and southern Europe, in the Far East, in the Middle East, and even for a short period in Latin America, I can say that to know your neighbor is not necessarily to like him--although I have been persuaded that it helps one to do so--but it is almost inevitable that understanding and appreciation of another's way of life, his philosophy, his particular code of ethics does in fact constitute a thoroughly practical lesson in how to deal with others and how to solve problems that may arise between you. Certain things that one person by training and tradition takes for granted, certain beliefs that are held to be basic, certain principles that are accepted as axiomatic, we find to our astonishment are sometimes not so accepted or believed or held by others. This should make the intelligent among us pause and consider.

We need not be shaken in our faith, we should not abandon the heritage of our beliefs; but we should indeed recognize that we would do ourselves a grave disservice by impugning the motives of others who may be as true to their customs and code of behavior as we to ours. It is the belief that the fellow on the other side of the conference table is acting in bad faith--in other words, an impugment of his motives--that breaks up more conferences than any difficulties attendant upon the more ordinary matters of horse-trading.

It is essential to know and to understand the other nation's principles and point of view in order to negotiate intelligently in one's own interest, because the business of coming to terms requires that each side in a negotiation shall gain, or at least retain, something to his own advantage. But it is also important to bear in mind that an advantage to one side should be weighed carefully to determine the extent to which a corresponding disadvantage to the other side results. In cases where such occurs, compensation must be proffered to bring matters back into balance; in other words, it is only commonsense that both parties to a treaty, or a pact, or an agreement should achieve a measure of satisfaction. Only so long as these conditions obtain will it be in the interest of the signatories to maintain and respect it. Treaties are in fact scraps of paper, as Count von Bernstorff once resoundingly said. But lest this bald statement be taken out of context, let me hasten to say that I do not for one moment believe that they should be so; they are, and they should remain, solemn obligations binding upon both parties; and they should be amended as required by the orderly processes of negotiation. Nevertheless treaties, when written, have proven in actual practice to be a little more than a formal statement of the desires and intentions of the signatories at the time they are entered into. As soon as conditions have so altered as to render the terms burdensome or intolerable to one or the other, a treaty must be the subject of discussion and revision.

That brings up a general caveat having to do with the establishment of treaties between nations. Unless they are multilateral agreements of a very general nature, such as the Covenant of the League of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the Atlantic Charter, the Charter of the United Nations, and the like, it is usually desirable that they be limited to a definite period of time; and it is essential that they should have within them applicable provisions for their reaffirmation or revision at a suitable time and when circumstances may require. This last point is important even in agreements of the general kind which are not limited in periods of time. Any civilized nation is prepared to regard itself as bound by the provisions of a treaty, willingly entered into, for a reasonably limited period of time, even though conditions may have changed in such degree as to render the provisions extremely burdensome and even verging on the intolerable. But if there stretch into the future the unalterable bonds of an agreement or of a treaty whose provisions have become unacceptable to either party, and if that pact is not subject to revision, there must inevitably follow a unilateral abrogation by the aggrieved party that not only risks bringing armed conflict into play, but tends to undermine the entire basis of the sanctity of treaties.

The great weakness of the Four-Power and the Nine-Power Pacts of the Pacific, to which among others the United



States and Japan were co-signatories in the early 1920's, was the fact that they were conceived and brought into being in the tendency to believe that they could settle all the Pacific problems for all time. They were thought to codify a permanent settlement; and no provision was made for their being brought up-to-date and into line with the changing circumstances. The result was that when Japan lost her alliance with Great Britain, due largely to our importuning of the British, she found herself in a position of relative isolation and inferiority and one in which she was destined to remain if she continued to be bound by the terms of the treaty that was designed to maintain the 5-5-3 naval ratio. In other words, circumstances had so altered for Japan that the terms of the treaties she entered into willingly in 1921-22 had then become unacceptable to her for reasons that should be obvious. The unpalatable 5-5-3 ratio was tolerated by her only so long as the British Alliance was in force; but when that element was withdrawn, the circumstances under which she signed the treaties of 1921-22 were altered to such a degree that she felt her basic security was involved. And, there being no provision built into the treaty for revision, Japan had no other recourse but that of abrogation.

Such unilateral action is of course highly undesirable and strikes at the very roots of orderly relationships

among civilized nations. And yet it is impossible to lay the blame on one side alone in the example we have just been considering when the very nature and character of the treaty itself was at fault in that it was not flexible enough; it did not contain within itself the necessary applicable provisions for its own amendment. When changing circumstances outside the treaty removed from one of the signatories one of the foundation blocks on which its interests rested, an imbalance in equity was established which the other signatories refused to recognize, and which the treaty itself was unable to deal with through its own terms or machinery.

In a brief glance backwards at the principles involved in arriving at sound international agreements, we may perhaps discover that these three are worthy of consideration: First, that international negotiators should be guided by motives of self-interest in contra-distinction to selfish interest; secondly, that most agreements should be limited either as to objectives or as to periods of time, or both; and, thirdly, that in international relations above all the principles of equity should prevail over purely legal concepts. In the case of the 5-5-3 treaty, it would appear that all these principles were violated.

Another point might also be brought up here. As a matter of general principle it seems scarcely necessary to

emphasize the need for precision and clarity; in fact, it is essential if an agreement is to represent a meeting of the minds on the part of the signatories. The utmost care must be devoted in draughting so that misunderstanding and confusion may not result; this is especially true in treaties or agreements of a specific nature designed to settle boundaries, to bind the signatories to a certain course of action, to limit reciprocal trade, to control illegal traffic, and so on and so forth.

Paradoxically enough, however, circumstances may arise in which adherents to an agreement find their interests are best served by introducing a measure of vagueness or generalities into the text so as to leave a margin of flexibility, a latitude of interpretation, a certain amount of elbow-room, so to speak, that might be used by the signatories to deal with unforeseen conditions which could arise in the future. This freedom of action could then be used to settle matters that might otherwise assume an importance beyond their intrinsic worth if the letter of the law had been spelled out too thoroughly. This flexibility might be the technique to be followed in treaties of the multilateral types dealing with voluntary restrictions on international conduct, such as those I mentioned earlier.

It is, however, absolutely essential that if any

imprecision be introduced into such agreements it must be done deliberately and for effect, and that vagueness or lack of precision should not arise out of the defect of poor draughting. An example of the latter, for instance, is to be found in the Charter of the United Nations. In Article 27, the Russian, French, Chinese and Spanish texts state: (1) "Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote; (2) Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of 7 members; (3) Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of 7 members, including the concurring votes of all the permanent members, etc." The English text, however, omits the vital word "all." It was on the basis of the English text, of course, that we were able to act and took decision on the Korean matter, even though the Russians were not present to vote in the Security Council. However, Article 111 states that the five different language texts are equally authentic, which forms the basis of the Russian claim that the Security Council's decision to act in Korea was illegal, because she herself was not present to vote on it.

Again, in Article 37 it is stated: "If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Art. 36....." etc. However, the Russian text refers not to Art. 36 but to Art. 39, a different thing altogether. Art. 36

provides merely for recommendations for the adjustment of disputes; whereas Art. 39 provides for deciding what measures shall be taken. Whether this discrepancy arises from bad draughting or whether the Russians altered their text deliberately, is open to question.

\* \* \* \* \*

Let us now leave this very brief presentation of some of the principles and tactics which underlie international negotiations and, drawing on my memory, let me recall some of the various types of peoples and nations I have had to deal with over the years. And because these experiences are personal and reflect my own views, I hope that the use of the first person pronoun may be charitably received.

Perhaps the first experience of any consequence that I encountered in the field of international negotiation was when, as Second Secretary and Charge d'Affaires in Sweden in 1932, I was called upon to deal with the consequences following upon the collapse of the Financial Empire of Ivar Kreuger, the Swedish Match King. This story, now some 20 years old, may have faded from the memory of many and may be unfamiliar to others. Kreuger, a soft-spoken and shy Swedish real estate operator, formed a company with his partner, Toll, and became interested in acquiring match monopolies throughout the world for the manufacture and sale of Swedish matches on an exclusive

basis. From the outset this venture proved enormously successful; and with the growing profits he acquired more and more monopolies until he formed a company known as the International Match Company, whose assets, by the end of the 1920's, had reached into the hundreds of millions of dollars. I believe this company was incorporated in the U. S. under the laws of Delaware. American citizens had invested in the stocks and debentures of this company, the Swedish Match Company, and other associated Kreuger & Toll Companies, to the extent of some 350 million dollars; the British had about 300 million and the Swedes themselves, and a scattering of Swiss, Dutch, and other European holdings, accounted for perhaps another 300 million. These are round figures and are not important except to indicate the vast extent of foreign interests involved. And let us recall, somewhat nostalgically, that the dollar stood at 100 cents in those days so, for a comparative understanding of the sums involved, we may multiply by two or three times.

Kreuger soon was in a position to dispose of huge amounts of money and he began to make loans to European and other governments. He loaned some 75 million to France; some 125 million to Germany and about 105 million to Italy. These sums were welcomed by the Governments concerned, were available at reasonable interest rates and were usually secured by

Government bonds of various sorts. All seemed to be going well until the collapse in Vienna of the Austrian Kredit Anstalt and the stock market crash of 1929 in the United States. In a year or two Kreuger was forced to raise loans to keep his vast match empire afloat and, in order to do so, he pledged the foreign government bonds in his possession, until they were all used up. Needing more loans, he then turned to other means, and among them he resorted to forgery in order to create more collateral. It later was discovered that he actually, and with his own hand, forged the signature of the (then) Italian Minister of Finance on supposititious Italian State bonds to the amount of 21 million pounds sterling. In January, 1932, he attempted to raise a loan from J. P. Morgan & Company in New York. Although up to that time not a breath of suspicion had arisen against him or the soundness of his vast operations, nevertheless the firm of J. P. Morgan, employing what was certainly at that time unusual caution, decided to inquire into matters before granting the loan; and in February, 1932, sent lawyers and representatives quietly to Stockholm to make certain enquiries. I remember that when these gentlemen came into my office one morning and asked for the name of a reputable Swedish lawyer of the highest possible standing who was not connected in any way with any of the many Kreuger enterprises, I went over the list and was unable to find one who might be said to be entirely outside the orbit of the great network of

Kreuger interests. Nevertheless, we finally settled on a former Swedish Minister for Foreign Affairs of such eminence that his probity and standing in commercial and juridical circles was beyond reproach. And, with him to help them, these Morgan investigators proceeded to set in motion a train of inquiry that eventually brought to light one of the most fantastic financial tragedies the world had ever seen. Kreuger, in March, committed suicide in despair, but it was a week or more after this before the realization dawned upon an unsuspecting world that it had not suffered the loss of a great and good man and that, far from having created a huge, sound, financial and economic structure, Ivar Kreuger had at some point passed beyond the limits of legally justifiable activities and had finally been driven to downright forgery. If anyone wishes to search the files of the London Times during the first few days after March 12, 1932, he will find that in a moving editorial ~~Ivar Kreuger is eulogized as a very great man who contributed almost immeasurably to European recovery and whose untimely death was greatly mourned.~~ The language and tone employed were those usually reserved for Heads of State or world political figures. Not a breath of suspicion was stirring. But within ten days, revelation followed upon incredible revelation and the enormity of the swindle, hazy at first, slowly came into sharp focus; but before the full force of the circumstances was borne upon the world, the Swedish Government was already



taking steps to protect itself and, to preserve such assets as might remain among the ruins, legislation was introduced into the Riksdag specifically for that purpose. Among such assets was a small item of International Match Company Gold Debentures in the amount of fifty million dollars. Now, these gold debentures were physically held in Kreuger's own bank, the Skandinaviska Kreditaktiebolaget in Stockholm, which acted as a depositary only for the certificates. Neither the Bank nor the Swedish Government held title to these debentures which merely happened, for reasons of convenience, to be on deposit in a Swedish bank; they might just as well have been deposited in Amsterdam, Geneva, or New York. However, the Swedish Government hurriedly introduced legislation to freeze all the assets of the Kreuger enterprises in Sweden, in order to avoid dissipation of assets through panic-dumping on the open market before a full inventory could be made. However, the United States Government, having been informed of this impending legislation by the (then) American Legation in Stockholm, immediately cabled the Charge d'Affaires to protest on the grounds that an exception should be made in the case of the fifty million gold debentures to which the Swedish Government held no title and therefore no right to freeze or otherwise control. I immediately went to the Foreign Office, protested, and was politely informed that as Sweden was a sovereign state she could pass such legislation as she deemed proper in her own

interest and I had to cable Washington the result of my representations. This, of course, was a perfectly proper position for the Swedish Government to take; but feelings were running high in the United States to the effect that American citizens, having been bilked by Kreuger, did not propose to be done out of any of the assets that might remain. And so, upon receiving my first cable describing my polite but firm rebuff, the Department of State sent me another cable--not in language addressed to the Swedish Government--but expressing to me, very clearly and in sharp terms, the indignation that the United States Government felt at the action proposed by the Swedish Government. In other words, we realized that the Swedes were perfectly correct in their position but we were pretty annoyed about it. I remember that when I got the Department's second cable I scratched my head and wondered what I could do further. If I repeated my first request to the Swedes, I would be again politely invited to mind my own business--after all, I was only a second secretary and I could scarcely be expected to impress them too greatly--and yet I had no written communication to deliver from my Government. What to do? I finally hit upon an idea and I asked for an immediate appointment with the Secretary General of the Foreign Office (a position corresponding to the Under-Secretary of State in Washington) and I took a copy of the Department's cable with me. I restated my case and, as expected, was politely told off again. At

that point I said to the Secretary General, "Before I go, I wish you would read this cable I have just received from my Government" and, with that, I handed it to him. He read it and as he began to take in the tone of indignation that ran through it, he showed deep concern. Finally, he put the telegram down and said: "May I have a copy of this?" I shook my head and said I could not leave it with him except under instructions, but that he might wish to read it once more so that he could take careful note of the phraseology. This he proceeded to do and then he stood up, asked me to wait for him, and disappeared into the Office of the Foreign Minister. In a very few moments, he and the Minister came out, asked me to return to the Legation and there wait for a telephone call from them. I left and they disappeared together in the direction of the Riksdag. An hour later I got a 'phone call saying that the proposed legislation had been changed to make an exception not to include the fifty million of gold debentures, and that they hoped I would so inform my Government at once. After cabling this good news, I sat down with a martini and thought back over the situation to see what lessons I might learn from what had happened. First of all, I realized the value of creating an atmosphere of toughness without being tough; that is, I as a U. S. representative could scarcely bluster and threaten, but I was able to convey the sense of indignation and outrage that existed in

Washington merely by showing the Swedish Foreign Office a cable which had been addressed to me that employed some pretty strong language. And it was effective because the Secretary General was estopped from a direct rebuttal to me, personally, for the reason that I had made no direct communication to him or his government. Therefore, no question of face was involved and no positions had been adopted from which retreat or amendment might be difficult or impossible. Discussion had taken place in private and not in public, where a clamor might arise over what the press would undoubtedly call attempted interference in purely domestic matters; no doors were slammed, and this was in line with Ambassador Warren Austin's favorite dictum: "Always leave your adversary room for retreat." And, finally, no direct suggestions had been made; such action as they decided to take was on their own initiative. These have since proven to constitute sound rules for sound behavior in negotiating and I have always kept them in mind. There is a rather wry aftermath to this little story and that is that after we got our way and we had cooled down somewhat, the American Government came to appreciate the wisdom of the Swedish Government's proposed action to freeze all the assets involved and, consequently, of our own accord, we willingly left the gold debentures in the Swedish Bank. Some years later, I believe, these assets were recoverable in practically the full amount, which almost certainly would not have been the case had we taken them out of

Sweden and dumped them in a panic on the open market at a time when confidence had been so badly shaken. Another moral to this tale is that no matter how good one's title to property may be, if assets are physically within the borders of a foreign sovereign state physical control has also been lost.

Different techniques and approaches, of course, have to be employed in dealing with different peoples and countries. In this case we were dealing with a highly civilized friendly country in peace time, whose international morality and ethics were close to our own. Let us see what happens in another country. I was in Japan as First Secretary of Embassy at Tokyo from March, 1934, to June, 1942. One of the things I learned about dealing with the Japanese was that individual relationships with members of the Japanese Government were of little value in getting things done in our interest or in reaching accord or agreement. No Japanese likes to take responsibility; it is the thing he is trained to avoid. So that any attempt to negotiate is invariably frustrated by having the person with whom one may be attempting to deal blandly disclaim his own qualification to agree to anything, except after approval of higher authority. This is not limited to minor officials or individuals of lesser rank. It goes on up through the heads of departments, to Cabinet Ministers, and even the Prime Minister, right up to the Emperor. As tradition never

permitted him to enter into any direct negotiation, we can readily appreciate the sense of frustration that set in when any foreign representative tried to get anything out of the Japanese Government. It is in the Japanese nature fundamentally to avoid taking decisions excepting after consultation. They have, or had at that time, a shadowy, ever-changing, hazy group of high political figures and elder statesmen--nobody ever really knew who they were at any given moment--who met in secret to consult on all decisions of really great importance. These people, whoever they were--and they were always referred to vaguely as "they"--would then undertake to advise the Emperor; and whatever decision "they" had reached, would be taken in the Emperor's name. Decisions taken by the Japanese--even in the most trivial and inconsequential matters--almost invariably were taken on a national basis; that is, on what was conceived to be to the advantage of the nation as a whole. This made for an inflexibility and a ponderousness that often proved most exasperating. They also had other traits that were trying. For instance, it was considered to be impolite for a Japanese to refuse a request outright or to give a flat negative response; therefore, a foreigner had to learn that either a continued silence or an absence of forward motion in response to a request must be considered as a negative, no matter whether on occasion even a flat but prompt refusal might have been more acceptable than mere procrastination.

They also seemed to us to derive the wrong conclusions from certain facts; their logic was quite different from Occidental logic and thought processes. For instance, I recall that one summer when hundreds of foreigners lived at the seashore and commuted by train to Tokyo, some 45 to 65 minutes away, a petition was made to the Imperial Japanese Railway Administration to put extra cars on a certain morning train to relieve the congestion. People couldn't get seats; they had to stand all the way, and it was disagreeable. After due consideration, the authorities said they would grant our request; and so for the next two weeks an extra car was placed on the 8:00 A.M. train from Kamakura to Tokyo. At the end of this period the car was taken off again and, in reply to enquiries, the Railway Administration replied: "Oh, yes, we tried putting on an extra car but we found that the train remained just as crowded as before; so we took it off because it didn't help any!" I also remember on one occasion, late in 1941, when Ambassador Grew was trying to negotiate with the Japanese over the question of our Marines in Shanghai, the Foreign Minister finally at one point in the long discussion said: "Well, how do you expect us to negotiate this question if you refuse to do what we ask?" Nevertheless, in spite of all these difficulties and exasperations and frustrations, there are still certain of the same fundamental rules of behavior to be observed in negotiation with these

people as hold good in the case of the Swedes. The idea is to be extremely careful to see that the question of "face" is not allowed to arise; keep discussions out of the public domain; don't slam the front door without leaving the back door open.

In Portugal, where I was Counselor of the Embassy for a number of years during the war and until 1947, I was engaged in negotiations regarding the use of the Azores for military air bases (and later for commercial planes) and in trying to work out agreements also in other fields. I found out, in dealing with them, personal relationships and friendships were of far greater importance than had been the case in Japan. Nevertheless, the decisions were always made at the highest level--that is, by Dr. Salazar himself, who always had the last word. However, Dr. Salazar would listen to good advice from his subordinates on occasion; and if you could succeed in "selling" the proper official, he would sometimes exert a favorable influence on the Prime Minister's eventual decision. Another thing to be remembered in dealing with countries like Portugal--and I imagine the same applies to Spain--is that the people of countries who have had greatness in past ages are often inclined to live in an aura of that past greatness. Their prestige is of immense importance to them; this may lead to situations where the form becomes more important to them than the substance. It was so during the course of negotiations between the United States and Portugal over the



establishment and use of air bases in the Azores. For thirteen months we were locked in a struggle over details with Dr. Salazar on this vital question, during which time countless additional hours, gasoline, planes, shipping and lives were wasted as we were forced to fly to Suez and the Near East area by way of Brazil, Ascension Island, and across Africa. Nearly all these thirteen months could have been saved if our British allies, who have had a Treaty of Alliance with Portugal since 1374, had cut us in on the deal that they concluded in August, 1943, for the use of Lagens Field on Terceira Island. But we were forced to negotiate a separate agreement, which was not concluded until November of 1944. Several months at least might have been saved if Salazar had not been so insistent upon form, and we had not been so wary of it. The fact is that we in the Embassy often received, off the record, assurances from reliable Portuguese sources that if we would only accept the Portuguese drafting in certain cases we could do about what we wanted when it came to practice--no matter what the written word said. Quite naturally the U. S. Government--that is, the military--were unwilling to accept such informal oral assurances unless backed by the written word, and so the wrangle over details of draughtsmanship continued. On our side, too, there was an instinctive reluctance to commit ourselves to certain requirements unless we were willing and able to carry them out. Such an attitude is commendable, of course, but on

the other hand there are occasions when we seemed to be straining at a gnat. The outstanding example in this respect that I can recall--because I have no notes or records of those tedious and drawn-out talks the Ambassador conducted with Dr. Salazar--was his insistence that Portuguese troops be allowed to be the first to set foot on Timor when it became liberated. Timor had been seized by the Japanese early in the war and the Portuguese were looking forward with intense preoccupation to its liberation and return to them. However, the American negotiators, under instructions from our military, were forbidden to give such a guarantee on the grounds that it was possible Timor might eventually be liberated by the action of the Australians rather than ourselves, and that we could not undertake to commit the Australians! This impasse may have cost us two or three valuable months. How easy it would have been to say "Yes" to Salazar and arrange, if necessary, for a corporal's guard of Portuguese to be set ashore on Timor from an Australian or U. S. ship, or whatever Allied ship eventually drove the Japanese out. The Portuguese pride would have been catered to; it would have looked well in the written agreement; and we would have had the use of the Azores much sooner. That's what I meant earlier in my talk when I suggested that in negotiations it is extremely valuable to have a real understanding of the people you are dealing with--how their minds work; what their hopes, fears and aspirations are, and what their motivations.

We in the Embassy understood why Dr. Salazar put such stress upon what seemed to us a trivial thing; but the military back home in the United States couldn't be expected to understand. They merely saw a stubborn man trying to commit them to something to which they did not want to be committed. Although I was flown back in October, 1944, to go before a Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee on that and other matters, I was not able to move the committee on that particular point. I remember when we were negotiating a Commercial Air Agreement with Portugal after the war that I had to go before the Civil Aeronautics Board to plead that the Portuguese Transatlantic Air Line be given the right to land in Boston. The U. S. Government was very much against that at the time--for reasons never entirely clear to me, but I think it had to do with fear of congestion. At any rate, I finally persuaded the CAB to alter its stand because I was able to explain to them that the Portuguese wanted this written into the agreement almost entirely for reasons of prestige, and that in my opinion it would be a good many years before any Portuguese Air Line would appear to claim its rights. This was seven years ago--and the Line is not yet formed, even on paper! I cannot leave the subject of Portugal without recalling a little anecdote that illustrates the divergences that existed at that time between the minds of one whose basic training was military and one whose basic training was Foreign Service. At the Embassy at

Lisbon we had a two-star General who had been sent over by the Army Air Corps to assist and advise the Ambassador on technical matters concerning the intended air bases in the Azores. At one rather sticky juncture the Embassy received a cable from the Department of State--these cables are always over the Secretary of State's signature--instructing the Ambassador to deliver a certain message to Dr. Salazar. I forget just what the substance of the message was, but it was rather firm in tone and happened to be exactly what the General would have liked to have the Ambassador say. It so happened, however, that before the receipt of the cable certain developments had occurred which would have rendered it unwise to deliver the message to Salazar. The Ambassador called a meeting of his staff and advisors to discuss ways and means. We at once produced a draft of a reply to the Department saying that under the circumstances it was proposed to withhold action on their instructions and pursue other tactics. At this point, the General protested that we had no right to go counter to our instructions. He said: "You have received an order from your Commanding Officer and you must obey it." After a lively and somewhat heated discussion the Ambassador decided to reject the General's strong recommendation and to pursue his own course, much to the General's chagrin. Now I only bring up this incident to support my belief in the great wisdom of having Foreign Service Officers attached to the several military

war colleges, to live and study with their military colleagues, to establish mutual confidence with them, and to exchange points of view. Then when they meet abroad under circumstances such as I have described and have to work together in our common aims and purposes, there will be mutual understanding, appreciation and sympathy of ideas instead of divergence and perhaps friction. The General was entirely right, of course, from the point of view of a military officer whose training and instinct was properly based on obedience to command. No layman would have it otherwise. On the other hand, the Ambassador, who was a skilled negotiator and an experienced Foreign Service Officer, was trained to flexibility; trained to be nimble on his feet, to play it by ear, so to speak. Either characteristic if out of place might lead to disaster; yet it would be absolutely essential in the right place and at the right time.

---

Now let us take a look at the Poles. When it comes to negotiating with any of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain it is axiomatic that the personal traits or national characteristics of the people in those countries--which might ordinarily be a guide to a skillful negotiator in dealing with them--must be disregarded. Anyone who is trusted by the satellite governments to conduct talks or discussions with foreign representatives is sufficiently indoctrinated with the Moscow line, and

trained in Soviet methods, to reduce him to the common denominator of Russian communism. Experience, I hope, has taught us that there is no such thing as true negotiation with Russian communism; you can talk, you can discuss, you can go through the outward form with such people, but it is quite impossible to attain a true meeting of the minds wherein each side understands and appreciates the desires and motives of the other to the end that satisfaction may be mutually achieved. That is, I think, because the cleavage between the two sides is so vast, so fundamental, that there is no real desire to negotiate. Moscow and its puppets understand and yield only to force; they appear never to agree voluntarily to anything. In brief, they are perfect examples of people who are motivated by selfish interest to the detriment, in my opinion, of their own self-interest. At any rate, that's the way it has seemed to me, although I was only behind the Iron Curtain for about a year and a half. It appeared to be impossible even to attempt to come to an understanding with the Moscow-controlled types unless force was either employed or the ability to use it was made so evident to them that they would accept the other alternative rather than suffer compulsion. There is one more basis, perhaps, for "negotiating" with such people and that is on the basis of a fait accompli. If you can get what you want first, and can hold it, there is some chance of getting them to agree to accept the fact--if you want to call that negotiation.

I remember that in Warsaw we bought a building to house the Consulate and the U. S. Information Service office, and then found that one of the floors was tenanted by squatters (living space was at a premium in that city which had been almost 85% physically destroyed). All our protests and representations to the Polish Foreign Office led to no results. We talked of rights, of equity; we brought up the question of reciprocal treatment; saying that if the Poles bought a house in Washington they could have unwanted tenants evicted by legal action. The Poles merely shrugged their shoulders and did nothing. So the Ambassador--a man of direct action and little patience, admirably fitted for at least certain phases of the job in Poland--had the USIS office set up three or four radios and phonographs, with loud speakers directed right at the walls and windows of the squatters' premises, and set them going full blast for twenty-four hours a day. He kept this up for several weeks, and I must say it became a question as to whose nerves would give way first--the Americans in the Consulate or the Polish tenants. He stuck to his guns, however, and in just under a month he had the squatters out of there and the Polish Foreign Office found other quarters for their harassed citizens. Well, I don't believe there is much to be gained by spending any more time on the subject of how to negotiate with Poles--at least the Poles of today--and I'll close with a few remarks about the Arabs.

Of all the countries I have lived in, and the people with whom I have had to deal, I should think that personal relationships count for more in the case of the Arab than anywhere else I know. The Arab is a great individualist; he is tribal by nature. Nationalism as it is known in the modern world is something new to the Bedouin, who for centuries has roamed the desert; lived off the sparse diet it provides; owned little personal property beyond the clothes he wears, the gun and dagger he carries and the horse or camel he rides. He owes allegiance to no one but his elders, his tribe and its chief. National boundaries have been created only comparatively recently in the Arab world, and those boundaries were largely imposed upon him by Europeans and were not always of his own choosing. Even today herdsmen drive their sheep, their cattle and their camels north and south with the seasons, seeking water and grass where it can be found, with little knowledge and utter disregard of national boundary lines. Matters that came up for discussion and settlement in their inter-tribal relationships were always handled by the respective tribal leaders, or sheikhs, and the pattern was set many centuries ago for the conduct of affairs by individuals rather than by groups. The few who were qualified by personality, courage and wisdom took care of the needs of the masses who were inarticulate, unread, and were regarded as younger children in the family are regarded. Rather abruptly--within a matter of 30 or 40 years--these people have been forced



into a pattern of nations and into intimate contact with other nations who have had the advantage of experience in international affairs. The Arab is not unintelligent--quite the contrary; but he is almost wholly without experience in the complex world of the second half of the 20th century. That makes him unsure of himself. He feels insecure and, consequently, he is suspicious--as is quite natural. He feels that he is largely at the mercy of the more sophisticated and is unprotected; therefore, his best defense lies in attempting to assess the character of the person with whom he must deal, to read his mind, to estimate his worth, to probe for his motives. And I must say that the Arab has developed an amazing skill in this art. He is quick to detect insincerity, sham, pretense, hidden motives and the like; it almost seems that he is gifted with a sixth sense in this direction. At any rate my experience there taught me that if you can win the confidence of an Arab, if he really believes that you do not consider yourself his better merely by birth or nationality or reasons that have no bearing on the matter, he will come to trust you, and on that basis you can get a lot out of him. But if the reverse is the case and he detects the slightest indication of pretense or lack of genuineness, you can do nothing with him. He may not reveal his feelings in any other way, though, because the Arab is naturally courteous and dignified and a strict observer of the amenities. So in negotiations with an Arab it is wise to

pick your man with the utmost care to see that he has the qualities which may gain the Arab's respect and friendship--that is of the greatest importance. Then, too, it is equally desirable, if possible, to deal with the right Arab on their side. Often time is lost by dealing with one who is either not in a key position or who is without influence in the proper quarters, or who does not himself have a good character because they, of course, vary in character as do people everywhere. Another characteristic of the Arab is that he is a realist and at the same time a fatalist; this all adds up to a willingness to compromise, and a liking for bargaining and settlement by discussion. This is a trait that should always be kept in mind and one which, if fully understood, can render negotiation in that part of the world a pleasure--turning the matter into a game of skill, thrust and parry, fast footwork, and the exercise of patience and adroitness that brings real satisfaction to the participants.

In looking back over some thirty years of living among and dealing with many and varied peoples, races, religions, codes of ethics and characteristics, I believe the most valuable lesson which has been drawn from this experience is that an understanding of others, an appreciation of their thought processes, and a sympathy with their motivations and the bases from which they spring--coupled with a genuine respect and liking for people--

is extraordinarily helpful in negotiating to the advantage of one's own country. Humility in the sense of according the same respect to your adversary as you do to yourself, firmness in adherence to your own principles and code of ethics, and a recognition of the fact that a lasting agreement can only be achieved where the interests of both parties is in some sort of balance--all these things are essential to the art of international negotiation.