

12-2014

Jeane Kirkpatrick and Neoconservatism: The Intellectual Evolution of a Liberal

Bianca Joy Rowlett
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Citation

Rowlett, B. J. (2014). Jeane Kirkpatrick and Neoconservatism: The Intellectual Evolution of a Liberal. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/2114>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, uarepos@uark.edu.

Jeane Kirkpatrick and Neoconservatism:
The Intellectual Evolution of a Liberal

Jeane Kirkpatrick and Neoconservatism:
The Intellectual Evolution of a Liberal

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in History

By

Bianca Rowlett
Arkansas Tech University
Bachelor of Science in Biology, 2002
University of Arkansas
Master of Arts in History, 2007

December 2014
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Dr. Randall B. Woods
Dissertation Director

Dr. Kathryn Sloan
Committee Member

Dr. Patrick Williams
Committee Member

Abstract

Dr. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, a leading voice in the neoconservative movement, is best known for her articulation of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes that served as the foundation for the Reagan Administration's Latin American policies. Her prominence within the neoconservative movement, her impact on foreign affairs, and her political accomplishments in a masculine environment make her an important historical figure in recent American domestic and diplomatic history. This work explores her transition from liberal democrat to neoconservative by examining her early life and educational background, her publications and critiques of American diplomacy in the 1970s, along with her membership in neoconservative organizations. Moreover, this piece scrutinizes her efficacy as Permanent Ambassador to the United Nations and assesses her impact on American foreign policy throughout her tenure with the Reagan Administration.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to the women in my family, including my recently deceased great-grandmother – Edna Faye Rowlett, my grandmother – Geraldine Rowlett, my mother – Susan Rowlett, my aunt – Brenda Rowlett, and my daughter – Aziza Rowlett. Without their love and support, I could not have come this far in my academic endeavors.

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	1
II. Chapter One.....	7
III. Chapter Two.....	50
IV. Chapter Three.....	100
V. Chapter Four.....	147
VI. Chapter Five.....	198
VII. Conclusions.....	242
VIII. Bibliography.....	255

Introduction

Dr. Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, a political science professor at Georgetown University from 1967 to 2002, was a prominent member of the neoconservative movement of the 1970s and 1980s who became President Ronald Reagan's Permanent Ambassador to the United Nations in 1981, a post she retained until 1985. Kirkpatrick served on Reagan's National Security Council, the National Security Planning Group, was a member of the Presidential Cabinet, and was widely acknowledged to be the expert within the administration on Latin American affairs. Following her resignation as Permanent U.N. Ambassador, Kirkpatrick remained active in governmental matters, serving as a member of the Presidential Commission on Space (1985-1987), the Presidential Blue Ribbon Commission on Nuclear Products (1985-1987), the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (1985-1990), the Defense Policy Review Board (1985-1993), the Commission on Fail Safe and Risk Reduction, Department of Defense (1990-1992), and Chairman of the U.S. Delegation to the U.N. Human Rights Commission (2003). Moreover, the political scientist helped to provide the legal justifications for George W. Bush's war on Iraq. Kirkpatrick also worked for several advocacy groups including the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, the Committee on the Present Danger, the Committee for a Free World, Empower America, the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, Freedom House, the Henry M. Jackson Foundation, U.N. Watch, the Center for a Free Cuba, the Nicaraguan Freedom Fund, and the Cuban-American National Fund, among others. In addition, Kirkpatrick joined the staff of the conservative think-tank, the American Enterprise Institute, where she remained a senior fellow until her death in 2006. Throughout her life, the ambassador published several books and articles, and wrote a syndicated weekly column for the *Los Angeles Times* (1985-1998).

The Georgetown professor is best-known for being a leading voice amongst neoconservatives and for her articulation of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine. The distinctions she drew between right-wing authoritarian and left-wing totalitarian governments served as the rationale behind American support for right-wing dictatorships throughout the Reagan years. Indeed, it was the Kirkpatrick Doctrine that caused Ronald Reagan to recruit the political scientist to be an advisor on foreign affairs for his 1980 presidential campaign. Following his victory, the president made Kirkpatrick the first female ambassador to the United Nations from the United States. She also became the first woman to sit on the National Security Council and the National Security Planning Group.

Her prominence within the neoconservative movement, her political achievements in a male-dominated environment, and the importance of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine in the formulation of the Reagan administration's foreign policies make Jeane Kirkpatrick a significant historical figure in the examination of American domestic politics, gender studies, and Cold War diplomacy. Despite this, the literature devoted to the former U.N. Ambassador remains rather slim and incomplete, in part because her papers are inaccessible at the moment.¹ Works that have referenced her tenure with the Reagan administration focus almost exclusively on her role as mouthpiece for the president and pay little attention to her involvement in policy-making.²

¹ There are only two biographical accounts of her life: Harrison, Pat. *Jeane Kirkpatrick*. Part of the American Women of Achievement Series, (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1991); Collier, Peter. *Political Woman: The Big Little Life of Jeane Kirkpatrick*. (New York: Encounter Books, 2012). Harrison's account is rather brief and was written for a younger audience. Collier's account, though much more thorough, suffers from bias due to his own friendship with the subject. Moreover, perhaps due to his background as a journalist, Collier's work is lacking in primary source research and citations.

² See: Gerson, Allan. *The Kirkpatrick Mission: Diplomacy without Apology* (New York: The Free Press, 1991); Hindell, Keith. "Madame Ambassador: An Appraisal of Jeane J. Kirkpatrick as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, 1981-1985" *Passport*, Vol. 39, Issue 3, January 2009; Finger, Seymour Maxwell. *American Ambassadors at the UN: People, Politics,*

Accounts written by Reagan's staff and foreign policy elite follow suit in their marginalization of Kirkpatrick and their refusal to credit her with the development of diplomatic strategies.³ Works on the rise of neoconservatism relate her transition from liberal Democrat to neoconservative to her disenchantment with the New Left and her foreign policy views; however, most gloss over the details of the political scientist's studies of domestic politics, rendering their accounts incomplete.⁴ Throughout the literature, scant attention is paid to the fact that she broke the gender barrier that had prevented women from attaining the highest diplomatic positions, thus paving the way for Madeleine Albright, Condoleezza Rice, and Hillary Clinton.⁵

and Bureaucracy in Making Foreign Policy (New York: UNITAR, 1992); Fasulo, Linda M. *Representing America: Experiences of US Diplomats at the UN* (New York: Praeger, 1990); Ostrower, Gary B. *The United Nations and the United States* (New York: Twayne Publishers/Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1998). Gerson provides an overview of his experiences working with Kirkpatrick as the U.N.; however, it is not a comprehensive account of the important issues brought up at the international organization during Kirkpatrick's tenure. Hindell, Finger, Fasulo, and Ostrower focus on the ambassador's 'confrontational style' and inexperience.

³ See: Reagan, Ronald. *The Reagan Diaries* (New York: Harper Collins, 2009); Haig, Alexander. *Caveat: Realism, Reagan, and Foreign Policy* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1984); Meese, Edwin. *With Reagan: The Inside Story* (Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1992); Shultz, George P. *Turmoil and Triumph: My Years as Secretary of State* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1993). Reagan often misspells her name, while Haig references complaints made by the ambassador regarding her office, limo, staff, and security detail. Meese states that her UN duties kept her away from the NSC and NSPG which limited her ability to influence policy. Shultz claims she was too ideological and confrontational to be National Security Advisor. In all these accounts, Kirkpatrick is a negligible figure.

⁴ See: Vaïsse, Justin. *Neoconservatism: The Biography of a Movement* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010); Gerson, Mark. *The Neoconservative Vision: From the Cold War to the Culture Wars* (New York: Madison Books, 1996); Ehrman, John. *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1994* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995); Hoeveler, Jr, J. David. *Watch on the Right: Conservative Intellectuals in the Reagan Era* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991). Vaïsse provides the best overall analysis of Kirkpatrick's domestic and foreign policies and their places within the neoconservative movement. Gerson only mentions Kirkpatrick in nine pages of his work, but he relies heavily on her works for his analysis of neoconservatives' foreign policy views. Ehrman and Hoeveler focus on the Kirkpatrick Doctrine and neoconservative foreign policy.

⁵ See: Morin, Ann Miller. *Her Excellency: An Oral History of American Women Ambassadors*. (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995). Morin examines what it is like to be a female

This work will attempt to address such issues in the historical literature by providing a more thorough examination of Jeane Kirkpatrick's life. Chapter One surveys the formative years of her life from childhood to the first years of her marriage. Throughout this period, Kirkpatrick refused to conform to stereotypical gender roles, became a loyal member of the Democratic Party, and received an education in the evils of totalitarianism through her mentor Franz Neumann, his friend Hannah Arendt, and her exposure to first-hand accounts of totalitarianism in Nazi Germany, Soviet Russia, and Red China. The chapter ends with an early articulation of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine as laid out in her first edited work – *The Strategies of Deception*.

Chapter Two focuses on three books published by Kirkpatrick in the 1960s and 1970s: *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society: A Study in Peronist Argentina*, *Political Woman*, and *The New Presidential Elite*. Her dissertation – *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society* – was a study of Argentine politics in the years following the downfall of Juan Perón which Kirkpatrick used to further buttress her distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. In addition, the publication of this work won Kirkpatrick a reputation as an expert in Latin American political systems. In contrast, both *Political Woman* and *The New Presidential Elite* dealt primarily with American domestic politics – the former constituted the first major study of women in politics, while the latter was an analysis of the rise of the New Left within the Democratic Party. These works offer valuable insight into the ambassador's views of feminism and other facets of the New Left's domestic and foreign agendas which pushed her further to the right of the political spectrum.

Chapter Three concentrates on Kirkpatrick's transition into neoconservatism through her membership in neoconservative organizations and her criticism of the Carter Administration's

ambassador in a male-dominated world. Her work places Kirkpatrick at the end of a short line of female ambassadors and diplomats.

foreign policies. In the late 1970s, the political scientist joined several neoconservative groups including the Coalition for a Democratic Majority (CDM), the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), and the American Enterprise Institute (AEI). Kirkpatrick was a founding member of the CDM, an organization dedicated to saving the Democratic Party from the influence of the New Left. She was also a founding member of the CPD, an organization that traced its intellectual origins to Paul Nitze and NSC-68. The CPD criticized détente policies for allowing Soviet expansion and called for increased military spending and action on the part of the U.S. Kirkpatrick joined the AEI, a conservative think-tank, in 1977 as her disenchantment with the Democratic Party grew. In 1979, the Georgetown professor published “Dictatorships and Double Standards” a scathing review of Carter’s foreign policies based on her distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. The chapter concludes with an overview and analysis of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine.

Chapter Four examines Kirkpatrick’s efficacy as United Nations Ambassador by concentrating on various issues discussed in the international body including the Arab-Israeli Conflict, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia, and the occupation of Namibia by South Africa. The chapter also investigates the legitimacy of various criticisms of Kirkpatrick’s performance as ambassador, along with her opinions of the organization and her recommendations for increasing American influence therein.

Chapter Five is devoted to Kirkpatrick’s role in the formulation of the Reagan Administration’s Latin American policies. It begins with an overview of her article “US Security and Latin America” which lays out a blueprint of sorts for successful diplomatic strategies in the region. The administration’s policies – providing aid to the Contras, waging covert operations against the Sandinistas, giving military and economic aid to the government of El Salvador

regardless of the regime's human rights' violations – all squared nicely with Kirkpatrick's prescriptions for containing communism and protecting national security in America's front yard. The chapter concludes with the ambassador's analysis of the significance and intentions of the Reagan Doctrine.

Chapter One: An Education in Totalitarianism

Jeane Kirkpatrick's distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian governments, her assertion that authoritarian regimes were capable of collapsing into approximate democratic states, thus warranting American support, while totalitarian governments were not, and her criticisms of totalitarianism and modern revolutionary liberation movements did not arise out of a vacuum. Rather, the Kirkpatrick Doctrine was the culmination of years of academic study and life experiences. Therefore, in order to properly understand and critique her theories as they were utilized by the Reagan Administration and in the United Nations, one must examine her early life experiences and the various works that influenced the evolution of her thought. This chapter will attempt to do just that through a brief investigation of her childhood, her college years, and early married life, culminating in an analysis of her earlier articulation of the doctrine.

“An American Girlhood”⁶

Jeane Duane Jordan was born on November 19, 1926 to Welcher ‘Fat’ Jordan and Leona Jordan in the small, southwestern town of Duncan, Oklahoma.⁷ Her parents were both natives of Texas. Though born in Texas, Welcher's family moved to Walters, Oklahoma when he was a young boy. There he grew up wrestling with local Native American boys, along with his seven brothers, and developed into an imposing athlete. The University of Oklahoma offered him a football scholarship and he happily accepted the offer, seeing athletics as a means to enable him to study the law. Unfortunately, he broke his leg in a preseason scrimmage and was unable to

⁶ Title is taken from Jeane Kirkpatrick's own account of her younger days. “An American Girlhood” by: Jeane Kirkpatrick, *The Weekly Standard*, Monday, February 5, 2007. Article can also be found at <http://www.aei.org/article/25531> Last accessed: 10/01/12

⁷ Biographical information is taken from Harrison, Pat. *Jeane Kirkpatrick*. Part of the American Women of Achievement Series, (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1991); Collier, Peter. *Political Woman: The Big Little Life of Jeane Kirkpatrick*. (New York: Encounter Books, 2012); and Kirkpatrick, Jeane. “An American Girlhood”.

continue his gridiron career. Without the athletic scholarship, Jordan could not afford college tuition and was forced to drop out and become a laborer in the oil fields. Eventually, through hard work and thrifty living, he worked his way up from laborer to driller to drilling contractor. In 1922, while visiting a friend in Arlington, Texas, Welcher Jordan met Leona Kile. Described by her daughter as “an independent woman in the flapper era”⁸, Leona was temporarily living with her sister while she took shorthand, typing, and bookkeeping courses. Leona and Welcher fell in love and were married in 1923, after which they moved into a rented, two bedroom house in Duncan, Oklahoma.

Duncan was located approximately forty-four miles north of the Oklahoma-Texas border and eighty-one miles southwest of Oklahoma City. The town was founded by William Duncan who took over a trade store in 1879 located near Cow Creek alongside the Chisolm Trail, a cattle-driving route between Texas and Kansas. In 1884, Duncan opened a post office. Soon after, the entrepreneur heard rumors that the Chicago, Rock Island, and Pacific Railway had plans to construct a rail-line through Indian Territory which prompted him to buy land in the area. Through his wife, Sally, a member of the Chickasaw Nation, Duncan was able to claim 500 acres of land, and there he laid out a site for a town. In 1892, the promised railroad line was constructed through Duncan’s land and the town bearing his name was born.⁹

In 1907, Oklahoma received official statehood, and Duncan was made the county seat of Stephens County. By 1909, the town claimed approximately 150 commercial establishments including cotton gins, flour mills, a grist mill, and a farm implements dealer. In 1918, oil wells were opened in southeastern Stephens County and the town began to boom. In 1920, the

⁸ Kirkpatrick, “An American Girlhood”, 3.

⁹ <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia/entries/D/DU005.html>

Last accessed: 10/12/12

population of Duncan stood at 3,463; ten years later, it had more than doubled to 8,363. In response to the economic and population booms, the town leaders “prohibited the construction of shacks and aggressively policed other boomtown activities to ensure that Duncan grew substantively in an orderly, permanent fashion.”¹⁰ During the 1920s, a variety of oil-related industries developed in Duncan, foremost among them being the Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Company founded by Erle P. Halliburton.¹¹ Though Welcher Jordan was acquainted with Halliburton, he worked for various other clients including Carter Oil, a producing company of Standard Oil out of Indiana.¹² In 1922, one year before the Jordans moved to Duncan, the town had its first oil refinery – the Rock Island Refinery.¹³

In 1926, after three years of marriage, Leona Jordan gave birth to the Jordans’ first child. It became apparent to the couple from an early age that their daughter, Jeane, was blessed with an intelligent and inquisitive mind. Jeane could say her alphabet backwards by the age of three, was reading by the age of four, and, by the age of five, she had committed to memory entire passages of a multi-volume set of poems, essays, and stories designed for much older children. Her mother instilled in her daughter a love of reading, and Jeane often lost herself in books for weeks on end. At the age of ten, Jeane managed to save enough of her allowance to buy her first book - a thesaurus. Her interest in literature and learning made her an excellent student who consistently ranked at the top of her class. In addition to her scholastic aptitude, Jeane was musically inclined. At the age of seven she started taking piano lessons and joined the Schubert Music Club, a group of piano students who studied the lives of composers and performed recitals

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Collier, 6.

¹³ <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia/entries/D/DU005.html>

10/12/12

for each other. When she was not engaged in musical or academic pursuits, Jeane spent a lot of time involved in what she described as “unconventional role behavior” or tomboyish activities – collecting arrowheads and feathers, climbing trees, and playing softball and touch football with the neighborhood boys.¹⁴

Though her childhood revolved largely around school, church, music, and play, Jeane’s parents made sure to introduce their daughter to the world of politics – specifically, the Democratic Party. With but two exceptions – Welcher’s father, who in his youth was with both the Populist and Socialist Parties, and Leona’s great-grandfather, who fought on the side of the Union during the Civil War – both of Jeane’s parents came from a long line of Democrats. They were of the Southern yellow dog variety who would vote for any member of the party unless he had been convicted of a felony.¹⁵ According to Jeane, Franklin Delano Roosevelt “cemented the allegiance of everyone in my family to the Democrats;” during the depression, they regarded New Deal programs such as the Rural Electrification Program, the Civilian Conservation Corps, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and Social Security as ‘godsends’ and Roosevelt as a ‘savior’.¹⁶ Family loyalty to the Democratic Party became even more obvious to Jeane when her father informed her that she could bring home a black boy or an Indian boy, but, by God, she had better not bring home a Republican.¹⁷

It was also during her childhood that the Jordans’ daughter became aware of various racial inequalities that existed within her hometown. Despite the Jordan family’s tolerance and acceptance of minorities, Duncan was not well-known for its racial tolerance or commitment to

¹⁴ Kirkpatrick, *An American Girlhood*, 4.

¹⁵ Ibid, 2. This was Jeane’s mother’s modification of the saying “I’d vote for a yellow dog if he was Democrat”.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Collier, *Political Woman*, 8.

social equality. Because the town boasted a large Native American population and was located only twenty miles from a major Indian reservation, Jeane grew up being exposed to Native American culture. She attended school with several Native American children and listening to them speak in their native tongue was her first exposure to foreign language. Jeane found them to be exotic and romantic symbols of a vanishing America, which prompted her to read Indian lore, make bows and arrows and beaded things, and imagine herself as an Indian girl with “shiny black braided hair”.¹⁸ Despite her interest in their customs and culture, Jeane’s friends and playmates were white children. Furthermore, Jeane’s piano teacher, Mrs. Thompson, remained an object of ‘curiosity’ to her students and the local townspeople for having married, and subsequently been abandoned by, an Indian man.¹⁹

Race relations between blacks and whites in Duncan were of a different nature. The Ku Klux Klan had been active in the town harassing both blacks and Catholics, lynching several of the former.²⁰ In her reminiscences of life in Duncan, during the twilight years of her life, Jeane claimed that the races were not segregated in Duncan as blacks lived in white neighborhoods as servants. Moreover, African Americans participated in nearly all aspects of white society and family life, but again, as servants. In contrast to Jeane’s recollections of the lack of racial segregation, there were few blacks living in Duncan, and those who did reside there lived in their own run-down neighborhoods. Furthermore, Oklahoma had instituted Jim Crow laws beginning in the 1890s before the territory became a state. Though segregation was not written directly into the initial Oklahoma state constitution in 1907, due to fears that President Theodore Roosevelt

¹⁸ Kirkpatrick, *An American Girlhood*, 4.

¹⁹ Collier, *Political Woman*, 9.

²⁰ Harrison, *Jeane Kirkpatrick*, 27.

would not approve it, one of the first acts of the new state legislature had been the passage of ‘Senate Bill Number One’.

This measure defined an African American as any person with any black or mixed ancestry (basically, the ‘one drop rule’), banned interracial marriages, and segregated all schools, public facilities, and means of public transportation. In 1915, Oklahoma made history by becoming the first state to segregate public pay telephone booths.²¹ Thus, prejudice against black Americans permeated throughout Duncan society just as it did in other regions of the United States, especially in the South. Such prejudice was built into the local vernacular where “nigger toes” referred to Brazil nuts and a “nigger shooter” referred to a sling-shot.²² To a young girl, these words seemed perfectly ordinary; however, as Jeane matured into adolescence, she began to recognize the derogatory nature of such terms and how segregation and discrimination violated the basic ideals of equality guaranteed by the American constitution.

Jeane’s awareness of the inequalities that existed between the races in American society, along with the history behind them, was heightened by her family’s decision to move to Illinois when she was twelve years old. Though not a state at the time of the Civil War, many residents of Oklahoma, including various Native American groups, had sympathized with, and fought for, the Confederacy. Thus, Jeane had grown up hearing about the nobility of the Confederate cause in the “War of Northern Aggression”. In Illinois, she learned about the Civil War from another perspective. After all, Illinois had been a Union state and the home of President Abraham Lincoln. In fact, the first middle school she attended in Vandalia, Illinois had been a stop on the

²¹ <http://digital.library.okstate.edu/encyclopedia/entries/S/SE006.html>
10/12/12

²² Kirkpatrick, *An American Girlhood*, 4.

Underground Railroad. After spending less than a year in Illinois, Jeane became an ardent fan of Abraham Lincoln and a strong supporter of the Union.²³

Regardless of her newfound sympathy for the Union cause and her recognition of the social and economic inequalities of her hometown, Jeane remained quite fond of Duncan, using it throughout her life as a model when writing about the nature of, and conditions necessary for, democracy. To Jeane, the culture of Duncan, Oklahoma was democratic, egalitarian, and libertarian, all attributes that constituted the basic building blocks of a truly democratic society. Furthermore, Duncan was a ‘frontier town’ with an open, ‘frontier society’. “A frontier society is open in special ways,” Jeane wrote, “It is new – so there was unusual opportunity for individuals to break free of invisible chains and define themselves and make their way.”²⁴ She went on to describe the fluidity of such a society, where nobody was stuck in one role, where anybody could be whatever they wanted to be, and where everyone was welcome. She noted, “The most remarkable fact about American frontier societies, surely, was that people who found themselves in the same area found it natural to govern themselves by democratic means, by getting together, talking things over, choosing leaders, and working together to provide basic community needs.”²⁵ Moreover, the civic culture exemplified within such towns appeared to Jeane as the epitome of the American experience and political philosophy; for it was in these towns where initiative, optimism, determination, and the acceptance of shared responsibility dominated the American mentality. Much later in her life, as she transitioned from liberal Democrat to

²³ Harrison, 29-30.

²⁴ Ibid, 4.

²⁵ Ibid, 4.

neoconservative Republican, Jeane often criticized liberal democrats as embodying the opposite of these truly American traits.²⁶

Jeane's political transformation was far into the future when the family first moved to Vandalia, Illinois in 1938 before settling permanently in Mount Vernon, Illinois in 1940. Jeane described the family's move as one of the two dramatic events that punctuated her childhood, the other being the birth of her baby brother, Jerry, when she was eight. The family's move to Illinois left Jeane inconsolable for a time. Her idyllic life appeared to be at an end and she recalled that she thought she might die.²⁷ Her initial loneliness and unhappiness over moving caused her to spend most of her time in the public library. There she eagerly absorbed the classics – Dickens, Thackeray, Dumas, Jane Austen, and George Eliot – as well as many contemporary authors such as Steinbeck and Hemingway. Jeane continued with her piano lessons, acted in school plays, fell in love with Shakespeare, and edited the high school newspaper. For her senior thesis, she wrote an essay on four novels by George Eliot, a British woman who chose to publish her works under a male pseudonym due to the prejudices of that time.

Jeane had always engaged in activities that were, for the most part, not deemed suitable for girls, hence, perhaps her attraction to the works of Eliot. Her parents had approved of her academic curiosity and were proud of her scholastic achievements, but they expected her to conform to prevailing gender roles after finishing high school which meant marriage and

²⁶ This is most evident in her fiery speech at the 1984 Republican National Convention where she labeled Democrats as members of the 'Blame America First' club who had lost the initiative in the Cold War, the determination to fight the Cold War and stand up to the communist menace, and who were entirely too pessimistic about America's strength and moral role in the world. Furthermore, she accused them of not accepting responsibility for the deterioration and demoralization of society by allowing the rise of the New Left and its 'radical' policies.

²⁷ Ibid, 5.

children. Jeane, however, had other ideas. After graduating at the top of her class, she requested that her parents allow her to go to college. Jeane wanted to attend the University of Chicago, but her parents preferred something less rigorous and more feminine. Thus, it was determined that Jeane would go to Stephens College, a two year women's college in Columbia, Missouri. In the minds of Welcher and Leona, college was only a two year detour before their daughter entered into a normal, domesticated life. Jeane, whose ambitions at that time were to be a spinster teacher, did not share their view.

An Education in Totalitarianism

In 1944, Jeane left home to pursue her studies. Stephens College, the second oldest women's college in the United States, was established in 1833. At the time of Jeane's arrival, Stephens served as both a finishing school, designed to prepare elite women for marriage and social niceties, and as a women's college with a rather progressive curriculum. For example, the college offered communication classes designed to enable women to write effective and clear business and social letters. Stephens also offered a wide variety of science courses including psychology, chemistry, biology, geology, etcetera, but it should be noted that these were geared towards women's needs. For instance, botany classes were designed to help women plant gardens on the grounds of their future homes. Stephens was the first women's college to offer aviation courses, but it also encouraged women to take marriage education, child-study, and clothing courses. In addition to history, economics, international relations, and sociology classes, young women attending Stephens were instructed in hair styling, make-up procedure, and good grooming.²⁸ For these reasons Jeane described Stephens as "an unlikely place for a would-be

²⁸ <http://cdm.sos.mo.gov> This website contains all of the yearbooks from Stephens College dating back to the early 20th century. I have taken course descriptions from its yearbook, the *Stephensophia*, between 1944-1948. 10/10/12

intellectual”; however, eschewing the majority of the finishing school aspects of the college and throwing herself into liberal arts studies, she found much to stimulate her academic curiosities.²⁹

During her two years at Stephens, Jeane devoted herself to the study of literature, history, writing, and philosophy. It was there that Jeane discovered Plato and Aristotle. She read Thomas Hobbes and John Stuart Mill and briefly embraced Utilitarianism. She absorbed Dostoevsky, Virginia Woolf, George Eliot and embraced Modernism. She read Karl Marx and flirted with Socialism. Her exposure to Mary Wollstonecraft, Virginia Woolf, and other writers on the subjugation of women allowed her to articulate more clearly her “vague feeling that the distribution of privileges and power between the sexes was not quite as symmetrical as it should be.”³⁰

As her two years at Stephens began to come to an end, her parents assumed that she would soon return home, living the life of a lady, playing the piano, reading, and helping her mother in the home until she got married. Jeane was determined to continue on with her education, however. Her academic prowess earned her a full scholarship to the University of Chicago. She was also accepted to Barnard College, which was affiliated with Columbia University, and one of the finest women’s colleges in the United States. Jeane opted for the University of Chicago. She was so excited by this opportunity that she could not wait for September classes to begin, and in June she moved to Chicago where she hoped to enroll in summer courses. Unfortunately, everything seemed to go wrong for her. First, there appeared to be no housing available for her near campus. Second, the university lost her student file, and by the time they found it, all of the courses she wanted to enroll in were full. The last straw for Jeane occurred while she was waiting at a bus stop when a group of men grabbed her and

²⁹ Kirkpatrick, *An American Girlhood*, 6; Harrison, *Jeane Kirkpatrick*, 33-34.

³⁰ Kirkpatrick, *An American Girlhood*, 6.

attempted to drag her into the bushes. Jeane screamed which caught the attention of bystanders who scared the attackers away. At that point, she decided that Chicago was not the place for her. So, she spent the rest of the summer of 1946 at home in Illinois before leaving in September for New York City to attend Barnard College.

“New York was the right place to pursue big ideas,” Jeane wrote, “and it was big ideas that I decided to aim for in my life.”³¹ Upon arriving at Barnard, her first task was deciding on a major. Though she had planned to study political philosophy, Jeane decided instead to major in political science reasoning that it would allow her to continue to study both philosophy and history. Furthermore, a degree in political science appeared to her to be quite practical. After all, Jeane needed a degree that might offer her job opportunities after her college education was complete since she had no plans for returning to Mount Vernon and settling into domestic life.³² Accordingly, the young woman threw herself into her studies. In addition to her political science courses, she began taking French classes and soon fell in love with the language and French culture, spending the summer following her junior year enrolled in an intensive language course at McGill University in Montreal.

The two years at Barnard College went by quickly for Jeane and in 1948 she graduated with a Bachelor’s of Arts degree in Political Science. This was quite an accomplishment for during that period only 6% of all women in the United States had a bachelor’s degree and only 23% of American women had completed four years of high school.³³ Because her parents (and most other Americans) believed that she had received more than enough education for a woman, the Jordans expected their daughter to at long last return to Mount Vernon. As usual, Jeane had

³¹ Ibid, 6.

³² Harrison, *Jeane Kirkpatrick*, 38.

³³ Ibid, 41.

other plans. She considered attending law school, but decided instead to enroll in graduate school at Columbia where she would pursue a master's degree in political science.

A major factor in drawing Jeane towards Columbia was the prospect of having Franz Neumann as her advisor. Neumann was a German Jew who had fled to Great Britain following the advent of the Nazi regime in 1933.³⁴ During the Weimar period, Neumann had served as a labor lawyer to the Builders Workers' Union. When he was not involved in a specific case, Neumann delivered lectures at various German universities on business and industrial law. He completed two doctoral degrees, one in Germany where he wrote his dissertation on the relationship between the state and punishment, and the second on the rule of law and the relationship between political theories and the legal system which he completed at the London School of Economics.³⁵ During World War II, Neumann moved to the United States and worked for the Office of Strategic Services. He later served under Justice Robert H. Jackson during the Nuremberg trials and helped author a new constitution for West Germany.³⁶ In 1942, Neumann published his magnum opus, *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism*. Jeane had read this book while attending Barnard and it was this work that prompted her lifelong interest in non-democratic regimes and totalitarianism, an interest that would eventually propel her into the national spotlight as both a public intellectual and a policymaker.

The first class Jeane signed up for at Columbia was a four semester course on German politics taught by Neumann. As a member of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) during the Weimar Era, Neumann was a staunch defender of democratic socialism. In his writings and lectures he identified dual causes for the destruction of the Weimar Republic: the inability of the

³⁴ *Social Democracy and the Rule of Law: Otto Kirchheimer and Franz Neumann*. Edited by: Keith Tribe. (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987).

³⁵ *Ibid*, 17-20.

³⁶ *Ibid*. Collier, *Political Woman*, 23.

socialists and leftist liberals to implement effective social and political reforms, and the inability (or unwillingness) of all the German political parties to defend parliamentary democracy from minority groups bent on its destruction.³⁷ Neumann placed the blame for these problems on extremists from the right – the fascists, authoritarians, conservative clergy, and military – who had no respect for democratic institutions, and on extremists from the left – the Communists (German Communist Party, KPD) – who shared the right’s distaste for liberal political systems.³⁸ Thus, in his view, extremists from both the right and the left collaborated to cause the fall of the Weimar Republic while its supporters passively stood by appeasing them.

Jeane paid close attention to the dangers posed to democracies from both right-wing and left-wing extremists. Her biographer, Peter Collier, notes Jeane recounting how Neumann’s description of life in the late Weimar Republic appalled her, particularly stories about Nazi or Communist groups who took over German towns while the Social Democrats responded by filing law suits. By the time the courts produced a verdict, “the totalitarian party had already consolidated control, killed some people and smashed some things.”³⁹ Further fueling her outrage toward political extremists were the Nazi government files in Neumann’s possession which he allowed her to read. Much of the material contained within the files pertained to the Holocaust, information that Jeane found chilling. “I had led a pretty sheltered life up until then,” she said, “I had little idea of the human capacity for evil. It was a deeply disturbing view that I acquired from these documents and from the sense I was getting of the magnitude of the Holocaust. It changed

³⁷ Tribe, *Social Democracy and the Rule of Law*, 1.

³⁸ Collier, *Political Woman*, 23.

Neumann, Franz. *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1942), 30-31.

³⁹ Collier, *Political Woman*, 24.

me forever.”⁴⁰ Her exposure to the inner workings of the Nazi regime, especially in relation to the “Final Solution”, along with the lessons she absorbed in the classroom about political extremism, only enhanced her desire to learn more about totalitarianism.

Much of her fundamental understanding of the nature of totalitarian regimes came from her advisor’s book – *Behemoth*. From this work, Jeane learned how totalitarian parties took over all legislative and administrative functions of the state, thereby eliminating representative government and democracy.⁴¹ Having eliminated the political power of the people through the disbanding of parliamentary bodies, the totalitarians then proceeded to invest legislative, administrative, judicial, and military power in the hands of the party’s leader. Thus, a totalitarian dictatorship was formed.⁴² Jeane learned that anxiety, periods of civil strife, religious turmoil, and profound social and economic upheavals could cause the “least rational strata of society” to turn to charismatic leaders of totalitarian movements.⁴³ Subsequently, the special, messianic qualities supposedly possessed by the leader were used to foster a continued sense of helplessness and hopelessness amongst the people in order to more easily abolish equality and substitute a hierarchical order upon a previously democratic society.⁴⁴

In *Behemoth*, Jeane read about how totalitarians managed to reorganize a nation’s or people’s society and culture. First, all private organizations and civil institutions which gave the individual an opportunity for ‘spontaneous behavior’ were replaced by totalitarian, authoritarian organizations, the goal of which was to atomize the subordinate population by destroying every

⁴⁰ Ibid, 24-5.

⁴¹ Neumann, *Behemoth*, 51.

⁴² Ibid, 84-85.

⁴³ Ibid, 96.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

autonomous group that mediated between them and the state.⁴⁵ Thus, family, church life, work associations, etc. were all broken down and replaced by large bureaucratic organizations; the greater the size of the organization, the greater its bureaucratic power, and the less important the individual member.⁴⁶ Even leisure time was taken away from the population via ‘Strength Through Joy’ programs which did nothing but glorify work as it enhanced the power of the state. Finally, Jeane learned that propaganda, supplemented by terror, were necessary in order for the totalitarian state to maintain control over the masses⁴⁷.

The knowledge that Jeane collected from her mentor’s writings and lectures on totalitarianism was supplemented by her exposure to other intellectuals who were speaking and writing about this new political phenomenon. One such intellectual who inspired and influenced the aspiring student was Hannah Arendt. Neumann introduced Jeane to Arendt, and together they attended her lectures on totalitarianism.⁴⁸ Arendt was a German Jew who had fled to Paris from Nazi Germany in 1933. In 1941, she migrated to the United States where she became a noted political philosopher, publishing books and essays on totalitarianism, revolution, freedom, authority, and tradition. Two of her major works, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, and *On Revolution*, proved to be instrumental in the development of Jeane’s political theories regarding the nature of modern revolutions and the evils of totalitarianism.

In *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, Arendt expounded upon various characteristics of National Socialism discussed by Neumann in *Behemoth* and applied them to Communism in the Soviet Union. For example, the book described the atomization of society through the abolition of individual freedom, autonomous institutions, and the elimination of human spontaneity, the

⁴⁵ Ibid, 366, 400-402.

⁴⁶ Ibid, 402.

⁴⁷ Ibid, 403-410.

⁴⁸ Collier, *Political Woman*, 24.

qualities of the ‘infallible’ leader of the totalitarian party, and the use of terror and propaganda by both the Soviets and the Nazis. Thus, the book served to reinforce Jeane’s initial understanding of how such regimes functioned, while also supplying her with new information about totalitarianism, all of which she used later to buttress the Kirkpatrick Doctrine. In particular, she learned from Arendt that the goal of totalitarian regimes was global domination.⁴⁹ Though many historians have claimed that the Russians were merely obsessed with defending themselves and that any talk of ‘global domination’ was purely rhetoric, Arendt disagreed. She claimed that having declared itself to be on the side of history and the victor of the war against capitalism, the communist government in the Soviet Union *had* to pursue global domination or it would lose its legitimacy.⁵⁰ Jeane also learned from Arendt that despite the abhorrent nature of totalitarianism and its desire for world domination, many still found it to be appealing, especially totalitarianism in its communist form. Arendt blamed its appeal on the world’s fascination with utopian dreams of universal equality, where wishful thinking about the nature of communism blinded the world to its evil.⁵¹

In addition to her writings about the evils of communist totalitarianism, Arendt also published *On Revolution*. In this book, Arendt focused on the differences between the ‘successful’ American Revolution and the ‘unsuccessful’ French Revolution and concluded that a combination of history and ‘the social question’ determined the course of these and all subsequent revolutions. According to Arendt, “there is nothing more natural than that a revolution should be predetermined by the type of government it overthrows.”⁵² Arendt noted that

⁴⁹ Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966), 392, 460.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 433.

⁵² Arendt, Hannah. *On Revolution*. (New York: Viking Press, 1965), 154.

the American colonists had been living under a constitutional monarchy with limited representative government. Thus, their political history made the transition from limited government to democratic republic relatively easy. On the other hand, the French had lived under an absolute monarchy without representation; therefore, the transition from absolutism to democratic republic was quite problematic.⁵³ The rise of Napoleon and the failure of the revolution, then, were not surprising given French political history.

Arendt, along with her emphasis on the role of a nation's political history, spent much time analyzing 'the social factor' in revolutions. According to her, the American Revolution was fought against the political rule of Great Britain and did not involve any attempts to remake American society by instituting social and economic equality amongst the citizenry. Conversely, the French Revolution's emphasis on equality meant that society would have to be entirely remodeled. This reconstruction of society would have to be brought about through the use of politics. The failure of the new French government to accomplish this – to solve the social problems in France, specifically, its inability to institute social and economic equality – caused the people to turn against the revolution, which resulted in the Republic resorting to state terror in order to maintain its control.⁵⁴ Thus, a comparison can be drawn between the goals of the communists in the Soviet Union and those of the French Revolutionaries of the 18th century. Both desired to remake society in the name of equality, and both utilized an authoritarian, terroristic state to either achieve their goals or repress the emergence of counterrevolution when those goals were not realized. Arendt concluded, perhaps erroneously, that no revolution had

⁵³ Ibid, 154.

⁵⁴ Ibid, 106.

ever solved the ‘social question’ and “liberated men from the predicament of want”, and that all attempts to solve the social question through revolutionary means have led to terror.⁵⁵

The knowledge Jeane gained about totalitarianism and revolution from both Neumann and Arendt constituted the core of what would be known as the Kirkpatrick Doctrine. At the time, however, such readings only served to further arouse her interest in non-democratic governments and totalitarianism. Accordingly, under the direction of Neumann, Jeane wrote her master’s thesis on Oswald Moseley’s British Union of Fascists. She was a hard worker, and by the time she finished her MA degree in 1951, she had already completed nearly all the coursework required for her PhD. She lacked only one seminar course and a dissertation. She had already begun working on her dissertation, an inquiry into the appeal of communism to the French middle classes, but was unable to continue with her studies when her father suddenly cut her off financially.⁵⁶ Welcher believed that his daughter had received more than enough education for a woman and was in danger of becoming a spinster. At this point, Jeane had two options: she could move back to Illinois with her parents or she could get a job. Not surprisingly, she opted for the latter.

Armed with letters of recommendation from her mentor, Jeane left New York for Washington, DC to interview for two positions in the State Department – one with Herbert Marcuse, another European émigré with whom she was familiar from her days in Columbia, and who would later be an intellectual godfather to the New Left, and one with a political science professor, Evron ‘Kirk’ Kirkpatrick. Both interviews went well, but Jeane, who found Marcuse to be a bit off-putting and pompous, chose to accept Kirkpatrick’s offer to become a research

⁵⁵ Ibid, 108.

⁵⁶ Collier, *Political Woman*, 25. Harrison, *Jeane Kirkpatrick*, 43. NOTE: I am still trying to get my hands on her MA thesis.

analyst in the Office of Intelligence Research. Her first assignment was to edit and condense interviews of Russian citizens who had fled from the Soviet Union during World War II.⁵⁷

The interviews Jeane read came from a variety of sources: some had been collected by the Nazis from Russians attempting to flee the Soviet Union during World War II, while others originated from Allied military personnel. No matter the source, each Soviet citizen's description of life in communist Russia left Jeane horrified. The refugees talked about the series of purges, the show trials that were held, the millions who died from enforced famine in the Russian countryside, and the existence of the gulag, all of which served to keep the population in a constant state of terror. Jeane, of course, had heard or read about many of these things, but she had never been exposed to first-hand accounts of life under a communist system. Reading those interviews confirmed her sense that totalitarianism did nothing but create a hell on earth.⁵⁸

Jeane worked for about a year at the Office of Intelligence Research before she won a fellowship to study at the Institute de Science Politique at the University of Paris in France. Some speculation surrounds her rather abrupt decision to move to France. According to one account, Jeane had gotten bored with her work at the State Department and saw the French fellowship as a means to finish her dissertation and PhD.⁵⁹ However, her biographer and friend Peter Collier asserts that she had fallen in love with Evron Kirkpatrick, a much older man who was in the midst of ending his second marriage, a situation from which she wanted to flee.⁶⁰ Whatever the reasons behind her decision to leave, in September of 1952 Jeane boarded the *Ile de France* and set sail for Paris.

⁵⁷ Collier, 37, Harrison, 45.

⁵⁸ Collier, 38.

⁵⁹ Harrison, 46.

⁶⁰ Collier, 40.

When Jeane arrived in Paris, she settled into Reid Hall, an international home for women. Despite the fact that it consistently had heat and hot water in a time when much of Paris was suffering from fuel shortages and a lack of utilities, the young American felt that if she stayed in Reid Hall she would not be able to immerse herself completely in French culture and society. Consequently, she rented a room in an apartment belonging to a French widow on the Rue de Lübeck. A routine soon developed: attending classes at the University of Paris, researching at the Bibliothèque Nationale, shopping in outdoor markets, eating at bistros, and drinking coffee in Parisian cafes.⁶¹ Various activities planned by the French government for the foreign fellows at the University of Paris provided some variety – Jeane went on excursions into the French countryside, met French politicians, and heard lectures from French intellectuals including Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus, two men whose recent falling out was the talk of the town.

The fracture of the friendship between Sartre and Camus had followed the 1951 publication of Camus' work *The Rebel* which Sartre's *Les Temps modernes* had given a rather unfavorable review. Camus took the critique as a personal insult and responded with an angry letter to the paper in which he blasted Sartre's political and philosophical points of view. This was followed by a series of insults and accusations between the two men, at the core of which, was their stance on communism. By 1951, Camus had come to the conclusion that 'communism equals murder' which caused him to reject Marxism-Leninism as a means for the reordering of society. Sartre, on the other hand, while not a member of the Communist Party, viewed the

⁶¹ Harrison, 48-9.

communists as being on the side of history and the best means for bringing social and economic equality to France and the world.⁶²

Between 1946 and 1948, both Camus and Sartre had called for a democratic and transformed Europe that would avoid war and pursue a path between communism and capitalism. By 1950, however, Sartre had decided that this was an unrealistic option, and, as he was committed to socialism and change, he accepted what he viewed to be the reality of the situation, that the best option for social change and progress in Europe was communism.⁶³ Sartre was attracted to Marxism's stress on science and its eschatology, and was convinced that the communists were on the side of history and the working classes. Though Sartre was aware of the violence associated with the rise of communism, especially in the Soviet Union, he still regarded the Soviets as true proletarian leaders who would transform the world into a socialist paradise.⁶⁴ He excused proletarian violence as a justifiable means for countering violence brought about by the capitalists; after all, to make an omelet one must break some eggs. In Sartre's mind, the violence and brutality of Russian communism confirmed how serious they were about creating a new society.⁶⁵ Camus disagreed.

In *The Rebel*, Camus sought to define the difference between a rebel and a revolutionary. According to him, a rebel continually struggled against a power that he viewed as oppressive while maintaining a respect for human life. The rebel was immersed in an 'obscure protest' involving neither systems nor reasons which was limited in scope and only a testimonial.⁶⁶ In

⁶² For an excellent overview of the Camus-Sartre debate, see: Aronson, Ronald. *Camus and Sartre: The Story of a Friendship and the Quarrel that Ended It* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

⁶³ Aronson, *Camus and Sartre*, 106-107.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 71.

⁶⁵ *Ibid*, 71, 129.

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, 115-116.

contrast, the revolutionary, through ‘nihilistic frustration’, sought to transform the world and strove to acquire the power to do so. Revolutionaries, in their zeal for total societal transformation, sought to do too much, which, in part, resulted in their resorting to killing in order to achieve their goals.⁶⁷ Camus deplored such acts of political violence where philosophical systems were utilized in order to justify murder. He described such acts as ‘crimes of logic’. In his mind, communism fit this model, a philosophy in which the initial impulse of the revolutionary for freedom and equality led to murder and totalitarianism.⁶⁸ To him, the creation of a communist world did not justify the liquidation of millions, therefore he rejected ‘Marxist realism’ and violence, maintaining that there were moral values which were independent of history. He insisted that communism was a flawed doctrine based on utopian dreams and the faulty belief that historical dialectics constituted the entire context of the human experience.⁶⁹

According to Collier, Jeane considered herself very fortunate to have arrived in Paris during the midst of the famous intellectual battle royale between Sartre and Camus over communism.⁷⁰ She, along with many other intellectuals, French and foreign, avidly followed their debate in *Les Temps modernes*, as it appeared to represent in microcosm the conflict between the Soviet Union and the West in the burgeoning Cold War. Jeane bought Camus’ work, *The Rebel*, which had inspired the debate between the two men, and read it in French. She attended a lecture sponsored by the University of Paris which featured Camus and was fascinated with what she called his ‘moral voice’. Jeane saw Camus several times in Paris and actually spoke with him on a few occasions. She also attended a Sartre lecture at a Parisian bookstore, and though she

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Ibid, 32,85,122.

⁶⁹ Ibid, 121.

⁷⁰ Collier, 42.

remained impressed with his intellect, she was appalled by what she called his ‘intellectual delirium’ regarding the nature of communism in the Soviet Union.⁷¹

Given Jeane’s educational background, it was not surprising that she supported Camus in his debate with Sartre. She was most impressed with “his suspicion of abstract theory and its friendship with totalitarianism; his elevation of the human dimension over the political one; his focus on the impact of ideas and the personal consequences of ideologies.”⁷² As the Parisian elite increasingly supported Sartre and attacked Camus, Jeane felt as if she were watching “the intellectual equivalent of mob violence.”⁷³ Jeane furiously defended Camus to her French fellows, and in doing so, felt as if she were defending herself and her country. According to her biographer, the Camus-Sartre debate crystallized her view of the evils of totalitarianism and the righteousness of the United States’ role in the Cold War.⁷⁴

During her ten months in Paris Jeane had perfected her French language skills, actively engaged with intellectuals and politicians from all over Europe, acquired a love for French cuisine, and finished the research for her dissertation. Only a couple of instances marred her otherwise heavenly time in France – the return of an illness that a French physician diagnosed as rheumatic fever, a condition which permanently weakened her heart, and the return of Evron Kirkpatrick into her life. Evron had written her letters throughout her stay in France, and Jeane considered remaining in France indefinitely in order to “outrun the moral issue Kirk represented.”⁷⁵ The issues surrounding her feelings for her former employer, however, could not

⁷¹ Harrison, 50. Collier, 42-5. According to Collier, Jeane found Camus ‘mesmerizing’ and ‘had a soft spot for Mediterranean types’.

⁷² Collier, 45.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Ibid, 42, 45. Jeane equated Reaganism with Camus’ theories on the danger and evil of communism.

⁷⁵ Collier, 47.

be avoided. Near the end of her fellowship, Evron arrived in Paris determined to woo Jeane. His efforts were successful and the two of them sailed home together as a couple to the United States in the fall of 1953.

Life After Paris

Upon arriving back in Washington, Jeane felt it would be improper to return to work for Evron Kirkpatrick, so she got a job working for the Economic Cooperation Association. There she aided in the writing and publication of a book detailing the successes of the Marshall Plan. Jeane wrote several chapters of the book which dealt with the political aspects of the massive aid scheme, but when the book, *The Marshall Plan and Its Meaning*, was finally published, she was given no credit. Angry, Jeane blamed this omission on “prejudice against women.”⁷⁶ This experience made her determined to get back to work on her dissertation and finish her doctoral degree. Unfortunately, her mentor, Franz Neumann, was killed in a car accident in 1954 while on a vacation in the Swiss Alps. Neumann’s death took its toll on Jeane both personally and academically, for in addition to grieving for the loss of her mentor and friend, Jeane was informed by Columbia University that no other member of the political science department was qualified to guide her dissertation. As none of the faculty members were well-versed in French intellectual and political theory, she would have to change her dissertation topic and start her research anew. Momentarily overwhelmed, she decided to postpone her doctoral work and look for another job.

Jeane soon got a job at the Human Resources Research Organization at George Washington University transcribing interviews with communist Chinese soldiers who had been taken as prisoners of war in Korea and subsequently refused repatriation. The project, known as

⁷⁶ Collier, 48. Harrison, 53.

“Project Tick”, was underwritten by the Defense Department and run by University of Chicago psychologists and sociologists as part of an effort to understand what was going on behind the bamboo curtain.⁷⁷ The interviews reminded Jeane of the Nazi files that Neumann had allowed her to read at Columbia along with the testimonials of Soviet citizens that she had read while working at the Office of Intelligence Research. Thus, for the third time in a few short years, Jeane was again exposed to the impact that totalitarianism had on individual citizens.

The psychological aspects of totalitarianism – the methods used to break down individuals in order to create politically compliant zombies – she found quite intriguing. “It was perversely fascinating,” she wrote, “to watch through these interviews as a version of the New Man was created by the slow drumbeat of daily psychological violence.”⁷⁸ Jeane read about doctors who were told they could no longer practice medicine, engineers who were forced to build bridges that they knew would collapse, and families who were forcibly separated and commanded to denounce each other. All of this she viewed as ‘systematic violations of the human being’. “I became convinced,” Jeane noted, “that a diabolical vision of the public good is the greatest horror and the source of the greatest evil in modern times.”⁷⁹

When she was not engrossed in researching the real-life Orwellian nightmare that was communism, Jeane continued to date Evron and in 1954 he proposed. Jeane was then forced to inform her parents of her decision to get married. The Jordans were somewhat uneasy about the match at first; after all, Evron was sixteen years older than Jeane, with three children, two of which were still living, from two previous marriages. However, Jeane’s parents had long wanted her to get married and settle into domestic life so Welcher informed his daughter that he would

⁷⁷ Collier, 49. Harrison, 54-56.

⁷⁸ Collier, 50.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

rather her be married to a man paying alimony and child support than be a spinster.⁸⁰ He, Leona, and Jeane's brother, Jerry, came to Washington over Christmas of 1954 and gave their blessing to the marriage. On February 22, 1955, Jeane and Evron were married in her parents' living room in Mount Vernon, Illinois. The next day they left Illinois for their honeymoon which they spent at the annual convention of the American Political Science Association at Northwestern University.⁸¹

In his biography of Jeane, Collier describes Evron as "the Pygmalion who would intellectually sculpt" Jeane in a way that brought her fully to life.⁸² And, in fact, many of her friends noted that Evron always pushed her hard to achieve academically, and as he got older, he increasingly urged her specifically to embrace the role of public intellectual. As her husband, the father of her children, and her intellectual companion Kirkpatrick's support and influence on Jeane became central to her life.

Evron Maurice Kirkpatrick, known to his friends and family as 'Kirk', had been born in 1912 in Indiana. His parents divorced when he was four years old and Evron lived with his mother. Shortly thereafter, his mother married a divorced man who had a daughter named Doris. Though his mother was uneducated, she saw education as a means for her son to get ahead, so she saved money to buy her son books and encouraged him to excel in school. At the age of sixteen, Evron graduated high school and left home to attend college at the University of Illinois at Champaign. Within four years, he had finished both his Bachelor's and Master's degrees in political science. In 1932, he accepted a scholarship to Yale where he received his doctoral

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Collier, 51. Harrison, 57. Though most would consider a honeymoon at a political science convention to be quite un-romantic, Jeane and Kirk thought otherwise. After all, they were both intellectuals in the same field, and attending a convention with their academic peers during their honeymoon seemed to them to be a fine way to begin their marriage.

⁸² Collier, 26.

degree after two years.⁸³ While at Yale, Evron was recruited by the political science department at the University of Minnesota.

In between finishing his master's degree at the University of Illinois and starting his doctoral studies at Yale, Evron was forced into marriage. His mother and step-father accused him of impregnating his step-sister, Doris, and a shotgun wedding was performed. Though Doris was not pregnant at the time of their wedding, she and 'Kirk' had two children together after they moved to Minnesota – a son named Thomas and a daughter named Mary.⁸⁴ Their marriage had problems, specifically his infidelity and her lack of education, and in 1949 they divorced. In 1950, Evron met Evelyn Petersen, a journalist who later became the first female editor of *National Geographic*, and the daughter of a former Minnesota governor. The political science professor found her to be both physically and intellectually attractive and Evelyn soon became pregnant. The couple married in 1951. Shortly after their marriage, Evelyn gave birth to a daughter – Anna. Meanwhile, tragedy struck as Evron's son from his first marriage, Thomas, died in a car accident at the age of 16. By the time of Anna's birth and Thomas' death, Evron and Evelyn's marriage was already on the rocks and divorce proceedings soon followed.⁸⁵ It was during this time that Evron Kirkpatrick and Jeane Jordan first met.

Though Jeane met Kirkpatrick when his personal life was in disarray, his professional life was flourishing. During his time in Minnesota, Evron – a New Dealer and loyal member of the Democratic Party – founded and headed Minnesota's first chapter of the American Federation of Teachers. He had also published a book entitled *The People, Politics, and the Politician* with other big names in his field including V.O. Key, Stuart Chase, Harold Laski, and Charles Beard.

⁸³ Collier, 27-29.

⁸⁴ Ibid, 29.

⁸⁵ Ibid, 39.

In the 1940s, Kirkpatrick, a fervent anti-communist, worked to rid the Minnesota Farmer Labor Party from communist influence in order to unite it with the Democratic Party in the state. In addition to his teaching, writing, and political activities, he mentored the politician and future Vice President of the United States – Hubert Humphrey. Evron helped his mentee to get a job at LSU, supported his efforts to become mayor of Minneapolis, and later backed Humphrey’s senatorial and presidential candidacies. Kirkpatrick and Humphrey became life-long friends, and along with Eugene McCarthy (future Senator) and Orville Freeman (future governor of Minnesota) they formed a tight-knit social circle known as the ‘Minnesota Mafia’.⁸⁶

For several years, Evron’s life revolved around his teaching and political activities in Minnesota. This all changed, however, with U.S. entry into World War II. Following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, he attempted to join the military, but due to a hearing impairment, he was turned down. Subsequently, he volunteered to serve in the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) as a specialist in politics and political systems. During his time at the OSS, he became friends with the organization’s head, William Donovan.⁸⁷ When the war ended, Evron moved back to Minnesota, but by this time, public service was in his blood. Consequently, he wrote a memorandum proposing that the government continue to maintain contacts with academics whose work might be useful to the government in restructuring the postwar world. Several months later the professor received a call from the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, requesting that he return to Washington and work for the State Department. In 1947, Evron moved back to Washington and became the deputy director of the Office of Intelligence Research, later known as the Office of Research and Intelligence. From this position, and later from his position as director of the Office of External Research, Kirkpatrick forged ties between

⁸⁶ Ibid, 29-33.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

leading intellectuals and the State Department, while coordinating the intelligence community's uses of scholars and research institutions such as RAND – a research and development organization that started as a research project under the U.S. Air Force.⁸⁸

Shortly after Jeane and Evron's marriage, he published a book entitled *Target: The World: Communist Propaganda Activities in 1955*.⁸⁹ The following year he edited its sequel, *Year of Crisis*. Both of these works were intended to alert the American population to the supposed propaganda advantage enjoyed by the Soviet Union during the early years of the Cold War. The books discussed the organization and direction of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, the various propaganda themes utilized by the party, communist-dominated international front groups, and propaganda activities in several areas of the world. Though the books were associated with the United States Information Agency and published by a private company, the information in them came from the Office of Research and Intelligence which was associated with the Central Intelligence Agency.⁹⁰

⁸⁸ Collier, 36.

To learn more about RAND quickly, see www.rand.org. According to Collier, part of Kirkpatrick's job was to recruit European and Russian intellectuals and politicians and place them in American universities, defense and state department positions, etc in order to gain insight into the USSR and the situation in Eastern Europe. It has been asserted that they helped the intelligence service recruit former Nazis.

⁸⁹ Kirkpatrick, Evron. *Target: The World: Communist Propaganda Activities in 1955*. Prepared by the Office of Research and Intelligence, United States Information Agency (NY: Macmillan Company, 1956).

⁹⁰ Henry Loomis, Director of the Office of Research and Intelligence, claimed that the CIA's association with the books was intentionally left out in order to increase the effectiveness of them. National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD, CREST files, CIA-RDP80B21676R001000200030-8, ER 9-8558. The letter from Loomis to the Deputy Director of the CIA goes as follows: "Dear General Cabell: I am sending you a copy of *Year of Crisis*, a comprehensive study of world-wide Communist propaganda activities in 1956. This book, although published without attribution to this agency, in order to increase its effectiveness abroad, is actually the third volume produced annually by our Office of Research and Intelligence. Mr. Evron Kirkpatrick of the American Political Science Association sponsored the book as editor."

Evron Kirkpatrick began his book by describing communism as the official ideology of a movement totalitarian in nature, international in its scope, and global in its aspirations. He asserted that unlike traditional dictators, communist leaders have not been content with launching political revolutions and achieving power. Instead, the communists sought to impose a cultural revolution from above.⁹¹ Due to the communists' emphasis on cultural revolution, he warned, Americans must pay more attention to the ever mounting communist cultural offensive, i.e. propaganda, of the Soviet Union. According to him, the United States had been forced into a propaganda battle, a battle that the free world must win due to goal of global domination by the communists⁹².

Like a number of liberal intellectuals of the time, Evron Kirkpatrick likened communism to fascism, and labeled them both as totalitarian systems. Similar to the Nazis, the Soviets seized monopoly control over the mass media and communications networks, demanded conformity to an official ideology that dominated all aspects of life, monopolized political power, and organized an oppressive secret police which operated through terror. Both totalitarian regimes exterminated or incarcerated all political opponents, attempted through military or political campaigns to subvert or capture the governments of neighboring countries, and used propaganda to help them achieve their goals of global domination.⁹³ The last characteristic of the communist totalitarian system described by Kirkpatrick – the use of propaganda in order to facilitate world domination – constituted the primary theme of the book.

According to Kirkpatrick, the communists used propaganda to hide from the world their ultimate goal of domination. When they joined “United Front” parties or organizations, it was

⁹¹ Kirkpatrick, Evron. *Target: The World*, xiii-xiv.

⁹² *Ibid*, xix.

⁹³ *Ibid*, xiv-xv.

only to lend to themselves legitimacy in the eyes of the world. Furthermore, the communists saw joining with other political parties as only a temporary necessity, a means to gain some of their goals immediately, while waiting to consolidate total control later on.⁹⁴The political scientist maintained that their goals were to divide and conquer, to cause confusion among allies in the West, and to use colonialism, a salient issue in the 1950s, to make the Western nations, along with their political and economic systems, appear unappealing to the Third World.⁹⁵All of this, he claimed, was evident in their propaganda. For example, Kirkpatrick asserted that the Soviet adoption of a ‘soft line’ approach in 1955, their embracing of the ‘Spirit of Geneva’ where the Soviet Union touted itself as the promoter of world peace, was merely a propaganda tactic designed to make the Soviets appear conciliatory.⁹⁶Moreover, he believed that Soviet opposition to the proliferation of nuclear weapons was nothing more than a ploy to distract the West from the Soviet nuclear build-up.⁹⁷Finally, the offering of economic aid to developing nations by the Soviets, accompanied by with anti-colonial propaganda, was merely a means of ensuring the economic dependence of the Third World on the Soviet Union and the communist bloc, a dependence that would eventually facilitate a communist take-over of those states.⁹⁸ In short, Kirkpatrick firmly believed that the Soviet Union and all communists were extremely duplicitous, thoroughly untrustworthy, and bent on world domination.

At the time that *Target: The World* was published, Evron and Jeane were settling into married life. Following their honeymoon, the Kirkpatricks moved into a house in the Georgetown area of Washington, DC where Jeane continued working for George Washington

⁹⁴ Ibid, 6-7.

⁹⁵ Ibid, 11.

⁹⁶ Ibid, 43.

⁹⁷ Ibid, 313-318.

⁹⁸ Ibid, 210.

University while Evron took on the Executive Directorship of the American Political Science Association. Outside of their work, the Kirkpatricks were at the center of a busy social network that included members of the Minnesota Mafia, such as Hubert Humphrey and Eugene McCarthy, and others of a similar political and academic pedigree. Members of the Kirkpatrick's social circle in the 1950s and 1960s were committed Cold Warriors and over the years several transitioned into neoconservatism.

One such person was Ernest Lefever, the husband of Margaret Briggs, an old college friend of Jeane's from her days at Stephens. Lefever was a professor, a minister, and the founder of the Ethics and Public Policy Center.⁹⁹ In 1957, he published his first major work, *Ethics and United States Foreign Policy*. This was followed over the years by several books that covered a wide range of topics, including United Nations policy in the Congo, arms control, violence and revolution, and the impact of television on national defense. These works were supported by the Ethics and Public Policy Center, the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research, and the Brookings Institution.

Max Kampelman was another member of the Kirkpatrick's social circle. Kampelman met Hubert Humphrey and Evron Kirkpatrick at the University of Minnesota during World War II. A pacifist at the time, he went to the University in order to take part in a 'starvation project' that studied the effects of malnutrition in order to treat American prisoners of war upon their release

⁹⁹<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/05/us/politics/05lefever.html>
10/09/12

Though he was rejected by the U.S. Senate as Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights in 1981 due to his controversial views, Lefever served as an advisor on counterterrorism to the Secretary of State from 1981 to 1983. According to the *New York Times*, Lefever was, like Kirkpatrick, a hardline anti-communist who excused violence associated with right-wing dictatorships.

from Japanese camps.¹⁰⁰ While in Minnesota, Kampelman, already an established attorney, decided to get a PhD in political science. In later years, he worked for Hubert Humphrey while he was in the Senate, turned his back on pacifism, at least when it came to the totalitarian menace of communism, and was recruited by Ronald Reagan to head delegations to both the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (1981-1983) and the Negotiations on Nuclear and Space Arms in Geneva (1985-1989).¹⁰¹

Other members of the group included Howard Penniman, Willmoore Kendall, Sidney Hook, Freda Utley, and Hede Massing. Penniman was a political science professor, associated with the American Enterprise Institute, who published numerous studies on elections and electoral politics in nations around the world. Willmoore Kendall was a political science professor who had worked for the OSS, the CIA, and in the Office of Research and Intelligence.¹⁰² Kendall, a former communist, became a mentor to William F. Buckley, Jr. during his years at Yale and was the only ‘conservative’ member of the Kirkpatrick circle. Sidney Hook, also a former communist, was a professor of philosophy at New York University who became a well-known public intellectual, publishing numerous books, articles, and editorials until his death in 1989.

Freda Utley was introduced to the Kirkpatricks through Hook. Utley was a well-educated British woman who had joined the communist party in the late 1920s. She married a Russian communist, and the two of them lived in the Soviet Union from 1930 until his arrest and subsequent imprisonment in the gulag in 1936. Utley fled from the Soviet Union after her husband’s disappearance, going first to Great Britain then to the U.S. The former communist

¹⁰⁰ Ibid, 35.

¹⁰¹ <http://www.loc.gov/about/awardshonors/livinglegends/bio/kampelmanm.html> 10/9/12

¹⁰² <https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/kent-csi/vol35no2/pdf/v35i2a06p.pdf> 10/12/12

published several works on Japan, China, and the Soviet Union and became an outspoken opponent of communism and the Soviet Union.¹⁰³ Hede Massing, the former Austrian actress-turned-communist spy who testified against Alger Hiss, was introduced into the Kirkpatricks' circle by Hook.

The members of the Kirkpatricks' social circle kept Jeane intellectually stimulated and politically active; however, she soon had to divert her attention to more pressing, domestic concerns. Shortly after her marriage, Jeane became pregnant and on July 17, 1956, she gave birth to her first son – Douglas. Jeane had planned on returning to work shortly after the baby's arrival, but she soon changed her mind. "I think any woman who voluntarily deals herself out of motherhood," she said, "is making a terrible mistake."¹⁰⁴ Despite such sentiments, Jeane also believed that women should not give up their careers entirely, noting "If a woman declines to develop her intellectual, aesthetic or professional skills, she also is dealing herself out of major life experiences. Why should anybody voluntarily truncate her life in such a fashion? My motto is 'refuse to choose'."¹⁰⁵ During the next several years Jeane was both a full-time mother, giving birth to two additional children, sons John and Stuart, and a part-time academic, taking on freelance work as a research associate at Amherst College.¹⁰⁶ Her research at Amherst revolved around communism in the government and was supported by a private party, the Fund for the Republic, an organization sponsored by the Ford Foundation.¹⁰⁷

Following the birth of their third son, the Kirkpatrick family bought a home in Bethesda, Maryland where Jeane continued to pick up freelance research work. In between raising her

¹⁰³ http://findingaids.stanford.edu/xtf/view?docId=ead/hoover/reg_218.xml;chunk.id=bioghist-1.7.4;brand=default 10/11/12

¹⁰⁴ Harrison, 58.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, 58.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid, 58, Collier, 60.

children, doing housework, and researching, Jeane still managed to remain active in political affairs. In 1960, she and her husband campaigned for Hubert Humphrey in his run for the 1960 Democratic Presidential nomination. Early in the primary season, Evron encouraged his wife to write a pro-Humphrey article about the Wisconsin primary. The article, published in the *New Republic* on April 15, 1960, pointed out that northern, urban African Americans, a strong voting bloc for the Democrats, tended to favor Humphrey over John F. Kennedy. Much to the Kirkpatricks' chagrin, Kennedy's popularity within the party increased throughout the primary season, and Humphrey was forced to drop out of the race. Nonetheless, the Kirkpatricks attended the Democratic National Convention that year in Los Angeles, California where they hoped rumors that Minnesota governor, Orville Freeman, might receive the Vice Presidential nomination would prove to be true. The Kirkpatricks were with Freeman when Robert Kennedy informed the governor that the vice presidential nomination had gone to Lyndon Johnson.¹⁰⁸

Though the Kirkpatricks voted for Kennedy in 1960, neither of them demonstrated much love or admiration for the Kennedy Administration. Their lack of enthusiasm arose from their disappointment in Humphrey's and Freeman's losses in the nomination process, and from Evron's suspicion of the 'New Frontier' and Kennedy's foreign policies, specifically his failure to keep communism out of Cuba. Both Jeane and Evron blamed the Cuban missile crisis in October of 1962 on Kennedy's lack of leadership.¹⁰⁹ Like many other Americans, Jeane stayed glued to the television throughout the crisis which she described as "the most dangerous time, the closest to war that we've come in the post-World War II period."¹¹⁰ The family even considered building a fallout shelter in their backyard.

¹⁰⁸ Harrison, 58-9. Collier, 60-63.

¹⁰⁹ Collier, 63.

¹¹⁰ Harrison, 62.

Shortly before the Cuban missile crisis, Jeane began working out of her home. With her youngest child finally in nursery school, she gave up freelance work and accepted a part-time position as an assistant professor of political science at Trinity College. Trinity was a small, women's, Catholic college located outside of Washington, DC where Jeane began teaching four days a week. In addition to her teaching duties, Jeane received an offer to assemble and edit various essays by leading political scientists of the day on communist tactics around the world. The book, *Strategies of Deception: A Study in World-Wide Communist Tactics*, was published in 1963 and contained essays on communist tactics and strategies in China, India, Africa, Spain, France, Latin America, the United Nations. It included an essay, authored by the Kirkpatrick's friend, Max Kampelman, about the communist activities in the CIO. Jeane's introduction to the book constitutes the culmination of her education in the evils of totalitarianism and represents an early articulation of what would later be known as the Kirkpatrick Doctrine.

In *The Strategies of Deception*, Jeane began by asserting that communists were not swept into power by the tides of historical inevitability, but rather through political contests that they corrupted. Except where they come to power through military occupation, the success of the communist party depended on the skills utilized by their leaders in order to exploit political opportunities. Therefore, the world was not dealing with an "amorphous historical force", but with the activities of ruthless men in specific situations.¹¹¹ To further buttress this argument, Kirkpatrick pointed out that Marxist theory had actually been disproven by history, for in capitalist nations, the working classes had not been kept at a subsistence level as Marx had predicted. Instead of becoming more miserable and desperate, the working classes of highly industrialized nations enjoyed a level of prosperity "unprecedented in history" and unequalled in

¹¹¹ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *The Strategies of Deception*. (New York: Farrar, Straus and Company, 1963), xi.

any communist state.¹¹² Moreover, the governments of industrialized states had not become instruments of “fascist repression”, but had instead used regulation to eliminate the worst abuses of the capitalist system.¹¹³

In addition to her critique of Marxist ideology, Kirkpatrick noted that modern communists had moved far away from Marxist theory. According to her, this began during the Russian Revolution when Lenin “emancipated communists from the encumbrance of Marx’s error”, by moving the party away from economic determinism and towards political volunteerism.¹¹⁴ This occurred when Lenin declared that Russia could bypass the capitalist stage of economic development. Such a claim flew in the face of Marxist doctrine and was, according to Kirkpatrick, the first time that a communist leader advocated the use of state power to circumvent or transcend the laws of history. “Marx had suggested the communists could assist history,” she wrote, “Lenin proposed they outwit it.”¹¹⁵ The elimination of Marxist economic development theories from communist doctrine resulted in two consequences. First, if a capitalist stage of development was no longer required to bring about communism, then underdeveloped and colonial areas now appeared ripe for communist expansion. Second, the notion that communism could be brought about through the use of state power ensured that the goal of the communist party would be to capture state power everywhere.¹¹⁶

The presence or absence of the proletariat now meant nothing: it was the communists versus the non-communists. “In the name of tactical flexibility ‘socialism’ is imposed on pre-feudal societies; Communist parties serve as ‘vanguard of the proletariat’ in nations with no

¹¹² Ibid, xii.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Ibid, xiii.

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, xiv.

proletariat, no capitalists, no industry,” Kirkpatrick observed, “military conquest, subversion, and coups d’état are substituted for proletarian revolutions; tiny elites of intellectual freebooters are substituted for the working masses.”¹¹⁷ Thus, classical Marxism was absent from modern communism, and merely invoked to surround the communists with an aura of intellectual and historical validity. Moreover, Kirkpatrick contended that through its faith in the inevitable triumph of the movement, classical Marxism provided communists with moral justification; it freed the communist elite of moral inhibitions in their quest for power, justified their unceasing hostility towards all persons and organizations outside the movement, and sanctioned aggression as moral and inevitable.¹¹⁸

Kirkpatrick claimed that this absolute split between theory and practice made the communists merely another group of elites competing for political power, an idea that has proven to be difficult for many to comprehend. However, she asserted that Americans must understand that the Marxist theory of historical development had become irrelevant to the communist movement. The communists had no economic base, no specific relationship with any class, but instead concentrated their efforts on whichever groups were the most alienated from the traditional power structure. Americans often failed to recognize these facts, Kirkpatrick argued, because the communists continued to utilize the language of Marx; for instance, when they labelled tribal conflicts as struggles against the bourgeoisie.

“The notion that the communists are somehow engaged in the struggle between rich and poor,” she wrote, “haves and have nots, workers and employers, oppressed and oppressors leads to the consistent notion that communism is somehow more democratic and progressive than its

¹¹⁷ Ibid, xv.

¹¹⁸ Ibid, xvi.

undemocratic rivals.”¹¹⁹ According to Kirkpatrick, in all nations ruled by communists, the Marxists had never been elected to head the government or been swept into power by a mass revolt. Whenever they did receive large support from the masses, such as support from peasants, it was because they promised land reform, a promise they subsequently failed to deliver. Communists gained power by conducting guerilla warfare and terrorism against governments and opponents, or through military occupation. Such means to power did not suggest democracy or progress to Jeane.¹²⁰

Following her critiques of Marxist theory and modern communism’s abandonment of it, Kirkpatrick drew from her studies of totalitarianism and outlined distinctive differences between communism and other non-democratic regimes. One of the primary differences between the communists and traditional authoritarians was how they utilized power. According to Kirkpatrick, authoritarians were interested in maintaining the traditional social structure and culture. She used General Francisco Franco, a fascist, as an example, noting that he had not attempted to undermine the Catholic Church or despoil the large landowners. Furthermore, Franco and military dictators in Latin America had not attempted to alter the cultural, social, or economic status quo. Kirkpatrick claimed that maintaining a culture required less repression than the effort to radically alter it, and that though the traditional social structure found in authoritarian regimes may have produced hardships and poverty, its norms were internalized. Furthermore, traditional oligarchs and autocrats could rely on tradition to keep the masses of people under control, and for this reason they typically utilized coercion only to protect their own political power.¹²¹ Conversely, communists were more repressive than traditional dictatorships

¹¹⁹ Ibid, xviii.

¹²⁰ Ibid, xix.

¹²¹ Ibid, xix-xx

because they want to restructure society, culture, and personality. This caused them to try to control a wide range of activities normally governed by custom and personal preference, which in turn, required more police, more surveillance, and more terror.¹²²

Conclusions

Jeane Kirkpatrick's childhood, education, work, and early married life constituted formative life experiences that worked together to mold her into the public intellectual she would become in the ensuing decades. From the time of her early childhood, Jeane demonstrated that she was an intelligent, inquisitive, determined individual who resisted both familial and societal pressures to conform to stereotypical gender roles, and who chose, instead, to pursue her own dreams. Her independent and adaptive nature, along with her natural intelligence, allowed her to turn her back on traditional ideas of femininity and to embrace her own unique character. Note her tomboyish play as a child, her decision to ignore the finishing school aspects of Stephens College, her determination to go to graduate school, her decision to work, to go to Paris, and to marry and bear children on her own terms. This strength of will remained with Jeane throughout her life, enabling her to meet the challenges and pitfalls of life as a public intellectual, United Nations Ambassador, and American policy-maker.

In addition to molding her autonomous nature, the early years of Kirkpatrick's life shaped her political views. Her family's deep roots within the Democratic Party, their support for New Deal programs, and Jeane's own beliefs concerning race, gender, and the Cold War caused her to remain a member of the party long after she became disillusioned with its platform. As late as 1984, when Kirkpatrick, already a noted 'neoconservative', gave a speech in support of Reagan at the Republican National Convention, she was still a registered member of the Democratic

¹²² Ibid.

Party. “One’s party is a part of oneself”¹²³, she declared, and her decision to leave the Democratic Party in 1985 weighed heavily upon her for the rest of her life.¹²⁴

Not only was Kirkpatrick’s political affiliation fashioned by her early life, but her views on the nature of democracy itself were formed by her experiences growing up in Duncan, Oklahoma. Though probably romanticized, it was her vision of Duncan – a frontier town with a fluid, open society, where democracy, egalitarianism, and libertarianism prevailed – that Kirkpatrick referenced as the prime example of the nature of, and conditions necessary for, democracy. In later years, whether she was critiquing the changes brought to American democracy by the rise of the New Left, or evaluating political systems, revolutions, and regime changes abroad, Kirkpatrick used her hometown as a model for how democratic societies should function.

A belief in the righteousness of democratic political systems was reinforced by her in-depth study of totalitarianism. Franz Neumann and Hannah Arendt both offered her a fundamental understanding of how totalitarian regimes came to power and how they functioned. Neumann’s analysis of the fall of the Weimar Republic, blaming it on political extremists on both the right and the left, provided Kirkpatrick with ammunition against the New Left whom she viewed as political extremists, determined to destroy the American democratic experiment in order to completely restructure American society and culture. Based on what she learned from Neumann and Arendt about political groups that sought to remake society and culture, Kirkpatrick later concluded that the New Left was ‘totalitarian’ in its nature.

¹²³ <http://www.nytimes.com/1987/11/02/us/washington-talk-presidential-politics-why-kirkpatrick-says-other-women-should.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm> 10/14/12

¹²⁴ Collier, 167-168.

Kirkpatrick utilized other lessons that she had learned from Arendt; for example, it was Arendt who first made distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian governments, distinctions that Kirkpatrick would expound upon and utilize over time. Furthermore, Arendt's analyses of revolutions and the 'social question' influenced Kirkpatrick's views of revolutions abroad. Kirkpatrick believed that it was impossible to create democracy anywhere at any time, and often relied upon the history of a nation to determine whether a revolution in pursuit of democracy could be successful. Moreover, like Arendt, she believed that any attempt by revolutionaries to institute social and economic equality, i.e. to do more than incrementally change the political system, would result in totalitarianism and state terror. Finally, Kirkpatrick spoke often as a public intellectual about the hazards of utopian political ideologies, dangers she learned about from both Arendt and Camus.

Kirkpatrick's education in the evils of totalitarianism was buttressed by her exposure to firsthand accounts of life in NAZI Germany, the Soviet Union, and communist China. Neumann's Holocaust files, interviews with Russians who had fled from the Soviet Union during World War II, and interviews with Chinese communists who refused repatriation following the Korean War painted a dystopian picture of the lives of those unfortunate individuals forced to live under totalitarian rule. Kirkpatrick never forgot these stories; nor did she forget any of the horror stories that she heard from Neumann, Arendt, Freda Utey, and other persons she met throughout her lifetime who had fled from the totalitarian menace. Rather she utilized these firsthand accounts in her frequent denunciations of communism.

Kirkpatrick's critiques of totalitarianism and American domestic and foreign policies were also influenced by her husband. Evron provided her with a new social circle, composed of intellectuals, political scientists, government officials, politicians, and professors; all committed

Cold Warriors whose interests overlapped with those of the Kirkpatricks'. In addition, Evron encouraged his wife to remain intellectually and politically engaged. Moreover, his own research and work could not help but to influence Jeane's intellectual evolution. Already a fervent anti-communist prior to World War II, Evron's research into the global propaganda techniques of the communists in the 1950s further cemented the Kirkpatricks' belief in the dangerous, power-hungry, duplicitous, and untrustworthy nature of the Soviet Union.

Thus, by 1963, with the publication of *The Strategies of Deception*, Jeane Kirkpatrick's view of totalitarianism and the American role in the Cold War had been crystallized. Her critiques of communism and defense of traditional authoritarian regimes in the book were based upon all that she had learned over the years about the nature of totalitarianism from Neumann, Arendt, Camus, her work, and her husband, and constituted the core of what would later be known as the Kirkpatrick Doctrine. Over the next two decades, Kirkpatrick continued to expound upon her critiques and defenses of non-democratic governments, which, along with her criticisms of the leftward drift of the Democratic Party and her condemnation of the foreign policies of the Nixon, Ford, and Carter Administrations, propelled her into the national spotlight.

Chapter Two

Throughout the 1960s and early 1970s, Jeane Kirkpatrick's professional life thrived. She completed her doctoral degree in Political Science at Columbia University, gained tenure at Georgetown University, and published three books - *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society: A Study of Peronist Argentina*, *Political Woman*, and *The New Presidential Elite*. In *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society*, Kirkpatrick continued to build upon her defense of authoritarian regimes, as compared to totalitarian ones, through a study of Argentine politics in the 1950s and 1960s. The book not only served to reinforce the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, it also helped her to establish a reputation as a Latin American political expert in the 1970s and 1980s. Unlike her work on Peronist Argentina, *Political Woman* and *The New Presidential Elite* were devoted to the analysis of domestic politics, namely the role of women in American politics and the rise of the New Left within the Democratic Party. Published in the mid-1970s, these works were inspired by the rapidly changing nature of American society and politics brought about via a rising tide of protest by women, the youth, African Americans, and anti-war advocates. Though providing astute assessments of female politicians and the political characteristics of delegates to the national conventions, the books also provided insight into Kirkpatrick's critiques of the New Left. Her opposition to both the methods and goals of the New Left caused her to become increasingly alienated from the Democratic Party, which, in turn, pushed her further to the right on the political spectrum.

A Lousy Decade

The tumultuous nature of American society during the 1960s prompted the Kirkpatricks to label the decade as 'lousy'.¹²⁵ Despite their overall unfavorable opinion of the period, the

¹²⁵ Collier, 62.

couple's careers, political activism, and family life flourished. Jeane Kirkpatrick began to gain renown both with the general public and in academic circles when her first book, *The Strategies of Deception*, was featured as a national Book of the Month Club. She continued to teach part-time at Trinity College while her husband maintained his position as the Director of the American Political Science Association.¹²⁶ In addition to their scholarly pursuits, the Kirkpatricks remained active in politics, specifically, party politics, and together they attended the 1964 Democratic National Convention. The couple was thrilled that their friend Hubert Humphrey was chosen to be Lyndon Johnson's running mate, and they spent the majority of their time at the convention working on Humphrey's speeches. Throughout the campaign, the couple continued to write speeches for the future Vice President, and Jeane analyzed polling data.¹²⁷

Before the campaign, Evron had begun pressuring his wife to finish her PhD, telling her that in order to accomplish her goals she needed to complete her doctoral degree. By this time, Jeane had more free time as all three of the Kirkpatricks' sons were enrolled in the Sidwell Friends School, a prestigious private institution, run by Quakers. Kirkpatrick was committed to finishing her doctorate, but was at a loss as to what her dissertation topic should be. Due to her interest in non-democratic forms of government, both she and Evron decided that Peronism in Argentina would be an ideal topic. Thus, Kirkpatrick made arrangements to be re-admitted into the Political Science doctoral program at Columbia, was assigned a new dissertation advisor, and began to seek funding for her research. She first applied to the American Association of University Women; however, her application was rejected and a representative from the AAUW

¹²⁶ <http://www.nytimes.com/1995/05/09/obituaries/evron-kirkpatrick-83-director-of-political-science-association.html>. 01/15/13

¹²⁷ Harrison, 62.

informed Jeane that her children were too young for her to go back to school.¹²⁸ Though stung by this rejection, Kirkpatrick persevered and was finally able to secure funding for her research through the Andreas Foundation, an organization run by Hubert Humphrey's friend and campaign contributor, Dwayne Andreas.¹²⁹

Having obtained the necessary funding, Kirkpatrick began working on her dissertation. As a political scientist, her research was based on interviewing and collecting data from a 'representative' sample of the Argentine population between October and December of 1965. The majority of the fieldwork, though, was carried out by the International Research Associates who completed interviews with a total of 2,014 persons. As the data was being collected, Kirkpatrick focused on researching the history of Latin American politics, and in particular, the phenomenon of Peronism. In 1968, she completed her doctoral work and was awarded a PhD in Political Science from Columbia University¹³⁰. Kirkpatrick's dissertation was later published as a book entitled *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society: A Study of Peronist Argentina*.¹³¹

Contemporary reviews of the book were mixed. In *The Journal of Politics*, Kenneth Coleman praised her analysis of Peronism as a continuation of "politics as usual", rather than a "distinct political subculture", a "radical mass movement", an illustration of "left-fascism", or an example of "working class authoritarianism".¹³² Whereas Coleman commended Kirkpatrick's conclusions on the nature of Peronism, other reviews were more critical. In the *Political Science Quarterly*, Eldon Kenworthy accused Kirkpatrick of failing to produce a fresh perspective on Peronism and adhering too often to conventional wisdom by presenting Perón's supporters as

¹²⁸ Collier, 62.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹³⁰ Harrison, 65-6.

¹³¹ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society: A Study of Peronist Argentina* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1971).

¹³² *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (February, 1973), 250.

“alienated” and “psychologically predisposed to authoritarian leadership”.¹³³ Kenworthy bemoaned the fact that Kirkpatrick could not clear her mind of “working-class authoritarianism” and “Latin-Mediterranean” political styles which would have allowed her to project “herself freshly and emphatically into the lives of those whose opinions she tabulated.”¹³⁴ He went on to criticize Kirkpatrick for hiring a polling organization to do her work, and for not spending time in Argentina talking to Peronists as real people instead of “isolated responses to a questionnaire.”¹³⁵ Though acknowledging that the data in the book was useful, Kenworthy concluded that Kirkpatrick’s work “exemplifies that style of research from afar... that makes other people’s politics look far simpler than one’s own. Is not ‘condescension’ the word we generally apply to such behavior?”¹³⁶

Reviews of the book in the journals *International Affairs* and the *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs* were also uncomplimentary. J. A. Camacho criticized the book for being misleading, as its subtitle, *A Study of Peronist Argentina*, promised a study of the years Perón was in power, yet the bulk of the work was focused on the mid-1960s.¹³⁷ In addition, Camacho asserted that the book failed to shed new light on the nature of Peronism, noting “it did not take a poll to discover that the bulk of the support for *Peronismo* comes from the working and lower middle classes”, and “a poll is hardly necessary to discover that the bulk of the population of Argentina is Catholic”. “Kirkpatrick’s conclusions,” he declared, “expressed in a manner so elaborate as to be almost obscure, are no different from those of other competent

¹³³ *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (March, 1974), 245.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 246

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*

¹³⁷ *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1944 -)*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (April 1973), 319.

observers.”¹³⁸ Alberto Ciria claimed that the book did not provide a satisfactory analysis of the nature of Peronsim in 1965, due in part to the fact that the questionnaire utilized in the survey “reads like a superficial adaptation of North American ‘political culture’ values with obvious concessions to Argentine idiosyncratic features.”¹³⁹

Though apt, contemporary critiques of Kirkpatrick’s work were written before she became a member of the National Security Council and the United Nations Ambassador. Naturally, they could not examine how the book correlated either to her foreign policy views or the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, nor could they assess how her education in totalitarianism may have affected her views on the nature of authoritarian regimes in general and Peronism in particular.

Kirkpatrick noted in her introduction that her interest in Peronism grew out of her interest in non-democratic regimes, an interest that was stimulated by her tutelage under Franz Neumann. She claimed that traditional autocracies, political systems that tended to be neither democratic nor totalitarian, had been neglected by political scientists, and that despite their “antiquity and ubiquity”, autocratic governments were often viewed as “transitional” systems, political incidents on the way to becoming democratic regimes.¹⁴⁰ According to Kirkpatrick, Latin America contained a wide array of non-democratic systems ranging from military dictatorships, traditional autocracies, left and right-wing movements and regimes, to dictatorships that had incorporated some democratic practices. Peronism in Argentina, a nation with wealth, a large European population, high literacy rates, an industrialized economy, and a Latin political tradition that mixed autocratic and democratic elements, proved especially interesting to her as it provided another variant of autocracy. She compared Peronsim to a

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (May, 1978), 216.

¹⁴⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society*, ix.

contemporary Caesarist movement in a technologically advanced society, with Perón as a non-revolutionary military leader supported by a mass base, and went on to assert that such systems would become more common in Latin America as technological advances were made in societies with autocratic systems.¹⁴¹

In her analysis of the history of the Argentine and Latin American political systems, Kirkpatrick noted that such systems had a long history of regime instability, oligarchy, democratic interludes, military coups, direct action, personalismo, and institutionalized violence. Argentina itself had a very limited experience with democracy, having enjoyed only twenty years of it since its independence in 1810. Electoral reforms were implemented within Argentina in 1911 and 1912 that provided for a secret ballot and suffrage rights for all adult males. Such reforms increased the voting population of Argentina from 9% of the total male population (land-owning, upper classes) to one of universal male suffrage. In the wake of these enfranchisement measures, a constitutional, democratic government remained in place until 1930 when a military coup toppled the regime and claimed power.¹⁴²

The Peronist period began in 1943 when Juan Perón participated in a coup that overthrew the conservative, minority government in power at that time. Perón was part of a group of officers (Grupo de Oficiales Unidos or GOU) who saw themselves as progressive nationalists and who sympathized with European fascism, specifically, that of the Italian variety. The officers hoped to bring to Argentina the unity, strength, progress, and discipline that they believed were characteristic of the German and Italian fascist states.¹⁴³ However, despite their calls for unity, the

¹⁴¹ Ibid, xx.

¹⁴² Ibid, 14-20.

¹⁴³ Ibid, 30.

GOU was perpetually divided. As a result, three different generals rapidly succeeded each other as Argentina's leader, with Perón ultimately ascending to power in 1945.

In her study, Kirkpatrick was careful to distinguish Peronism from totalitarianism. According to her, Peronism lacked most of the distinguishing characteristics of totalitarian systems; for example, there was no official ideology for re-ordering society, culture, and personality. Moreover, Perón did not attempt to establish total control over the political process or to destroy those associations such as church, family, or schools that influenced political practices. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick claimed that during his rule, there was not a single, mass party that monopolized political functions in Argentine society. Finally, no 'ubiquitous terror' was associated with Peronism.¹⁴⁴ Instead of 'totalitarian', Kirkpatrick labels Peronism as neither communistic nor capitalistic, but rather a reformist, "justicialist philosophy" that mixed limited individualism and limited collectivism.¹⁴⁵

In order to buttress her arguments about the nature of Peronism, Kirkpatrick examined various aspects of the regime, including its class orientation, the economic and social changes initiated by Perón, the social characteristics of the Peronist elite, and the cultural and political policies of the government. She began by noting that Perón gained a mass following from the working classes. In her discussion of why this was so, Kirkpatrick focused on the economic and social changes wrought by Perón. She devoted most of her attention to welfare measures and their impact on workers' lives, describing the Peronist system as a 'New Deal' for Argentine workers that included a comprehensive system of social security that provided for old-age pensions, disability pay, and other benefits. In addition to social security, workers received paid vacations, sick leave, holidays, minimum wage and maximum hour legislation, and child labor

¹⁴⁴ Ibid, 41.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid, 37.

laws. Price controls were also introduced that reinforced wage benefits. Furthermore, collective bargaining, the right to strike, public housing projects, and slum clearance all contributed to workers' well-being. Finally, a system of free public education through college "democratized the distribution of skill and enlightenment".¹⁴⁶ According to Kirkpatrick, such measures constituted *limited* social and economic change which altered the pre-Perón economic and social structures of Argentina, but did not destroy them.¹⁴⁷

The integration of the working classes into political life made Perón's relations with Argentina's traditional ruling classes especially interesting to Kirkpatrick. One might think that mass support from the working classes would lead to a dismantling of the traditional Argentine hierarchy; however, this did not occur. According to Kirkpatrick, Perón's treatment of the Argentinian oligarchy qualified as evidence of the non-communist, non-revolutionary, reformist nature of his regime. The oligarchy in Argentina consisted of large-landholders, the hierarchy of the Catholic Church, wealthy merchants, and the upper ranks of the military. During the Peronist period the traditional Argentinian ruling classes managed to hold on to some of their political power, while new social groups were welcomed into the political arena. Under Perón, the political power and social status of the large-landholders and wealthy merchants declined, but, their economic status remained relatively unchanged. Furthermore, the power and prestige of the Catholic Church and the military remained intact.¹⁴⁸

Kirkpatrick maintained that such changes in the political system more accurately reflected the transformations that had occurred within the population and economy of Argentina in previous decades. According to her, the economic base that had allowed the large-landholders

¹⁴⁶ Ibid, 37.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid, 38.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid, 36-42.

to ascend to political power in the past had been eroded by industrialization, urbanization, and the commercialization of Argentina's economy. Thus, Perón attacked a segment of the oligarchy whose political and social status and influence exceeded its economic power, thus bringing the social, political, and economic power of the oligarchy into a more realistic relationship.¹⁴⁹ Though, for the most part, politics continued to be dominated by members of the oligarchy, specifically the military and the plutocracy, some governmental positions were opened to those who had previously been excluded from political power including trade union leaders, sons of immigrants, Jews, and members of the working-classes.¹⁵⁰

Although Perón championed political, social, and economic reforms designed to create a more just and equitable society, these moves were not accompanied by protection of individual rights and liberties such as those enshrined in Western, liberal, democratic governments. This becomes quite evident in Kirkpatrick's discussion of Peronist cultural policies. For example, freedom of the press did not exist in Peronist Argentina. Newspapers were prohibited from publishing items that were 'contrary to the general interest of the nation or disturbing to public order'. In addition, the press could not publish anything that undermined Christian morals, upset Argentina's relations with other states, injured government officials, or was 'untrue'. Of course it was Perón who could determine what constituted a violation of these laws, and opposition newspapers, or those found guilty of breaking these laws, were harassed and ultimately shut down by the state. Enforcement of this legislation was possible because of a selective purge of the Argentine judiciary.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹ Ibid, 36-38.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid, 38-39.

¹⁵¹ Ibid, 40.

In an effort to distinguish these policies from similar ones instituted by totalitarian governments, Kirkpatrick was quick to point out that Perón was unable or unwilling to stifle all opposition. First, she notes that anti-Peronist papers, though harassed by paper shortages, threats, and arrests still managed to print anti-Peronist editorials. Second, opposition politicians, though harassed and arrested, continued to criticize the government. Third, Peron allowed elections in 1946 and 1951. Finally, though the opposition parties were debilitated by restrictive legislation, threats, and arrests, they were not totally destroyed. “Perón hamstrung and limited his opponents but did not silence all opposition,” Kirkpatrick wrote, “he did not attempt to achieve full control of the symbolic environment, but he dominated it through a combination of censorship, intimidation, and harassment.”¹⁵² Thus, she concluded that the Peronist regime constituted a continuation of the Argentine tradition of a hybrid government that combined democratic and autocratic elements.¹⁵³

Despite the existence of democratic elements associated with Peronism, the political scientist asserted that it did not constitute a step on the road towards democracy. In order to back up this assertion, Kirkpatrick drew from Arendt’s writing on the nature of revolutions and looked to Argentina’s political history. She wrote,

Given Argentine experience, it would have been extraordinary in 1955 if Argentine political culture had been characterized by attitudes, opinions, and, especially, expectations typical of developed democracies. It would have been most surprising if, just after the downfall of Perón, broadly aggregative democratic parties had emerged capable of organizing and channeling opinion, recruiting leaders, competing in elections, and accepting the results. It would have been very surprising if Argentines had expected that political decisions should, could, and would be made by majorities whose preferences would be peaceably expressed through honest institutions and implemented by officials responsive as well as responsible to the people. It would have been very surprising if military officers, politicized by several decades of participation in the distribution of values in the society, should have promptly eliminated themselves from

¹⁵² Ibid, 40.

¹⁵³ Ibid, 47.

the political arena. It would have been surprising indeed if, after 150 years of experience with a different tradition, Argentina should have emerged after the fall of Perón a full-blown, Anglo-Saxon democracy.¹⁵⁴

Following her discussion of Peronism, Kirkpatrick examined the development of Argentine politics in the decade after Perón was overthrown via a military coup in 1955. She argued that the continued instability of Argentine politics during this period was typical of Latin American political systems. Despite the instability and violence inherent within the Argentine political system, Kirkpatrick maintained that the nation's system was competitive, that competitors for power were comprised of diverse actors with diverse goals, that competition took place in a variety of arenas despite governmental restrictions, and that the style of politics and the arenas of competition changed due to the political involvement of the middle and lower classes.¹⁵⁵

In support of these assertions, Kirkpatrick pointed out that no man or party held power for even four years, a fact that demonstrated that no one group possessed sufficient power to preempt control of the government. Instead, there were multiple groups who competed for political power in a variety of arenas. Kirkpatrick defines an 'arena' as a site of decision-making, and in Argentina, competition was not limited to the arenas typical of constitutional democracies. Groups who competed for power in various arenas included conventional political parties who sought power in the electoral arena; labor unions who sought power through electoral participation, strikes, lobbying, and violent action; movement-type parties that sought power through electoral politics, street demonstrations, and quasi-terrorist actions; military leaders who sought power through civil war, coups, and electoral politics; and the clergy, student groups,

¹⁵⁴ Ibid, 47-8.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid, 50-1.

industrialists, and landowners who sought power through direct action and electoral activities.¹⁵⁶

According to the political scientist, the interactions between such groups vying for political power determined the policies and personnel of the Argentine government. Though not all of the competitors were involved in interactions in all political arenas, each group's strengths, methods, and commitments had to be taken into account at all levels of the decision-making process.¹⁵⁷

“The persistence of competition between such diverse groups and by such diverse methods,” Kirkpatrick noted, “demonstrates the continuing lack of agreement in Argentina about the legitimate sources of political authority.”¹⁵⁸ As no political procedure was recognized as *the* legitimate route to power, no group had enough power or authority to impose its political will for very long. Furthermore, the lack of agreement on legitimate means to power meant that multiple routes were acceptable, including the use of violence and military coups. According to her, the presence of violence in a political system, though often associated with a breakdown in the social order, was, in the case of Argentina and many other Latin American and autocratic regimes, patterned, and thus must be considered a ‘mode’ of the social order rather than a disruption.¹⁵⁹ Violence was an integral, regular, and predictable part of the Argentine political process, even during Argentina's democratic interludes; therefore, revolutions and military coups actually constituted signs of continuity and stability within the Argentine system.¹⁶⁰

“It seems to me,” Kirkpatrick wrote, “that a new name is needed to designate those political systems in which, through a substantial period of time and regardless of the legal structure of government, diverse and multiple actors compete for political power in diverse and

¹⁵⁶ Ibid, 51-2.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid, 66.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, 77.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid, 76.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid, 75, 77

multiple arenas.”¹⁶¹ Such systems may be called ‘polyocracies’, where ‘poly’ references the multiplicity of both political actors and arenas. Such systems tended to suffer from institutional instability caused by a lack of agreement about legitimate arenas of decision-making or modes of competition. Consequently, shifting power relations among actors are usually accompanied by structural changes in the political system. Political parties were the most vulnerable actors to such changes as their strength depended upon mass support expressed through the electoral arena. Conversely, the positions of military leaders, church leaders, and other political actors were less vulnerable to shifts between democratic and autocratic systems because their political activities took place largely outside of the electoral arena.¹⁶²

Kirkpatrick’s analyses of the Argentine political system served to buttress her defense of authoritarian regimes in Latin America and other regions around the globe, along with American support for such regimes. According to her, though autocratic governments, such as Peronist Argentina and other Latin America dictatorships, were oppressive, they were less repressive than their totalitarian counterparts. Therefore, though he purged the Argentine judiciary, repressed opposition parties, and imposed severe restrictions on the press, Perón did not eliminate all opposition to his regime through mass terror as a totalitarian dictator would do. Moreover, authoritarian regimes left in place existing allocations of power, wealth, and status, but they worshipped traditional gods and observed traditional taboos. Unlike totalitarian regimes, they did not disturb the habitual places of residence, rhythms of work, or patterns of family and personal relations. Furthermore, because they allowed for limited competition and political participation, authoritarian governments, especially those in Latin America which had a long tradition of mixing liberal and autocratic political styles, were more susceptible to liberalization and thus

¹⁶¹ Ibid, 78.

¹⁶² Ibid, 78.

capable of evolving into approximate democratic states.¹⁶³ Even though the political system of Argentina between 1945 and 1965, like those of other autocratic states, was far from democratic, political action and freedom existed outside of the electoral arena as long as political actors were able to stage demonstrations and utilize strikes, lobbying actions, and violence in order to influence the political system.

In 1967, while in the midst of completing her dissertation, Jeane Kirkpatrick was hired as an Associate Professor of Political Science at Georgetown University in Washington, DC. She was offered the job by Karl Cerny, Howard Penniman's successor as Chairman of the Political Science Department. Both Cerny and Penniman had been members of the Kirkpatricks' social circle for years. In her role as a faculty member at Georgetown, Kirkpatrick developed a reputation as a committed teacher who did her own work, without the aid of researchers or assistants. She even insisted upon grading exams herself. Her hard work paid off, and she became only the second woman to gain tenure at Georgetown.¹⁶⁴

Jeane Kirkpatrick finished her PhD and began working at Georgetown during a time when American society, politics, and foreign affairs were experiencing enormous changes. Much of this upheaval was due to the emergence of the New Left, a countercultural movement that centered on the expansion of rights to various minority groups and women, and the American population's increasing disenchantment with the Vietnam War. The Civil Rights movement that began during World War II had garnered increasing support over the ensuing decades, and, by the mid-1960s, had achieved several victories for African Americans including the restoration of

¹⁶³ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Dictatorships and Double Standards*. (New York: American Enterprise Institute, 1982), 49.

¹⁶⁴ Harrison, 63-5; Collier, 70.

voting rights, the integration of public schools, and the end to de jure segregation. The success of the Civil Rights movement for African Americans soon prompted other minorities within the United States, such as Native Americans and Latinos, to fight for their own rights. Feminism and the struggle for equal rights for women also gained momentum during the 1960s as an increasing number of working and college-educated women became more willing to address the inequalities that existed between the sexes within American society. College students across the nation banded together to protest against university policies which they deemed to be repressive and stifling, and homosexuals began agitating for equal rights and an end to sodomy laws. In the realm of foreign affairs, Cold War tensions increased as the Cuban Missile Crisis reignited fears of nuclear war and mutually assured destruction, the Iron Curtain gained a new permanency to Americans with the construction of the Berlin Wall, and the war in Vietnam escalated.

By the late 1960s, the rise of the New Left and the growth of the anti-war movement had fractured both the social and cultural norms along with the Cold War consensus which had dominated American life in the postwar years. To many Americans, the Civil Rights movement appeared to have degenerated into violence with the emergence of Black Power organizations and urban rioting. Radical Feminist groups, labeled 'bra burners' by the media, began actively protesting events such as the Miss America pageant and calling for a war between the sexes. Student organizations staged sit-ins, strikes, and protests against their alma maters and managed to temporarily shut down universities all across America. Meanwhile, anti-war protests increased in number and intensity.

The rising tide of protest within the United States reached its zenith in 1968. During that year, the nation was shocked by the assassinations of two larger-than-life political figures – Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy. Meanwhile the Tet Offensive belied the

government's claims that the war was nearly won in Vietnam. Kirkpatrick personally experienced the effects of the student protestors when on April 23, 1968, between 150 and 300 members of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) occupied several administration buildings and the Low Library of Columbia University.¹⁶⁵

The SDS were protesting against the construction of a gymnasium that they labeled as 'racist' as it was to be built on the site of a park that had served the surrounding black neighborhood. Though community residents would be able to use the gym, they would have to use a separate 'colored' entrance. They were also protesting against the Institute for Defense Analysis, a Columbia University defense organization affiliated with the U.S. government which supported the war in Vietnam.¹⁶⁶ In the midst of the student occupation, Kirkpatrick had to deliver her dissertation to the library. In order to avoid the chaos occurring on the campus, she had to be escorted by police through underground tunnels beneath the university. Though she was able to avoid any direct contact with the protestors, two of her friends, both of whom were faculty members at Columbia, were not as fortunate. One had his office destroyed by members of the SDS, while the other was hit on the head by the brass nozzle of a fire hose.¹⁶⁷ Kirkpatrick later described the students and their actions at Columbia as 'fascist'.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁵ <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/hnpnewyorktimesindex/docview/118290871/13C3EE1D74C607BB449/613?accountid=8361> The Radicals 'Do Their Thing' at Columbia
Hechinger, Fred M. **New York Times (1923-Current file)** [New York, N.Y.] 28 Apr 1968: E15.
(Accessed 2/14/13)

¹⁶⁶ <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/hnpnewyorktimesindex/docview/118438267/13C3EE1D74C607BB449/654?accountid=8361> 300 Protesting Columbia Students Barricade Office of College Dean: 300 ATCOLUMBIA SET UP BARRICADE
By DAVID BIRD. **New York Times (1923-Current file)** [New York, N.Y.] 24 Apr 1968: 1.
(Accessed 2/14/13)

¹⁶⁷ Harrison, 69.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

Her encounters with radical protest groups did not end with the incident at Columbia. In August of 1968, she, her husband, and her eldest son attended the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Illinois. The Kirkpatrick family stayed at the Palmer House at night and spent their days at the Conrad Hilton analyzing polls for Vice-President Hubert Humphrey. At one point, the police and the military were called in to respond to a bomb threat at the Hilton.¹⁶⁹ Then, a radical group identified by Jeane as ‘The Weathermen’ put uric acid in the air conditioning system at the Palmer House, causing the building to reek of vomit for several days.¹⁷⁰ Outside of the convention, an army of anti-war protestors and New Left countercultural organizations had amassed to demonstrate. Though most were there to peacefully protest, some, like the Yippies, were not. The Yippies threatened to poison Chicago’s water supply with LSD, and both the SDS and the Yippies resorted to throwing bags of urine at police.¹⁷¹ Chicago police and Illinois National Guardsmen responded with violence, beating and gassing the protestors.¹⁷² The violence between police and protestors continued for three days.

Tensions ran high inside the Democratic National Convention as well, as the delegates were divided on multiple issues, the most polarizing being the Vietnam War. The anti-war faction that supported unconditional, unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam coalesced behind

¹⁶⁹ <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/hnpnewyorktimesindex/docview/118472618/13C3F094EE47B9397BF/332?accountid=8361> Bomb Threat at Hilton **New York Times (1923-Current file)** [New York, N.Y.] 28 Aug 1968: 30 (Accessed 2/14/13)

¹⁷⁰ Harrison, 71.

¹⁷¹ Woods, Randall B. *LBJ: Architect of American Ambition* (New York: The Free Press, 2006), 864.

¹⁷² Ibid.

<http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/hnpnewyorktimesindex/docview/118472801/13C3F094EE47B9397BF/347?accountid=8361> GAS IS USED AGAIN TO QUELL PROTEST: 2,000 DISPERSED AS POLICE CLEAR PARK IN CHICAGO By SYLVAN FOX Special to The New York Times. **New York Times (1923-Current file)** [New York, N.Y.] 28 Aug 1968: 36. (Accessed 2/14/13)

Senator Eugene McCarthy. The pro-war faction of the party lent its support to Vice President Hubert Humphrey who favored a negotiated settlement in which U.S. action depended upon reciprocal action from the North Vietnamese.¹⁷³ Humphrey, despite being labeled a warmonger by the peace faction and members of the New Left, still managed to secure the nomination. Due to the turbulent nature of American society, culture, and politics in the late 1960s, Evron Kirkpatrick had encouraged Humphrey to ask Nelson Rockefeller, a member of the Republican Party, to be his Vice Presidential candidate in order to run on a 'Unity' platform. After much discussion, Humphrey agreed to let Evron Kirkpatrick and Max Kampelman broach the matter to the New York Republican. Though he initially appeared to be in favor of the idea of a unity ticket, Rockefeller declined the offer¹⁷⁴. With Rockefeller out of the picture and the nomination secured, Humphrey chose the moderate liberal Edmund Muskie as his running mate.¹⁷⁵

The Kirkpatricks were upset by the divisions within the Democratic Party, but they were happy that their candidate had won the day and both worked diligently over the next few months on the Humphrey campaign. Unfortunately, the "Happy Warrior" lost the election by a narrow margin. Nixon received 31.7 million votes to Humphrey's 31.2 million. However, in the Electoral College, Nixon was able to secure 32 states, leaving 13 to Humphrey and 5 Southern states to George Wallace. Jeane Kirkpatrick blamed Humphrey's loss to Nixon in 1968 on the rise of the New Left and on President Johnson. According to her, Johnson set the convention date too late, leaving very little time for campaigning. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick accused Johnson of not raising enough money for the Democratic Party which further hampered the campaign. Johnson biographer, Randall B. Woods, supports her assertions. "Unbeknown to the media, the

¹⁷³ Harrison, 69-70; Woods, 861.

¹⁷⁴ Collier, 71.

¹⁷⁵ Woods, 862.

delegates, and the American public,” Woods writes, “the chief challenger to Hubert Humphrey... was Lyndon Johnson.”¹⁷⁶ Johnson attempted to dominate the convention and its proceedings, made sure that the convention coincided with his birthday, August 27, and even tested the waters for his own re-nomination, despite the fact he had already announced he would not run. After discovering that the party would not re-nominate him, Johnson finally threw his support behind his Vice-President¹⁷⁷

Disheartened by Humphrey’s loss and the seeming disintegration of the Democratic Party, the Kirkpatricks decided to take a vacation from politics. Accordingly, Jeane Kirkpatrick took a sabbatical from Georgetown while her husband took a leave of absence from the American Political Science Association allowing the family to spend 1969 in France. Evron Kirkpatrick took a position as president of the board of trustees for the Institute of American Universities, an organization based in Aix-en-Provence and dedicated to helping American students to study abroad in France. The plan was for Evron to spend the year teaching at the Institute while his wife wrote. The family rented a house near Mount St. Victoire, a picturesque location which had been the subject of many works by the famous French painter Paul Cézanne. With their three sons enrolled in a local French school for boys, the Kirkpatrick family spent the next year immersing themselves in French culture.¹⁷⁸

Jeane was especially excited about being back in France. She loved the language, the culture, and especially the food. In between writing and spending time with her family, she began learning about local ingredients and practicing her cooking techniques. The learning process was not easy on the family as Kirkpatrick was frequently distracted from the kitchen by

¹⁷⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷⁷ Woods, 862-863.

¹⁷⁸ Collier, 72-3. Harrison, 71-72.

intellectual pursuits. Often the kitchen resembled a disaster area: pans smoking, food burning, water boiling away, all while Kirkpatrick was immersed in reading a book. Despite such culinary chaos, spectacular dinners sometimes appeared on the table.¹⁷⁹

Jeane often described the family's time in France as the best of times. On weekends, the entire Kirkpatrick family would go on road trips throughout the South of France. Evron labeled these weekend getaways "Kirkpatrick's Follies". The three boys sat in the backseat, bickering as siblings do, and complaining of car sickness, while their mother helped their father to navigate. In between giving directions to Evron, Jeane read books such as *The Odyssey* and *The Iliad* aloud to the family. The family enjoyed their time in France in 1969 so much that the country became the site for annual summer vacations. The Kirkpatricks would spend all of 1974 living in France and eventually bought a home in Provence.¹⁸⁰

A Political Woman: Jeane Kirkpatrick in the 1970s

As the turbulent era of the 1960s gave way to the decade of disco, the lives of the Kirkpatrick family began to change. Evron Kirkpatrick, now a man in his 60s, began retiring from the public eye. Having spent decades working in academia, for the government, in electoral politics, heading the American Political Science Association, and sitting on the boards of various organizations, Evron was ready to embrace a less rigorous lifestyle. In addition, he felt increasingly alienated from the Democratic Party throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s. Such an estrangement hastened his desire to retire from large-scale political activism. Finally, Evron's work for the government came under attack in the late 1960s as his name was associated with alleged front organizations for the Central Intelligence Agency.

¹⁷⁹ Collier, 73.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

Collier, 73.

In the late 1950s, Evron Kirkpatrick founded and chaired the Operations and Policy Research (OPR), a non-profit organization associated with the United States Information Agency. The OPR was staffed by American academics, primarily in the social sciences, who recommended books and pamphlets for distribution overseas. The organization also conducted political studies within the United States and abroad, specifically in Latin America. In 1967, the OPR was accused of being a CIA front organization.¹⁸¹ Max Kampelman, Vice President of the OPR, long-time friend of the Kirkpatricks, and friend and former aide to Hubert Humphrey, denied having any knowledge of the organization's relationship with the CIA.¹⁸² Jeane Kirkpatrick also remained rather ambiguous about her husband's activities within the OPR, stating, "I became aware that Kirk was advising the CIA on public opinion polling – sampling, interviewing, analyzing data – during the Vietnam War... I have no doubt that his activities were honorable and his purposes were good and that I would have been proud of them if I'd known more about them than I did."¹⁸³

As Evron settled into retirement, he encouraged his wife to remain active and in the public eye. Refreshed from her year abroad, Jeane returned to her job at Georgetown and began working on a new book. Shortly thereafter, her parents' health began to deteriorate. Kirkpatrick had maintained close ties to her father and mother, Fat and Leona, and with her brother, Jerry, now a prominent attorney living in Ohio with his wife and three children. In 1974, one of those

¹⁸¹ <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/118074595?accountid=8361>
New York Times, February 19, 1967, pg 1: author: Niel Sheehan 11/15/12
AID BY C.I.A. PUT IN THE MILLIONS; GROUP TOTAL UP: A WIDE SPECTRUM OF YOUTH, LABOR, STUDENT AND LEGAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE CITED AID BY C.I.A.IS PUT IN THE MILLIONS AS TOTAL OF GROUPS GROWS
For a more detailed introduction to CIA front organizations during the Cold War see: Hugh Wilford's *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008).

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Collier, 68.

ties was irrevocably broken when her father passed away. Five years later, in April of 1979, Kirkpatrick's mother, Leona, died of leukemia.¹⁸⁴ With her parents gone, her husband retired, and her sons reaching adulthood, Kirkpatrick felt a sense of loss, not only in her personal life, but in her political life as well, for like her husband, Kirkpatrick had begun to feel more and more isolated from the Democratic Party.

Her disaffection began in 1968 and continued to grow throughout the 1970s. Kirkpatrick took issue with many of the policies espoused by various New Left groups, who she perceived as gaining too much power within the party, but she was especially upset by their attack on centrist liberalism that she and her husband believed to have been the source of American postwar prosperity and the guarantor of the nation's defense and safety. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick resented the fact that liberals such as herself who had supported Civil Rights at home, along with decolonization abroad, were now labeled as 'racists' and 'imperialists' by the New Left.¹⁸⁵ Moreover, she found the belief of these groups that the United States was "a sick society, presided over by a repressive government whose motives are base, whose methods are immoral, and whose soul is corrupt"¹⁸⁶ to be particularly repugnant and wholly untrue. "I deeply opposed attacks on the integrity of our government and culture," Kirkpatrick said, "I always believed in the importance of truth, law, and authority. Military kids grow up with such values. So do Oklahoma kids."¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁴ Harrison, 78-9, Collier, 75: Note: Collier claims Kirkpatrick's father died in 1973 while Harrison claims he died in 1974. I have been unable to find an obituary for him, or information that supports one year over the other.

¹⁸⁵ Collier, 66.

¹⁸⁶ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988), 401.

¹⁸⁷ Collier, 64.

Steeped as she was in the literature of totalitarianism, Kirkpatrick found the New Left's cavalier attitude towards communism to be reprehensible. She was particularly offended by the anti-war protestors who claimed that the United States' escalation of the war in Vietnam was immoral. But, in truth, such sentiments were not confined to radical anti-war protestors, as many of her academic associates, such as Hans Morgenthau, began criticizing the war based on both moral ground and the American national interest. During the late 1960s, Kirkpatrick attended a lecture given by Morgenthau during which he critiqued the war in Vietnam in several ways. In *A New Foreign Policy for the United States*, Morgenthau elaborated on his views, arguing that communism in Vietnam was nationalistic in nature, meaning a revolution would have occurred without the presence of communists, and that the United States was now involved in a counterrevolution. Morgenthau went on to assert that because the Vietnamese Communist Party was primarily a vehicle to achieve national unity and independence, it was different from, and thus irrelevant to, the containment of Chinese or Soviet communism. He pointed out that for centuries Vietnam had acted as a barrier to Chinese expansion, yet, ironically, American involvement in Vietnam was pushing the Vietnamese closer to their traditional Chinese enemies. In Morgenthau's opinion, the war did not serve the national interests of the United States. Furthermore, the limited nature of the war was illogical in view of the rationales put forward to justify U.S. involvement – that the Chinese and the Soviets were manipulating Ho Chi Minh. Finally, Morgenthau asserted that American objectives in Vietnam were unattainable without incurring unacceptable moral liabilities and military risks.¹⁸⁸

In many ways, Kirkpatrick disagreed with Morgenthau's analysis of the war. She did admit that there were issues with the ways in which the Johnson and Nixon administrations had

¹⁸⁸ Morgenthau, Hans. *A New Foreign Policy for the United States*. Published for the Council on Foreign Relations (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969), 129-149.

sold the war, stating that “One of the responsibilities governments have to citizens is not to ask them to make impossible sacrifices – in this case, sacrifices ordinary Americans can’t understand, identify with, or accept.”¹⁸⁹ Her problem seemed to be not with the war itself, but rather with the government which had not properly explained to the American public the reasons why Vietnam was so important. As a political scientist educated in the evils of totalitarianism, the Cold Warrior believed that the American cause in Vietnam was both right and moral. “I didn’t have a moral issue with Vietnam. I thought we were morally right,” she said, “Kirk and I were never under any illusions that Ho Chi Minh was just some peasant nationalist.”¹⁹⁰ Following the American withdrawal from Vietnam, Kirkpatrick complained to Hubert Humphrey that American policies in Vietnam constituted “the most shameful display of irresponsibility and inhumanity in our history.”¹⁹¹

In addition to her disagreements with the anti-war faction of the New Left, Kirkpatrick found herself at odds with the radical feminist vision that emerged in the early 1970s. Though she was a feminist, Kirkpatrick viewed herself as a rugged, female individualist whose accomplishments were of greater value since she had achieved them without the “institutional brace of a movement.”¹⁹² She disagreed with radical feminist assertions that men were the enemy and that women were the “most oppressed political caste in history.”¹⁹³ Furthermore, feminist organizations’ refusal to respect Kirkpatrick as a woman who “made it in a male world”¹⁹⁴ served to further increase her indignation towards the movement. Even in the 1980s, after

¹⁸⁹ Collier, 63.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid.

¹⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁹² Collier, 77-8; See also “At Lunch with Jeane Kirkpatrick”, *New York Times*, August 17, 1984, Section C, page 1.

¹⁹³ Collier, 78.

¹⁹⁴ “At Lunch with Jeane Kirkpatrick”, *New York Times*, August 17, 1994, Section C, page 1.

becoming the highest ranking woman within the American foreign policy apparatus, feminists continued to vilify her. For example, in 1981, Vassar College held the Berkshire Conference on the History of Women. Though Kirkpatrick was now a United Nations Ambassador and author of a book on women in politics, the keynote speaker at the event, history professor Joan W. Scott, dismissed her as “not someone I want to represent feminine accomplishment.”¹⁹⁵

Just as radical feminism began to gain strength in the United States in the early 1970s, Kirkpatrick published her third book – *Political Woman*.¹⁹⁶ As a feminist, a political scientist, and a political activist, Kirkpatrick began questioning the role of women in politics and government; specifically, why, fifty years after the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, were women absent from the upper levels of American politics? In hopes of gaining greater insight, Kirkpatrick took part in a 1972 conference for women in politics sponsored by the Center for the American Woman and Politics at Rutgers University. There she conducted interviews and handed out questionnaires to the fifty female state senators and representatives from 26 states who attended the conference. The politicians surveyed had all served more than one term in their state legislatures and were all selected for the conference by the various state organizations of the American Association of University Women, the League of Women Voters, and the National Federation of Business and Professional Women.¹⁹⁷ Kirkpatrick took information gained from these women, along with similar data gathered from male legislators, to write one of the first major studies of women in American public life.

Kirkpatrick began by noting that male dominance of governments and policy-making was indisputable. “Political man is a familiar figure with a long history,” she wrote, “As chief,

¹⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁹⁶ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Political Woman*. (New York: Basic Books, 1974).

¹⁹⁷ Ibid, ix – x.

prince, king, counselor, premier, president, dictator, chairman he has led, battled, pillaged, conquered, built, judged, governed. Political man has fascinated and challenged historians and philosophers; he has been described, dissected, praised, excoriated and psychoanalyzed.”¹⁹⁸

Kirkpatrick acknowledged that women had traditionally been ignored in studies of politics due to the fact that they have had such a small share of political power. However, given the changes in the roles of women that had occurred in the 20th century, in particular, the enfranchisement of females, she wondered why very few women sought or wielded political power. Kirkpatrick noted that women were quite numerous at the lower levels of American politics – being active in precincts, at party picnics, getting out the vote, telephoning, and fundraising, yet “no woman has been nominated to be president or vice-president, no woman has served on the Supreme Court... no woman in the cabinet, no woman in the Senate, no woman serving as governor of a major state, no woman mayor of a major city, no woman in the top leadership of either party.”¹⁹⁹ Why was this so?

In order to answer this question, Kirkpatrick first examined women as a political category. Politics was an activity that was carried out in the name of collectivities where the possession and use of power is generally justified with reference to some larger good and demands are made in the name of a group. As time goes on, new collectivities or groups are created around attributes such as nationality, religion, race, income level, or gender. In general, once a group with such common identities had coalesced, its grievances and demands were made manifest. In late 20th century America, “women” had been transformed from a group possessing specific biological characteristics into a symbol of political identity.²⁰⁰ Despite being identified as

¹⁹⁸ Ibid, 3.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰⁰ Ibid, 5-6.

a political collectivity, Kirkpatrick asserted that gender has only occasionally been used as a basis for common political activity by women. For example, women worked together to achieve voting rights, successfully organizing and agitating in the name of their sex; however, once the right to vote was secured, the collective concerns of women were rarely articulated within the political arena. Furthermore, unlike after the enfranchisement of other categories of people, women's suffrage did not affect the major social composition of government, as the feminine half of the population was seldom represented by more than five to ten percent of the members of any state legislature. Moreover, according to Kirkpatrick, gender has had less influence on political behavior than ethnic, regional, or economic identifications.²⁰¹ Thus, the tendency of women to coalesce around issues other than their gender may account, in part, for their absence from political power.

Following her assessment of women as a political category, Kirkpatrick considered four hypothetical constraints that might also account for the low levels of political participation of women – physiological constraints, cultural constraints, role constraints, and male conspiracy. Physiological constraints referred to the biological differences between men and women, both physically and mentally, and were based on the notion that the political aspects of social life have evolved around power and force. Men were able to physically dominate; women were not. Men were programmed for leadership, decision-making, and force; women were not. Though brute force was not necessary for a person to achieve political power in the United States, political scientists maintained that underlying modern campaigns was a continuing struggle to

²⁰¹ Ibid, 7-8.

achieve and assert dominance – a struggle that largely excluded women based on their physiology.²⁰²

In addition to hypothetical physiological constraints, women also faced cultural constraints that could discourage them from engaging in politics. Kirkpatrick noted culture elaborates the psychological, moral, and social implications of biological characteristics, where definitions of masculinity and femininity are learned and internalized. She noted,

The essential elements of the cultural explanation of sex role behavior are the propositions that:

1. Culture embodies norms defining the sexes and identifies behavior appropriate for each: these are perpetuated through the socialization process
2. These norms determine the identity, expectations, and demands of males and females
3. Sex stereotypes are not necessarily derived from the physiological characteristics of the two sexes
4. Norms are internalized regardless of their biological relevance
5. In all modern, industrial societies, specifically including the United States, cultural norms exist which arbitrarily limit women's personal development, social choices, and opportunity to share fully in the dominant values of society.²⁰³

Thus, politics becomes an example of cultural exclusion; for though legal barriers to women's participation in political life had been abolished, cultural norms have preserved the definition of politics as 'man's world'. Furthermore, cultural expectations regarding gender roles were complemented by a dual status system that measures women by different criteria than men where women gain status through excelling in sanctioned roles – nurturing, homemaking, personal adornment, etc. Any effort to perform roles assigned by the culture to the opposite sex is likely to result in a loss of status.²⁰⁴ Though cultural norms concerning gender roles were changing, and the penalties of nonconformity were not as great as they had been in the past, Kirkpatrick predicted that traditional culture may conserve politics as a male domain for some time.

²⁰² Ibid, 8-12.

²⁰³ Ibid, 14.

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

Kirkpatrick argued that role constraints were more restrictive to women than physiological and cultural restraints.²⁰⁵ Both the physiological and cultural explanations viewed the personality of men and women, whether programmed through biology or culture, as the primary cause for women's absence and men's dominance of politics; however, personality was deemphasized in discussions of social roles. A role refers to a position in the social structure and its associated set of coherent norms. In most societies, roles are complementary, meaning men's roles and women's roles complement one another and provide structure for the relations between the sexes. Women's primary role of wife and mother had been viewed as irreconcilable with the role of professional as both had been described as full-time, life-long jobs. Furthermore, two professions were more easily combined when they have common role requirements, for example, law and politics, but the nurturing skills associated with women's roles as wives and mothers were not viewed as applicable to politics.²⁰⁶

Finally, there was the male conspiracy theory, or the belief that women were oppressed, banned from power by the ruling classes – men. From this point of view, the situation of women was comparable to that of African Americans, where both groups were dominated and excluded from power by white men. Not surprisingly, those who adhered to the notion of male conspiracy viewed feminine traits as similar to characteristics of subjected persons and/or oppressed groups – lack of education, vulnerable to peer prejudice, economic discrimination, low aspirations, more emotional than rational, more dependent than autonomous, and more predisposed to be governed than to govern. Supporters of the male conspiracy theory held that cultural and role constraints served as effective instruments of male domination.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ Ibid, 221.

²⁰⁶ Ibid, 17-19.

²⁰⁷ Ibid, 19-20.

Given that the cards were seemingly stacked against female politicians – the lack of a cohesive political identity, physiological, cultural, and role constraints, along with male prejudice – just who were the women who successfully participated in the political world? Based on the information drawn from interviews and questionnaires, Kirkpatrick depicted the average female legislator as an attractive, forty-eight year old mother of two, who, despite having a college education, had rarely worked outside of the home. She lived in the town in which she was born and was provided for financially by her husband who had supported her decision to run for government office. Competing for office was an extension of her many years of volunteer experience. Though the lives of the state legislators surveyed differed in many respects, the vast majority shared several key characteristics including a small town background, geographic stability, membership in the middle-class, participant and active parents, higher education, and community service.²⁰⁸

In many ways, the women surveyed were very similar to the male state legislators. The majority of the men examined also came from smaller towns, were college-educated members of the middle class, had active parents, and had participated in extracurricular activities and community volunteerism before running for political office. Where male and female legislators differed were in their education levels, employment history, age, and number of offspring. Most of the men were more highly educated than their female counterparts and had been continuously employed. In addition, the male legislators tended to have more children and ran for office at an earlier age. Whereas many of the men had children under the age of ten when they first ran for office, the majority of women waited until after their children were grown before embarking

²⁰⁸ Ibid, 29-30.

upon a political career.²⁰⁹ Based on the similarities and differences between the sexes surveyed, Kirkpatrick concluded that “the same social experiences seem to contribute to the development of politically active males and females. Many of the same personality patterns characterize both. Observable differences... derive more from social roles than from inherent predispositions.”²¹⁰

Notwithstanding the many similarities between male and female legislators, the women surveyed were forced to adapt and survive in a male-dominated environment once they took office. Many of them reported being rebuffed by their male counterparts in several ways. Some were excluded from certain events or meetings, while others were excluded linguistically as all members of the chamber were referred to as ‘men’. Others reported “the most subtle form of put down” – being killed with kindness and treated like a helpless child.²¹¹ These women were called ‘darlings’ of the house and the men treated them with exaggerated courtesy. Still others were excluded from discussions and debates that revolved around ‘masculine’ topics such as economic measures and were directed instead towards committees that dealt with more ‘feminine’ issues like education. Some were openly insulted; one state senator reported being told “You should be in the kitchen, not in the Senate” by a male colleague.²¹² Regardless of the difficulties faced by female politicians, the women surveyed were able to overcome male resistance through hard work and perseverance. Kirkpatrick wrote, “These women not only feel that it is possible to win professional acceptance and cooperation of their male colleagues, they are convinced that they have done so.”²¹³

²⁰⁹ Ibid, 38, 55.

²¹⁰ Ibid, 55.

²¹¹ Ibid, 109.

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Ibid, 123.

Like Kirkpatrick, the majority of female legislators surveyed were critical of radical feminism. She noted, “Approximately 60% of the legislators expressed opposition to the women’s liberation movement and many criticisms were leveled against the women’s liberation movement.”²¹⁴ Several of them expressed the view that the movement posited an inaccurate conception of women’s situations and problems. Few believed that women were exploited by men and society and very few felt that they were deprived or denied self-fulfillment and freedom. Furthermore, many of the legislators disapproved of the movement’s denigration of the role of wife and mother. Likewise, the majority of the legislators viewed women’s liberation as extremist. “In the eyes of many,” noted Kirkpatrick, “women’s liberation is a branch of radical politics – and so is regarded with the same distaste as they regard the counter culture, the ‘new’ politics, student riots, dropouts and flag burners.”²¹⁵ Moreover, many labeled the movement as partisan. Kirkpatrick asserted that even the moderate wings of the feminist movement, which included the National Organization of Women, were regarded as partisans of the most liberal wing of the Democratic Party. Finally, many expressed the view that women’s liberation actually made it more difficult to be elected into office as all women seeking to do ‘men’s jobs’ were then being lumped together as “extremist nuts and bra-burners”.²¹⁶

Not all of the legislators surveyed were opposed to women’s liberation. Kirkpatrick divided those favorable to the movement into two categories: those that found the movement to be too strident and ‘far out’ but saw it as useful in broadening the opportunities and rights for women, and those that explicitly supported and identified with the movement. Approximately

²¹⁴ Ibid, 164.

²¹⁵ Ibid, 165.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

1/5 of the women surveyed fell into each of these categories.²¹⁷ “Disagreements about the women’s movement within this group of legislators,” noted Kirkpatrick, “illuminate the problem of uniting women in a single, political action group.”²¹⁸ In fact, the only issue agreed upon by those surveyed as being a ‘women’s issue’ was the Equal Rights Amendment, which was supported by all but three of the women surveyed.

In the conclusion of *Political Woman*, Kirkpatrick speculated on the future for women in politics. She maintained that in order for women to gain de facto political equality, both a social and a cultural revolution were required. Many fundamental beliefs about the nature of men, women, children, and government would have to be abandoned or, at the very least, revised. Kirkpatrick acknowledged that within the United States cultural and social changes were already in progress. “Current trends in mass opinion suggest a continuing and increasing demand for progressive inclusion of women,” she wrote, “they suggest larger numbers of professional women, increasing efforts to combine family and professional roles. Should they continue, increased numbers of women will be seeking public office.”²¹⁹ Despite these trends, Kirkpatrick remained cautious, observing that preferences change slowly and that change does not always follow the opinion of the masses, even in democracies. She stated,

The national experience with desegregation seems to prove that, at least under certain circumstances, it is possible to legislate against mores. This experience seems to suggest that, at least under certain circumstances, coercion can be used to achieve goals (e.g. the end to school segregation) that do not have the support of public opinion. Can political power be used to bring about the full (equal) participation of women in power processes? Recently some men have used the power vested in their roles to procure a larger voice for women in politics. The “McGovern-Fraser guidelines” for the 1972 Democratic Convention decreed that there should be equal numbers of women and men in convention proceedings. The various “Affirmative Action” programs of recent years provide

²¹⁷ Ibid, 166.

²¹⁸ Ibid, 166.

²¹⁹ Ibid, 250.

examples of the deliberate use of public policy to achieve greater participation by women in various social processes from which they had been excluded.²²⁰

Kirkpatrick opposed affirmative action policies and the use of quotas to increase women's participation in politics, asserting that they sacrificed important values such as equal opportunity, intra-party democracy, and self-government.²²¹ In lieu of the institution of quotas, she believed the government could expedite greater political participation for women in several ways including the appointment of more women to higher positions in government and the withholding of public support from universities and related institutions that discriminated against females in admissions, and in the awarding of scholarships, fellowships, and other types of aid. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick asserted that sexual discrimination in law, employment practices, education, and elsewhere was intolerable and that such practices had to be addressed by the government. "These and comparable policies can be adopted without serious violations of existing norms," she wrote, "and would probably accelerate the trend towards increased participation of women in public power processes."²²²

Political Woman was praised in both academic and non-academic circles. Noted political scientist Harold D. Lasswell called it a "landmark study...packed with beautifully analyzed information".²²³ Following the book's publication, Kirkpatrick developed a reputation as an expert on women in politics that not only boosted her standing amongst her peers, but also enabled her to extend her political activities outside of the United States. In 1975, the United States Information Agency asked her to represent the U.S. at a conference held in West Africa. The gathering was part of the United Nations' International Women's Year. At the conference,

²²⁰ Ibid, 250.

²²¹ Ibid, 251.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ *Signs*, Vol.1, No.2 (Winter, 1975) pg. 527.

Kirkpatrick delivered lectures on women in public affairs and American democracy.²²⁴ Her foreign language skills served her well as she travelled to the former French colonies of Togo and Niger.²²⁵

Shortly after the publication of *Political Woman*, Kirkpatrick completed her fourth book, *The New Presidential Elite*. This work grew out of her growing disenchantment with the rise of the New Left within the Democratic Party. In 1972, Kirkpatrick attended the Democratic National Convention in Miami, Florida where she worked as a speechwriter and pollster for Hubert Humphrey's doomed presidential campaign. Kirkpatrick blamed Humphrey's loss of the nomination to George McGovern on changes made to the rules regarding delegate selection. In 1968, the Democratic Party's Commission on Party Structures and Delegate Selection, more commonly known as the McGovern Commission or the McGovern-Fraser Commission, took measures to guarantee participation of all interested Democrats. Such measures included the institution of racial, gender, and age quotas for delegates which, in turn, she asserted, allowed for the New Left (or 'new class' as she labels them in the book) to dominate convention proceedings. Kirkpatrick's disgust over this turn of events led to the publication of *The New Presidential Elite* and caused her to vote Republican for the first time in her life.²²⁶

In *The New Presidential Elite*, Kirkpatrick utilized data gathered from mail questionnaires and personal interviews with delegates to both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions in 1972 in order to determine whether or not a new breed of political elite had emerged. Drawing on the data collected, Kirkpatrick described the social and personal

²²⁴ Harrison, 76.

²²⁵ "Getting to Know You: Jeane Kirkpatrick on Personal Diplomacy" by: Donnie Radcliffe. *The Washington Post*, December 13, 1983, Final Edition, B1.

²²⁶ Collier, 84. She said, "When I voted for Richard Nixon I didn't do it easily and I wasn't proud of it. But I knew McGovern was going to lose and thought he should."

characteristics of the delegates, the various incentives that caused them to participate in presidential politics, the delegates' political perspectives, and the various factions extant within the parties.

Kirkpatrick began by asserting that large numbers of new men and women whose motives, goals, and ideas differed from those who have dominated American politics in the past had ascended to power. Until the late 1960s and early 1970s politicians and politics in general were, for the most part, pragmatic and moderate rather than ideological and extreme. According to her, such pragmatic politicians had adopted policies favorable to the electorate and had chosen candidates based on voter appeal. Kirkpatrick attributed the lack of such pragmatism at the 1972 Democratic National Convention to the McGovern reforms which were themselves a result of many changes occurring in American politics and society. She wrote,

The decline of party identification and the growth of split ticket voting; the appearance of a third party; the increased reliance on public relations techniques rather than organization; the decreased confidence in government and in other public institutions; the appearance of direct action – assassinations, sit-ins, demonstrations, draft evasion; the progressive breakdown of consensus on such basic values as patriotism, obedience to law, and compromise; the rise of new kinds of pressure groups and new kinds of issues... the persistence of 'cross cutting' issues that cut across traditional party alignments; the landslide defeat of the majority party's presidential candidate; 'Watergate' and all that it implies about the decline of restraint in the use of power – these and many other phenomena of the recent past argue that the American political system is undergoing quite fundamental changes.²²⁷

The changes occurring in American society had a dramatic effect on American politics, especially within the Democratic Party. According to Kirkpatrick, from the Great Depression to the mid-1960s, Democratic politics was dominated by welfare issues, "how to guard the society against drastic and catastrophic economic fluctuations, how to provide minimum economic well-

²²⁷ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *The New Presidential Elite: Men and Women in National Politics*. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976), 4- 5.

being for all, how to use government's power to stimulate economic growth, how to pay for new services and public activities – all without destroying the fundamental elements of the free enterprise system.”²²⁸ However, the issues prominent at the 1972 Democratic National Convention were not the bread and butter welfare state issues on which Democrats were relatively united. Instead, focus was shifted towards social and cultural issues, which, she charged, created a preoccupation with the political advantages of white males. Accordingly, more attention was paid to three groups: African Americans, women, and youth.²²⁹

Beginning in 1968, efforts were made within the party to “overcome the effects of past discrimination” through the use of affirmative action.²³⁰ Kirkpatrick opposed the party's use of quotas, writing, “Until recently, liberals and liberal doctrines emphasized providing equal access to power (as to other values). It was believed that abolition of legal discrimination and of discriminatory practices satisfied the requirement of equal access; from that point, ability, ambition, hard work, and luck were expected to serve as the basis of selection.”²³¹ In her mind, the use of quotas violated the hallowed American value of equal opportunity by providing special assistance to specific groups at the expense of others.²³² Furthermore, affirmative action policies pitted the ‘old-timers’ – those who had dominated traditional politics for decades and who supported traditional, ‘establishment’ candidates such as Hubert Humphrey and Henry Jackson, against the ‘newcomers’ – those who were stimulated by passionate concern with the issues of the late 1960s to enter the political arena and who supported more radical candidates

²²⁸ Ibid, 160.

²²⁹ Ibid, 51, 83-84.

²³⁰ Ibid, 43.

²³¹ Ibid, 83.

²³² Ibid, 83, 85.

like George McGovern.²³³ This division, she charged, crippled the party organization, exacerbated party divisions, weakened state parties in the recruitment process and in convention proceedings, and increased the importance of new constituencies at the expense of traditional ones.²³⁴

Kirkpatrick asserted that the McGovern reforms were much more concerned with participation rather than actual representation. The political scientist pointed out that *representing* the rank and file members of a party was not the same as making sure that everyone who desired to influence the nominating process was able to do so. Moreover, Kirkpatrick disregarded the commission's belief that the previous unequal political participation of women, minorities, and the youth could *only* be due to discrimination instead of other qualities such as ambition, interest, or skill.²³⁵ Thus, Kirkpatrick found fault with the convention's adoption of the doctrine of demographic representation for choosing delegates over the more traditional doctrine of radical representation. She claimed,

The goal of demographic theories is an assembly in which some specific physical and/or social characteristics are present in roughly the same proportions as their occurrence in the total electorate. The goal of the radical theories is an assembly that reflects the opinions and orientations of the electorate in its decisions on matters of public policy...proponents of demographic representation propose to achieve the desired outcome through institutional devices, notably quotas... radical representation relies on the dynamics of personal ambition, intraparty and interparty competition, and the preferences of the *represented* to determine the composition of the representative assembly... The radical doctrine... does not deny that sex or race may be importantly related to social positions and political views. But it does not *assume* that these characteristics have special, unique, or definitive relevance to political perspectives, roles, or outcomes. It leaves the decision concerning the relevance of different statuses to those to be represented... The demographic approach... *requires that someone other than voters determine which of the many statuses of a person are in fact most important*: the McGovern Commission decided in favor of sex, race, and age.²³⁶

²³³ Ibid, 5.

²³⁴ Ibid, 41, 45.

²³⁵ Ibid, 287-289.

²³⁶ Ibid, 290.

According to Kirkpatrick, despite its efforts, the commission failed to make the party truly representative of both the rank and file party members and the American electorate in its entirety. To prove this, she examined the age, sex, and race of the delegates of both parties. As the women's movement began to grow in the late 1960s and early 1970s, both parties were forced to pay attention to women's issues. This led to an increase in the number of women present at both the RNC and the DNC; however, based on their totals in the general population, women were under-represented. Forty percent of the delegates at the DNC were women, while thirty percent of Republican delegates were female. Kirkpatrick maintained that though more women were represented, many of them, specifically those belonging to the Democratic Party, were not *representative* of the majority of women in America. Instead, the majority of female delegates were affiliated with the women's liberation movement, a group she described as 'political amateurs' who were most concerned with feminist issues and who cared little for party unity.²³⁷

African Americans, the majority of whom were Democrats, increased their influence at the DNC as they, like women, benefitted from the new quota system. As compared to their total numbers within the American population (approximately eleven percent), African Americans were over-represented at the DNC and under-represented at the RNC, constituting sixteen percent of Democratic delegates and five percent of Republican delegates. Though over-represented, Kirkpatrick praised black delegates at the DNC for their party loyalty, noting that though they had distinct views on busing, crime, and welfare, their views on other issues resembled those of the rank and file members of the party.²³⁸ Nonetheless, black delegates who supported McGovern were not necessarily representative of black party members. For example,

²³⁷ Ibid, 233-4.

²³⁸ Ibid, 235.

many African Americans remained divided over the busing issue, with a slight majority favoring neighborhood schools; however, black McGovern delegates overwhelmingly favored busing.²³⁹

Thanks to the baby boom that occurred within the United States in the postwar era, 25 million persons became first-time voters in 1972. Accordingly, the age structure of the two conventions changed, most notably within the Democratic Party. Twenty-three percent of Democratic and eight percent of Republican delegates were between the ages of 18 and 29. Among Democratic delegates, those under the age of 30 were most numerous in the McGovern ranks. According to Kirkpatrick, these delegates were similar to the new female delegates in that “the opinions of that group were remote from those of rank and file Democratic identifiers of any age.”²⁴⁰ What of other age groups? Whereas persons between the ages of 30 and 50 were overrepresented at the DNC, those aged 40 to 65 were overrepresented at the RNC. Those over the age of 65 were substantially underrepresented at both conventions: persons over the age of 65 constituted fifteen percent of the total American population, yet Democratic delegates over the age of 65 comprised only four percent of the total while only nine percent of Republican delegates were of this age group.²⁴¹

According to Kirkpatrick, the McGovern Commission, “for reasons known best to its own members, preoccupied with representation of women, blacks, and youth” paid little attention to the representation of socioeconomic classes.²⁴² She found the social homogeneity of the two conventions to be interesting, yet not surprising, noting that the vast majority of all delegates at both conventions boasted higher educational levels, better jobs, and made more money than the majority of Americans. This was true even of those delegates who were African

²³⁹ Ibid, 321.

²⁴⁰ Ibid, 326.

²⁴¹ Ibid, 293.

²⁴² Ibid.

American, female, or under the age of 30. Although in 1970 fifty percent of American families had incomes under \$10,000.00 per year and five percent had incomes over \$25,000.00, only five percent of Republican and thirteen percent of Democratic delegates earned less than \$10,000.00. Meanwhile fifty-eight percent of Republican and thirty-five percent of Democratic delegates earned more than \$25,000.00. Contrasts in education were sharper: forty-two percent of rank and file Democrats and thirty-five percent of Republicans had less than a high school education, but only four percent of the Democratic and two percent of the Republican delegates fell into this category. Though $\frac{3}{4}$ of Democratic and $\frac{2}{3}$ of Republican Party members had only a high-school education, sixty percent of both conventions' delegates held a college degree.²⁴³

The occupation of delegates matched their educational levels. Kirkpatrick noted that relatively small numbers of self-employed businessmen, farmers, and workers were present at the DNC as compared to previous years.²⁴⁴ Businessmen, farmers, and workers constituted self-interest groups that were concerned with material rewards and economic incentives that Kirkpatrick deemed as legitimate incentives for political action. In lieu of such typically 'democratic' groups there was an increase in the number of middle-class professional elites, in particular lawyers and teachers, who were, she argued, more concerned with the symbolic aspects of politics. Kirkpatrick paid special attention to the rise to political prominence of professionals she termed "symbol specialists" – teachers, advertisers, journalists, clergy, publishers, and commentators. Such groups were experts in the production, manipulation, and communication of the symbols with which persons interpret events, define goals, and attribute meanings. According to Kirkpatrick, symbol specialists not only communicate values and myths, they were also "guardians, destroyers, and creators of the collective myths that bind together and

²⁴³ Ibid, 294-5.

²⁴⁴ Note that this was true at the RNC as well.

rip apart communities and societies.”²⁴⁵ The majority of symbol specialists present at the DNC were critics of the traditional culture and supporters of McGovern. Therefore, they used their communication skills to focus attention on issues with which they were concerned. Kirkpatrick noted that politics dominated by such professionals, “is likely to have a higher ideological content and the political process is more likely to be conceived as an arena for setting public agendas and resolving moral problems than as an arena for winning and compromising material interests.”²⁴⁶

Consequently, this ‘new class’, which dominated the Democratic Convention, exhibited less party loyalty and deemphasized winning elections as the party’s principal and legitimate goal. In her studies of both the Republican and Democratic National Conventions Kirkpatrick found that an emphasis on winning was high among the Republicans and those Democrats that supported ‘traditional candidates’ such as Hubert Humphrey. According to Kirkpatrick, an emphasis on winning stimulated the parties’ efforts to broaden their coalitions and to harmonize differences between various factions. Those, such as the ‘new class’, who did not emphasize winning and party loyalty, only increased controversy within the party over various issues.²⁴⁷

Kirkpatrick questioned delegates about their stances regarding a number of issues including authority, foreign affairs, economic issues, welfare policies, race relations, and crime in order to ascertain what other differences existed between the New Left or ‘new class’ and the more established party members. When it came to viewpoints concerning authority, McGovern supporters exhibited a higher disrespect toward it than traditional Democrats and the vast

²⁴⁵ Ibid, 356

²⁴⁶ Ibid, 71-2.

²⁴⁷ Ibid, 114-5, 128, 151.

majority of Republicans.²⁴⁸ Kirkpatrick's interest in authority stemmed from its relationship to legitimacy and force – legitimate governments have the authority to utilize force to coerce compliance with their decisions. Members of the New Left repeatedly challenged the legitimacy and authority of the American government and its policies, and consistently opposed the state's use of coercive power, both at home with police and national guardsmen, and abroad with the U.S. military. Kirkpatrick noted that a low opinion of government and authority was relatively new on the American political scene, at least since the New Deal and World War II, and that such attitudes were bound to have important effects on the political system. She claimed,

Cynicism about government and governors can justify diverse assaults on the public order. The demand for radical change is one well-known response. Corruption is another... the belief that government is corrupt itself becomes a corrupting factor. When the political elite holds such beliefs, political dialogue is likely to be shrill or cynical or both. Redemptive zeal and cynical manipulation are the normal products of a loss of confidence in the political institutions of society.²⁴⁹

Cynicism, along with the questioning of authority and the legitimate use of force, were also representative of the New Left's attitudes towards American foreign relations. According to Kirkpatrick, several factors caused Americans to re-examine American military and foreign commitments in the late 1960s and early 1970s including Vietnam and the Nixon Administration's emphasis on détente. Of fundamental importance was the emergence of a new generation who had no personal memory of either the Nazi holocaust or communist expansionism. Though delegates at both the RNC and the DNC remained divided on many foreign policy issues, in particular Vietnam and the American presence in Southeast Asia, the McGovern delegates were most opposed to the use of American military force and to the maintenance of American military superiority. Instead of force, they favored greater U.S. support

²⁴⁸ Ibid, 169-174.

²⁴⁹ Ibid, 175.

for the United Nations and increased economic aid to needy nations. Kirkpatrick related this attitude to their perception of the world, noting that if one viewed the world as a dangerous place, where the aggression of the great communist powers was only kept in check by the fear of retaliation, then it was important for the most powerful non-communist nation, the United States, to maintain military superiority and observe its commitment to collective security agreements and treaties negotiated during the postwar years. However, if one believed that the world was not dangerous and that communists did not pose a threat to the vital interests of the United States then it did not make sense to maintain the world's most powerful military establishment. From this point of view, it was more appropriate to embrace a strategy of international cooperation.²⁵⁰

In addition to their lack of respect towards authority and Cold War policies, the New Left or 'new class' differed from traditional Democrats in their economic views. With the economy showing signs of "acute strain in shifting from a wartime to a peacetime basis and from the impact of Republican economics", economic issues – an ever higher cost of living, higher taxes, and increasing unemployment numbers – were considered most pressing to the American electorate as a whole in 1972.²⁵¹ In order to establish the economic orientation of the delegates, questions were asked about the role of government in the economy and attitudes towards business interests and labor. Overall, Kirkpatrick found the results interesting, though not unexpected. For one, the results testified to the withering away of laissez-faire economics by demonstrating that, at least on the elite level, the economic 'right' did not exist, for nearly all delegates – Republican and Democrat – believed that the government should take action to combat inflation.²⁵² Second, the delegates' respective attitudes towards business interests and

²⁵⁰ Ibid, 182-185.

²⁵¹ Ibid, 185.

²⁵² Ibid, 186.

trade unions indicated the persistence of traditional differences between the parties. Democrats were more favorable towards unions than Republicans, while Republicans were more favorable towards business interests than Democrats.

At the same time, there were marked differences among the supporters of Humphrey, McGovern, and Wallace which, as stated by Kirkpatrick, demonstrated a weakening of the historic alliance between organized labor and the Democratic Party. Whereas Humphrey delegates were much more favorable towards organized labor, Wallace delegates remained hostile towards them. Furthermore, Humphrey delegates, while being the most pro-labor of all Democratic groups, were also the most favorable to business interests. The New Left's animosity towards business was much higher than that of the other groups, yet this animosity was not offset by widespread support for labor. "Apparently McGovern delegates viewed both the major proponents on the economic scene," Kirkpatrick noted, "big labor and big business, with a certain distaste."²⁵³ Such distaste was acknowledged by labor when the nation's largest union, the AFL-CIO, refused to endorse McGovern's candidacy in 1972.²⁵⁴

Yet another indicator of delegates' economic orientation was their view on welfare policies. According to Kirkpatrick, during the early 1960s the majority of Americans agreed with the proposition that governments should provide public funds to help those unable to help themselves to achieve a minimum standard of physical well-being; however, by the late 1960s, welfare policies had "collided with the achievement ethic".²⁵⁵ President Johnson's 'War on Poverty' defined larger numbers of people as 'poor', relaxed eligibility requirements for public relief, and increasingly abandoned policies that able-bodied recipients of welfare be required to

²⁵³ Ibid, 191.

²⁵⁴ Ibid, 186.

²⁵⁵ Ibid, 192.

work.²⁵⁶ Kirkpatrick charged McGovern's supporters with attacking the achievement ethic (or work ethic) by backing the use public funds to support "able-bodied but lazy persons".²⁵⁷

Conversely, the majority of Wallace and Nixon supporters were in favor of the obligation to work, while Humphrey delegates remained divided on welfare issues.²⁵⁸

McGovern delegates also differed from traditional Democrats, Wallace supporters, and Republicans in matters concerning race relations. By 1972, controversy concerning government action in the field of race relations centered on busing school children across district lines in order to achieve racial balance. "Busing children out of neighborhood schools involves mixing cultures and classes as well as races," Kirkpatrick noted, "It deprives parents who must use public schools of control over the environment in which their children are socialized."²⁵⁹ She went on to point out that the busing issue and civil disobedience were examples of how questions of race and civil rights had become intertwined with social policy. McGovern delegates were overwhelmingly in favor of both busing and civil disobedience, while Wallace supporters and the majority of Republicans were opposed to both. Moreover, the majority of Humphrey supporters were able to make distinctions between civil rights and social policy by approving of civil rights and disapproving of busing and civil disobedience.²⁶⁰

Following its publication, the book received mixed reviews. One reviewer praised the book for its "extremely rich and intelligently analyzed" data, yet noted that it was "too long, discursive, repetitive, and fragmentary, with bits of theory tacked on here and there".²⁶¹ Though this commentator agreed with Kirkpatrick's overall assertion that a new breed of political elite

²⁵⁶ Ibid.

²⁵⁷ Ibid, 193, 321.

²⁵⁸ Ibid, 194.

²⁵⁹ Ibid, 194.

²⁶⁰ Ibid.

²⁶¹ *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 84, No. 6 (May, 1979), 1490.

had evolved, one that was motivated primarily by value concerns and issue commitments, others were less sympathetic. One critic claimed it was not methodologically sound to choose an extreme case (1972) and compare it with an arbitrarily chosen baseline (1948 and 1952). Moreover, it was difficult to prove that an evolution in the political elite had occurred since similar data did not exist for national conventions between 1952 and 1972. Finally, the author pointed out that the ‘new breed’ Kirkpatrick described was barely present within the Republican Party, thus the ‘new breed’ may well represent only a short-term phenomenon within the Democratic Party.²⁶²

Overall, it is obvious that Kirkpatrick found the establishment of the McGovern reforms to be disastrous for the Democratic Party. Whereas some saw the McGovern reforms as a landmark in the struggle for party democracy, an emancipation proclamation that freed the party from control by bosses and entrenched interests, others viewed them as a mistaken, though well-intentioned effort that ended up crippling party organization, exacerbating party differences, and making electoral victory nearly impossible. To others, the reforms constituted “a naked power grab by one faction that used its control of the reform commission to write rules that assured it an advantage in the contest for the nomination.”²⁶³ It is clear from her work, especially by her assertion that most delegates were chosen as “supporters of particular presidential candidates”²⁶⁴ that Kirkpatrick fell into the latter category.

Conclusions

During the 1960s and 1970s, Kirkpatrick’s interest in totalitarianism and non-democratic regimes, an interest sparked during her college years and cemented by her exposure to the first-

²⁶² *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 72, No. 3 (September, 1978), 1068-9.

²⁶³ Kirkpatrick, *The New Presidential Elite*, 41.

²⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 55.

hand accounts of fascist and communist refugees, did not wane. Her fascination with authoritarianism led her to choose Argentina during the Peronist period as the topic of her dissertation. In her analysis of Peronism and Argentine politics in the decade following Perón's downfall, Kirkpatrick asserted that Peronism did not constitute fascism or any form of totalitarianism; rather it was a blend of authoritarian and democratic elements, common in Latin American regimes. The Argentine political system, similar to those of other Latin American nations, was characterized by a limited experience in democratic methods, an entrenched oligarchy, a military that often interfered with politics, the use of violence by various groups, and direct political action such as the use of strikes and lobbying activities. Such systems involved a variety of legitimate political behaviors including voting, oligarchical control, military coup, violence, and strikes. According to Kirkpatrick, as long as citizens were able to utilize such methods to influence the political system, a certain degree of political action and freedom existed.

Despite this, Kirkpatrick was careful to point out that Peronism was not necessarily a stepping stone on the path to liberal democracy. Based on the history of Argentina, Kirkpatrick deemed it unlikely that the country's political system would become a full-fledged democracy in the near future. Though this assertion seemed to be at odds with one of the major contentions of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, namely that authoritarian regimes were capable of evolving into approximate democratic states thereby warranting American support, this was not necessarily the case. Kirkpatrick believed that it was impossible to create democracy anywhere, at any given time; instead, democratic values and institutions must develop over time. Even the United States, the beacon of democracy to the world, did not emerge as a mature democratic state in the late 18th century following its independence from Great Britain; it took another two hundred years for

political equality to be available to all Americans. Accordingly, the U.S. should be patient and continue to support authoritarian regimes, especially those in Latin America whose political systems included some democratic characteristics. Such governments were preferable to totalitarian regimes, and were, with American support and encouragement, capable of evolving into liberal states over time.

Kirkpatrick's belief that political change should occur slowly was not limited to the evolution of democracy in nations around the world. One of her major critiques of the rise of the New Left within American society and politics involved the movement's demands for instantaneous social and cultural change. This is particularly true of the radical feminist and civil rights organizations. Though she was a feminist and an advocate for civil rights, Kirkpatrick supported only governmental action that would guarantee political equality and non-discrimination. Once political and social equality were guaranteed, hard work, ambition, and ability would determine the success of an individual. She opposed the establishment of gender and racial quotas due to her belief that such laws violated the American tradition of equal opportunity by providing special assistance to specific groups. Moreover, Kirkpatrick remained highly critical of legislation that went against social mores or violated existing social and cultural norms. She maintained that society's attitudes towards, and beliefs about, women and minorities could not be changed overnight via legislation. Such changes could occur only gradually as more women and African Americans took advantage of available opportunities in order to advance themselves within society.

In addition to its demand for radical change, Kirkpatrick disapproved of the New Left's methods and goals. Though she condoned the use of violence, strikes, and direct action in authoritarian regimes as legitimate political activities that occurred outside of the electoral arena,

Kirkpatrick found similar actions by student protestors, anti-war activists, and black power organizations to be unacceptable within the United States. In fact, Kirkpatrick labeled such activities as 'fascist'. American radicals were, to her, nothing less than totalitarians whose ultimate goal was to institute a social and cultural revolution. Though her classifications of the New Left as 'fascist' and 'totalitarian' were extreme and exaggerated, based on her educational background, it is not surprising that Kirkpatrick viewed the New Left as political extremists, similar to both the fascists who had brought about the fall of the Weimar Republic and to the communists who had taken over Russia and China, whose goal was to destroy the American democratic experiment by fundamentally restructuring American society and culture.

Given her beliefs about the nature of the New Left, Kirkpatrick was outraged by its increasing power within the Democratic Party. Her frustration reached its zenith in 1972 when, due to rule changes in delegate selection, the Democratic National Convention was dominated by the New Left and its various agendas. Kirkpatrick's antipathy towards what she viewed as the hijacking of the Democratic Party by leftist extremist groups caused her to vote Republican for the first time in her life. Immediately following the 1972 elections, the political scientist, along with other centrist liberals, formed the Coalition for a Democratic Majority (CDM), an organization dedicated to reversing the rule changes which had allowed for the New Left's temporary takeover of the party. In their zealous efforts to rid the party of radicalism, many members of the CDM, including Kirkpatrick, were pushed further to the right, so much so, that by the late 1970s they were no longer viewed as liberals; instead, they became known as neoconservatives.

Chapter Three

By the end of the 1970s, Jeane Kirkpatrick had become part of the burgeoning neoconservative movement. Though she remained a member of the Democratic Party, the lingering effects of the New Left's power both within the party and upon American society had pushed the political scientist further to the right of the political spectrum. Her transformation from liberal Democrat to neoconservative was also fueled by her disenchantment with détente policies and the increasing American tolerance for totalitarianism such policies represented. Accordingly, Kirkpatrick became a member of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority – an organization determined to defeat the influence of the New Left within the Democratic Party in both domestic and foreign affairs; the Committee on the Present Danger – a bipartisan group dedicated to the destruction of détente policies which demanded an increase in American military spending; and the American Enterprise Institute – a conservative think tank whose members shared her distaste for détente and the New Left. As a neoconservative activist, Kirkpatrick was a vocal detractor of the Carter Administration's foreign policies. Following the overthrow of the Shah of Iran and the Somoza regime in Nicaragua in 1979, Kirkpatrick published a scathing critique of the administration's policies entitled "Dictatorships and Double Standards". The article, a summary of her evolved political philosophy, pointed out several distinctions between non-democratic regimes, an analysis that became known as the Kirkpatrick Doctrine. The piece outlined the necessary requirements for democracy, criticized the Carter administration's misunderstanding of revolutions and the nature of right-wing governments, and denounced the administration's utilization of modernization theory as the basis for a foreign policy. The article caught the eye of Republican presidential hopeful, Ronald Reagan, who recruited Kirkpatrick to work for his campaign and later, his administration.

Coalition for a Democratic Majority

Nearly immediately following McGovern's loss to Nixon in the 1972 Presidential election Kirkpatrick, along with several other like-minded liberals, formed an organization known as the Coalition for a Democratic Majority (CDM). The purpose of the CDM was to wrest control of the Democratic Party away from the New Left by both reversing the rule changes instituted through the McGovern-Fraser Commission and revamping the party platform. Members included former Humphrey aid and Kirkpatrick family friend Max Kampelman, Civil Rights leader and activist Bayard Rustin, Midge Decter, Editor in Chief of *Commentary* magazine Norman Podhoretz, political scientist and future National Security Advisor Zbigniew Brzezinski, Soviet historian Richard Pipes, and attorney and former Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Eugene Rostow, among others. The organization's manifesto, "Come Home, Democrats", written by Norman Podhoretz and Midge Decter (and subsequently 'toned down' by Kirkpatrick) appeared in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* on December 7, 1972.²⁶⁵

The manifesto began by claiming that Nixon's victory did not represent a major political shift to the right in the United States; rather, it demonstrated the American people's rejection of New Left policies. Such a decisive refutation should serve as a wake-up call for the party to return to its traditional roots. According to the coalition, the Democratic tradition involved the following: the creation of an ever fairer distribution of the fruits of the country's vast wealth and productivity; a sustained effort, through compensatory action, to give those who had been disadvantaged either by birth or background a full opportunity to compete as equals in American

²⁶⁵ Vaïsse, Justin. *Neoconservatism: The Biography of a Movement*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 88.

"Come Home, Democrats", *New York Times*, December 7, 1972, p. 14.

life; a sober but spirited assumption of America's share of responsibility for the establishment of a more secure international community; a knowledge that without democratic order there could be no justice and without justice there could be no democratic order; a belief that democracy worked and that it worked because American voters were wisely and prudently aware of their own self-interests.²⁶⁶

The manifesto goes on to describe the various ways in which the 'new politics', or the New Left, had undermined the traditional beliefs and values of the Democratic Party. In particular, the CDM faulted the New Left's neo-isolationism in foreign affairs, its depiction of American society as immoral and sick, its penchant for disruptive demonstrations, and its insistence on utilizing quotas in order to bring about social equality. Such activities had marginalized traditional constituents of the party, and, worse yet, had allowed the Republicans, "a party so long and so accurately known as the party of privilege," to represent themselves for the first time as the champions of the values and concerns that had long been a part of the Democratic Party's tradition.²⁶⁷ "Come Home, Democrats" concludes with an appeal for like-minded persons to join the group and support the coalition's efforts to rescue the Democratic Party:

to all who believe this society must end all forms of discrimination against some without recourse to discrimination against others; to all who believe in a pluralistic political process in which no single group or class enjoys a special moral status: to all who believe that, regardless of past miscalculations or failures of policy, US involvement in international affairs continues to be necessary to the establishment of a stable and viable international order; to all who believe that while our society must be vastly improved, it has not failed.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁶ "Come Home, Democrats", *New York Times*, December 7, 1972, p. 14

²⁶⁷ Ibid.

²⁶⁸ Ibid.

Until recently, historians have paid little attention to the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, except to note that many of its founders and members ended up in the neoconservative camp. When it has been discussed, the organization is often dismissed as ultimately ineffective.²⁶⁹ This may have to do with the fact that the CDM was a small, underfinanced association which only produced newsletters and pamphlets, and then only sporadically. Despite these institutional deficiencies, Justin Vaïsse, author of *Neoconservatism: The Biography of a Movement*, views the Coalition for a Democratic Majority as a milestone in the evolution of neoconservatism and credits the group for ushering in what he calls the ‘Second Age of Neoconservatism’.

In his work, Vaïsse identifies three ‘ages’ of neoconservatism, the first of which was born out of domestic political issues, in particular, various social policies of the 1960s that successfully ruptured the vital center of American politics. Members of the first age of neoconservatism consisted largely of New York intellectuals and former radicals who began criticizing the limits of the social policies largely associated with the Great Society. Vaïsse contends that the second age of neoconservatism was born in 1968 and solidified by 1972 with the creation of the CDM. This age was distinguished from the previous one by two factors. First, neoconservatives moved beyond purely intellectual debates over policies and became actively involved in the political process. And second, they expanded their interests to include foreign affairs as well as domestic issues.²⁷⁰ Those associated with the second age of neoconservatism were primarily Democratic Party members who were upset by the rise of the New Left. Vaïsse

²⁶⁹ See Ehrman, John. *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1994*. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 61. Ehrman claims that the only achievement of the CDM was to keep Henry “Scoop” Jackson supporters united under one organization.

²⁷⁰ Vaïsse, *Neoconservatism*, 81, 96.

dates the third age of neoconservatism from 1995 and argues that it consisted only of right-wing conservatives who were concerned primarily with increasing the use of American power abroad.

The first priority for the members of the CDM was to retake control of the Democratic Party; therefore, during the first two years of its existence the organization focused on restructuring the reforms that had allowed for the New Left to dominate the 1972 Democratic National Convention. Beginning in 1973, coalition members took part in party efforts to revamp the delegate selection process and involved themselves in rewriting the Democratic Party's charter. Their efforts towards re-empowering party regulars and traditional party members through work on the Mikulski Commission were somewhat successful. The Mikulski Commission, also known as the Commission on Delegate Selection and Party Structure, organized in 1973 and led by future Maryland Senator Barbara Mikulski, was given the task of reforming the delegate selection process for the 1976 Democratic National Convention. Specific quotas for delegates based on race, gender, and age were shelved by the commission, along with the approval of a provision that allowed for greater participation by party regulars.²⁷¹

Having, it believed, rescued the party from political extremists, the CDM began turning its attention towards foreign policy issues. This turn away from domestic policies by the coalition was also facilitated by the decline of the various protest movements of the 1960s counterculture. In February of 1974 the Foreign Affairs and Defense Task Force was created within the CDM. Jeane Kirkpatrick became a member of the Policy Drafting Committee of the task force, a committee that included Eugene Rostow, former Undersecretary of State George Ball, Norman Podhoretz, former Treasury Secretary Henry Fowler, union activist Albert Shanker, and several academics such as Samuel P. Huntington, Robert James Maddox, Lucian

²⁷¹ Caeser, James W. *Presidential Selection: Theory and Development*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), 284-5.

W. Pye, John P. Roche, and Paul Seabury.²⁷² Vaïsse credits this task force with producing a neoconservative foreign policy.

According to Vaïsse, the neoconservative foreign policy espoused by the CDM contained five elements: the defense of democracy, the promotion of human rights, the assertion of American military power, support for Israel, and decreased emphasis on multilateral action and the United Nations.²⁷³ Coalition members strongly believed in the defense of democracy: the United States, as the only democratic superpower, had a duty to protect and support other democratic states. Though skeptical of the 1975 Helsinki Accords, the CDM was a strong champion of human rights, primarily in communist nations. They worked with the media to bring about greater awareness of human rights issues and held several events and fundraising dinners in the late 1970s to support communist dissidents and human rights advocates from the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc.²⁷⁴ Kirkpatrick and the other members of the Foreign Affairs and Defense Task Force were dedicated Cold Warriors, and as such they called for an increase in defense spending so that the U.S. military might thwart any efforts made by the Soviets to expand. Geopolitical concerns, such as the expansion of the Soviet Union into the Middle East, constituted one of several reasons why support for Israel was such a large part of the neoconservative foreign policy vision. Other factors, including the defense of democracy in the region, along with the strong ties between American Jews and Israel on one side, and between American Jews and the Democratic Party on the other, were also important.²⁷⁵ Finally, members

²⁷² “The Quest for Détente”, a statement by the Foreign Policy Task Force of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, July 31, 1974, Washington, DC.

http://neoconservatism.vaïsse.net/doku.php?id=the_quest_for_detente Accessed 10/21/13

²⁷³ Vaïsse, 136.

²⁷⁴ Ibid, 143-4.

²⁷⁵ Ibid, 145-6.

of the CDM wanted the U.S. to distance itself from the United Nations and multilateral action in general.

Having established a framework for the conduct of foreign relations, the task force began criticizing those diplomatic strategies that failed to fall under the purview of their neoconservative vision, namely the Nixon-Kissinger policy of détente. In July of 1974, the Foreign Policy Task Force of the CDM released a statement entitled “The Quest for Détente”. This report, issued in response to Kissinger’s call for public debate on American-Soviet relations, was one of the first major critiques of the Nixon Administration’s efforts at rapprochement.²⁷⁶

In “The Quest for Détente”, the group claimed to support American efforts to achieve ‘true’ détente – arms limitations treaties and mutually beneficial economic agreements with the Soviets. However, according to the CDM, three conditions were necessary in order to attain ‘true’ détente: an end to the race for military supremacy, along with agreements on arms limitations based on parity; a more humane attitude by the Soviets toward the movement of people and ideas and toward the rule of law; and respect by the Soviets of the Charter of the United Nations governing the use of international force both in guerrilla and conventional warfare.²⁷⁷ Not surprisingly, the coalition did not envision the meeting of these prerequisites anytime in the foreseeable future. “It takes two to achieve détente,” the CDM asserted, and in the

²⁷⁶ Vaïsse, 102.

²⁷⁷ “The Quest for Détente”, a statement by the Foreign Policy Task Force of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, July 31, 1974, Washington, DC.
http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=the_quest_for_detente Accessed 10/21/13, pages 1 and 4.

minds of the task force, only the United States was seriously engaged in the process.²⁷⁸ Given the coalition's conclusions, the organization found much to condemn in the Nixon policies.

The CDM attacked Nixon's claims that détente had been achieved and that a new relationship, one based on mutual understanding, had begun between the Soviet Union and the United States. The group declared these statements to be both preposterous and dangerous – dangerous because the belief that they were true led to 'wishful thinking', which had a remarkable power to reshape the appearance of reality, and preposterous because such claims were not true. The CDM pointed out that the Soviet Union had not changed its behavior; instead it continued to both repress and undermine democratic movements and governments and provide support for terrorism, guerilla warfare, and wars of aggression around the globe. Furthermore, the group argued that détente was an American concept, one completely foreign to the Soviet Union, and that the American tendency to project its values and motives onto others was inappropriate. Instead of détente, the Soviets viewed American overtures as the acceptance of 'peaceful coexistence' and a retreat from containment. Moreover, according to the report, the Soviets believed that détente policies stemmed from an American reappraisal of its values and concerns, a reassessment brought about through intimidation by the increasing military power of the Soviet Union.²⁷⁹

Though the members of the CDM dismissed this notion that the U.S. initiated detente due to intimidation, the group was quick to sound the alarm regarding the growth of Soviet conventional and nuclear forces. The task force pointed to the recent rapprochement with China as evidence of the growing threat posed by Russian armed forces. "The change in relationships between the U.S. and China, did not arise through a change in the totalitarian character of the

²⁷⁸ Ibid, 4.

²⁷⁹ Ibid, 1-3.

Chinese regime,” the organization argued, “or through a resurgence of good will toward Americans that lay dormant in the hearts of the Chinese people...China ultimately approached the United States for one compelling reason – because it perceived a mortal threat in the Soviet mobilization of fifty divisions in Siberia, and in the Soviet penetration of India, Southeast Asia, and the South Pacific. The United States is the only power on earth that can check what China believes to be a genuine danger of the military power of the Soviet Union.”²⁸⁰

Consequently, the group urged the U.S. government to increase its military spending so that American nuclear and conventional forces would remain superior to those of the Soviet Union. The CDM noted that in this area the U.S. and its allies were at a disadvantage when compared to the Soviets and Warsaw Pact members due to differences among their political systems. The domestic political repercussions of *détente* could be controlled and regulated in closed, communist societies as there was no risk that the rhetoric of Soviet-American *détente* or *rapprochement* could cause independent-minded legislatures to cut defense spending or withdraw armed forces from Europe. Conversely, the rhetoric and arguments employed in Nixon’s proclamations of *détente* in the U.S. had worked to increase the public’s demand for a unilateral and massive reduction of American military forces.²⁸¹ Thus, by pointing out the Chinese fear of the Soviets, highlighting Soviet interventions throughout the globe, and repeatedly emphasizing the growth of the Soviet military, the organization hoped to overcome the “mood of relaxation which President Nixon’s claims of ‘*détente*’ have inspired”.²⁸²

The authors of “The Quest for *Détente*” also criticized the economic dimensions of Nixon and Kissinger’s policies. They pointed out that the U.S. had gained nothing substantial in return

²⁸⁰ Ibid, 6-7.

²⁸¹ Ibid, 9.

²⁸² Ibid, 10.

for its subsidized sale of grains and the extension of credit for industrial goods at low rates to the Soviets. Though the CDM claimed to favor mutually beneficial economic relations between the two superpowers, it noted that this was unlikely to happen since the Soviets had very few resources that the U.S. needed. The Soviet Union did possess rare precious metals and large quantities of oil and gas, all of which they proposed to sell to the U.S. in exchange for technological information and capital, but the CDM opposed such trade agreements for a variety of reasons. First, the coalition argued that it would be unwise on the part of the U.S. to become dependent on the Soviets for strategic resources such as oil, for the Soviets could, at any time, hold these resources hostage. Second, by providing the Soviet Union with capital, the U.S. would be enabling the Kremlin to continue to finance its large military. After all, the group argued, the Soviets could finance their own industrial endeavors if they would only divert funds away from defense spending and towards domestic industrial production, something they consistently refused to do. Finally, should the U.S. provide the Soviets with advanced technology and large sums of money, its control over and exploitation of labor would give them an unfair advantage in the market.²⁸³ The CDM maintained that they would only support economic assistance and long-term credits to the Soviets in exchange for clear, substantial political benefits, the specifics of which they did not describe.

Yet another criticism of détente made by Kirkpatrick and company centered on the ideological differences between the two superpowers. In the decades following the end of World War II, anti-communism in the U.S. lost its fervor, so much so that ‘anti-communism’ in the 1970s was largely associated with McCarthyism and witch-hunts. In the meantime, Americans had fallen prey to ‘convergence theory’ which held that as both American and Soviet

²⁸³ Ibid, 10-11.

industrialized societies began facing similar environmental, organizational, and technological problems the differences between the two would subside. Nixon's claims of having both achieved détente and forged a new relationship with the Soviets based upon mutual understanding served to further undermine anti-communist attitudes in the U.S. Conversely, the same could not be said of the Soviets whose belief in communism required there to be a bourgeois capitalist enemy. To abandon its ideological hostility to Western, capitalist nations would be tantamount to the rejection of communism, the belief system that gave the Soviet Union legitimacy both at home and abroad. Therefore, despite American efforts to ease tensions between the two superpowers, the Soviets would never cease to view the U.S. as their major ideological enemy.²⁸⁴

“The Quest for Détente” declared that it was in the national interest of the United States in world politics to achieve and maintain a balance of power which could effectively deter general war. The best way for Americans to do this would be to solidify its relationship with China, maintain complete solidarity with European and Pacific allies, and do ‘all that is required’ to deter Soviet nuclear and conventional power. The CDM acknowledged that the U.S. should persist in pursuing détente; however it should do so without any misconceptions concerning the Soviet Union. The threat of Soviet military power could not be taken lightly, for if “we allow ourselves to be deceived by a myth of détente, reduce our military strength, and permit our alliances to erode” the safety of democracy in America could be at stake.²⁸⁵ Despite this dire warning, the CDM remained convinced that the U.S. was up to the challenge. The nation had the

²⁸⁴ Ibid, 12-14.

²⁸⁵ Ibid, 15.

resources to do it. All Americans required was a common understanding of foreign policy goals and the recovery of “our confidence and our will.”²⁸⁶

As a member of the CDM’s Foreign Affairs and Defense Task Force, Jeane Kirkpatrick was a major contributor to the critiques of the Nixon-Kissinger policies. However, the political science professor’s denunciations of détente were not limited to those voiced by the coalition. Given her educational background, Kirkpatrick naturally distrusted the Soviet Union, and consequently, American efforts towards normalizing relations with the communist state. She often referenced the work of Hannah Arendt in her criticism of détente, noting that wishful thinking about the nature of communism had blinded the world to its evil. “Again and again in our century,” she wrote, “the will to disbelieve the horrible has overwhelmed our sense of reality and left us unable to take prudent precautions.”²⁸⁷ Kirkpatrick blamed this will to disbelieve or ‘wishful thinking’ on utopian dreams of universal equality.

Kirkpatrick was quite critical of utopianism which she likened to rationalism as both were concerned with abstract theories rather than concrete realities. She wrote,

The rationalist spirit assumes that human nature in the future may be qualitatively different than in the past. It views non-rational factors such as sentiment, habit, and custom as obstacles that can and should be overcome. It views each situation as a tabula rasa on which a plan can be imposed and views experience in other times and places as having no relevance... Because it assumes that man and society can be brought to conform to a preferred plan, the rationalist orientation tends powerfully to see everything as possible and prospects for progress unlimited.²⁸⁸

Such utopian or rationalist thinking had been projected upon the Soviet Union by those who had instituted détente. According to Kirkpatrick, policy-makers had ignored the fact that the nature of

²⁸⁶ Ibid.

²⁸⁷ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988), “The Will to Disbelieve”, 23.

²⁸⁸ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Dictatorships and Double Standards*. (New York: American Enterprise Institute, 1982), 17-18.

the Soviet system was a totalitarian one, derived from a tradition of oriental despotism and from a tsarist synthesis of economic, social, and bureaucratic state power.²⁸⁹ Thus, the American expectation that the proliferation of economic and cultural ties and rewards would serve as incentives to restrain Soviet expansionism was based upon the Nixon Administration's willingness to ignore and disbelieve historical realities and to substitute rationalism for realism. Based on such flawed theories, "unprecedented incentives were developed; yet unprecedented aggression nonetheless occurred."²⁹⁰

Kirkpatrick also criticized détente because of the policy's basis in stimulus-response and frustration-aggression theories. According to these theories, American military superiority served as a provocation to the Soviets which, in turn, stimulated countermeasures such as the Soviet military build-up. Should the United States exhibit restraint in its own military build-up, this would quiet Soviet fears and produce reciprocal restraint allowing for arms limitations treaties to be signed and a relaxation of tensions all around. Kirkpatrick declared that such theories were ludicrous: it was unrealistic to believe that the United States could control the actions of other nations, especially the Soviet Union, by merely taking care not to be threatening. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick maintained that frustration-aggression and stimulus-response theories placed danger into a psychological rather than military category, causing the global environment to appear to be less threatening. Thus, the utopianism and rationalism of détente provided Americans with a subjective sense of security that ignored the totalitarian, revolutionary, irrational, and expansionist nature of the Soviet Union.²⁹¹

²⁸⁹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force*, 38.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid*, 385.

²⁹¹ *Ibid*, 352-3, 367, 385-6.

Many neoconservatives, including Kirkpatrick, also viewed détente as the revival of 19th century European realpolitik policies where nations jockeyed for position and influence within a stabilizing equilibrium, balanced and measured by professional diplomats. CDM members maintained that such a view did not accurately describe the U.S. and Soviet rivalry for it missed the ideological qualities inherent in modern global politics. Therefore, détente or realpolitik constituted the “vulgar substitution of expedience for principle,” which caused the nation to sacrifice its moral principles for a cynical appeal to national self-interest.²⁹² Kirkpatrick maintained that U.S. foreign policy must always serve moral goals. “The notion that foreign policy should be oriented toward balance of power politics, or realpolitik,” she wrote, “is totally foreign to the American tradition and, in fact, foreign to the American scene today. All of our wars...were justified in terms of the protection and extension of universal human rights.”²⁹³ In her mind, and in the minds of the neoconservatives, the extension of American power and influence in the world amounted to a human rights program in and of itself. For despite any flaws in the American system, liberal capitalism, with its emphasis on freedom, liberty, and equality, was morally superior to communist totalitarianism.

The Committee on the Present Danger

Shortly after the publication of “The Quest for Détente” in 1974, Eugene Rostow called for the formation of a bipartisan foreign affairs lobbying group that came to be known as the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD). According to Vaïsse, the most important precursor to the Committee on the Present Danger was the CDM. Rostow, along with other members of the CDM, felt that the coalition’s foreign policy task force was not as effective in the fight against

²⁹² Hoeverler, J. David. *Watch on the Right: Conservative Intellectuals in the Reagan Era*. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 151-2.

²⁹³ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*, 146-7.

détente as it needed to be.²⁹⁴ Consequently, the CPD was created. The organization that was formed in 1976 was inspired by both a previous version of the CPD that was active in the early 1950s, and by the findings of Team B – a group of outside ‘experts’ sent to ‘re-evaluate’ the CIA’s intelligence reports on Soviet missile and military capabilities in the mid-1970s. Several members of the CDM became members of the CPD, including Jeane Kirkpatrick who was invited to join by family friend, Max Kampelman. Other ties existed between the groups as several CDM members, including Richard Pipes, Paul Nitze, and Paul Wolfowitz, were members of Team B. Furthermore, both CPDs could trace their intellectual origins to Nitze, either through NSC-68, or the reports of Team B.²⁹⁵

In September of 1976, the Committee on the Present Danger drew up its rules of operation. The purpose of the CPD would be to facilitate national discussion of foreign policy issues. The organization claimed it existed only to educate the public and that its judgments were based on a full, fair, and objective factual foundation.²⁹⁶ In order to educate the masses about national security issues, the CPD planned to conduct and participate in seminars and conferences, publish pamphlets and articles, and advertise its findings through all forms of media. The group pledged to stay out of electoral politics and to refrain from supporting or opposing nominees for appointive offices. The committee declared that it was concerned only with broad principles and policy objectives. “It is not within our purview or our competence to comment on the intricacies and complexities of short-range tactics or maneuvers,” the group

²⁹⁴ Vaisse, *Neoconservatism*, 157-8.

²⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁹⁶ “How the Committee on the Present Danger Will Operate”, September 8, 1976, page 1.

Accessed through

http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=how_the_committee_on_the_present_danger_will_operate

Accessed 10/28/13.

maintained, “Our concern is with strategies and goals... not with all of the ramifications and details of its day-to-day implementation.”²⁹⁷

Having established what the CPD would and would not do, committee members focused on drafting the organization’s manifesto, “Common Sense and the Common Danger”, which was released at a press conference in Washington, DC on November 11, 1976.²⁹⁸ In its manifesto, the CPD warned that the primary threat to the United States, to world peace, and to human freedom was the Soviet drive for world domination and the unparalleled military build-up orchestrated by Kremlin during the previous decade. The group declared that such a massive military build-up could not be explained or justified by reasons of national defense; rather it was intended to enable the Soviet Union to play a more dominant role on the global stage. This increase in Soviet power, Kirkpatrick and her colleagues argued, threatened the political independence of America’s allies, fair access to raw materials, and freedom of the seas.²⁹⁹ The U.S. must meet this challenge by increasing military spending, which was at an all-time low according to the committee, on both nuclear and conventional forces and research and development. Only from a strong foundation could the U.S. “pursue a positive and confident diplomacy”.³⁰⁰ Should the U.S. ignore the Soviet danger and not opt for military preparedness,

... we shall become second best to the Soviet Union in overall military strength; our alliances will weaken; our promising rapprochement with China could be reversed. Then we could find ourselves isolated in a hostile world, facing the unremitting pressures of Soviet policy backed by an overwhelming preponderance of power. Our national survival

²⁹⁷ Ibid, page 2.

²⁹⁸ Vaïsse, *Neoconservatism*, 163.

²⁹⁹ “Common Sense and the Common Danger” November 11, 1976, Washington, DC. Accessed through:

http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=common_sense_and_the_common_danger ,

Accessed 10/28/13, pages 1-2.

³⁰⁰ Ibid, 3.

itself would be in peril, and we should face, one after another, bitter choices between war and acquiescence under pressure.³⁰¹

In 1976, as the United States celebrated its bicentennial, Kirkpatrick and the Coalition for a Democratic Majority began preparing for the Democratic National Convention and the forthcoming election season. The group threw its support behind Senator Henry ‘Scoop’ Jackson for the Democratic nomination. Vaïsse devotes a significant amount of attention to Jackson in his work, noting that the second age neoconservatives were often referred to as “Scoop Jackson Democrats”.³⁰² Jackson’s attitude toward the Soviet Union was relentlessly hawkish; he had consistently fought for increased defense spending since the 1950s, and, in the 1970s, had successfully undermined Nixon and Kissinger’s détente policies with the passage of the Jackson-Vanick Amendment. This initiative made favorable economic and trade agreements between the U.S. and the Soviet Union dependent upon the liberalization of emigration policies by the Soviets for Russian Jews.³⁰³ Jackson’s Senate staff which included Richard Perle, Paul Wolfowitz, Elliot Abrams, and William Kristol, was labelled a ‘neoconservative nursery’ by Vaïsse.³⁰⁴

Jeane Kirkpatrick referred to Jackson as both a mentor and a friend and praised him for his consistency and integrity.³⁰⁵ In addition to analyzing polling data for him, she travelled with Jackson across the country during his campaign as one of the Senator’s ‘issue’s people’. Disappointed by Jackson’s loss to Carter, Kirkpatrick and fellow CDM members Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Ben Wattenberg focused their attention on the Democratic Party Platform. Their

³⁰¹ Ibid, 4.

³⁰² Vaïsse, 110.

³⁰³ Ibid, 114-6.

³⁰⁴ Ibid, 118-21.

³⁰⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*, 470.

hope was to achieve a moderate platform, one that was strong on national defense and did not give in to the New Left. For the most part, they were successful. The platform included much of what the CDM and Jackson wanted, so much so that one paper reported that Jackson may have lost the nomination, but he had won the policy war.³⁰⁶

Following Jimmy Carter's electoral victory in November of 1976, tensions between the CDM and the new president began to rise. According to Vaisse, one of the reasons for the 'falling out' had to do with the personal relationship between Carter and Jackson, or rather, the lack thereof. The two men had not gotten along well before the presidential primary and the relationship soured further in the wake of Jackson's failed presidential bid.³⁰⁷ In addition, the group gave two separate lists of personnel recommendations labeled 'CDM' to Tony Lake, advisor to future Secretary of State Cyrus Vance. As only a couple of their recommendations received nominations, the CDM felt as though it had been blacklisted by the new administration. Lake later claimed to have misplaced the CDM's recommendations; however the coalition did not believe him. Regardless of what may or may not have happened to the lists, Vaisse points out that Carter owed nothing to the CDM which had provided only lukewarm support during the electoral campaign.³⁰⁸

Jeane Kirkpatrick was featured in both of the recommendation lists sent to Lake. She was suggested for an ambassadorial appointment and for Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs; however she was passed over by the Carter Administration for both.³⁰⁹

³⁰⁶ Vaisse, 125-6. Collier, 91.

³⁰⁷ Ibid, 127.

³⁰⁸ Ibid, 128.

³⁰⁹ List of CDM Recommendations to Jimmy Carter for Ambassadorial Appointments, accessed through:
http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=list_of_cdm_recommendations_to_jimmy_carter_for_ambassadorial_appointments, Accessed 10/29/13. See Also Collier, 91-2.

Kirkpatrick's biographer and friend Peter Collier claimed that this was providential, for if she had been selected she would have "labored for a year or two in obscurity and been so tainted that Ronald Reagan probably would never have chosen her for his administration."³¹⁰

By the time of Carter's victory, Kirkpatrick had reached middle age. Her focus remained where it had been for the past two decades – on her family, academia, and politics. Kirkpatrick's family life, though, was experiencing some changes. For one, she had lost her father and her mother would soon follow. For another, her husband was settling further into retirement while her children – John, Douglas, and Stuart were all growing up. According to friends and family, Kirkpatrick had always characterized her family life, along with her roles as a wife and mother, as positives. Though she may have felt occasionally left out as the only woman of the family, Kirkpatrick was a proud mother, one who often repeated, and possibly embellished upon, the things her boys would say. For example, she loved to tell the story of how, when asked by his first grade teacher about his family's ethnic background, little Douglas responded "Democrat" when all of the other children were answering "Irish" or "French" or "Scottish".³¹¹ Another story involved how the Kirkpatricks punished their sons whenever they misbehaved. Normal punishment involved the boys being sent to their rooms to write an essay about what they had done wrong and why they would never do it again. Stuart supposedly became exasperated by this and declared that he wished he and his brothers could get spankings like other kids.³¹²

Kirkpatrick desperately wanted her sons to follow in their parents' footsteps and become intellectuals. For this reason, she often helped them too much with their homework. This help

³¹⁰ Collier, 92.

³¹¹ Ibid.

³¹² Ibid.

continued once the boys entered college as Kirkpatrick both allowed them to take her courses at Georgetown and gave them all very high scores. In truth, none of the boys were as intellectually or academically-minded as their parents. Furthermore, trouble seemed to visit them, usually in the form of cars, girls, and alcohol. Kirkpatrick once remarked to a friend that she wished there were “some sort of ritual like the Indians did where you could send your sons out to kill a bear or something and they’d come back men.”³¹³

One of the most overwhelming family issues faced by Kirkpatrick was her eldest son’s alcoholism. Douglas’ drinking, which had started in high school had escalated heavily very quickly after he reached young adulthood. By the time he graduated from high school, family members were constantly finding empty bottles hidden under his bed and in other parts of the house. Over the years, the problem only grew worse. At one point Jeane and Evron sent him to live with her brother, Jerry, in Ohio who persuaded his nephew to seek help. According to friends and family members, Douglas was in and out of rehab for over 20 years, costing the family a little over \$1 million dollars. Moreover, in addition to the monetary toll it took on the Kirkpatricks, Douglas’ alcoholism caused a rift in the family as the other brothers resented his behavior and the fact that their mother always continued to support him.³¹⁴

Adding to her familial struggles, Kirkpatrick’s husband’s health began to decline. In the spring of 1977, Evron contracted Legionnaire’s Disease and nearly died. He had travelled to Bloomington, Indiana in order to receive an honorary degree where he first became sick. Evron initially thought it was the flu, but in a matter of days, his health had deteriorated to a dangerous

³¹³ Ibid, 81-2.

³¹⁴ Collier, 82, 195-6. According to Collier, the tragedy of Douglas’ alcoholism crossed party lines. In 1996, George McGovern, Kirkpatrick’s old New Left foe, published a story of his failed attempts to deal with his alcoholic daughter who froze to death one night while drunk. After reading this story, Jeane Kirkpatrick called McGovern to offer her condolences. They then bonded over their shared experiences parenting an alcoholic.

degree. Legionnaire's disease was a form of pneumonia that had only been discovered the previous year, and the newness of the illness, combined with his initial negative prognosis, made Kirkpatrick fear for her husband's life. She spent a great deal of time researching the disease before moving Evron to a better hospital where he eventually recovered.³¹⁵

While Evron Kirkpatrick was recuperating, his wife was approached by William Baroody, the president of the conservative think-tank, the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), and asked to join the organization. Feeling increasingly alienated from her fellow liberal Democrats, Kirkpatrick jumped at the chance to work with colleagues who shared her policy views, specifically those concerning national security and foreign affairs. Accordingly, she took a one year sabbatical from Georgetown University in order to devote herself to study at the AEI. While there, Kirkpatrick ran into several of her fellow CDM and CPD members including Irving Kristol, and fellow Democrats Michael Novak, Penn Kemble, and Ben Wattenberg. She also met figures such as former President Gerald Ford, future Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, and former solicitor general Robert Bork. In addition, Kirkpatrick learned more about Latin America as the AEI staged conferences dedicated to the region's issues. At one such conference she met José Napoléon Duarte, the future president of El Salvador.³¹⁶

Over the next couple of years, Kirkpatrick's standing as a public intellectual began to grow. She had published three books of her own along with an edited volume and several journal articles. She continued teaching at Georgetown and remained an active member of the CDM, the CPD, and the AEI. Consequently, in 1979, Kirkpatrick was invited by the United States Information Agency to go on a speaking tour in India. While there, she took part in the dedication of a new building for the American Studies Research Center in Hyderabad, India. The

³¹⁵ Ibid, 92.

³¹⁶ Ibid, 94-5.

center was home to a 100,000 book library and served as a resource facility for Indian and Asian scholars who taught or researched American subjects. To mark the dedication, the Center hosted a three day seminar on “American Studies in Cross-Cultural Perspectives” in which Kirkpatrick took part. Other participants of the conference came from India, the United States, Nepal, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Thailand, Japan, and Hong Kong.³¹⁷

Criticizing Carter

Before her visit to India, Kirkpatrick, along with others affiliated with the CDM and CPD, had become much more vocal in criticizing the Carter Administration’s policies and in warning of the increasing dangers posed by the Soviet Union. “Although we had supported Scoop in 1976, almost no one expected that Carter would turn out as bad as he did,” Kirkpatrick wrote.³¹⁸ In fact, she viewed Carter as a second George McGovern, another politician who embraced the flawed worldview of the New Left. She summarized this new liberalism as embodying the beliefs that ‘weak is strong’, ‘vulnerable is safe’, ‘rich is guilty’, ‘hostile is neutral’, and ‘friendly is suspect’.³¹⁹ Fellow neoconservative, Daniel Patrick Moynihan agreed, noting that with the exception of National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Carter had surrounded himself with McGovernites who were not, he claimed, representative of the mainstream Democratic Party.³²⁰

Opposition to Carter from the CDM, and the CPD in particular, centered on arms limitations agreements. The Committee on the Present Danger became obsessed with what it viewed as “unfavorable trends in the US-Soviet military balance” and made it its mission to alert

³¹⁷ Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs (CU), MC 468, Box 35, File 5, “International Communication Agency News Release”, pages 3-4. University of Arkansas, Special Collections

³¹⁸ Collier, 93.

³¹⁹ Ibid.

³²⁰ Vaïsse, 128.

Americans to the increasing dangers of the “ominous Soviet military build-up”.³²¹ The urgent tone of the various works of the CPD came from the committee’s belief that the CIA had consistently underestimated the massive Soviet military effort.³²² This belief was based on the findings of Team B. In the spring of 1976, CIA director George H. W. Bush appointed a team of analysts to review the agency’s intelligence estimates of Soviet military capabilities. Critics like the neoconservatives and Republican presidential hopeful, Ronald Reagan, had been charging the agency with underestimating Soviet power. Three Team A’s and Team B’s were organized, with Team A’s consisting of CIA analysts, while Team B’s were drawn from outside of the agency. The first teams dealt with Soviet anti-aircraft systems, the second with the accuracy of Soviet missiles, and the third with ‘Soviet intentions’. It was the third Team B under the leadership of CDM and CPD member Richard Pipes, an anti-Soviet Polish immigrant and historian, which would become famous. The team also included other neoconservative figures such as Paul Nitze and Paul Wolfowitz.³²³

According to Team B, the Soviet military build-up was occurring at a pace comparable to that of Nazi Germany in the 1930s. This surge had occurred despite the signing of SALT and subsequent American ‘restraint’ in developing and deploying nuclear strategic forces. The Team asserted that unless the U.S. increased its military spending, the Soviets would gain nuclear and strategic parity, if not superiority, by the early 1980s. Furthermore, the group maintained that the CIA had underestimated Soviet capabilities because it failed to take into account the Kremlin’s intentions, or the ideas, motives, and aspirations behind Soviet capabilities, namely its goal of

³²¹ *Alerting America: The Papers of the Committee on the Present Danger*. Edited by: Charles Tyroler, II. (Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey’s International Defense Publishers, 1984), xv, xviii.

³²² *Ibid*, xv.

³²³ *Ibid*. See also Vaïsse, 154.

achieving global hegemony. The majority of Team B's findings were leaked to the press between October and December of 1976, and then published by the CPD in April of 1977 in a pamphlet entitled "What is the Soviet Union Up To?". This, Vaisse asserts, began a neoconservative pattern that would endure: "a commission of experts warns decisionmakers about strategic dangers that have previously been underestimated, most notably by the CIA. These warnings are always accompanied by leaks to the press designed to launch a polemic and to reach a large public audience."³²⁴

Though the press began to pay attention to the portentous warnings of the neoconservative groups, the Carter Administration appeared to ignore their concerns. Accordingly, both the CDM and the CPD launched attacks against the administration's efforts at arms control. First, the CDM attempted to prevent the Senate confirmation of Paul Warnke as head of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and chief SALT negotiator. The neoconservatives had several reasons for opposing Warnke's confirmation: one, he had been an advisor to George McGovern in the 1972 presidential campaign; two, he had denounced the arms race as absurd, costly, unnecessary, and dangerous, which was, of course, anathema to the members of the CDM and CPD; and three, the neoconservatives were opposed in principle to another round of SALT agreements.³²⁵ Though ultimately unable to prevent Warnke's confirmation to both posts, Nitze's testimony against him in Senate confirmation hearings garnered much wanted media attention for the group and their cause.

Subsequently, both the CDM and the CPD endeavored to prevent the Senate ratification of SALT II agreements signed by Carter and Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev in 1979. Prior to the

³²⁴ Vaisse, 157. See also: *Alerting America: The Papers of the Committee on the Present Danger*, "What is the Soviet Union Up To?", 10-15.

³²⁵ Vaisse, 129-30.

signing of the agreements, the CPD had published pamphlets and held press conferences outlining their opposition to SALT, all of which gained attention from the press. CPD opposition to the treaty's ratification coalesced behind Henry "Scoop" Jackson, the leading adversary of SALT in the Senate, and members of the group testified against the treaty seventeen times before various congressional committees. Their efforts, combined with the Carter Administration's lackluster attempts at defending the treaty and various foreign policy blows suffered by the administration in 1979, forced the president to give up on ratification and withdraw the treaty from the Senate.³²⁶

Kirkpatrick's own critiques of Carter began almost immediately after his election. Not only did she oppose his support for détente, she also found fault with other aspects of the administration's foreign policies. In a commencement speech delivered at the University of Notre Dame in May of 1977, Carter outlined the multiple components of his foreign policy, highlighting the administration's emphasis on human rights. For one, the president declared that the U.S. should have a democratic foreign policy, one based on the nation's fundamental values which meant using American power and influence for humane purposes such as the support for human rights.³²⁷ Such a policy would serve as an example for those nations around the world who doubted the merits of liberal capitalism or the intentions of the United States. Furthermore, Carter stated that the U.S. was at long last free of rabid anti-communism, the intensity of which

³²⁶ Ibid, 178-9.

³²⁷ "Text of President's Commencement Address as Notre Dame on Foreign Policy" *New York Times*, May 23, 1977, page 12. Accessed 10/31/2013 through: <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/hnpnewyorktimesindex/docview/123250672/1418558024C1E592561/6?accountid=8361>

had caused the nation to embrace any dictator who shared our fear and to utilize the tactics of our enemies, tactics which failed to live up to the nation's liberal values.³²⁸

Carter declared that a new world had emerged, one not dominated solely by the Cold War. The end of colonialism was fostering a fresh sense of national identity in newly independent nations across the globe. Accordingly, U.S. policies should be based on five cardinal objectives: the promotion of human rights around the world, cooperation with the industrial democracies of the world, the improvement of American relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China (PRC) in order to decrease the threat of war, an increase in economic aid to developing nations, and a focus on international cooperation on global issues such as the threat of nuclear war, environmental concerns, racism, the arms race, hunger, and disease.

In addition to these general principles, Carter spoke specifically about the administration's goals in achieving a settlement between Israel and Egypt in the Middle East, the expansion of trade with the PRC and developing nations, decreasing arms sales around the world, and a peaceful settlement to issues in Southern Africa based on majority rule and democratic principles. Altogether, Carter maintained, such policies were based on the historical vision of America's role, derived from a larger view of global change, rooted in our moral values, reinforced by the United States' material wealth and military power, and designed to serve all of mankind.³²⁹

In response to the president's speech, Kirkpatrick wrote a short essay entitled "On the Invocation of Universal Values" which outlined her concerns with Carter's policies. Kirkpatrick praised Carter for accentuating human rights in foreign affairs as such an emphasis served as a

³²⁸ Ibid.

³²⁹ Ibid.

reminder to Americans that the nation's identity and purpose had always been deeply involved with the assertion of human rights. Kirkpatrick declared that there were three positive consequences of such a policy. First, it broke the anti-establishment, or New Left's, monopoly on moral rhetoric. Second, it reassured Americans and others around the world that U.S. policy is guided by a vision of the public good. Third, it affirmed the idea that there were universal human rights that persons were entitled to, and that these ought to be respected by governments. In a reference to détente, Kirkpatrick noted that people could not live on pragmatism and profits alone. "For having recalled Americans to historic moral imperatives and for having placed individual rights back on the agenda," Kirkpatrick wrote, "I applaud Carter."³³⁰

Nonetheless, the political scientist questioned many other aspects of Carter's foreign policy. For instance, Kirkpatrick expressed doubt that the example of democracy would actually help to spread liberal political systems throughout the world because as history had demonstrated, democratic governments were rare and difficult to maintain. She pointed out that there were a number of pitfalls and perils that confronted those nations attempting to construct governments limited by law, based on majority rule, and guaranteeing political competition and respect for minority rights. "One may *hope* that the example of freedom provided by the Western democracies will reinforce the human appetite for liberty," she wrote, "but there hardly seem to be adequate grounds for confidence that their example will be compelling."³³¹ Her emphasis on 'hope' implied her belief that Carter had fallen prey to that utopian rationalism which was causing many Americans to ignore the reality of global politics.

Kirkpatrick also took issue with Carter's stance on the arms race, his goal of normalizing relations with the People's Republic of China, and his African policies. Carter's description of

³³⁰ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Dictatorships and Double Standards*. (New York: AEI Press, 1982), 92.

³³¹ *Ibid*, 93.

the arms race as ‘morally deplorable’ naturally aroused the ire of the dedicated Cold Warrior. Kirkpatrick questioned what exactly he meant by that statement: was it immoral to spend money on weapons regardless of the context? Did not the moral quality of an arms race depend on the consequences of arming or not arming?³³² In addition, she posed many questions about Carter’s insistence on establishing true diplomatic relations with the PRC: why was it so important to do so? Did the president truly believe that the future of the Sino-Soviet split depended on the title of the American emissary in China? In reference to previous Cold War happenings and traditional American support for Taiwan, Kirkpatrick questioned whether normalization was “more important than demonstrating the fidelity of our commitments.”³³³

Finally, Kirkpatrick found fault with Carter’s determination to bring majority rule to southern Africa. She did not doubt his sincerity in advocating a democratic system in Rhodesia and other parts of southern Africa, nor did she believe that Carter’s insistence on majority rule meant ‘black rule’, or that he ‘covertly’ desired to replace white oligarchies with black dictatorships. However, she found his emphasis on the region to be problematic. She wrote,

...if a white oligarchy does not seem to him more obnoxious than a black dictatorship, on what principle did the President decide that it is more important to establish majority rule and minority rights in southern Africa than, say, in Uganda, or Tanzania, or Zaire, or Togo, or Ghana, or Nigeria, or Benin, or Kenya, or Guinea-Bissau, or Niger, Upper Volta, Chad, Ethiopia, Somalia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Camaroons, Mozambique, or Angola? Or for that matter, how did he decide that it was more important to have majority rule and minority rights in southern Africa than in, say, Cuba, Cambodia, North Korea, or the Soviet Union, or than in Chile, Paraguay, or Panama?³³⁴

According to her, this question demonstrated the difficulties that could be encountered by a government when it attempted to invoke universal moral rules as the justification for a policy which would necessarily be selectively applied. Carter and his administration should, in her

³³² Ibid.

³³³ Ibid, 94.

³³⁴ Ibid, 94-5.

opinion, move beyond the invocation of universal values to the difficult business of applying them in an imperfect, intractable world.³³⁵

Kirkpatrick's most compelling critique of the Carter administration occurred in 1979 with the publication of "Dictatorships and Double Standards" in the November issue of *Commentary* magazine. The article was written following the overthrow of the Somoza regime in Nicaragua and the fall of the Shah of Iran. The publication of this article would have a profound effect on Kirkpatrick's life. The article was widely-read, advancing her reputation as a public intellectual. One reader, Republican Presidential hopeful Ronald Reagan, was so impressed by her foreign policy analysis that he began actively recruiting her to aid in his campaign. In addition to garnering attention in political and academic circles, *Dictatorships and Double Standards* outlined various distinctions between non-democratic governments and their relation to American foreign policy which became known as the Kirkpatrick Doctrine.

Kirkpatrick began by claiming that President Carter's sole foreign policy achievement was in laying the groundwork for the transfer of the Panama Canal to a "swaggering Latin dictator of a Castroite bent".³³⁶ Indeed, Kirkpatrick claimed that his administration's policies were riddled with failures. For one, she asserted, there had occurred a dramatic Soviet military build-up which had been accompanied by the stagnation of the American armed forces, and together, these phenomena had resulted in a dramatic extension of Soviet influence in Africa, Afghanistan, and in the Caribbean. For another, in one year alone, the United States had suffered two major blows – the loss of two long-time allies, Nicaragua and Iran. In both cases,

³³⁵ Ibid, 95.

³³⁶ Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, 23.

Kirkpatrick charged Carter with actively collaborating in the replacement of moderate autocrats, friendly to American interests, with less friendly ones of extremist totalitarian leanings.³³⁷

According to Kirkpatrick, there were several similarities that existed between Nicaragua and Iran, similarities also shared with other American allies. Neither Iran nor Nicaragua was a democracy; rather both nations were ruled by autocrats. Despite this, the leaders of both nations tolerated limited opposition including the existence of oppositional newspapers and political parties. Moreover, both the Shah of Iran and Somoza in Nicaragua were faced with radical, violent revolutions which threatened their power and the political stability of their respective states. The violence wrought by revolutionaries caused both leaders to “sometimes” invoke martial law and to arrest, imprison, exile, and occasionally, “it was alleged”, torture their opponents.³³⁸ Though the Shah had attempted to create a technologically modern society in Iran, and Somoza had tried to introduce modern agricultural methods in Nicaragua, neither leader had attempted to reform their societies based on abstract ideals of social justice (which she viewed as euphemisms for communism) or political virtue, and neither had altered significantly the distribution of goods, status, or power in their respective nations. Both men were trying to bring modernity to traditional societies.³³⁹

In addition, Kirkpatrick found the course of events in Nicaragua and Iran to be similar to those that had unfolded in China, Cuba, Vietnam, and Angola. In each case, she maintained, the American effort to impose liberalization and democratization on a government confronted with violent internal opposition not only failed; it actually assisted the coming to power of new regimes in which ordinary people enjoyed fewer freedoms and less security. More important, the

³³⁷ Ibid.

³³⁸ Ibid, 24.

³³⁹ Ibid, 24-5.

new regimes were hostile to American interests. In Iran and Nicaragua, autocracies that had established friendly relations with the United States were attacked by insurgents, some with ties to communist states, whose arms were provided nearly entirely by communists. The Carter Administration had ignored or minimized the ‘Marxist’ presence among the insurgents on the grounds that it was the American support for the dictator that left the revolutionaries with little options than to search for arms elsewhere.

Over time, violence had spread throughout the two nations, and rhetoric utilized by the revolutionaries reminded Americans of their nation’s own revolution against autocratic and imperial rule, increasing sympathy for the rebel forces. In the meantime, requests for help from the besieged dictators remain unheeded. The U.S. had announced its determination to stay out of the conflicts as American involvement supposedly “confirms our status as an agent of imperialism, racism, and reaction; is inconsistent with support for human rights; alienates us from the ‘forces’ of democracy; and threatens to put the US once more on the side of history’s losers.”³⁴⁰ Only after the insurgents had come to power and anarchy had spread throughout the nation would it be noticed that the new rulers had no significant following, no experience at governing, and no talent for leadership. Meanwhile, Kirkpatrick contended, the United States would have helped to replace an erstwhile friend and ally with a government hostile to American interests and policies. “At best we will have lost access to friendly territory,” she wrote, “at worst the Soviets will have gained a new base.”³⁴¹

Kirkpatrick acknowledged that not all situations conformed exactly to the sequence of events described above. For example, in the case of Iran, Carter had continued to support the Shah for quite some time, and at no point did he call for the Iranian leader to be deposed.

³⁴⁰ Ibid, 27.

³⁴¹ Ibid, 28.

However, as the revolution in Iran gained momentum, the Carter Administration expressed its dedication to non-intervention, a principle that proved more important to Carter, Kirkpatrick charged, than American strategic interests in the region or national pride. For, instead of sending in marines to protect an ally and maintain stability in the region, Carter and his staff decided that the course of the revolution had to be determined by the Iranian people.³⁴² The situation in Nicaragua was different as the role of the communists in the insurgency was much clearer and more significant than in Iran. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick accused American officials of actively working to get rid of Somoza. “In a manner uncharacteristic of the Carter Administration,” she wrote, “which generally seemed willing to negotiate anything with anyone anywhere, the US adopted an oddly uncompromising posture in dealing with Somoza.”³⁴³ Thus, the scenario in Nicaragua conformed nearly exactly to the described pattern.

According to Kirkpatrick, Carter’s unwitting assistance in bringing to power regimes hostile to American interests occurred due to several misperceptions about what was actually going on in Iran and Nicaragua. First, the administration mistakenly believed that a democratic alternative to the incumbent government existed within the opposition. Second, Carter and his staff erroneously assumed that it was impossible to continue the status quo in both nations. Finally, Washington was operating under the misguided belief that any political change in the two nations was preferable to the current regimes.³⁴⁴

Despite enormous evidence to the contrary, Kirkpatrick contended, Americans, including President Carter, mistakenly believed that it was possible to democratize governments anytime, anywhere, and under any circumstances. In doing so, Americans were ignoring the lesson of

³⁴² Ibid.

³⁴³ Ibid, 29.

³⁴⁴ Ibid, 29-30.

Vietnam which had presumably demonstrated the dangers of trying to be the world's midwife to democracy, especially when the birth was to occur in the midst of a guerilla war.³⁴⁵ In fact, Kirkpatrick insisted, democratic institutions were difficult to establish and preserve under *any* circumstances; democratic regimes make heavy demands on their populations, and they were dependent upon complex social, cultural, and economic conditions. For democracy to work, a substantial number of persons must consider themselves participants in the decision-making process and not just subjects bound by laws. Second, leaders of all sectors of society must agree to pursue power only by legal means and, in doing so eschew violence, theft, and fraud. Competitors for office must also be able to accept defeat when necessary and be skilled at finding and creating common ground among diverse points of view and interests; indeed they must be willing to compromise on all but the most basic of values. Third, democratic government required institutions strong enough to channel and contain conflict. Finally, Kirkpatrick pointed out that the development of democracy took time. In nations where democratic governments did exist, it had taken several decades, and in most cases, centuries for the people to acquire the disciplines and habits necessary for democracy to thrive.³⁴⁶ Based on these assessments, Kirkpatrick determined that neither Iran nor Nicaragua possessed the fundamental preconditions necessary for democracy.

Kirkpatrick went on to point out the difficulties that ensued when rapid political change occurred within autocratic systems. According to her, the longer a dictator has held power, the more dependent upon him a nation's fundamental institutions became. Because of this, the fabric of authority could unravel quickly once the power and status of the autocrat has been undermined or eliminated, leading ultimately to the collapse of society as a whole. Kirkpatrick

³⁴⁵ Ibid, 30, 34.

³⁴⁶ Ibid, 30-1.

noted that the speed with which armies collapsed, bureaucracies abdicated, and social structures dissolved once the autocrat was removed surprised Americans who were used to public institutions based on ‘universalist norms’ rather than ‘particularistic relations’. The failure to understand the relationship between a dictator and his nation’s infrastructure, Kirkpatrick charged, was one cause for the failure of American policies in recent administrations.³⁴⁷

Furthermore, in the cases of Nicaragua and Iran, as in the previous instances in China, Cuba, Vietnam, and Angola, the American government had failed to properly understand the nature of the opposition. The United States had overestimated the political diversity of revolutionary nationalism, believing that moderate, democratic elements were in the majority, while at the same time underestimating the power of the radical groups. “When US policymakers and the liberal press interpret insurgency as evidence of widespread popular discontent and the will toward democracy,” Kirkpatrick wrote, “the scene is set for disaster.”³⁴⁸

Kirkpatrick declared that many of Carter’s errors in Iran and Nicaragua stemmed from his conviction that political change in autocracies was inevitable, desirable, and in the American interest. In part, this was because of the administration’s embrace of modernization theory, otherwise known as development theory. According to Kirkpatrick, modernization theory involved more than simple industrialization or liberal political development; it was the process through which a traditional or pre-technological society passed as it became transformed into a society characterized by machine technology, rational and secular attitudes, and highly differentiated social structures.³⁴⁹ Development theory hypothesized an ongoing process of change that was complex – due to the fact that it encompassed all dimensions of human life;

³⁴⁷ Ibid, 32-3.

³⁴⁸ Ibid, 34.

³⁴⁹ Ibid, 36.

systemic – because its elements interacted in predictable ways; global – because all societies would eventually pass make the transition from traditional to modern; lengthy – because the process was evolutionary; phased – in that all modernizing societies would pass through the same stages; homogenizing – modernity would lead to the convergence and interdependence of societies; irreversible; and progressive in the sense that it was desirable, providing in the long-run significant benefits to all people. Thus, rather than viewing events through the lens of American national interest, the administration insisted on viewing them in what Kirkpatrick termed as “a contemporary version of the same idea of progress that has traumatized Western imaginations since the Enlightenment.”³⁵⁰

Because modernization theory encouraged the view that revolutions and coups were manifestations of deep, historical forces that could not be controlled, Kirkpatrick firmly believed that it was wholly inadequate as a foundation on which to base foreign policy. When faced with such complicated, inexorable, impersonal processes, Kirkpatrick queried, what could one do? If revolutions were not caused by human conditions but by ‘forces’, then they could not be stopped by human efforts. The best any government could hope to do would be to serve as a midwife to history, helping events to move where they were already headed. Consequently, developmentalists believed that the function of foreign policy under these conditions was to understand the process of change, and, like the Marxists, to align the United States with history, in hopes of contributing a bit of stability along the way.³⁵¹ Never mind, she pointed out, that the invasions, coups, civil wars, and political struggles around the world did not seem to be incidents of a “global personnel search for someone to manage the modernization process” or that the

³⁵⁰ Ibid.

³⁵¹ Ibid, 41.

persons involved in these struggles did not appear to know that they were “searching for viable forms of government capable of managing the process of modernization.”³⁵²

Finally, Kirkpatrick indicted the administration for failing to understand the differences between right-wing and left-wing revolutionary (totalitarian) autocracies. She pointed out that the very nature of traditional right-wing authoritarian governments was offensive to Americans. Americans disliked the notion that public affairs in such systems are ordered on kinship, friendship, and personal relations as this stood in stark contrast to the objective, rational standards utilized in liberal democratic systems. Furthermore, the preference for stability over change in autocracies also bothered Americans whose entire national experiences rested on the principles of growth, change, and progress. Extremes of wealth and poverty in such nations were also offensive to Americans, especially since the powerless are often very poor while the rulers are very rich. Moreover, Americans were offended by the lack of concern on the part of authoritarians with the poverty, ignorance, and disease of their subjects. When confronted by such regimes “our vaunted cultural relativism evaporates and we become as censorious as Cotton Mather confronting sin in New England.”³⁵³

Whereas the politics of authoritarian regimes appeared antithetical to the American system, the rhetoric of left-wing revolutionary and totalitarian regimes was not. Kirkpatrick maintained that Americans tended to sympathize with socialist revolutionaries because they spoke the language of the Declaration of Independence. After all, she pointed out, socialism and communism were ideologies rooted in the same values that sparked the Enlightenment and the various democratic revolutions of the 18th century, including the American Revolution. According to her, Marxist revolutionaries spoke the language of a hopeful future, not an

³⁵² Ibid, 39, 41.

³⁵³ Ibid, 44.

unattractive past. They emphasized egalitarianism rather than hierarchy and privilege, liberty rather than order, activity rather than passivity, all of which, Kirkpatrick wrote, was “highly congenial to Americans at the symbolic level.”³⁵⁴

Thus, Kirkpatrick charged, the Carter administration’s foreign policy failed because of its lack of realism concerning the nature of traditional versus revolutionary autocracies and the relation of each to the American national interest. According to her, traditional autocracies were less repressive, more susceptible to liberalization, and more compatible with American interests than revolutionary nationalism. Kirkpatrick offered as evidence the fact that the communist governments of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam were much more repressive than the autocratic regimes that preceded them, that the PRC was more repressive than Taiwan, and that North Korea was more repressive than South Korea. Furthermore, Kirkpatrick argued that there were systemic differences between right-wing and revolutionary left-wing autocracies. In general, traditional autocrats tolerated social inequities, poverty, and brutality, whereas revolutionary autocracies (totalitarians) created them. Traditional autocrats left in place existing allocations of wealth, power, status, and other resources, but they allowed for the worship of traditional gods and the observation of traditional taboos. They did not disturb the habitual rhythms of work and leisure, places of residence, or patterns of family and personal relations. Because the miseries of traditional life were familiar, Kirkpatrick maintained, they were bearable to ordinary people who, growing up within the society, had learned to cope with its difficulties from an early age. Such societies, Kirkpatrick asserted, did not create refugees.

Conversely, revolutionary communist regimes created refugees by the millions because they controlled and changed all aspects of society, culture, and politics in their efforts to create

³⁵⁴ Ibid, 45.

socialist utopias.³⁵⁵ Due to the repressive nature of such regimes, Kirkpatrick claimed that there was not any evidence that totalitarian governments could transform into liberal, democratic states. “At the moment there is a far greater likelihood of progressive liberalization and democratization in the governments of Brazil, Argentina, and Chile,” she wrote, “than the government of Cuba; in Taiwan than in the People’s Republic of China...”³⁵⁶ This was due to the fact that traditional autocracies, unlike totalitarian systems, permitted limited contestation and participation. Therefore, according to Kirkpatrick, it was not impossible that American policy could effectively encourage the process of liberalization and democratization in autocratic systems, provided that the effort was not made at the time when the incumbent government was fighting for its life against violent adversaries, and that proposed reforms were aimed at producing gradual change rather than perfect democracy overnight.³⁵⁷

Though Kirkpatrick acknowledged that it might not always be easy to differentiate between democratic and totalitarian ‘agents of change’ in revolutionary situations, she claimed that it was not impossible. Should revolutionary leaders describe the United States as the enemy of freedom-loving people, or as the perpetrator of imperialism, racism, colonialism, genocide, or war, then they were not authentic democrats. Kirkpatrick maintained that such groups had defined themselves as enemies and should be treated accordingly. She concluded,

The US is not, in fact, a racist, colonial power, it does not practice genocide, it does not threaten world peace with expansionist activities... We have also moved further, faster in eliminating domestic racism than any multiracial society in the world or in history. For these reasons and more, a posture of continuous self-abasement and apology vis-a-vis the third world is neither morally necessary nor politically appropriate. Nor is it necessary or appropriate to support vocal enemies of the US because they invoke the rhetoric of popular liberation. It is not even necessary or appropriate for our leaders to forswear unilaterally the use of military force to counter military force. Liberal idealism need not

³⁵⁵ Ibid, 49-50.

³⁵⁶ Ibid, 51.

³⁵⁷ Ibid.

be identical with masochism, and need not be incompatible with the defense of freedom and the national interest.³⁵⁸

With the Kirkpatrick Doctrine's incorporation into government policy in the early 1980s, "Dictatorships and Double Standards" became the subject of some scrutiny from historians. According to J. David Hoeveler, Jr. Kirkpatrick's distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes constituted the "most influential contribution to foreign policy discussion in the conservative literature of two decades."³⁵⁹ Her analysis, he argued, provided authoritarian states with a safety valve of tradition, history, and continuity by which one could measure them against the rending of social fabric caused by leftist revolutions and the total control over all aspects of life in communist states. Mark Gerson notes that Kirkpatrick's article served as a reminder that there were degrees of evil in the world, and authoritarian regimes were the lesser of two evils when compared to governments of the totalitarian variety.³⁶⁰ Others argued that the article provided a rationale for ignoring bad behavior from right-wing dictators around the world as long as such leaders were anti-communist.³⁶¹ John Ehrman asserted that Kirkpatrick's work turned conservatives' gut feelings into theories and demonstrated how conservative the neoconservative foreign policy views had become.³⁶²

Each of these analyses had merit, as far as they went, but there were other problems with the Kirkpatrick Doctrine. Though she theorized that authoritarian regimes could evolve into

³⁵⁸ Ibid, 52.

³⁵⁹ Hoeveler, J. David Jr., *Watch on the Right: Conservative Intellectuals in the Reagan Era*. (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991), 159.

³⁶⁰ Gerson, Mark. *The Neoconservative Vision: From the Cold War to the Culture Wars* (New York: Madison Books, 1996), 176.

³⁶¹ Friedman, Murray. *The Neoconservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 145.

³⁶² Ehrman, John. *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1994* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995), 121.

democratic systems, Kirkpatrick failed to offer any guidelines, prescriptions, or illustrations for *how* the United States could help to facilitate such political change. Indeed a number of her assertions regarding the nature of democracy made it appear as though facilitating in the development of democratic systems was beyond the capabilities of any one nation, including a superpower such as the United States. For example, the history of authoritarian regimes which lack experience with democracy, the amount of time required for persons to develop habits and customs necessary for a functioning democracy, and the political, social, and economic instability that occurs when a dictator is removed all appear to indicate that a democratic progression in authoritarian states is unlikely to occur.

Vaïsse credits “Dictatorships and Double Standards” for pointing out the double standard in Carter’s policies, namely the American insistence that right-wing authoritarians liberalize and democratize while not demanding the same from left-wing totalitarian regimes.³⁶³ However, based on Kirkpatrick’s own contentions on the nature of totalitarianism, it was impossible for such regimes to undergo liberalization. If, as she insisted, there was no evidence that totalitarianism could evolve into some form of democracy, then *any* efforts by the United States to encourage such changes would constitute exercises in futility. Therefore, though her distinctions squared nicely with her opposition to détente, they failed to buttress her arguments regarding the inconsistencies inherent within the Carter administration’s policies.

Historian Walter LaFeber contends that instead of evolving into approximate democratic states, authoritarian regimes sometimes become more repressive and restrictive. He maintains that many authoritarian dictators, through their actions of repression, brutality, and exploitation,

³⁶³ Vaïsse, 139.

bring revolutions upon themselves.³⁶⁴ Ergo, authoritarians were not always as benign as Kirkpatrick implied in her article with her assertion that they ‘sometimes’ invoked martial law and ‘allegedly’ tortured dissidents *only* when faced by violent revolutions. Moreover, it stands to reason that despite being born into and having adjusted to what Kirkpatrick described as the ‘miseries of traditional life’, many persons may find such miseries unbearable and, in the face of intractable leaders, opt for revolution. After all, just because certain institutions, practices, customs, or governments are steeped in tradition does not mean that they are not exploitative, damaging, demeaning, and destructive towards their peoples.

Shortly after the publication of “Dictatorships and Double Standards”, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. This, combined with the ‘losses’ of Nicaragua and Iran, caused the Carter Administration to take a more confrontational stance towards communism in general and the Soviet Union in particular. Worried about how such foreign policy issues might affect his bid for re-election, the president attempted to establish better relations between himself and the more hawkish members of the Democratic Party, namely the Coalition for a Democratic Majority. To this end, Carter requested National Security Advisor and former CDM member Zbigniew Brzezinski and Vice-President Walter Mondale to set up the meeting with Max Kampelman.

Before the meeting, which was scheduled to take place on January 30, 1980, Kirkpatrick, Ben Wattenburg, Max Kampelman, Elliot Abrams, Norman Podhoretz, and Midge Decter met over coffee to work out their strategy. The group decided to have Austin Ranney, a political scientist and friend of Evron Kirkpatrick, serve as their spokesperson. Upon arriving at the White House, the group was ushered into the Roosevelt Room where they were soon joined by Carter and Mondale. By all accounts, matters did not go well. According to the neoconservatives, Carter

³⁶⁴ “The Reagan Administration and Revolutions in Central America” by: Walter LaFeber. *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 99, No. 1. (Spring, 1984), 6.

remained tense and defensive throughout the half-hour meeting. He reportedly interrupted Ranney's introductory presentation, refused to accept criticism of his policies, ignored the group's recommendations on specific policy matters, and responded to the groups' questions in an often 'incoherent' manner.³⁶⁵ After thirty minutes, the president departed rather abruptly, leaving Mondale to attempt to smooth over relations between the White House and the CDM.

According to Vaïsse, for many of the members of the CDM, the meeting with the president represented the last straw. The encounter ended the sentimental loyalty that several still felt towards the Democratic Party, thus paving the way for them to move into the Republican camp.³⁶⁶ Kirkpatrick was among the defectors. Though she remained a nominal member of the Democratic Party at that time, she told Midge Decter on their way out of the White House that day that she did not yet know who she would support for the presidency, but it would not be Carter. Less than a month after the disastrous meeting at the White House, Kirkpatrick received a letter from Republican presidential hopeful Ronald Reagan praising her for "Dictatorships and Double Standards" and requesting a meeting. Shortly thereafter, Richard Allen, future National Security Advisor to Reagan, called Kirkpatrick and invited her to join the California governor in a discussion of American foreign policy. She accepted, the talks went well, and was soon followed by another meeting. Kirkpatrick subsequently agreed to act as a foreign policy advisor for the Reagan campaign.³⁶⁷

Conclusions

Kirkpatrick's article, "Dictatorships and Double Standards", represented the culmination of years of higher education, political activism, and academic study. Beginning with her years at

³⁶⁵ Vaïsse, 134, Collier 106.

³⁶⁶ Vaïsse, 134.

³⁶⁷ Ibid, 185. Collier, 107-110.

Columbia, Kirkpatrick embarked upon a study of non-democratic regimes that would last throughout her entire life and eventually propel her into the national spotlight. Under the tutelage of Franz Neumann, and later Hannah Arendt, Kirkpatrick learned of the evils of both fascist and communist totalitarianism. This knowledge was supplemented by her exposure to Nazi Holocaust files, interviews with Soviet and Chinese expatriates who had fled from communist regimes, and her personal connections with individuals who had escaped the totalitarian menace. Her education in the evils of totalitarianism left Kirkpatrick convinced that whether it was communism or fascism, any diabolical vision of the public good was the greatest horror and the source of the greatest evil in modern times.

Drawing from the works of Arendt and Camus, Kirkpatrick identified communism as a utopian philosophy, a set of ideas based upon wishful thinking and blind optimism rather than history and experience. She likened utopianism to rationalism noting that both failed to distinguish between the domains of thought and experience, both were more concerned with the abstract rather than the concrete, and both cared more about the possible rather than the probable. Kirkpatrick took the comparison further, noting that there was an affinity between utopianism and rationalism on the one hand, and rationalism and tyranny on the other. “There is a powerful tendency to move from the conviction that one *knows* the public good,” she observed, “to the use of power to impose that good.”³⁶⁸ Thus, the totalitarian impulse was grounded in the rationalist’s search, through power, for virtue, solidarity, perfect unity, the end of conflict, and the end of exploitation of man by man. Such goals were unachievable, but the utopian rationalist could not accept this, and in his zeal to transform society he resorted to terror and murder. Kirkpatrick wrote,

³⁶⁸ Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, 12.

When an unrealizable goal becomes the operational aim of an elite endowed with coercive power and a sense of righteousness, tragedy becomes more probable than progress. Historians may contemplate the irony of liberating revolutions that enslave, of brotherhood that ends at the guillotine, of equality enforced by a maximum ruler; the people, on the other hand, are left to suffer.³⁶⁹

According to Kirkpatrick, the dangers posed to the United States from utopian rationalists, or totalitarians, were not restricted to foreign affairs and issues of national security. The political scientist also associated utopian rationalism with the New Left and the rise of the counterculture within the U.S. during the 1960s and 1970s. She viewed their attacks on the basic beliefs and institutions of American society, their challenging of the morality of the American experience and the legitimacy of American national interests, and their utilization of disruptive, sometimes violent protest methods as a threat to democracy and the American way of life. Kirkpatrick compared the Nazi assault on the Weimar Republic to the New Left's assault on American society: in the case of Weimar, the moderates had stood passively by while extremists destroyed democracy. Kirkpatrick's refusal to stand by and watch the same thing happen in the U.S. led her to assist in the formation of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority. She had no doubt that the New Left, intoxicated with a utopian vision of society, sought to take over the state in order to extend the jurisdiction and coercive power of government over all institutions and aspects of life.³⁷⁰

Though the New Left failed in its bid for power, it had left an indelible mark on American foreign policy, paving the way for détente and Soviet expansion. Kirkpatrick maintained that the New Left's assault on the American experience, namely their belief that the

³⁶⁹ Ibid.

³⁷⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume I*, 136-9.

According to Ehrman, Kirkpatrick "turned conservatives' gut feelings into theory" with her contention that the New Left and liberal attitudes towards totalitarianism were an assault on American democracy. Ehrman, *The Rise of Neoconservatism*, 135.

U.S. was a sick, immoral, and corrupt society, had undermined national security. “As long as the United States was perceived as a virtuous society,” she wrote, “policies which enhanced its power were also seen as virtuous.”³⁷¹ However, if the U.S. were an immoral state, then the pursuit of American power must also be immoral. This assumption prompted the New Left to call for a decrease in American military power in the face of a well-armed international communist community. This crisis of confidence, inspired by the New Left, infected various segments of the population, including the American national security apparatus, opening the door to negotiations with totalitarians and a policy of détente. To Kirkpatrick, a committed Cold Warrior and believer in American exceptionalism, this was intolerable. Consequently, she joined the Committee on the Present Danger in hopes that the organization could inform both the public and the government of the dangers of détente before it was too late.

According to Kirkpatrick, the New Left and the forces of international communism were tacit allies. She maintained that the U.S. was being seduced by Marxist rhetoric due to the philosophy’s relation to Enlightenment thought and communism’s ‘perverse’ usage of democratic lexes. Drawing from her study of totalitarianism and from her husband’s work on Soviet misinformation, Kirkpatrick was adamant in her assertion that the language of Marxism-Leninism was nothing more than propaganda. “By calling ‘autonomous’ that which is powerless, ‘federated’ that which is unitary, ‘democratic’ that which is autocratic,” she charged, “by systematically corrupting language to obscure reality, the communists have made inroads into our sense of political reality.”³⁷² Kirkpatrick labelled the communists’ appropriation of liberal language ‘verbal imperialism’ and bemoaned the fact that Americans had begun to believe that

³⁷¹ Ibid, 136.

³⁷² Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, 135.

the communists were engaged in the struggle between the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots, the workers and the employers, and the oppressed and the oppressors.

Kirkpatrick insisted that the communists had, in fact, strayed from the classical Marxist tradition. Lenin's revisionism dispensed of the prerequisite capitalist phase of socialist development in favor of political power, or the imposition of socialism from above. Such heresy proved that the primary goal of the communists was the capture of state power, and that Moscow and Beijing viewed colonial and underdeveloped states as suitable targets for communist expansion. Marxism was invoked to surround the communist drive for political power and global domination with an aura of morality and science, and to provide moral justification for the terroristic methods they employed in their efforts to mold societies and cultures into socialist utopias.

The popular utopian rationalist faith in the perfectibility of mankind, the crisis of confidence in the American system due to the rise of the New Left, and the language utilized by leftist revolutionaries and communists had caused Americans to turn a blind eye to the iniquitous nature of totalitarianism, all of which led to the expansion of communism and the enlargement of Soviet military power throughout the 1970s. Making matters worse, according to Kirkpatrick, was the Carter Administration's acceptance of modernization theory, its misguided belief that democratic states could be created from without, and its misunderstanding of the nature of right versus left wing autocracies. Taken together, these misperceptions had alienated traditional American allies, facilitated the expansion of communism in Latin America, and contributed to the destabilization of authoritarian regimes friendly to American interests. In order to retake the Cold War initiative, the U.S. must acknowledge the obdurate nature of communist totalitarianism and dispense with détente and those policies grounded in utopian rationalist theories.

Furthermore, the U.S. must continue to provide aid to its anti-communist allies, whether those allies were fellow liberal democrats or authoritarian dictators. Finally, Americans must regain confidence in their society, institutions, values, government, and status as a global superpower.

Chapter Four: Madame Ambassador

In 1980, Americans went to the polls to elect a president. Though initially ahead in the polls, Carter's advantage over his Republican opponent began to dwindle by September. Ronald Reagan, former actor and Governor of California, was a captivating public figure who took advantage of the foreign policy and domestic disasters that had occurred under Carter's watch. From a domestic standpoint, Reagan focused on the economic downturn of the 1970s and asked Americans if they were better off in 1980 than they were four years previous. Many Americans were not, and they responded positively to Reagan's promise of tax cuts and new economic policies. Moreover, in an effort to stem the tide of what Reagan saw as defeatism that had plagued the American spirit following U.S. defeat in Vietnam, the former California governor spoke often of America's greatness, its exceptionality. Reagan the Cold Warrior reminded Americans repeatedly that the U.S. was a force for good in the world and promised to restore American military and economic superiority.

As Reagan's foreign policy adviser, a member of the CPD, and a critic of Carter, Kirkpatrick supported the Republican nominee wholeheartedly. Other neoconservatives joined her, along with members of the northern working classes, former Democrats who felt abandoned by their party through its embrace of affirmative action policies and whose economic status had declined throughout the 1970s. The neocons and northern working classes were joined in their support for Reagan by the social conservatives and the religious right which were attracted to Reagan's stance on issues such as abortion and school prayer, along with fiscal conservatives and supporters of supply-side economics. This new coalition of voters allowed Reagan to win 51% of the popular vote compared to Carter's 41%.

Jeane Kirkpatrick was unabashed about Ronald Reagan's triumph in the 1980 Presidential election, declaring his victory to be a watershed event in American history. According to her, Reagan's inauguration signaled the end of one major postwar epoch and the beginning of another. Kirkpatrick claimed there were three distinct periods in the postwar era. The first, known as the Cold War Era, began at the end of World War II and lasted until approximately 1968. She described it as a "relatively happy respite during which free societies and democratic institutions were unusually secure. The west was united, strong, and self-assured".³⁷³ The second period, the Era of Détente, began with the rise of the New Left in the late 1960s and lasted until the election of Reagan in 1980. Unlike the previous era, this one was marked by the relentless expansion of Soviet military and political power and a corresponding contraction of American influence. It featured the rise of the Third World dictators espousing anti-American and anti-Western ideologies and the emergence in Western Europe of a neutralist position. Throughout this period, an attitude of defeatism and self-doubt prevailed within the United States. Kirkpatrick maintained that Reagan's victory marked a new beginning for America, one that would correct mistakes made during the era of détente, restore faith in the American way of life, and increase American power throughout the world.³⁷⁴

With the election of Ronald Reagan, many members of neoconservative groups, such as the Coalition for a Democratic Majority (CDM) and the Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), were appointed to government positions allowing them the opportunity to influence and shape policy. CDM members who supported Reagan and subsequently worked for his administration included: Ben Wattenberg – Vice President of Radio Free Europe, Max Kampelman – Ambassador to the Conference on Security Cooperation in Europe, Eugene

³⁷³ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume 1*, 381.

³⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 382-3.

Rostow – director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and Elliot Abrams – Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs.³⁷⁵ Due to the fact that Ronald Reagan was a member of the CPD, several of its committee members were also given prestigious government jobs including: George Shultz – Secretary of State, Richard Allen – National Security Advisor, William Casey – CIA Director, John Lehman – Secretary of the Navy, Richard Pipes – Director of East European and Soviet Affairs, Donald Rumsfeld – Special Envoy to the Middle East, and Richard Perle – Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy.³⁷⁶

A member of both the CDM and the CPD, and foreign policy advisor to Ronald Reagan during the 1980 election, Jeane Kirkpatrick was named Permanent Ambassador to the United Nations, a position given Cabinet level ranking and made part of the National Security Council by President Reagan. As U.N. Ambassador, Kirkpatrick was responsible for articulating and advocating the Reagan Administration’s positions on various international events. As U.N. Ambassador she served largely as a mouthpiece for the administration, but Kirkpatrick had opportunities to influence policy thanks to her inclusion within the NSC and the National Security Planning Group (NSPG). Furthermore, Reagan’s fondness for and admiration of the ambassador allowed her direct access to the president, which, in turn, enabled her to bypass normal diplomatic channels between the U.S. Mission at the United Nations and the State

³⁷⁵ “Coalition for a Democratic majority members Joining Reagan in 1980” from Vaïsse, *Neoconservatism*.
http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=cdm_members_joining_reagan_in_1980
Accessed 12/9/13

³⁷⁶ “Executive Functions of CPD members in the Reagan Administration” from Vaïsse, *Neoconservatism*.
http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/doku.php?id=executive_functions_of_cpd_members_in_the_reagan_administration Accessed 12/9/13.

Department. Thus, did Kirkpatrick the academic, intellectual, and party activist become Kirkpatrick the ambassador and policymaker.

During Kirkpatrick's tenure at the United Nations, the institution dealt with hundreds of issues ranging from budgetary concerns, refugee crises, and public health alarms to issues affecting women and disabled persons, economic development, decolonization, and war. Indeed, a cursory glance at the resolutions voted on within the General Assembly and Security Council in any given year of Kirkpatrick's time as ambassador can seem overwhelming due to their sheer numbers. Among those that she and the Reagan Administration deemed to be the most important were: Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict; El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Central America; the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan; the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia; and Namibian independence and South Africa.³⁷⁷

Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict

The Reagan Administration's policies towards the Middle East had two primary goals: to maintain the special relationship between the United States and Israel and to prevent the expansion of Soviet influence in the region. More often than not, the administration's support for Tel Aviv exacerbated tensions in the region, causing more difficulties in the bilateral relationships between the United States and other Middle Eastern nations. Tensions also rose between the U.S. and Israel, for despite America's steadfast support for its Middle Eastern ally, Tel Aviv often acted on its own accord: in December of 1981 Israel ignored American appeals for restraint and annexed the Golan Heights, and in 1982 Tel Aviv invaded Lebanon despite American protests. These actions garnered global condemnation of both Israel and the United States and brought about a brief withdrawal of American military aid to Tel Aviv. Nonetheless,

³⁷⁷NOTE: Due to both her reputation as a Latin American expert and her own interests in the region, Central American issues will be discussed in the next chapter.

America continued to back up its anti-communist ally; after all, Israeli targets in Lebanon – the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Syria – had ties to the Soviet Union. Indeed, the Reagan Administration sent troops into Lebanon, a move that resulted in the deaths of American diplomatic and military personnel, yet failed to bring peace to the region.

Throughout her tenure as Permanent Ambassador to the United Nations, Kirkpatrick demonstrated an unwavering support for the state of Israel.³⁷⁸ In a speech before the Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations in New York City, she noted that her relationship with the state of Israel began in her college days. “I remember vividly the bells on the Riverside Church ringing on the day in 1948, the establishment of Israel,” she related, “I was in philosophy class at Barnard and Harry Truman had taken a strong and marvelous stand.”³⁷⁹ In subsequent years, Kirkpatrick’s sympathy for Israel and the Jewish people grew, especially following her exposure to the Nazi Holocaust files and her friendships with various German and European Jews who had fled from the Nazis. Though sympathetic to Israel, her relationship with the organized Jewish community of the world did not begin until she became the U.N. Ambassador and was exposed to what she described as the “obsessive anti-Israel campaign that dominates the agenda of the UN.”³⁸⁰

³⁷⁸ For an overview of the special relationship between the U.S. and Israel see: Schoenbaum, David. *The United States and the State of Israel*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). For a more critical view of US-Israeli relations see: Chomsky, Noam. *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1999). Also: Ball, George W. and Douglas B. Ball. *The Passionate Attachment: America’s Involvement with Israel, 1947 to the Present*. (New York: Norton, 1992). For an overview of the U.S. in the Middle East see Hahn, Peter L. *Crisis and Crossfire: The United States and the Middle East Since 1945*. (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, INC), 2005.

³⁷⁹ Kirkpatrick, Jeane. *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*. (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988), “Address before the Conference of the Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations”, April 19, 1985, page 49.

³⁸⁰ Ibid.

Kirkpatrick's introduction to the 'anti-Israel obsession' of the United Nations began in June of 1981 when the Security Council met to discuss the June 7th Israeli bombing of a French-made nuclear reactor in Iraq. In her address to the Security Council, Kirkpatrick noted that the Middle East was a combustible region, similar to the Balkans before the outbreak of World War I. She pointed out that there were many issues that plagued the region including the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the war between Iran and Iraq, the terrorist state of Libya and its occupation of Chad, the territorial violations of Lebanon by its neighbors, and, the most recent crisis – Israel's attack on the nuclear reactor in Iraq. Though acknowledging that Israel had not exhausted all diplomatic means before acting, and that its actions had damaged the peace and security of the region, Kirkpatrick maintained that Israel's actions should not be taken out of context. The ambassador noted that Iraq had refused to acknowledge the existence or legitimacy of the Israeli state, and thus the Israeli attack was essentially a defensive maneuver or preemptive strike against an enemy state armed with weapons of mass destruction. Kirkpatrick declared that the United States was a proud friend and ally of Israel and that it would not approve of any decision made by the U.N. that would either harm Israel's basic interests or be overly punitive.³⁸¹

Wielding the threat of a Security Council veto, Kirkpatrick was able to mitigate the language of the resulting resolution. Resolution 487 strongly condemned the Israeli attack as a violation of the U.N. Charter, called for Israel to both refrain from such attacks in the future and to place its own nuclear facilities under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency,

³⁸¹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the UN Security Council, "Condemning Israel: The Iraqi Reactor", June 19, 1981, pages 59-61.

and maintained that Iraq was entitled to appropriate redress for the destruction brought about by the attack.³⁸²

Though she was successful in toning down the language of the Security Council's resolution regarding the Israeli attack on Iraq's nuclear reactor, Kirkpatrick was unable to do the same when the General Assembly began discussions of a resolution entitled "The Situation in the Middle East". By a vote of 109 in favor, 34 abstentions, and 2 opposed (the U.S. and Israel), the General Assembly passed a resolution that expressed support for the Palestinian people and other Arab nations in their struggle against Israeli 'aggression and occupation'. The resolution went on to condemn Israel's occupation of Palestinian and other Arab territories, along with its treatment of peoples in those areas. The General Assembly's white paper declared that the strategic cooperation between the U.S. and Israel only encouraged the latter to pursue aggressive and expansionist policies. The resolution called upon all states to put an end to the flow to Israel of any military or economic resources that might encourage its aggression.³⁸³

In an address before the General Assembly, Kirkpatrick strenuously objected to the use of the word 'aggression' and insisted that Israel's actions should be taken within the proper context. Kirkpatrick also questioned why the resolution called for nations to desist in giving aid to Israel, yet failed to condemn those nations supplying arms to Israel's enemies. She declared that the ongoing debate and its subsequent resolution were frivolous and served to divert attention from the pursuit of peace and stability in the Middle East.³⁸⁴

³⁸² [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/487\(1981\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/487(1981)) Last Accessed 6/9/14.

³⁸³

http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/36/226&Lang=E&Area=RESOLUTION Last Accessed: June 9, 2014

³⁸⁴ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the U.N. General Assembly, November 12, 1981, "A Constant Friendship", 63-64.

The day before she delivered her address to the United Nations, *The New Republic* published an article by Kirkpatrick entitled “Dishonoring Sadat”. The piece celebrated the bravery of the Egyptian leader in signing the Camp David Accords with Israel and called for other Arab leaders to follow his lead. Kirkpatrick was inspired to write the piece when American and foreign pundits began questioning the outcomes of foreign policies that depended or appeared to depend on the survival of a ‘strong man’. Many were comparing Sadat’s death to the fall of the Shah of Iran in 1979 – both were powerful authoritarian leaders, important to the United States, whose governments rested upon personal power, and who were abruptly removed from the scene.

Though many liberals continued to express doubt concerning the wisdom of relying on agreements with authoritarian regimes, Kirkpatrick argued that the political realities of the Middle East forced the U.S. to do just that. The U.N. Ambassador pointed out that the tradition of paternalistic authority was strong in the region. She wrote:

The truth is that we cannot control the governments of the area or choose the rulers. We cannot structure their institutions or transform their beliefs. We have no magic wand to turn the Moslem states that stretch from North Africa to South Asia into replicas of modern, secular, democratic nations living harmoniously with one another. We must deal with them as we find them: authoritarian, traditional, deeply religious, subject to the kinds of instabilities characteristic of personal autocracies. These last include periodic rebellions, chronic succession crises, and complicated personal rivalries, all of which have culminated repeatedly in war.³⁸⁵

Although the governments of the Middle East shared many similarities, Kirkpatrick was quick to point out that the Arab states remained heavily divided: Iraq was at war with Iran, Libya was exporting terrorism throughout the region, Syria was destabilizing Lebanon, and Saudi Arabia

³⁸⁵ “Dishonoring Sadat” reprinted in *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, 5.

and Jordan were experiencing internal turmoil due to radical politics associated with the PLO. Meanwhile, Soviet expansionism threatened the entire region.³⁸⁶

“In need of a unifying factor – beyond language and religion,” she wrote, “many Arabs have associated themselves with the cause of radical Palestinian nationalism. This cause is closely related to... hostility to the state of Israel.”³⁸⁷ Kirkpatrick maintained that it was not surprising that Israel had become a special object of hatred in the region; after all, it was a modern, democratic, egalitarian, Jewish state in the midst of traditional, authoritarian, class-based, Moslem societies. According to her:

The PLO wins acceptance from modern Arab nations because their leaders have been persuaded that the link between faith and politics calls for the destruction of Israel, and the PLO is the group most militantly dedicated to that cause... the ideological appeal of *jihad* – which provides a certain sense of Arab unity – is reinforced by terror, selectively, effectively, and ruthlessly employed. The ideology that links faith, politics, the destruction of Israel, and Palestinian nationalism is continually reinforced by violence and fear. Note, however, that the same linkage covertly commits traditional Arab rulers to strengthening the radical forces, which are carriers of revolutionary politics hostile to their own survival. The PLO thus enlists traditional Arab rulers in their own destruction. Never has the dialectical ‘cunning of history’ operated more clearly to enlist the powerful in the struggle for their own undoing.³⁸⁸

Kirkpatrick declared that there were three urgent problems that American foreign policy needed to address in the region. First, the U.S. should work to prevent the Soviet Union from invading, occupying, or incorporating by other means additional Arab lands into the Soviet sphere of influence. Second, the U.S. should strengthen those regimes friendly to, or compatible with, American interests. Kirkpatrick maintained that reinforcing moderate Arab governments would enhance regional order and help prevent the transformation of such regimes into threats. Third, the U.S. must protect Israel against its sworn enemies. The political scientist declared that

³⁸⁶ Ibid, 5-6.

³⁸⁷ Ibid, 6.

³⁸⁸ Ibid, 7.

the United States was tied to Israel through security interests, common democratic political systems, by honor, and by a mutual membership in an ancient community of values (Western Civilization and Judeo-Christian heritage).³⁸⁹

Overall, Kirkpatrick contended, the primary obstacle to peace had been the refusal of the Arab governments to recognize Israel's right to exist. Sadat, she claimed, embodied the solution to all of the problems facing the U.S. in the region. He was a devout Muslim, a revolutionary leader, and a friend of the United States and Israel; he was a serious Muslim who was both dedicated to the Arab cause and committed to finding a solution to the Palestinian issue. She noted:

Anwar Sadat struck out in new directions... he insisted that his separate peace did not imply indifference to Palestinian aspirations and well-being. He insisted that the PLO was not the custodian of Palestinian aspirations; that Israel's existence was not incompatible with Arab self-fulfillment; and that frank friendship with the U.S. was the route to regional order, national independence, and economic development in the Middle East. What is most needed now is that other Arab leaders match Sadat's courage, originality, and tolerance.³⁹⁰

In December of 1981, less than a month after Kirkpatrick published "Dishonoring Sadat", the Arab-Israeli conflict again resurfaced as a topic of debate within the General Assembly. By this time, the ambassador had become noticeably frustrated with the body's 'obsession' with Israel and the refusal of the Arab states to follow Sadat's lead. In an address before the General Assembly entitled "Perpetuating the Arab-Israeli Conflict", the ambassador criticized the U.N. for passing resolutions that both repudiated the Camp David Accords which she described as 'the sole existing framework' for bringing about a settlement between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and enhanced the status of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), an organization that

³⁸⁹ Ibid, 8.

³⁹⁰ Ibid, 9.

refused to acknowledge Israel's right to exist. "The adoption of these resolutions by the General Assembly," she stated, "diminishes the ability of the United Nations to further the cause of peace in the Middle East."³⁹¹

Noting that the title of the debate was "The Situation in the Middle East", Kirkpatrick called upon the world body to discuss the numerous issues that threatened the peace and stability within the region such as the Iran-Iraq War, the destabilization of Lebanon, Libya's subversion and terrorism, and the threat of Soviet expansion.³⁹² "All of these issues should be of vital concern to this Assembly," Kirkpatrick stated, "instead, the focus of this debate has again been on one item and one item alone: the Arab-Israeli conflict."³⁹³ The ambassador pointed out that nothing was accomplished by the endless stream of criticism directed at Israel. "What are the people of my country to conclude," she queried, "when they witness year after year these condemnations of Israel, a friend and fellow democracy?"³⁹⁴ Rather than focusing on the Arab-Israeli conflict, the American ambassador urged the U.N. to devote its energies towards a non-partisan effort to achieve a permanent peace in the Middle East.

On the same day that Kirkpatrick was defending America's ally to the General Assembly, Israel passed legislation annexing the Golan Heights, territory initially seized from Syria in 1967. Tel Aviv's action prompted an investigation by the U.N. Security Council which was followed by debate within the General Assembly. On January 20, 1982 Jeane Kirkpatrick addressed the Security Council and stated her country's opposition to a pending resolution criticizing Israel's actions. She claimed that the resolution was an aberration and a perversion of the purpose of the

³⁹¹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the U.N. General Assembly, December 14, 1981, "Perpetuating the Arab-Israeli Conflict", 65.

³⁹² Ibid.

³⁹³ Ibid, 65-66.

³⁹⁴ Ibid, 66.

Security Council. According to her, the Council had the responsibility to first deal with activities that threatened world peace and security, and second, to prevent an aggravation of a situation. Kirkpatrick declared that the proposed resolution would only exacerbate tensions in the region. The ambassador maintained that the U.S. would never approve of Israel annexing the Golan Heights, and claimed that there was doubt in Washington that such an annexation had even occurred. Instead of focusing on a non-event, the U.N. should direct its attention towards other, more pressing issues. “What an extraordinary institution this is that, in the more than a month since the massive, brutal repression of the people of Poland got under way,” she stated, “there has been no mention here of the violations of their human rights.”³⁹⁵

With the U.S. veto blocking any action by the Security Council on this matter, the General Assembly called an Emergency Special Session to discuss the Golan Heights. Not surprisingly, the Assembly passed a resolution against Israel despite American opposition. “The Situation in the Occupied Arab Territories” regretted that one vote from a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council prevented that body from doing its job in dealing with Israel in January. It went on to strongly condemn Israel for its actions in the region, declared that it was illegal for the state to take over the Golan Heights, and that its decision to do so constituted aggression. Moreover, the resolution claimed that in order for there to be a comprehensive and just peace in the Middle East, there must be the total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from Palestine and other Arab territories which had been occupied since 1967. Finally, the document stated that Israel’s actions made it clear that it was not a peace-loving state and the Assembly called on all member states to refrain from selling weapons to Israel, to suspend

³⁹⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, January 20, 1982 “Golan and Poland”, 68.

economic, financial, and technological assistance and cooperation with Israel, and to sever diplomatic, trade, and cultural relations with the Jewish state.³⁹⁶

Kirkpatrick was outraged by the tone and text of the resolution. In a speech entitled “This Miserable Resolution”, the United States Ambassador noted that her country opposed both the ends and the means of the resolution because it called for unreasonably punitive measures in order to get revenge and retribution. Kirkpatrick declared that the U.N. should be devoted to building peace and security instead of deepening divisions and exacerbating conflicts. According to her, the resolution undermined the integrity of the U.N. and demonstrated that any institution could be made to serve purposes remote from its *raison d’etre* – the United Nations, conceived as a palace of reason, was now being used to polarize nations and spread hostility.³⁹⁷

Though the ambassador had previously denied that an annexation had occurred, Kirkpatrick now claimed that the U.S. had called upon Tel Aviv to rescind the decrees incorporating Golan Heights into Israel and to reaffirm its commitment to a negotiated settlement in the region. She declared that Israel had acquiesced to American requests and that the only constructive role for the U.N. at this point was to facilitate such negotiations. The ambassador maintained that Israel had not committed an act of aggression as “no shots were fired, no soldiers were brought into place.”³⁹⁸ She also objected to the “barely veiled attack on the United States” in the paragraph referencing the negative vote of a permanent member of the Security Council and defended the right of the U.S. to use its veto to block actions that it deemed seriously flawed.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁶ http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/ES-9/1 Last Accessed: 6/9/14.

³⁹⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*. Address before the Emergency Special Session of the 36th General Assembly, February 5, 1982, “This Miserable Resolution”, 69-72.

³⁹⁸ *Ibid*, 70.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid*, 71.

The American ambassador continued her defense of Israel in the following months as the Assembly refused to budge and convened another special emergency session. In a speech entitled “War by other Means” she stated:

But who among us sincerely believes that the exercise in which we are now engaged – this ‘resumed’ emergency special session – will take us closer toward the goal? Who among us believes that the cause of peace is served by still another round of bitter denunciation of Israel? Who among us – I wonder – believes that peace is even the *goal* of this assembly? This Assembly can repeat its familiar and unbalanced charges, it can issue flamboyant ultimata, and adopt ever harsher resolutions, all with the usual predictable effect. That effect will be to increase – not reduce – tensions; to inflame – not to calm – passions; to widen – not to narrow – divisions; and to make war more, not less, likely to take place. The fact that this institution, conceived to resolve conflicts is thus used to exacerbate and embitter divisions among nations is the cruelest of ironies.⁴⁰⁰

Kirkpatrick concluded that the ultimate goal of the resolution was to delegitimize Israel. By claiming that Israel was not a peace-loving state and that it had violated several provisions of the U.N. Charter, the resolution was laying the groundwork to expel Israel from the institution. “This special session and its accompanying draft resolutions are one more clear example of a strategy whose goals and tactics are clear,” she declared, “use a United Nations body to make ‘official’ demands incompatible with Israel’s security and survival.”⁴⁰¹ Thus, when Israel failed to comply, members could ‘prove’ that Israel was an international law-breaker and unworthy of membership in the community of peace-loving states.⁴⁰²

Over the next three years, the Arab-Israeli conflict continued to be discussed in the United Nations. Each time the subject was broached, Kirkpatrick came to Israel’s defense. The American representative likened the General Assembly’s ongoing indictment of Israel as representing the justice of Alice in Wonderland – where the Assembly (Queen of Hearts) had

⁴⁰⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Emergency Special Session of the 36th General Assembly, April 23, 1982, “War by other Means”, 75-76.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid, 78.

⁴⁰² Ibid.

repeatedly found Israel (Alice) guilty of numerous offenses without thoroughly investigating the situation and ignoring the context in which events occurred.⁴⁰³ She continued to defend the United States' alliance with Israel and refused to accept the Assembly's charges that American aid to Israel allowed the nation to continue to ignore U.N. resolutions.

The ambassador often criticized the United Nations for its treatment of Israel, especially to Jewish organizations. In October of 1982, Kirkpatrick spoke of her disillusionment with the U.N. to the B'nai B'rith International, an organization founded in 1843 to protect and advocate for Jews around the world.⁴⁰⁴ In her speech, entitled "An Unrelenting Assault", the ambassador noted that both the U.N. and the state of Israel were born out of World War II and the fight against Nazism. She then lamented the fact that the U.N. was now involved in an assault against the one state that served as a haven for the survivors of Nazi persecution.

Indeed, Kirkpatrick appears to have bought into the notion that opposition to Israeli policies was proof of prejudice against Jews. The American ambassador declared that the United Nations had become a hot-bed of anti-Semitism. Such sentiment had increased after a 1975 General Assembly resolution declared that Zionism was the equivalent of racism. Kirkpatrick pointed out that over 150 anti-Israel resolutions had been passed within the United Nations since 1945, and 25 of the 60 U.N. Security Council meetings in 1981 alone had dealt with Arab complaints against Israel. Moreover, anti-Semitism had spilled over into the specialized agencies of the United Nations, turning UNESCO, the WHO, the U.N. Conference on Women, and the International Atomic Energy Agency 'anti-Israeli platforms'.⁴⁰⁵ According to Kirkpatrick, this

⁴⁰³ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the 39th General Assembly, December 11, 1984, "The Question of Palestine", 87.

⁴⁰⁴ For more information on the B'nai B'rith International, see: <http://www.bnaibrith.org/>

⁴⁰⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*. Address before the B'nai B'rith International, Toronto, Canada, October 18, 1982, "An Unrelenting Assault", 10.

effort was being spearheaded by the Arab states and the Soviet Union, who, in order to get a majority within the U.N., made a deal with the African bloc: the Arabs and the Soviets promised to support the African position against South Africa if the Africans supported the Arab position against Israel. Such an agreement between blocs allowed for the Arab position against Israel to have an automatic majority within the General Assembly, along with power within the specialized agencies.

In Kirkpatrick's mind, the campaign within the United Nations against Israel was part of "a systematic, totalitarian assault on language and meaning"⁴⁰⁶ comparable to both the pre-Holocaust German ordinances that dehumanized and discriminated against Jews and the signs of impending German aggression in Europe in the 1930s. This totalitarian assault on language and meaning, "inspired by the Soviets, elaborated upon by Arab speakers hostile to Israel, and now freely used by anti-Israel militants,"⁴⁰⁷ redefined Palestinian Arabs as 'the Jews of the Arab world' and Israel as the Nazis of the Middle East. Indeed, according to Kirkpatrick, the entire discourse within the U.N. had been appropriated by totalitarian verbal imperialism so that despotic governments were called 'democratic', policies intended to incite war were deemed 'peaceful', measures imposed by terror were termed 'popular', and where reactionary tactics were called 'progressive'.⁴⁰⁸ This type of rhetorical perversion, which served to invert the meanings of 'good' and 'evil', was especially clear to Kirkpatrick in the institution's treatment of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO). The ambassador noted that on the same day in 1975 that the General Assembly passed the 'Zionism is Racism' resolution, it also affirmed the

⁴⁰⁶ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Simon Wiesenthal Humanitarian Laureate Dinner, New York City, April 17, 1983, "The Dehumanization and Denial", 33.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid.

legitimacy of the PLO and endowed it with the rights of a member state, going so far as to establish a permanent committee with a large budget to promote the interest of the PLO. Now declared a ‘national liberation movement’, the PLO could ‘legitimately’ use force against Israel; meanwhile Israel’s use of force to defend itself against the PLO would be characterized as aggression.⁴⁰⁹

Kirkpatrick was adamant that the U.S. was determined to see Israel receive fair treatment at the United Nations; however, she conceded that such a goal was most likely utopian for no matter what Israel did, it was unlikely to get fair play in the international arena.⁴¹⁰ Nonetheless, the ambassador assured her audience that the United States would never support U.N. resolutions or statements that characterized Israel as aggressive or not a peace-loving state, as these were not consistent with American policies.⁴¹¹

The Soviet Invasion and Occupation of Afghanistan

Given Kirkpatrick’s education in the evils of totalitarianism, along with the Reagan Administration’s emphasis on containing communism, it is not surprising that she spoke out frequently and adamantly in the United Nations against the activities of the Soviet Union, most notably, its invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. When the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979, Carter had initiated limited covert aid. Reagan increased American military aid; however, despite his anti-communist rhetoric, he did not dramatically increase assistance to the mujahidin until 1985. Whereas the United States often stood alone in its opposition to

⁴⁰⁹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Conference on Zionism, Racism, and the United Nations, New York City, November 10, 1985, “Zionism, Racism, and the United Nations”, 47.

⁴¹⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Conference of Major Jewish Organizations, New York City, April 19, 1985, 49-50.

⁴¹¹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Jabotinsky Foundation, New York City, October 30, 1985, 55-6.

resolutions passed by the General Assembly involving either Israel or South Africa, the superpower received widespread support for resolutions denouncing the Kremlin. Indeed, other nations assisted the administration in providing covert military aid to Afghani “freedom fighters” including communist China, Pakistan, and Saudi Arabia. Though Russia’s status as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council allowed it to veto any resolutions that criticized its actions, each year throughout Kirkpatrick’s tenure, the General Assembly passed resolutions condemning the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan. And each time the subject was broached, Jeane Kirkpatrick was there, reminding the U.N. of the plight of the Afghan people, the atrocities committed by the Red Army, the dangers of totalitarianism, and the bravery of the Afghan “freedom fighters”.

Kirkpatrick first spoke of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in November of 1981. In her address to the General Assembly, the ambassador described the incursion as a momentous event that altered the climate and course of world politics.⁴¹² The ambassador described the invasion as a grave violation of the United Nations’ Charter that shook the very foundations of world order. Soviet aggression shattered the prospects for stability in South Asia and the Persian Gulf, severely aggravated tensions between East and West, and, more than anything, marked a “watershed in the postwar era, bringing to a definitive conclusion a period of optimism concerning the evolution of Soviet policy and intentions.”⁴¹³ Of course, as a member of the CPD and a Cold Warrior, Kirkpatrick had been warning Americans of the danger of the Soviet Union throughout the détente era or ‘period of optimism’, long before the 1979 attack on Afghanistan.

⁴¹² Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the General Assembly, November 18, 1981, “The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan”, 250.

⁴¹³ Ibid.

In her ongoing indictment of the Kremlin, Kirkpatrick observed that nearly three million people, roughly 1/5 the population of Afghanistan, had been forced to flee from their country. In addition to the large numbers of refugees, thousands of people had been killed. Whole villages were being destroyed, mosques had been desecrated, religious leaders imprisoned or murdered, schools turned into centers of political indoctrination, and Afghanistan's economic infrastructure, power and communication networks, and hospitals had all been severely damaged. According to the ambassador, the significant economic and social progress that had accompanied the decade of 'democratic freedoms and representative government brought about by the 1964 constitution' had been totally undone.⁴¹⁴

The Soviets, she charged, had worked hard to prevent the world from seeing just how destructive their occupation had been to the Afghan people. They sealed the country off from journalists and other foreign observers and banned entrance to humanitarian organizations such as the International Red Cross. Meanwhile, the Soviets utilized thousands of booby-trapped mines disguised as ordinary household items or toys against the Afghan people despite the fact that they had previously signed an international convention prohibiting the use of such weapons. According to Kirkpatrick, such actions demonstrated the true character of the Soviet Union.⁴¹⁵

In addition to noting the suffering of the Afghan people at the hands of the Red Army, Kirkpatrick made it her business to deconstruct any justifications offered by the Soviets for their invasion and occupation of the Middle Eastern state. The ambassador maintained that it was impossible for them to justify their actions based on any meaningful interpretation of international law. Kabul had not attacked the Soviet Union, and historically, it did not pose a threat to the Kremlin. Indeed, the two states had peacefully coexisted for decades. In fact,

⁴¹⁴ Ibid, 251.

⁴¹⁵ Ibid.

Afghanistan was a member of the Non-Aligned Movement, a group of states determined to stay out of the Cold War. Moscow stated that it felt threatened by the turmoil inside Afghanistan, but aside from student riots in 1965 and a brief period of unrest following a coup in 1973, Kirkpatrick proclaimed that tranquility had reigned throughout Afghanistan until the Communists violently seized power in 1978. The Soviet Union claimed to fear the rising tide of Islamic fundamentalism in the region which might eventually infect the Soviet Empire, but Kirkpatrick argued that the Afghan people were not fundamentalists and were tolerant of other faiths.⁴¹⁶

The Soviet's primary justification for entering into Afghanistan was that they were invited in by the Kabul regime which had invoked *its* right to self-defense. Kirkpatrick claimed that this, too, was a lie as not a shred of evidence had been produced to support such allegations. Moreover, she claimed that the Soviet invasion *preceded* the institution of the regime that professed to have invited the Soviets in. Furthermore, the ambassador maintained that the Kabul regime had no legitimacy in the eyes of the Afghan people as it existed only by virtue of Soviet actions. Evidence of this could be found in the fact that large numbers of Afghani freedom fighters continued to resist the Red Army and the puppet regime. According to Kirkpatrick, the Kabul regime was nothing more than an appendage of Moscow, maintained in power by the presence of 85,000 Soviet troops that allowed for the Soviets to direct all aspects of Afghanistan's administration, its military, and the nation's natural resources.⁴¹⁷ The American

⁴¹⁶ Ibid, 252. NOTE: In Worldnet interviews, Kirkpatrick never responded to any questions about whether the U.S. was worried that Islamic fundamentalism might take hold in Afghanistan under the mujahidin.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid, 253-4.

ambassador called upon the assembly to support the resolution against the Soviet Union which it did with an overwhelming majority.⁴¹⁸

In November of 1982, 1983, and 1984 debate over the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan resurfaced within the General Assembly. Each time that the matter was broached within the Assembly, the American ambassador delivered lengthy addresses denouncing the Soviet Union. Kirkpatrick provided details of the atrocities committed by the Red Army against the Afghan people, including specific instances of rape, torture, murder, the destruction of villages and infrastructure, and the use of chemical weapons. On every occasion, she praised the struggles of the Afghan freedom fighters and urged them to continue their fight against incorporation into the Soviet empire. Kirkpatrick continued to insist that the Afghan struggle had a much broader meaning. “If a small, relatively defenseless, nonaligned country like Afghanistan is allowed to be invaded, brutalized, and subjugated,” she stated, “what other similarly vulnerable country can feel secure?”⁴¹⁹

The American ambassador warned members that totalitarianism was once more on the march. “With the Soviet invasion of 1979,” she stated, “a totalitarian, one-party state ruled by the Afghan communists has given way to a totalitarian apparatus completely controlled by the Soviet Union.”⁴²⁰ According to Kirkpatrick, the communist totalitarian drive to totally restructure society was already underway inside Afghanistan. She stated:

Perhaps the most significant is the Soviet effort to reshape Afghan culture and to replace the decimated intellectual and middle classes with a new elite trained in the Soviet mold.

⁴¹⁸ For text of the resolution, see:

http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/36/34&Lang=E&Area=RESOLUTION Last Accessed: 6/11/14.

⁴¹⁹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the U.N. General Assembly, November 24, 1982, “The Meaning of the Afghan Struggle”, 255.

⁴²⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the U.N. General Assembly, November 22, 1983, “Unlawful Use of Force”, 266.

Thousands of Afghans, including even children between the ages of six and nine, are being trained in the Soviet Union and other bloc countries, while the Afghan educational system itself is being restructured along Soviet lines. The Sovietization of Kabul University is made evident by the presence of Soviet advisers at all levels of administration and instruction and in the preference given to party activists in admissions. The curriculum of Afghanistan's primary education system has been redrawn to promote indoctrination in Marxist-Leninist ideology and to prepare young Afghans for further study in the Soviet Union.⁴²¹

Kirkpatrick asserted that the 'Sovietization' of Afghanistan was accompanied by the terror and repression characteristic of totalitarian states. Secret police terrorized the Afghan population, and the number of political prisoners only increased as time went on: arbitrary arrests, detention, and torture were common tactics used by the secret police and the Red Army. Meanwhile, the government had destroyed freedom of speech, press, and political expression.⁴²²

As usual with Soviet foreign policy, ideology had been married to long-standing Russian strategic objectives. According to Kirkpatrick, the Soviet Union constituted a contemporary embodiment of the Russian Empire as it existed under tsarist rule. Since the time of the tsars, Russian leaders had pursued the dream of a warm water port on the Indian Ocean; therefore, domination of Afghanistan was essential to the fulfillment of Russian historical territorial aspirations.⁴²³ "The Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan is a clear and blatant example of imperialist expansion," the ambassador declared, "the fulfillment of a long-standing Soviet, and before that Tsarist, goal."⁴²⁴ Should it be successful in the annexation of Afghanistan, the

⁴²¹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the U.N. General Assembly, November 24, 1982, "The Meaning of the Afghan Struggle", 259.

⁴²² Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the U.N. General Assembly, "What Happened in Afghanistan?", November 14, 1984, 271-2.

⁴²³ *Ibid*, 273-4.

⁴²⁴ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the U.N. General Assembly, November 22, 1983, "Unlawful Use of Force", 264.

ambassador argued, the Soviet Union would then have a geopolitical access to Iran and Pakistan.⁴²⁵

The Vietnamese Occupation of Cambodia

On December 25, 1978, exactly one year before the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the communist government of Vietnam had invaded the neighboring state of Cambodia. Whereas the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan constituted the first instance of the Soviets using direct military force outside of the Soviet bloc since World War II, the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia was the first and only extended war between two communist nations. Though the Reagan Administration repeatedly expressed opposition to communist expansion, the uniqueness of this situation, the American defeat in Vietnam, previous U.S. actions throughout Indochina, and the complicated ties and rivalries that existed between Vietnam, the Soviet Union, China, and Cambodia inhibited Washington's ability and will to act. Accordingly, covert aid to 'freedom fighters' in Cambodia remained quite limited throughout Reagan's tenure. For one, there was a large, disparate coalition of insurgents, including the Khmer Rouge, fighting against the Vietnamese. American policymakers were concerned that military aid might fall into the hands of the Khmer Rouge, allowing them to regain control in Cambodia. For another, despite the administration's assertion that previous efforts at containing communism in Indochina had been morally right, nobody in Washington was eager to launch another intervention in the region. For these reasons, Kirkpatrick did not deliver as many forceful addresses to the United Nations regarding this situation even though the United Nations General Assembly debated the

⁴²⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Congressional Task Force on Afghanistan, "The Fate of Afghanistan", Washington, D.C. March 11, 1985, 284.

issue and passed resolutions against Vietnam nearly every year throughout her tenure.⁴²⁶

Furthermore, Kirkpatrick was not an expert on Asian politics. In her own collection of state documents, she included her speeches regarding Cambodia in the chapter devoted primarily to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This was most likely done because the political scientist considered Vietnam to be a puppet of the Soviet Union and believed that the Soviet Union was behind Vietnam's actions in Indochina.

In October of 1981, Kirkpatrick addressed the General Assembly stating that it had been nearly three years since the "Socialist Republic of Vietnam, supported and financed by the Soviet Union" first invaded and occupied Cambodia; meanwhile, nearly 200,000 Vietnamese troops still occupied the country.⁴²⁷ Kirkpatrick noted that the people of Cambodia had suffered greatly in previous years, having been "ravaged by a succession of horrors, including three decades of war and the savage destruction of Pol Pot"; if that weren't enough they were now enduring conquest and occupation by their historic adversaries.⁴²⁸ Despite the fact that the Vietnamese had overthrown the hated Khmer Rouge regime and were welcomed by some Cambodians as liberators, the American ambassador claimed that the Vietnamese occupation of Phnom Penh not only victimized Cambodians, but also all of the peoples of Southeast Asia, and that the entire region was suffering under the oppressive tyranny of Vietnam. "The pursuit of an unpopular war has caused widespread misery within Vietnam," she argued, "and imperialist

⁴²⁶ The literature on the war between Vietnam and Cambodia remains rather slim: For an overview see: McMahon, Robert J. *The Limits of Empire: The United States and Southeast Asia Since World War II*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999). See also: Morris, Stephen. *Why Vietnam Invaded Cambodia: Political Culture and Causes of the War*. (CA: Stanford University Press, 1999).

⁴²⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*. Address before the U.N. General Assembly, October 19, 1981, "Cambodia's Right to Self-Determination", 287.

⁴²⁸ *Ibid.*

adventures have necessitated escalation of the already scandalous level of oppression inside Vietnam.”⁴²⁹

As in the case with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, Kirkpatrick attacked Vietnam’s justifications for invading its neighbor. Vietnam claimed that it had entered Cambodia at the request of the Heng Samrin regime. This justification, according to Kirkpatrick, was absurd, especially as that regime did not even exist at the time of the Vietnamese invasion. “In this as in other respects,” she stated, “the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea is strikingly, tragically analogous to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.”⁴³⁰ Furthermore, the Vietnamese professed themselves to be the liberators of the Cambodian people. This, too, was a lie, she argued. For one, Kirkpatrick insisted that it was Vietnam that had brought the Pol Pot regime to power. She continued along this theme in future addresses before the Assembly, arguing that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam “must bear a full measure of responsibility for the tragic tyranny of the Khmer Rouge. Vietnam’s support was critical to the Khmer rouge victory in 1975... Vietnam only deposed Pol Pot when it became apparent that it could not dominate and control the Khmer Rouge.”⁴³¹ Moreover, Kirkpatrick blamed Hanoi for using Cambodia in its war against South Vietnam, a move that resulted in massive destruction throughout the country. Therefore, Vietnam’s contention that its invasion of Cambodia was prompted by a concern for the human rights of the Kampuchean people “constituted a falsehood that was as offensive as it was egregious”.⁴³²

⁴²⁹ Ibid. NOTE: No mention is made of American involvement in Vietnam or Cambodia.

⁴³⁰ Ibid, 288.

⁴³¹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the 39th General Assembly, October 30, 1984, “Cambodia’s Tragedy”, 293.

⁴³² Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*. Address before the U.N. General Assembly, October 19, 1981, “Cambodia’s Right to Self-Determination”, 289.

Kirkpatrick implored the Vietnamese and their Soviet patrons to join in negotiations to resolve the tragic plight of the Cambodian people. She also expressed support for a resolution calling for a U.N. supervised withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cambodia. It also contained provisions for the security needs of Cambodia, had safeguards to ensure that armed political factions would be unable to disrupt, intimidate, or coerce the outcome of free elections, and emphasized the need for an independent Cambodia to remain neutral. The resolution also called upon Vietnam to participate in the negotiation process. The General Assembly adopted the resolution by a large majority.⁴³³

Namibian Independence and South Africa

With the exception of the Arab-Israeli conflict, no issue dominated the United Nations' agenda throughout Kirkpatrick's tenure more than that of Namibian independence. Because the U.N. viewed South African rule over Namibia as illegal, discussion of Namibian independence almost always led to the vilification of Pretoria.⁴³⁴ Many member states viewed South African rule as a vestige of European colonialism and spoke out frequently against its policies of apartheid. Though the United States had gone on record favoring the establishment of an independent Namibia, its ties to South Africa often left Kirkpatrick standing alone in support for Pretoria. Due to historic 'ties', the United States and South Africa could sometimes count on the

⁴³³ To see the full text of the Resolution entitled "The Situation in Kampuchea": http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/36/5&Lang=E&Area=RESOLUTION Last accessed: 6/11/14.

⁴³⁴ For an overview of decolonization in Africa see: Cooper, Frederick. *Africa Since 1940: The Past of the Present*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002). For Namibia see: Dreyer, Ronald. *Namibia and Southern Africa: Regional Dynamics of Decolonization, 1945-1990*. (Geneva, Switzerland: Publication of the Graduate Institute of International Studies, 1994). For an overview of U.S. policies towards Namibia and South Africa see: Thomson, Alex. *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa, 1948-1994*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). Davies, J. E. *Constructive Engagement? Chester Crocker and American Policy in South Africa, Namibia, and Angola*. (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2007).

support of Great Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany; but, as was the case with Israel, the U.S. was often the sole nation within the United Nations overtly defending the interests of Pretoria. This put Kirkpatrick in the position of appearing to support European colonialism.

The Reagan Administration's policy in regards to South Africa and Namibian independence was known as 'constructive engagement'. Constructive engagement, a method in which pressure could be brought to bear on countries to improve their human rights records while maintaining cordial diplomatic relations and profitable economic contacts, represented an attempt to reconcile two ideals of American foreign policy – the spread of democracy and the containment of communism. As was the case with other regions, American policies towards southern Africa were dominated by Cold War concerns. A communist regime, maintained in power by the presence of thousands of Cuban troops, governed Angola, a state that shared a border with Namibia. Despite the racist, imperialist nature of South Africa, it was an anti-communist state that fought against various communist regimes in the region. Moreover, its occupation of Namibia was seen as a bulwark against communist expansion. Thus, Reagan and company were reluctant to apply pressure to Pretoria in the name of either Namibian independence or the end of apartheid. Indeed, constructive engagement linked Namibian independence to the total withdrawal of Cuban troops in neighboring Angola.

In a speech before the Overseas Press Club, Kirkpatrick laid out the administration's goals and policies towards Namibia and South Africa. Why was the United Nations obsessed with Namibia, she queried, why not deal with the Libyan invasion of Chad, or the Soviet threat to Poland, the destruction of Lebanon, or the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan? Kirkpatrick asserted that the reason that the U.N. was 'seized' with Namibia was because it was an institution

that specialized in certain kinds of issues, most notably ‘decolonization’.⁴³⁵ Furthermore, she claimed that the U.N. liked to deal with issues that were not of serious concern to the major global powers. Thus, the issue of Namibian independence and its occupation by South Africa was ‘safer’ to focus on than the illegal occupation of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union.

Kirkpatrick characterized the socio-economic make-up of the African state as a large, ethnically heterogeneous territory, rich in minerals, and poor in political experience. Similar to South Africa, Namibia’s population was predominantly black, with a small minority of white Europeans. The black population was dominated by the Ovambo tribe – predominantly poor, with only a very small middle class. Thus, wealth was concentrated primarily in the hands of the Afrikaaner, German, and English (or white) population. Kirkpatrick described Namibia’s ruler, South Africa, as a medium-sized power that did not constitute a major threat to any state within the international arena except to its immediate neighbors and “some of its own population.”⁴³⁶

Kirkpatrick maintained that the principal goal of the Reagan administration was to see Namibia achieve independence; however, since Namibia had the world’s largest uranium deposits, a concomitant goal of the U.S. was to prevent the mineral-rich territory from falling into the Soviet sphere of influence. Furthermore, the administration was determined not to sour its good relations with surrounding African states (South Africa) in its dealings regarding the issue of Namibian independence. Complicating matters was the presence of approximately 30,000 Cuban troops in neighboring Angola. Kirkpatrick gave no credence to the notion that the Cuban troops would leave once Namibia was independent and South Africa’s troops were pulled

⁴³⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Overseas Press Club, New York City, “The Problem of Namibia”, 303.

⁴³⁶ *Ibid*, 304.

away from the border of Angola. Instead, the U.S. asserted that the Cubans would use Angola as a base of operations to spread communist influence throughout the region.⁴³⁷

The number of political actors involved in the issue, including SWAPO, DTA, South Africa, the United Nations, Great Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany, further complicated any attempts at negotiating independence for Namibia. The South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) was the oldest, best-established coalition dedicated to Namibian independence. Though dominated by the Ovambo, SWAPO was, according to Kirkpatrick, a mixed bag: some were nationalists and some were enthusiastic supporters of Marxism-Leninism and closely tied to the Soviet Union. There were minor parties in Namibia, but Kirkpatrick only named one – the Turnhalle Alliance (DTA), a predominantly white party tied closely to South African government. Though she acknowledged that the DTA appeared to not be as 'strong' as SWAPO, the ambassador claimed that "one cannot accurately estimate the popular strength of a group in the absence of either free elections or careful opinion polls."⁴³⁸

In addition to political parties inside Namibia, one of the major actors involved in this issue was, of course, South Africa. Kirkpatrick described South Africa as a democracy on top and an authoritarian system on the bottom – meaning that its white population enjoyed all of the rights and protections of citizens living in a democracy, while the majority of its population, non-whites, suffered under authoritarian rule. According to the ambassador, South Africa's white population identified with Europe, considered itself to be an heir to Judeo-Christian, Western Civilization, and was deeply concerned about being accepted as such by the Western world. This desire to be accepted, she claimed, constituted an important factor in the equation as they might eventually submit to Western pressure to end apartheid. Moreover, though racist, the South

⁴³⁷ Ibid.

⁴³⁸ Ibid, 305.

African government featured a rule of law which was “of course, a protection to the population, a restraint on government, and a lever for peaceable change.”⁴³⁹

In addition to SWAPO, the DTA, and South Africa, the United Nations and Western European nations were also political actors involved in the Namibian equation. According to Kirkpatrick, the United Nations’ decision to recognize SWAPO, a national liberation organization comprised of communist elements, as the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people demonstrated partisanship and “tarnished its credentials” as a fair mediator in Namibia.⁴⁴⁰ As for Great Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany, Kirkpatrick noted that they had large investments in Africa which gave them a ‘special stake’ in the region.⁴⁴¹

The United Nations, she proclaimed, was ‘seized’ with obtaining Namibian independence via Resolution 435. This resolution was passed in 1978 and called for the following: the withdrawal of South Africa’s illegal administration of Namibia so that power could be transferred to the people of Namibia, and the establishment of a U.N. Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) which would remain in place for one year in order to ensure free elections under the supervision and control of the U.N. It welcomed SWAPO’s cooperation in signing and observing a ceasefire during this transitional period, and called upon South Africa to cooperate with the U.N. in this endeavor.⁴⁴² Kirkpatrick maintained that the U.S. was in favor of this resolution, but that it had many ‘gaps’ that the Reagan Administration was concerned about. For one, it failed to envision what kind of regime would emerge following elections; for another, it

⁴³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁰ Ibid, 305-6.

⁴⁴¹ Ibid, 306.

⁴⁴² For the full text of Resolution 435, see: <http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/368/80/IMG/NR036880.pdf?OpenElement> Last accessed: 6/13/14.

failed to state who would govern Namibia in the interim. The ambassador asserted that the U.S. would only support the resolution if such issues were resolved, if it included a provision for the protection of minority rights in Namibia, and if it provided a framework that would protect Namibian independence once it was won.⁴⁴³

In her first year at the United Nations, Kirkpatrick spoke before the General Assembly and the Security Council about Namibia and South Africa on multiple occasions. In March of 1981, the General Assembly attempted to revoke South Africa's credentials. Kirkpatrick was angered by this move, and in a speech before the Assembly she pointed out that according to the U.N. Charter, a member state could only be suspended or expelled upon the recommendation of the Security Council. With the U.S. strongly opposed to this action and having permanent veto power, South Africa could not be forced out of the U.N.⁴⁴⁴ The following month, Kirkpatrick chastised the Security Council for its unwillingness to hear from representatives of the DTA. "We do not purport to know how many Namibians support this party or any other party. We will not know the answer to that question unless or until free elections are held in that country," she stated, "we only know that some Namibians support this party." Should the Council refuse, then the fundamental principles of fairness, democratic spirit, and evenhandedness upon which the United Nations was founded would be violated, thus damaging the organization's capacity to act as a peacemaker and impartial mediator.⁴⁴⁵

In April of 1981, the Security Council passed four different resolutions regarding the occupation of Namibia by South Africa, all of which were vetoed by the United States, the

⁴⁴³ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Overseas Press Club, New York City, "The Problem of Namibia", 306.

⁴⁴⁴ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the 35th General Assembly, March 2, 1981 "Universality", 307.

⁴⁴⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, April 21, 1981, "Fair Play for Namibia", 308-309.

United Kingdom, and France.⁴⁴⁶ Kirkpatrick mounted a vigorous defense of the Western powers in debates. “There have been charges that the Western countries... have failed to achieve the goal of an independent, stable, self-governing Namibia,” she proclaimed, “It has been suggested that because the Western Contact Group... have substantial economic relations with South Africa, they are somehow responsible for the continuation of repression in South Africa.”⁴⁴⁷ This was not true, the ambassador declared. Moreover, in an effort to distance her country from such charges, Kirkpatrick alluded to the actions of the Soviet bloc in the region:

My government has no other objective than to achieve authentic independence and self-government for Namibia and indeed I believe that all the Western Contact Group has no other objective than this. We have no territorial objectives in Africa. We have no aspiration to station thousands of our troops in African countries. We have no desire to send armed surrogates to subvert the independence of the new states of Africa. We have no desire to divide this body or to divert its attention from the problem of self-government for Namibia to the creation of divisive decisions here.⁴⁴⁸

In addition to denying the charges levelled against the U.S. and other Western nations, Kirkpatrick opposed the resolutions’ calls for sanctions against South Africa. The ambassador maintained that the Reagan Administration did not view economic sanctions as an effective means of influencing political policy. Moreover, the administration did not see sanctions as a ‘realistic alternative’ to future efforts to resolve the issue peacefully by negotiation. Kirkpatrick argued that sanctions had not been effective against Italy in the 1930s or Rhodesia in the 1970s; furthermore, neither had American sanctions against the Soviet Union following its invasion of

⁴⁴⁶ See, for example: http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/14462 Last accessed: 6/13/14

⁴⁴⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, April 23, 1981, “Solving the Problem of Namibia”, 309-10.

⁴⁴⁸ *Ibid*, 310.

Afghanistan.⁴⁴⁹ Thus, given the historical ineffectiveness of sanctions, the United Nations should cease in its efforts to force member nations to adopt them.

In 1984, the General Assembly passed several resolutions against South Africa and the practice of apartheid. The U.S. either voted against or abstained from voting for each resolution with the exception of one – *The U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa* which provided humanitarian assistance to those persecuted under the apartheid system.⁴⁵⁰ American opposition to these resolutions was widely criticized by U.N. member states. The ambassador declared that the U.S. deplored and condemned apartheid “as we condemn all denial of full citizenship and rights of full citizenship and of democracy to all citizens of all countries, unequivocally.”⁴⁵¹

Unfortunately, ‘excesses of language’ prevented the U.S. from supporting these resolutions; for example, the ‘direct, hostile, and unfair references’ to specific members of the United Nations. In particular, the U.S. opposed the phrase “on account of the veto of the United States” as it implied that aggression committed by South Africa against its neighbors was solely the result of the American veto in the Security Council.⁴⁵² Such implications were preposterous, she declared.

⁴⁴⁹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, April 30, 1981, “No to Economic Sanctions”, 311-12.

⁴⁵⁰ See:

<http://unbisnet.un.org:8080/ipac20/ipac.jsp?session=14026Q54E65T6.7209&menu=search&aspect=power&npp=50&ipp=20&spp=20&profile=voting&ri=&index=.VM&term=A%2FRes%2F39%2F72&matchoptbox=0%7C0&oper=AND&x=9&y=10&aspect=power&index=.VW&term=South+Africa&matchoptbox=0%7C0&oper=AND&index=.AD&term=&matchoptbox=0%7C0&oper=AND&index=BIB&term=&matchoptbox=0%7C0&uloper=%3D&ullimit=&ulype=&uloper=%3D&ullimit=&sort=> This shows the voting record regarding A/Res/39/72 entitled “Policies of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa”. Last accessed: 6/13/14.

⁴⁵¹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, August 16, 1984, “The Right to Full Citizenship”, 326.

⁴⁵² Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the 39th General Assembly, December 12, 1984, “Achieving Namibia’s Independence”, 322.

Moreover, the language contained within the resolutions was calculated to discourage those engaged in the effort to bring independence to Namibia.⁴⁵³

Criticisms

The transition from college professor to policymaker was not an easy one for Kirkpatrick. She took a leave of absence from her job at Georgetown in order to devote herself to her new position which required her to travel frequently back and forth between New York and Washington, DC. Being a U.N. Ambassador and member of the NSC also required her to travel frequently around the globe. Inevitably, her new position forced her to spend more time away from her husband and children. Moreover, as the first female Permanent Ambassador to the United Nations from the United States and the first woman to sit on the National Security Council and the National Security Planning Group, Kirkpatrick faced special pressures and problems. In an interview with *People Magazine* in 1982, Kirkpatrick talked of the complications of being a woman in a high governmental position:

A woman in high office is intrinsically controversial. Many people think a woman shouldn't be in high office. Kissinger is described as 'professorial.' I am described as 'schoolmarmish.' Brzezinski is called 'Doctor.' I am called 'Mrs.' I am depicted as a witch or a scold in editorial cartoons—and the speed with which these stereotypes have been used shows how close these feelings are to the surface. It is much worse than I ever dreamed it would be.⁴⁵⁴

Her gender also placed her appearance under scrutiny. Dating back to her adolescence and her days at Stephens College, Kirkpatrick had never been interested in fashion, make-up, or hairstyles. This 'indifference' regarding her appearance did not draw much criticism in academic

⁴⁵³ Ibid, 323.

⁴⁵⁴ "Ambassador Under Fire" by: Clare Crawford-Mason. *People Magazine*. June 28, 1982. <http://www.people.com/people/article/0,,20082519,00.html> Accessed 12/9/13. NOTE: Searches through newspapers and magazines back her up. She is almost always noted as 'Mrs.' rather than 'Dr.' Other derogatory references were made: see also: <http://memory.loc.gov/> : Secretary of State, Al Haig, referred to her as a 'bitch'.

circles; however, it did land her on the worst dressed list of *People Magazine* in 1981. As a high profile diplomat and policy-maker, Kirkpatrick was required to look the part. She was given a make-over that included more make-up along with highlights and more fashionable clothing and jewelry.⁴⁵⁵

In addition to having to adjust to a new job, sacrificing time with her husband and children, and enduring difficulties due to her gender, Kirkpatrick also had to withstand public and political scrutiny concerning her job performance. Assessments of Kirkpatrick's tenure as United Nations Ambassador, outside of conservative circles, have been generally critical. *Notable U.S. Ambassadors Since 1775: A Biographical Dictionary* provides a brief biographical sketch of Kirkpatrick, along with an overview of various important issues raised at the U.N. during her tenure there. In the work, Kirkpatrick is described as an outsider who was not fond of public and social functions. This, combined with her insistence on appointing her own team, created additional distance between the U.S. mission and the foreign affairs bureaucracy. Many career officers felt left out and resigned as Kirkpatrick and other 'inexperienced outsiders' took over.⁴⁵⁶ The author praised Kirkpatrick for standing up for American interests at the United Nations, but also noted that the U.S. often stood alone in its support for both Israel and South Africa, and in its opposition to disarmament issues and international agreements such as the Law of the Sea Treaty. Finally, the author observed, it was under Kirkpatrick's watch that the United States government withdrew support from UNESCO (Educational, Scientific, and Cultural

⁴⁵⁵ Collier, *Political Woman*, 142.

⁴⁵⁶ *Notable U.S. Ambassadors Since 1775: A Biographical Dictionary*. Edited by: Cathal J. Nolan. (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997), 222.

Organization of the U.N.) and had the voting records of countries recorded and passed on to Congress to be used in the assessment of future aid requests.⁴⁵⁷

Seymour Maxwell Finger offers a much harsher assessment of Kirkpatrick as U.N. Ambassador in his work *American Ambassadors at the United Nations*.⁴⁵⁸ According to Finger, a major issue affecting her performance as ambassador was her negative view of the institution. He criticized her both for repeatedly speaking ill of the United Nations and for exhibiting confrontational attitudes towards other nations. Furthermore, Finger maintained that Kirkpatrick had appointed persons to the U.S. mission based solely on their political views rather than their experience in international diplomacy. The lack of experienced professionals, he charged, handicapped the mission, its goals, and its relations with other national groups. Though he praised her for defending American interests and standing up to the Soviets, Finger's overall analysis of her performance remained uncomplimentary. According to him, Kirkpatrick's ideological approach to international affairs, along with her frequent denunciations of the U.N., led to repeated unnecessary confrontations with Third World nations and resulted in diminished support for American policies. Moreover, her speaking style, lack of diplomatic experience, and inaccessibility hampered her effectiveness.

Both Gary Ostrower and Linda Fasulo offered negative assessments of Kirkpatrick's tenure as United Nations Ambassador in their respective works – *The United Nations and the United States* and *Representing America: Experiences of US Diplomats at the UN*.⁴⁵⁹ Ostrower

⁴⁵⁷ Ibid, 223.

⁴⁵⁸ Finger, Seymour Maxwell. *American Ambassadors at the United Nations: People, Politics, and Bureaucracy in Making Foreign Policy*. (New York: UNITAR, 1992).

⁴⁵⁹ Ostrower, Gary. *The United Nations and the United States*. (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1998).

Fasulo, Linda. *Representing America: Experiences of US Diplomats at the UN*. (New York: Praeger, 1984).

described Kirkpatrick as confrontational, blunt, acerbic, and angry – the most ideological of Reagan’s foreign policy team. He accused her of alienating many at the U.N. and the State Department and blamed her for the U.S. decision to cut funding from the U.N. and to withdraw from UNESCO. Ostrower was particularly critical of her decision to keep track of nations’ voting habits in the United Nations in order to determine whether or not the U.S. should acquiesce to future aid requests from them. Like Finger, Fasulo criticized Kirkpatrick for frequently speaking negatively of the United Nations and for being confrontational. Her willingness to bypass normal diplomatic channels in order to speak to the President one-on-one was deemed ‘unprofessional’. Moreover, Fasulo points out that Kirkpatrick was not of the same public stature as previous representatives, noting that this might be an indication of how the Reagan Administration felt about the U.N.

The most positive assessment of Kirkpatrick’s performance as ambassador comes from Allan Gerson, an international attorney who served as legal counsel and special assistant to Kirkpatrick throughout her tenure at the United Nations. *The Kirkpatrick Mission: Diplomacy without Apology*⁴⁶⁰ focused on major issues that arose within the U.N. between 1981 and Kirkpatrick’s resignation in April of 1985 and, as such, provides valuable insight into the workings of the U.S. mission. Gerson does address an issue that Ostrower, Fasulo, and Finger did not: Kirkpatrick’s influence over policy. He claimed that the political science professor had more influence over foreign policy than any previous United Nations Ambassador.⁴⁶¹ Though supportive of Kirkpatrick, Gerson’s descriptions of the workings of the United Nations were overwhelmingly negative. The lawyer noted how frequently the U.S. was outnumbered and out-

⁴⁶⁰ Gerson, Allan. *The Kirkpatrick Mission: Diplomacy Without Apology, America at the United Nations, 1981-1985*. (New York: The Free Press, 1991).

⁴⁶¹ *Ibid*, xvi.

voted on numerous issues, never acknowledging any legitimacy in opposing viewpoints. This is not surprising given his belief that traditional theories of international law constituted “make-believe universalism”⁴⁶², a sentiment that is reminiscent of Kirkpatrick’s distrust of ‘rational utopianism’. Gerson maintained that with the creation of the U.N., international law was erroneously seen as being able to overcome the multiple varied conceptions of justice and world order held by different cultures. Indeed, international law was viewed as nothing less than a guide to a promised land of universal peace. Gerson believed that instead of following traditional theories of international law, the U.S. should have adopted a more national security oriented approach.⁴⁶³ This theme – that United States policy should reflect American interests rather than those associated with the United Nations Charter – was often repeated throughout the book, making it quite clear that neither Kirkpatrick nor Gerson had much faith in multinational institutions.

Keith Hindell, a British journalist, offers a more recent critique of Kirkpatrick’s time as the American ambassador to the United Nations in his article “Madame Ambassador: An Appraisal of Jeane J. Kirkpatrick as U.S Permanent Representative to the United Nations, 1981-1985”.⁴⁶⁴ Hindell’s article analyzed the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, her performance within the United Nations, and her influence on foreign policy. The reporter began by criticizing the Kirkpatrick Doctrine’s assumption that right-wing dictatorships were somehow less repressive than other dictatorial regimes. “In view of all the horrors inflicted by juntas in Argentina, Chile, Honduras, Guatemala, El Salvador, Peru, Paraguay, and Brazil,” he wrote, “it was bizarre to speak up for

⁴⁶² Ibid, 4.

⁴⁶³ Ibid, 4-5.

⁴⁶⁴ Hindell, Keith. “Madame Ambassador: An Appraisal of Jeane J. Kirkpatrick as U.S Permanent Representative to the United Nations, 1981-1985”. *Passport*, volume 39, Issue 3, January 2009.

‘traditional autocracies’.”⁴⁶⁵ Hindell went on to point out the number of times Kirkpatrick did not know an answer during her confirmation hearing, implying that she was not qualified to be an ambassador. Like Finger, Ostrower, and Fasulo, Hindell disapproved of Kirkpatrick and her staff’s inexperience. “Despite being exposed as being less than the master of her brief,” he asserted, “she scorned an induction proffered by the State Department and underlined her view by appointing three outsiders to key positions in the UN mission, rejecting candidates from the Foreign Service.”⁴⁶⁶

Hindell claimed that Kirkpatrick was at her best defending Israel at the United Nations, something she had to do quite frequently. The journalist also praised her energy, noting that she gave seventy speeches to the U.N. Security Council, the General Assembly, and the Third Committee (the Social, Humanitarian, and Cultural Committee), that she regularly testified before Congress, and that she wrote numerous articles during her tenure. However, Hindell asserted that Kirkpatrick’s speeches failed to have a marked effect on the voting patterns of member states, and he described her as more of an advocate than a diplomat.⁴⁶⁷ Unlike Gerson, Hindell maintained that Kirkpatrick had little influence over the Reagan Administration’s foreign policies, after all, Reagan did not offer her a senior position in the government upon her retirement from the United Nations.⁴⁶⁸

Ann Miller Morin’s work, *Her Excellency: An Oral History of American Women Ambassadors*, offers a more balanced analysis of the political scientist turned ambassador.⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁵ Ibid, 19.

⁴⁶⁶ Ibid, 19.

⁴⁶⁷ Ibid, 22-3.

⁴⁶⁸ Ibid, 24.

⁴⁶⁹ Morin, Ann Miller. *Her Excellency: An Oral History of American Women Ambassadors*. (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995). The complete interview between Miller and Kirkpatrick is available online through the Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection at <http://memory.loc.gov/>.

Morin's work in many ways mirrored Kirkpatrick's own work with female legislators in *Political Woman*. Morin conducted interviews with 34 female ambassadors in an attempt to answer the following questions: What character/personality traits do these women have in common? How successful were female ambassadors? What effect did being a woman have on them? Did any of them influence foreign policy? At the time that Morin began her research in 1984, only 44 females had served as ambassadors, the first of whom was Ruth Bryan Owen who was made chief of the diplomatic mission to Denmark in 1933.

Based on her position as United Nations Ambassador, member of the Cabinet, the NSC, and part of the NSPG, Morin credited Kirkpatrick with having more foreign policy clout than any woman in the United States history.⁴⁷⁰ Though she had a reputation for being confrontational and lacking accessibility, Morin praised Kirkpatrick for taking down the 'Kick Me' sign on the back of the U.S. in the United Nations. Kirkpatrick sent letters to representatives who continuously voted against the United States, warning them that they could not repeatedly vote against American interests and then expect military and economic aid to continue. "From then on," Morin noted, "those who wished to maintain friendly relations with the United States were much more careful of how they voted."⁴⁷¹

In interviews Morin questioned Kirkpatrick about a number of issues including her gender, her accessibility, her relations with other ambassadors and diplomats, and her overall assessment of the United Nations. When asked about what role gender played in her treatment at the international institution Kirkpatrick told Morin, "I had no notion what a shock my gender would be. I was not only the first woman to head the U.S. mission to the United Nations. I was the first woman to ever represent a *major* power at the UN. I was the first woman to ever

⁴⁷⁰ Ibid, 247.

⁴⁷¹ Ibid, 249.

represent a *Western* government at the United Nations. I was also the first woman to sit in the National Security Council on a regular basis.”⁴⁷² Kirkpatrick was proud of her accomplishments, both for herself and for other women, noting “I have no doubt that my appointment and survival of those first two years in fact opened doors for women in career foreign service positions.”⁴⁷³ Despite initial negative reactions towards her gender, Kirkpatrick maintained that she profited as much from being a woman as she suffered. The ambassador told Morin: “I think in macho cultures, like both Latin and Arab – and somebody said African – they’re much less likely to regard a woman as a competitor. And I think women are generally, including me, trained to be good listeners. I did an awful lot of listening and a lot of seeking of advice, and my colleagues liked that.”⁴⁷⁴

Kirkpatrick acknowledged that she did delegate quite a bit, but pointed out that the U.S. Mission had specialists for all areas of the world who were trained to work on issues affecting those regions. Thus, based on their expertise, she felt it would oftentimes be better for them to deal with regional issues. As for charges of inaccessibility, Kirkpatrick conceded that at times she was. This she blamed on her frequent travel between Washington and New York. The ambassador maintained that taking part in both the NSPG and NSC was “absolutely essential” for the U.S. Mission to function effectively. After all, attending policy meetings gave Kirkpatrick access to authoritative decisions from the highest level⁴⁷⁵. Frequent travelling also increased her reliance on area specialists and delegating certain tasks to others at the mission.

In her conversation with Morin, Kirkpatrick described her relationships with fellow Security Council members as “very close”, noting that while she worked most closely with the

⁴⁷² Ibid, 250.

⁴⁷³ Ibid, 251.

⁴⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁷⁵ Ibid, 255.

British and the French she managed to maintain “reasonably good relations” with the Chinese and Soviet ambassadors.⁴⁷⁶ The ambassador noted that outside the Security Council, she was close with many of the Latin American ambassadors and some of the African diplomats. Kirkpatrick’s language skills – her fluency in both French and Spanish – were unique among American Ambassadors to the U.N. and allowed for her to work well with representatives of nations who spoke those languages⁴⁷⁷.

Perhaps the most common and germane critique of Kirkpatrick’s performance as U.N. Ambassador concerned her frequent denunciations of the institution. Critics wondered, rightly so, whether or not someone who did not believe in the efficacy of the United Nations was the best person to represent American interests there. In this vein, Morin asked Kirkpatrick about the effectiveness and the importance of the U.N. The ambassador described the institution as “a seriously bloated, overblown, international bureaucracy with a lot of the worst aspects of many national bureaucracies combined.”⁴⁷⁸ In regard to its central responsibilities, namely the peaceful resolution of conflict, peacekeeping, and peacemaking she declared the U.N. to be ineffective. There were, Kirkpatrick acknowledged, certain programs affiliated with the U.N. that were quite effective including the UNHCR (High Commissioner for Refugees), UNICEF (Children’s Fund), and WHO (World Health Organization). Though overall critical of the institution, Kirkpatrick maintained that the United States should not withdraw from the U.N. because it was too important to many small, poor Third World countries. “I don’t think it’s objectively important to them,” she relayed to Morin, “but it’s subjectively. I think what’s most important to Third World countries is that there be a place in which they can meet people, a lot of arenas, you know, in

⁴⁷⁶ Ibid, 259.

⁴⁷⁷ <http://memory.loc.org/> Accessed 5/3/12.

⁴⁷⁸ Ibid, 260.

which different kinds of problems are discussed and in which they can speak, just get a hearing.”⁴⁷⁹

Kirkpatrick elaborated on her views of the United Nations in *Legitimacy and Force*, a two volume set that included all of her speeches, testimonies, addresses, statements, and articles from her time as ambassador. The ambassador repeatedly deplored the relative impotence of the United States within the United Nations, observing that American influence had been in decline within the U.N. since the early 1960s, a time when European powers began giving up their empires. “There is no greater irony in our time,” she noted, “than that the decolonization process and the proliferation of former colonies as members of the United Nations should have been associated with the decline of U.S. influence”.⁴⁸⁰ As a former colony itself, the U.S. had declared itself in favor of decolonization in the immediate postwar era; however, it was the Soviet Union who was able to successfully seize upon the decolonization issue due to the capitalist nature of former imperial states. Kirkpatrick failed to acknowledge that American support for its European Cold War allies often placed Washington in opposition to independence movements throughout the Third World.

As more and more nations gained admittance into the United Nations, the U.S. slowly became more isolated.⁴⁸¹ Many of the new nations were former colonies whose entire national histories had been lived out since the end of WWII. Most were poor, weak, and unhappy, and very few were democracies. According to Kirkpatrick, these nations pushed two overriding agendas in the United Nations: decolonization and economic development; yet, despite the fact that decolonization, economic development, and development assistance were utterly consistent

⁴⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁸⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*, 194.

⁴⁸¹ Ibid, 195.

with American national experience, values, and practices, the United States still had major difficulties garnering support from these nations.⁴⁸²

Moreover, American impotence had to do with the structure of that U.N. General Assembly, specifically its emphasis on one nation, one vote. This method of representation, she charged, created a disjunction between power and responsibility; for example, the United States was responsible for 25% of the U.N. budget and had more responsibilities than other nations, but did not possess commensurate voting clout.⁴⁸³ In addition, Kirkpatrick blamed American diplomats for their longstanding lack of skill in practicing international politics in multilateral arenas. According to her, Americans had not been effective in defining or projecting a conception of U.S. national purpose within international forums. In short, Americans had not practiced good politics at the United Nations. Kirkpatrick placed part of the blame for American political ineptitude with the rapid turnover of delegates (one reason she stayed at her post as long as she did). However, the major issue for Americans at the U.N. was that they ignored the political nature of the United Nations, and instead operated as though there were no differences between relations with its supporters or opponents, no penalties for opposing American views and values, and no rewards for cooperating with a superpower.⁴⁸⁴

According to Kirkpatrick, a political culture had developed within the institution that featured all of the elements of interest-based politics. For instance, the political blocs inside the U.N. functioned similarly to the political parties in a parliamentary system, and as such, sought to control the dynamics of legislative politics. There were a variety of blocs: some were geographical blocs, such as the OAU (Organization for African Unity), and some consisted of

⁴⁸² Ibid, 217.

⁴⁸³ Ibid, 218.

⁴⁸⁴ Ibid, 219.

political and economic coalitions, such as the Soviet bloc. The most important and largest bloc during the 1980s was that of the non-aligned states, a bloc that claimed over one hundred nations that allegedly operated outside of the East-West conflict. The power of the blocs depended on their cohesion and their size; for example, Kirkpatrick noted that the African bloc was very cohesive while the Latin American one was not. Alliances are made among the blocs and these frequently determined outcomes. According to her, the Soviets had been very skillful in handling the blocs, especially the non-aligned group.⁴⁸⁵

Unlike the Soviets, the United States was a country without a party in the United Nations. The U.S. had never belonged to any bloc and because of this often ended up as a non-participant in key political decisions within the organization. Kirkpatrick maintained that American political isolation within the U.N. stemmed from its universalism, the very same universalism that led the U.S. to assist in the creation of a world assembly in which all the nations would be represented on the basis of one country, one vote. In keeping with their utopian, idealistic bent, Americans believed that a superpower should not become a part of any bloc in order to not demonstrate favoritism for one group over another. Apparently, the United States continued to take George Washington's warnings about 'entangling alliances' seriously, even in the United Nations. Therefore, the U.S. had influence within the U.N. only when the blocs failed to act like cohesive, disciplined parties; in all other cases, the American ambassador expended much time and energy in a fruitless effort to sway the major blocs and frequently had to exercise its veto power in the Security Council. Casting a veto meant, much to Kirkpatrick's chagrin, acknowledging that one's country did not have enough political clout to carry the day on the issue at hand.⁴⁸⁶

⁴⁸⁵ Ibid, 222-4

⁴⁸⁶ Ibid, 225-7.

Kirkpatrick believed that one way for the United States to become more effective within the United Nations was to be clear to other nations that the U.S. took the U.N. seriously – meaning that acts against the American interest within the U.N. by any nation would be taken into account in assessments of bilateral relationships. Consequently, she supported placing the voting records at the U.N. under congressional oversight. According to her, annual reviews of U.N. voting patterns and practices would provide Congress with a reliable, systematic basis for assessing the attitudes, policies, and decisions of member states. Thus, Congress could withdraw economic or military aid from nations that repeatedly voted against the United States in the United Nations.⁴⁸⁷

In addition, the United States could use its control over the international organization's purse strings in order to increase its influence. Kirkpatrick testified before congress on more than one occasion that despite having signed the United Nations Charter that committed member nations to perpetual financial support, the United States did not have to continue paying a quarter of the total U.N. costs. She pointed out that other countries sometimes refused to pay their share and were not penalized; therefore, the U.S. could do the same. Moreover, the U.S. had complete control over its voluntary contributions to the United Nations' specialized agencies. Kirkpatrick maintained that Congress should only favor those programs that were both supported by their constituents and consistent with American values. Conversely, U.N. programs that had succumbed to politicization or had strayed from their original purpose and task should be penalized by the withdrawal of American monetary support.⁴⁸⁸

Despite her numerous critiques of the international organization, Kirkpatrick declared that it was, in some ways, important to the global community. In speeches and articles, she

⁴⁸⁷ Ibid, 276-7.

⁴⁸⁸ Ibid, 261, 268-70.

repeatedly praised its work with refugees, children, and global health issues. The U.S. ambassador noted the importance of the organization as a global forum for small, Third World nations. In addition, Kirkpatrick maintained that the United Nations was able to focus world attention on various issues, for the problems discussed within the organization were publicized around the globe. Moreover, she charged, decisions made by the U.N. on various issues were often interpreted as reflecting global opinion, and as such, became endowed with moral and intellectual force.⁴⁸⁹ For these reasons, the United States should remain active within the U.N. while continuing to increase its influence therein.

Conclusions

As the Permanent Ambassador to the United Nations, Jeane Kirkpatrick was responsible for articulating and defending the Reagan Administration's foreign policies to the global community. In this respect, her ambassadorial tenure can be deemed quite successful. Due to her inclusion within the National Security Council and the National Security Planning Group, along with her personal access to the President, the Georgetown professor was privy to the development of policies as they evolved within the State and Defense Departments. Such direct access to the machinations of foreign policies allowed Kirkpatrick to excel in her position as mouthpiece for the administration, and, in each of the issues discussed in this chapter – Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict, the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia, and Namibian independence and South Africa – the ambassador faithfully represented the goals and views of her country.

Kirkpatrick's successful articulation of the Reagan Administration's policies, however, did not necessarily sway global opinion, especially in the cases of Israel and South Africa. In

⁴⁸⁹ Ibid, 278-9.

nearly every instance in which these issues were debated within the United Nations, the United States found itself as a country without allies, unable to amass support for its views. Within the domain of the U.N. Security Council, the U.S. was able to thwart majority opinions on the Arab-Israeli conflict and the illegal South African occupation of Namibia via the use of the veto. Indeed, throughout Kirkpatrick's tenure, the U.S. ambassador was forced to employ the veto on nineteen occasions: five of these vetoes pertained to South Africa and Namibia, while ten of them concerned Israel and the situation in the Middle East.⁴⁹⁰ Outside of the Security Council, Kirkpatrick was unable to garner the support necessary to block General Assembly resolutions which criticized America's allies.

As the U.S. appeared increasingly to stand alone against global opinion, Kirkpatrick's disenchantment with the United Nations increased. Her disillusionment with the international body, especially in regards to its unceasing attacks on Israel, caused the ambassador to call for controversial changes in American policy towards the organization. For one, Kirkpatrick spearheaded the decision to place U.N. voting records before Congress in the hopes that House Representatives and American Senators could utilize them in their assessments of aid requests from foreign nations. For another, the ambassador supported withdrawing U.S. funds from UNESCO due to its anti-Israel orientation. In both cases, Kirkpatrick hoped to utilize one of America's greatest resources – money – in order to increase U.S. influence within the United Nations. With regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict and the South African occupation of Namibia, such tactics were ineffective as the majority of member states continued to support measures that went against American wishes.

⁴⁹⁰ See: www.un.org/depts/dhl/resguide/scact_veto_en.shtml for the complete list of vetoes within the U.N. Security Council. Last accessed: 6/13/14.

Though the U.S. frequently stood alone in its support for Israel and South Africa within the United Nations, American policies and goals concerning the Soviet invasion and occupation of Afghanistan, along with the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia, were widely supported by the majority of member states. In these instances, the United States and the United Nations were in nearly complete agreement. President Reagan, who, like Kirkpatrick, was not the most ardent supporter of the international organization, publicly commended U.N. resolutions relating to Afghanistan and Cambodia.⁴⁹¹ Though these issues were not debated as frequently as those pertaining to Israel or South Africa, and resolutions passed against the Soviet Union and Vietnam were not, according to Kirkpatrick, as rhetorically ‘harsh’ as those that criticized Israel, the fact that the U.N. repeatedly passed resolutions condemning these actions constitutes evidence that the international organization was not completely dominated by the Soviet bloc and its aspirations as Kirkpatrick often implied.

Despite the passage of numerous resolutions vis-à-vis Israel, Afghanistan, Cambodia, and Namibia, none of these conflicts were resolved by the United Nations during Kirkpatrick’s tenure. Thus, her contention that the organization was ineffective in regards to its central responsibility which consisted of the peaceful resolution of conflicts, peacekeeping, and peacemaking may contain some truth. However, its inability to end these conflicts had much to do with both the veto power of the United States and the Soviet Union and the intransigence of

⁴⁹¹ See for example: The *Public Papers of the President: Ronald Reagan, 1981-1989*, The Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, “Statement on the Soviet Occupation of Afghanistan”, May 1, 1984 where Reagan calls on the Soviets to negotiate a settlement based on repeated UN General Assembly resolutions on Afghanistan which called for the withdrawal of Soviet forces, the restoration of an independent and non-aligned Afghanistan, self-determination for Afghanistan, and aid to Afghan refugees in returning to their homeland. Also see “Address to the Ministerial Meeting of the Association of South East Asian Nations in Bali, Indonesia”, May 1, 1986 where Reagan approves of ASEAN’s and the UN’s resolutions for Cambodia. www.reagan.utexas.edu/. Last accessed: 6/14/14.

the Middle Eastern states. Neither the Reagan Administration's policies nor the U.N. resolutions directed toward the Arab-Israeli conflict proved successful, as peace in the Middle East remains elusive even up to present day. Moreover, while the Soviet veto prohibited the Security Council from acting in Afghanistan and Cambodia, the American veto blocked U.N. efforts at realizing Namibian independence. In fact, these crises were not resolved until the end of the Cold War era – Soviet troops did not withdraw from Afghanistan until 1989, Vietnam did not withdraw its troops from Cambodia until 1989, and Namibia did not become independent until 1990.

East-West rivalry indeed played an important role in American support for South Africa and Israel. In her own analysis of Middle Eastern issues, Kirkpatrick had given first priority to the goal of preventing the Soviet Union from gaining an additional foothold in that region. President Reagan also named the 'strategic threat posed by the Soviet Union and its surrogates' as one of the most salient issues facing American interests there.⁴⁹² Given Israel's status as a democratic, anti-communist state, American support for Tel Aviv remained ironclad. Furthermore, though South Africa's status as a democracy was questionable at best, its stance against communism was not. In her description of the issues complicating the independence of Namibia, Kirkpatrick had noted that a major goal of the U.S. was to prevent Namibia's uranium deposits from falling into the hands of the communists. Given that communist-dominated movements had taken over Angola and Mozambique, states that bordered on Namibia and South Africa respectively, the U.S. believed that it had to support South African activities geared towards rolling back communism in Southern Africa. Therefore, the U.S. supported South Africa's refusal to grant Namibian independence until Cuban troops were taken out of Angola.

⁴⁹² Ibid, "Address to the Nation on United States Policy for Peace in the Middle East", September 1, 1982. Last accessed: 6/16/14.

The Reagan Administration's foreign policies were centered on the containment of communism. Such an emphasis mandated that the administration protect and assist friendly, non-communist nations, such as Israel and South Africa, do everything in its power to prevent the spread of Soviet influence in regions around the world, and provide aid to those freedom fighters, like the mujahidin in Afghanistan, who were resisting communist, totalitarian invasions and occupations. The administration's determination to not only contain, but also to rollback communism, though obvious in these particular cases, was even more apparent in its policies towards Central America. Faced with what it perceived as an expanding communist threat in its own front yard, the Reagan Administration, under the influence and guidance of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, intensified its support for Nicaraguan "freedom fighters" and stepped up military aid to the government of El Salvador.

Chapter Five: Central America

Kirkpatrick's long-standing interest in non-democratic regimes, her work on Peronist Argentina, her affiliation with the American Enterprise Institute and its focus on Latin American politics, and her critique of President Jimmy Carter's foreign policies in "Dictatorships and Double Standards" fostered her reputation as a Latin American political expert. Thus, throughout her tenure as United Nations Ambassador, Kirkpatrick took a special interest and played an important role in the formulation of the Reagan Administration's Latin American policies. In January of 1981, just prior to her appointment as ambassador, Kirkpatrick's critique of United States' policies towards the region was published in *Commentary* magazine.⁴⁹³ The article, "U.S. Security and Latin America", served, in many ways, as a complement to, and continuation of, her criticisms of Carter's global development strategies, human rights policies, and alleged misunderstandings of Latin American politics found in her "Dictatorships and Double Standards" article.

Kirkpatrick began by sounding the alarm over the spread of communism in the region, asserting that the Soviet Union had established itself as a major military power in the Western hemisphere, a fact that made the entire region at risk for a communist takeover. Along with Cuba, she maintained that Marxist-Leninist regimes had come to power in Nicaragua and Grenada, and the nation of El Salvador was on the brink of anarchy, a situation caused by communist guerillas whose "fanaticism and violence are reminiscent of Pol Pot".⁴⁹⁴ In addition to Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada, and El Salvador, Kirkpatrick proclaimed that Castroite forces were threatening the governments of the nations of Guyana, Martinique, and Guadeloupe. Thus,

⁴⁹³ The article can be accessed online at: <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/u-s-security-latin-america/> It was also reprinted in her book *Dictatorships and Double Standards*.

⁴⁹⁴ Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, 54.

according to the Georgetown political scientist, one of the most pressing tasks of the new administration was to review and revise the nation's flawed policies towards these states and the region as a whole.⁴⁹⁵

Kirkpatrick maintained that prior to the Vietnam War, the United States had a special relationship with the nations of Latin America, one that emphasized national security and anti-communism. However, the American defeat in Southeast Asia had prompted U.S. policymakers to reassess the objectives of Cold War policies around the globe based on 'lessons' learned from the war in Vietnam. According to her, such lessons included the following: the Cold War was over, therefore, East-West competition should be deemphasized; intervention in the affairs of other nations was immoral; the United States should not support autocrats faced with popular revolutionary movements; and the U.S. should make amends for its 'deeply flawed national character' and past actions by restraining itself in international affairs.⁴⁹⁶

Kirkpatrick disagreed with such conclusions and noted that these sentiments were strengthened by the increasing acceptance of development theory by many members of the American foreign policy apparatus. She pointed to Carter's National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and his work *Between Two Ages*, as a prime example of this new mode of thinking. In his work, Brzezinski claimed that global politics were in a state of flux: nationalism was waning and ideological competition was on the decline as nation-states became increasingly interdependent. Kirkpatrick contended that such dismissal of ideology and the East-West conflict allowed for the regional 'special' relationship between the U.S. and Latin America to be subsumed into a global framework that deemphasized American national security interests in order to focus on economic and technological development within the Third World. Having

⁴⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁹⁶ Ibid, 55-6.

divested the region of its strategic importance and incorporated Latin American states into the ‘Third World’, the Carter Administration was free to base its global policies on what Kirkpatrick deemed to be utopian and abstract ideals – development and human rights.⁴⁹⁷

Having criticized Carter’s global approach to foreign policy, Kirkpatrick turned her attention to Latin America. The political scientist noted that many similarities existed between Latin American political systems, especially among the nations of Central America. All were small states and relatively poor. Despite various attempts made by the wealthy and ruling classes to modernize their nations’ economies, the majority of persons living in Central America were landless peasants who worked on large estates and plantations and lived in poverty. Wealth remained heavily concentrated among the upper classes and the small middle classes.

Throughout the region access to education, medical care, decent housing, proper nutrition, and political power remained limited. In the realm of politics and government, the Central American states exhibited characteristics similar to other Latin American political systems: disagreement on the means and ends of government, widespread distrust of authority, broad ideological spectrums, low levels of participation in voluntary associations, preference for hierarchical modes of association, and a history of military involvement and intervention in government. Each had experienced democratic interludes; however, democratic reforms had been undermined by the fraud, corruption, and intimidation that seemed endemic to the region. Thus, political competition took place in a variety of arenas by diverse groups, a fact that demonstrated that there was a lack of consensus regarding legitimate routes to power.⁴⁹⁸ Such a lack of consensus allowed violence and military coups to remain legitimate avenues to power and ensured that

⁴⁹⁷ Ibid, 55-62.

⁴⁹⁸ Ibid, 65-7.

violence was an “integral, regular, and predictable” aspect of Latin American politics.⁴⁹⁹

Following her description of the similarities shared by the nations of Latin America, Kirkpatrick offered a brief political history of Nicaragua and El Salvador. The Nicaraguan political tradition combined both autocratic and democratic elements. Throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, Nicaraguan politics had been dominated by political factions controlled by the small, wealthy, ruling classes. These factions competed under a two party system in elections that were often decided by a very slim margin. Because of this, the United States was often called upon by various factions to assist in maintaining peace within the nation. This was the case until Anastasio Somoza García came to power in 1936. Somoza’s ability to maintain the loyalty of the National Guard, along with his political skills and ability to retain American support, made Nicaragua one of the most stable nations in Central America. Though he was a dictator, Kirkpatrick claimed that Somoza engaged in only ‘limited oppression’ and allowed for ‘limited opposition’. He made no effort to control the church or to change Nicaraguan culture. In short, Somoza’s government, like those of other Latin American states, was moderately oppressive and moderately corrupt.⁵⁰⁰

During the 1960s and 1970s, the Nicaraguan government was dominated by Somoza’s son – Anastasio Somoza Debayle, a West Point graduate married to an American woman. The younger Somoza, who had a reputation for womanizing and heavy drinking, continued the policies of his father and, according to Kirkpatrick, had every reason to believe that he would continue to receive American military and economic aid. He had no idea that his government would be brought down by the President of the United States, Jimmy Carter, and a group of

⁴⁹⁹ Ibid, 67.

⁵⁰⁰ Ibid, 69-70.

“Cuban backed terrorists”.⁵⁰¹ By the time Carter entered office in 1977, a revolution against the Somoza regime had begun. The Nicaraguan dictator’s efforts to put down the revolution made him vulnerable to charges of human rights abuses. In an attempt to placate the Americans and continue to receive military aid, Somoza oscillated between repression and reconciliation in his dealings with revolutionary groups. According to Kirkpatrick, this vacillation demonstrated to the Nicaraguan people and the guerillas that Somoza could not perform the basic function of government – the maintenance of order – which delegitimized the regime.⁵⁰²

Kirkpatrick contended that Carter brought about the fall of Somoza by cutting off military aid at a time when he needed it the most. By ignoring the violence brought about by guerilla revolutionary groups and focusing purely on Somoza’s attempts to curtail such violence, the administration helped bring down one of the most stable governments in Central America. Lack of military aid prevented Somoza from dealing with the opposition while it was still small enough to be taken out.⁵⁰³ Moreover, the ambassador claimed that Carter’s efforts at mediation between Somoza and his opposition within the Organization of American States (OAS) brought legitimacy to the revolutionaries. Furthermore, in the mistaken belief that progress and democracy could not come to Nicaragua if Somoza remained in power, the State Department demanded that Somoza resign.⁵⁰⁴ Eventually, due to the increase of revolutionary violence and the withdrawal of American military aid, Somoza was forced out and the Nicaraguan government was taken over by what Kirkpatrick characterized as a communist, totalitarian, terrorist group with ties to Cuba and the Soviet Union – the Sandinistas.⁵⁰⁵

⁵⁰¹ Ibid, 71.

⁵⁰² Ibid, 71-2.

⁵⁰³ Ibid, 72.

⁵⁰⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁰⁵ Ibid, 73-79.

Meanwhile, revolution was brewing in the neighboring state of El Salvador. As in other Latin American countries, military coups were a normal part of the political landscape in the small nation. Indeed, Kirkpatrick described El Salvador as a caricature or prototype of a Central American republic; its political history regularly featured oligarchy, violence, revolution, and militarism.⁵⁰⁶ Similar to Nicaragua, 19th and early 20th century politics were dominated by the wealthy Salvadoran elite who competed with each other in a two party system for political power. Over time, other factions of Salvadoran society became politically active, either in electoral politics as the franchise was extended, or in other political arenas typical of Latin American systems.

Though the nation had experienced periods of stability, such eras were short-lived. Kirkpatrick noted that the political system in El Salvador was chronically weak and unstable, even in comparison to other Central and Latin American states. Its political history was characterized by numerous constitutions and military coups. Indeed, there was a lack of agreement amongst the Salvadoran citizens as to the legitimate means and ends of government which, according to Kirkpatrick, left all holders of power vulnerable to the charge that they were usurpers.⁵⁰⁷ In such systems, government lacks legitimacy, and without legitimacy there is no authority; instead, there is only power and the habit of obedience to whomever successfully claims power.⁵⁰⁸ Such governments, Kirkpatrick claimed, were especially vulnerable to revolutionary violence and terrorist subversion.⁵⁰⁹

According to Kirkpatrick, had the Carter Administration understood the distinctive characteristics and problems inherent in the political structure of El Salvador, and other Latin

⁵⁰⁶ Ibid, 80.

⁵⁰⁷ Ibid, 81.

⁵⁰⁸ Ibid, 83.

⁵⁰⁹ Ibid.

American nations for that matter, then it might not have been so quick to embrace the overthrow of Romero. The administration had indeed greeted Romero's overthrow as the dawn of a new era and a watershed event in Salvadoran history. "A more prudent appraisal of politics in Central America," Kirkpatrick wrote, "would have left policymakers a little less enthusiastic about the destruction of any semi-constitutional ruler, not because they approve the ruler, but because they understood that authority in such systems is weak, stability fragile, and order much easier to destroy than reconstruct."⁵¹⁰

Though a change in government had occurred, revolutionary activity by Salvadoran guerilla groups continued, prompting Carter to offer military and economic aid to the new junta. In return for weapons and money, American policymakers insisted that the new government institute land reforms. Washington hoped that the transfer of land to the peasants would vaccinate the masses against the appeals of the communist guerillas and give them a stake in the new government. Kirkpatrick remained highly critical of these and other reform measures instituted by the Carter Administration and believed they would not be successful. She maintained that revolution sprang not from the resentments of landless peasants, but in the bosom of the middle classes. "Revolutions in our time," she wrote, "are born in the middle class and carried out by sons of the middle class who have become skilled in the use of propaganda, organization, and violence."⁵¹¹ Therefore, a greater understanding of revolution and Salvadoran politics would have allowed American policymakers to be less sanguine about the contributions of reforms to political stability.

Despite the advent of a new regime and the initiation of land reform policies, leftist guerilla groups with ties to the Nicaraguan Sandinistas stepped up their revolutionary activities

⁵¹⁰ Ibid, 86.

⁵¹¹ Ibid, 87.

causing the Salvadoran government to crack down on the opposition. As in the case of Somoza in Nicaragua, the U.S. viewed these efforts as human rights violations. Kirkpatrick wrote, “State Department supporters have consistently emphasized the danger from the Right – that is, from authoritarian, intensely anti-Communist defenders of the status quo”; however, the political scientist maintained that El Salvador was more likely in the long run to fall to a coalition of revolutionaries “trained, armed, and advised by Cuba and others.”⁵¹² A clear comprehension of the problem of order in El Salvador, she asserted, would have made American policymakers more sympathetic to the inability of the government to control the situation, and less anxious to inhibit the use of force against violent revolutionaries.⁵¹³

Kirkpatrick concluded that Carter’s Latin America policies were failures. She wrote,

Because it failed to take into account of basic characteristics of Latin American political systems, the Carter administration underestimated the fragility of order in these societies and overestimated the ease with which authority, once undermined, can be restored. Because it regarded revolutionaries as beneficent agents of change, it mistook their goals and motives and could not grasp the problem of governments which become the object of revolutionary violence. Because it misunderstood the relations between economics and politics, it wrongly assumed (as in El Salvador) that economic reforms would necessarily and promptly produce positive political results. Because it misunderstood the relations between ‘social justice’ and authority, it assumed that only ‘just’ governments can survive. Finally, because it misunderstood the relations between justice and violence, the Carter administration fell (and pushed its allies) into an effort to fight howitzers with land reform and urban guerrillas with improved fertilizers. Above all, the Carter administration failed to understand *politics*. Politics is conducted by persons who by various means, including propaganda and violence, seek to realize some vision of the public good.... When men are treated like ‘forces’ (or the agents of forces), their intentions, values, and world view tend to be ignored. But in Nicaragua the intentions and ideology of the Sandinistas have *already* shaped the outcome of the revolution, as in El Salvador the intentions and ideology of the leading revolutionaries create intransigence where there might have been willingness to cooperate and compromise, nihilism where there might have been reform.⁵¹⁴

⁵¹² Ibid, 85.

⁵¹³ Ibid, 86.

⁵¹⁴ Ibid, 89.

Kirkpatrick's assessment of the situation in El Salvador in "U.S. Security and Latin America" was, to say the least, flawed. Her political history of El Salvador was incomplete. In 1980, the tiny Central American nation boasted a population of approximately 4.75 million persons. The state itself comprised 8,236 square miles, an area roughly the same size as the state of Massachusetts. With an annual population increase of 3.5%, El Salvador was the most densely populated nation in the region. Nearly half of its citizens consisted of illiterate peasants who depended on working the land for their livelihood. Approximately 150,000 families worked as agricultural laborers while another 150,000 families were tenant farmers or sharecroppers. Altogether, about 1.8 million Salvadorans were landless peasants in a nation whose per capita income was \$680.00 U.S. dollars per year. The economy of El Salvador was based primarily on agricultural exports, along with economic aid from foreign nations.

As was the case with other Central and Latin American nations, El Salvador had experienced the harshness of Spanish colonial rule. Vestiges of colonialism remained following the nation's independence in the 19th century as the wealthy landowning classes continued to exploit the indigenous masses just as the Spanish had before. Over 60% of the arable land in the nation was owned and controlled by the wealthiest 2% of the population – the 'Fourteen Families'.⁵¹⁵ Terror, which had served as a useful tactic for the Spanish in their domination of the native peoples of El Salvador, continued to be utilized by the Salvadoran oligarchy, making violence a primary political tool throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. In addition to violence,

⁵¹⁵ LaFeber, Walter. *Inevitable Revolutions: The United States and Central America*. (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1983), 10.

See also: "Land Reform and the El Salvador Crisis", by: Roy L. Prostermann, Jeffrey M. Reidinger, and Mary N. Temple. *International Security*. Vol. 6, No. 1 (Summer, 1981), 60. For an excellent overview of the history of El Salvador and American foreign policies in Central America see: LeoGrande, William. *Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992*. (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1998).

the Salvadoran political system was characterized by a combination of rigged elections, military coups, oligarchical rule, and direct political actions such as strikes and demonstrations.

In December of 1931, members of the Salvadoran military staged a coup against the newly elected government and installed General Maximilian Hernández Martínez as President. Beginning in 1932, Salvadoran peasants, primarily those from the coffee- growing regions where economic conditions were the worst, began protesting against the new regime. These peasants were hit hard by the declining prices of coffee on the global market, and this, along with their dissatisfaction with the new political leadership, caused them to join socialist and communist parties. Augustin Farabundo Martí, a communist party leader, led the peasants and other Salvadoran dissidents in numerous strikes and demonstrations across the nation. The Salvadoran military responded with extreme force, killing between ten and thirty thousand Salvadorans, primarily peasants, and executing Martí. The military's crackdown on dissidents in 1932 was successful in the short-term, but memories of the uprising, as well as the injustices that spawned from it persisted. Many of the revolutionaries of the 1970s and 1980s claimed to be continuing the revolution began by the peasants and Martí in 1932, naming themselves the Farabundo Martí Front for National Liberation, or the FMLN, after the famous revolutionary.⁵¹⁶ In her own analysis of the 1932 uprising, Kirkpatrick discounted the 10-30,000 Salvadoran revolutionaries executed by Martínez and the Salvadoran military and instead praised the government for restoring stability to the nation. "It is sometimes said that 30,000 persons lost their lives..." she wrote, "the violence of this repression seems less important than the fact of restored order and the thirteen years of civil peace that ensued."⁵¹⁷

⁵¹⁶ LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions*, 72-3.

⁵¹⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, 82.

When Martínez overthrew the elected government of El Salvador in 1931, the United States was at first reluctant to acknowledge him as the legitimate ruler. However, once communists began leading revolts against the new regime, Washington began to change its stance, offering official recognition of the Martínez government in 1934. Thus, long before the advent of the Cold War or the articulation of the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, the United States showed that it preferred dictatorship and stability over revolution in Central America. The American acceptance of and support for autocracy in the region only increased in the postwar era as Cold War tensions escalated. The mastermind of containment, George F. Kennan, agreed with the American penchant for authoritarianism, noting in 1950 that “It is better to have a strong regime in power than a liberal government if it is indulgent and relaxed and penetrated by communists.”⁵¹⁸

The coup that placed General Martínez in power in El Salvador ushered in an era of military dominance over Salvadoran life. Between 1931 and 1944, the military became the primary source of political authority as it was the only institution that could guarantee stability and maintain order. Consequently, the traditional agrarian oligarchy drifted into the background of Salvadoran political life. This was part of a general trend; the phenomenon of dictatorships headed by generals and dependent upon the military for survival had become common throughout Central America. Indeed, with but two exceptions, from 1930 to the 1979 Nicaraguan revolution, every single extra-constitutional change in government within the region had required the acquiescence, support, and participation of the existing military establishment.⁵¹⁹

⁵¹⁸ LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions*, 107.

⁵¹⁹ *Political Parties and Democracy in Central America*. Edited by: Goodman, Louis W., William LeoGrande, and Johanna Mendelson Forman. (Boulder, CO; Westview Press, 1992), 56. The exceptions were the establishment of democracy in Costa Rica in 1948 and the American intervention in Guatemala in 1954.

The newfound wealth and power of the Salvadoran military gave it a large stake in preserving the status quo; reform of the existing political, social, and economic system became ever more difficult. Occasionally, elements within the military, specifically junior officers who felt far removed from power, would express the desire to improve the conditions of the poor; however, they were unsure how to simultaneously promote social justice while preserving the power of the military. Overall, the military was unable to resolve the many contradictions inherent in the effort to combine modernization with stability: How could the economy be modernized without the concomitant political and social mobilization becoming a destabilizing element? How could political coalitions be broadened while maintaining the hegemony and support of the oligarchy? How could the military allow political competitiveness without losing its authority?⁵²⁰ Unable to reconcile such contradictions, the Salvadoran military continued to repress its citizens and stifle efforts at reform.

In the 1970s, the political, social, and economic conditions within El Salvador worsened due to the eruption of war with Honduras, overpopulation issues, and the oil crisis. In 1969, El Salvador and Honduras went to war. Sparked by a qualifying match between the nations for the 1970 World Cup, the war was a result of long-standing border disputes and the increasing number illegal Salvadoran immigrants that had been flooding into Honduras. Economic conditions within El Salvador had caused many of its citizens to seek refuge in neighboring states. While the nations were at war, approximately 25,000 Salvadoran immigrants illegally working in Honduras were sent back to their homeland. This influx of people exacerbated the economic woes of the nation and caused many Salvadorans to suffer from starvation and malnutrition. Moreover, external factors, such as the 1973 oil embargo, conspired to make

⁵²⁰ Ibid, 135.

matters worse. By the end of 1973, the combination of war, overpopulation, and oil crisis had brought about inflation levels of sixty percent in El Salvador.⁵²¹

In the midst of this social and economic turmoil, opposition to the government grew. Many Salvadorans joined the Christian Democratic Party (PDC) led by José Napoleón Duarte, a Notre Dame educated engineer, former mayor of San Salvador, and acquaintance of Kirkpatrick. In 1972, Duarte ran against the military candidate, Colonel Arturo Molina, for the presidency. The military rigged the election and Molina was declared the winner. The outcome of the election angered some of the junior officers of the Salvadoran military who seized Molina and attempted to install Duarte as president. However, the majority of the military supported Molina and came to his aid. Nicaragua's leader – Somoza – sent his National Guard to thwart the attempted coup. Duarte was severely beaten and forced into exile. Meanwhile, as the military took measures to severely weaken the PDC, leftist revolutionary groups, including the FMLN, became more active.⁵²²

Throughout the 1970s, violence from both the right (military) and the left (FMLN) escalated. Those suspected of union activities or communist sympathies either disappeared, or they were arrested, and sometimes executed by the military's death squads. Leftist guerillas kidnapped members of the oligarchy and held them for ransom in order to raise money to buy arms. In the midst of this ongoing civil war, elections were held in 1977. Again, thanks to fraud on the part of the military, the will of the people was thwarted and General Carlos Humberto Romero was installed as president. Popular protests followed and with Romero's approval the military gunned down the protestors. Decrying this blatant disregard for human rights, the Carter

⁵²¹ LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 34, 103.
LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions*, 175, 243-245.

⁵²² LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 36.
LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions*, 244.

Administration threatened to suspend military and economic aid to El Salvador. Romero subsequently proclaimed that El Salvador did not want U.S. aid and proceeded to crack down harder on the opposition.⁵²³

Despite widespread government violence, protests against Romero's regime increased throughout 1977. Accordingly, Romero decreed the Law for the Defense and Guarantee of Public Order which made it illegal to oppose the government in any fashion. The law instituted full censorship of the press, outlawed strikes, banned public meetings, and suspended normal judicial proceedings.⁵²⁴ Political activities and violence only increased. By 1979, reports from Amnesty International, the Organization of American States, and the U.S. State Department were condemning the Salvadoran government and military for their systematic torture, murder, and persecution of political dissidents. Government violence brought about an increase in new recruits to the radical left which in turn stepped up its bombings, kidnappings, and assassinations of government officials.⁵²⁵

In October of 1979, Romero was overthrown in a coup led by junior military officers who accused the regime of corruption, electoral fraud, and human rights violations. Pledging to reform the nation's economic, social, and political structures in many ways, they offered to work with the leftist revolutionary forces in order to negotiate an end to the civil war, to initiate land reform so as to better the economic situation of the peasants, and to control the right-wing death squads. Though serious about instituting reforms, the young men were unable to deliver on their promises. Reform initiatives were consistently blocked by the military and the Salvadoran

⁵²³ LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions*, 245-246.

⁵²⁴ LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 39.

⁵²⁵ *Ibid.*

oligarchy. With the new regime increasingly paralyzed, violence began to escalate yet again.⁵²⁶ Throughout 1980, the Salvadoran government was battered by attempted coups on the part of the right wing of the military and increasing violence from leftist revolutionary groups. In response to events in neighboring Nicaragua, the Carter administration resumed military aid to El Salvador in hopes that the government would be able to put down the communist revolutionaries and prevent the extreme right from taking control of the government.

During 1980, more than eight thousand Salvadorans were killed, the majority slain by the government's security forces and the paramilitary right-wing death squads associated with the Salvadoran military. On March 24, 1980, the Archbishop of San Salvador, Oscar Arnulfo Romero, was assassinated by agents of the death squads while in the midst of giving mass. Romero had repeatedly called for social and political reforms, the end of repression by the government and military, and a negotiated settlement with the leftist guerillas.⁵²⁷ In November, leaders of the Revolutionary Democratic Front (FDR), a coalition of left-wing civilian opposition parties, were tortured, killed, and mutilated by a paramilitary death squad. The following month, four American nuns who had been working with the poor in El Salvador were raped and killed by a right-wing paramilitary group.⁵²⁸

In response to these assaults on the basic human right of 'life', President Carter temporarily suspended military aid and demanded that the Salvadoran military control its death squads. Carter discussed this decision in his memoirs:

I was insisting that the Salvadoran leaders protect the rights of their own people. The situation there was terrible: the murder of four American nuns, we believed by Salvadoran soldiers was another incredible act the country's officials were trying to

⁵²⁶ Ibid, 40-42.

LaFeber, *Inevitable Revolutions*, 249.

⁵²⁷ LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 46.

⁵²⁸ Ibid, 46, 50, 60-62.

ignore... I was determined that the murderers of the nuns be brought to justice, that elections be scheduled, that some equitable system of justice be established, and that promised land reforms be carried out. We had to convince the Salvadorans that brutal persecution of their own people was the major obstacle to their economic and political stability.⁵²⁹

With the death tolls rising, Carter sent envoys into El Salvador to assess the situation. American representatives visited the site where the nuns were killed and held talks with Duarte, the administration's choice as president of the nation. Reports from American emissaries prompted the president to describe the situation there as a bloodbath. Carter noted in his memoirs that right-wing death squads had killed approximately nine thousand persons in the last year. "They don't have anyone in jails," he wrote, "they're all dead. It's their accepted way of enforcing the so-called law."⁵³⁰

At the time, Kirkpatrick was working as a foreign policy advisor for Reagan's presidential campaign. Due to her professed concern with order and the fragility of the Salvadoran political system, she viewed the situation quite differently. The professor maintained that the military and their so-called 'death squads' were merely responding to the violence of the leftist guerilla groups. In regards to the murder of the American nuns, Kirkpatrick claimed that the nuns were not just nuns, but also political activists on behalf of the FMLN. Since the nuns had traveled to Nicaragua before going to El Salvador, she asserted that they had ties to the Sandinistas, and as such, were rightly perceived by the Salvadoran military as working on behalf of the revolutionaries.⁵³¹

⁵²⁹ Carter, Jimmy. *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*. (Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1995), 594-5.

⁵³⁰ *Ibid*, 594.

⁵³¹ *The Situation in El Salvador*. Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session, March 18 and April 9, 1981. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981), 197, 235. Kirkpatrick claimed that

In the weeks following the rape and murder of the American nuns, the civil war in El Salvador continued and violence from both the military and the guerillas again escalated. In January, two Americans working for the American Institute for Free Labor Development were gunned down by assassins while having dinner with the head of the Salvadoran Institute of Agrarian Transformation. The men responsible for the deaths claimed that the deputy director of intelligence of the Salvadoran National Guard had ordered to the killings. Shortly thereafter, the FMLN, the FDR, and other leftist groups embarked upon a 'final offensive' against the Salvadoran government. Though the military offensive failed, ties between the guerillas and the Nicaraguan Sandinistas caused the Carter Administration to reverse its policies towards El Salvador. The administration feared that the Salvadoran guerillas were communists that, once in power, would ally El Salvador with Nicaragua, Cuba, and the Soviet Union. Thus, Washington increased military aid to El Salvador via emergency provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act.⁵³² Such was the situation inherited by the Reagan Administration.

Kirkpatrick's writings on Latin America and American foreign policy enhanced her reputation as a Latin American political expert and made her a major player in the development of the Reagan Administration's Central American policies.⁵³³ In an NSC meeting in February of 1981, the president echoed Kirkpatrick's views on human rights and American foreign policy, noting that the U.S. had failed to establish good relations with its southern neighbors. "We must change the attitude of our diplomatic corps so that we do not bring down governments in the name of human rights," Reagan said. "None of them are as guilty of human rights violations as

her comments on the nuns were taken out of context, but she maintained that at least two of the nuns had ties to the Sandinistas.

⁵³² LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 70.

⁵³³ *New York Times*, June 24, 1981, Section A, page 11.

are Cuba and the USSR. We don't throw out our friends just because they cannot pass the 'saliva test' on human rights."⁵³⁴ Throughout Kirkpatrick's tenure as Permanent Ambassador to the United Nations, the Reagan Administration's policies, specifically, its unconditional support for the Salvadoran government, its opposition to a negotiated settlement to the Salvadoran Civil War, its unwavering defense of the Nicaraguan Contras, and its unceasing hostility towards the Sandinistas and the Cubans, adhered nicely to Kirkpatrick's prescriptions for regional security and stability.

Upon assuming office, President Reagan made Central America a top priority. Kirkpatrick was pleased with this move for she believed it represented efforts by the administration to both revitalize the special relationship between the U.S. and the nations of the region and reinforce American national security. "In foreign affairs, geography is destiny" Kirkpatrick declared.⁵³⁵ Situated at the southern-most tip of North America, the U.N. Ambassador designated the area as the 'fourth border' of the United States, making any expansion of communism in the region a threat to American national security.⁵³⁶ Though she was pleased that the administration recognized the importance of Central America to American national security interests, Kirkpatrick bemoaned the fact that Americans and many American allies seemed to not understand this. When critics of the administration expressed doubt concerning the importance of the region, the political scientist pointed out that the Soviet Union viewed Central America as an area of high strategic significance. NATO relief troops and

⁵³⁴ <http://www.thereaganfiles.com/1981026-nsc-1.pdf>

⁵³⁵ National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD. "Foreign Policy Issues" Worldnet No. 225. July 23, 1986. 306-WNET-241, Row 24, Compartment 29, Shelf 7.

⁵³⁶ NSC Meeting, February 10, 1982, "The Caribbean Basin". From The Reagan Files: <http://www.thereaganfiles.com/19820210-nsc-40-on-cbi.pdf>. Last accessed: 4/4/14. In this meeting, NSA William P. Clark labelled the region as America's 'front yard' whose importance to the U.S. was similar to the Mediterranean's importance to Europe.

equipment would be shipped overseas via the Caribbean Basin. In addition, raw materials travelling from the Middle East, Asia, and Africa to the United States passed through the Gulf and Caribbean region. Finally, American oil was refined in areas of the Caribbean.⁵³⁷ Thus, Kirkpatrick claimed that the area must remain out of communist hands in order to not only protect American national security, the security of Western Europe and Israel, but the security and independence of the nations of Central America as well.⁵³⁸

Though Central America was high on the administration's foreign affairs agenda, members of Reagan's National Security Council were at odds as to which particular situation in the region was of the utmost importance. In an NSC meeting in November of 1981, Secretary of State, Al Haig, maintained that the Sandinistas and the Cubans constituted the greatest threat to the region and to American national security. Kirkpatrick disagreed. She argued that El Salvador should be the first priority for the United States as the government of El Salvador would collapse if the guerrillas were allowed to continue in their destruction of the Salvadoran economy. Once El Salvador was stabilized, the U.S. could turn its attention more fully towards Nicaragua. In the meantime, covert action and proxy forces would "do the work for us" in fighting the Sandinistas.⁵³⁹

Reagan's NSC did agree that the threat to American national security in Central America was unprecedented in severity, proximity, and complexity. National Security Advisor William P. Clark observed that the weak economies and political institutions invited subversion from the Soviet Union, Cuba, Nicaragua, Grenada, Vietnam, Libya, and the PLO. Kirkpatrick argued that the real problem was the projection of Soviet military power in the region. "At a minimum, they

⁵³⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, 207.

⁵³⁸ *Ibid*, 171.

⁵³⁹ NSC Meeting, November 10, 1981, "Strategy Towards Cuba and Central America". From The Reagan Files: <http://www.thereaganfiles.com/19811110-nsc-24.pdf>. Last accessed: 4/4/14.

may neutralize us,” she said, “at a maximum, they can threaten us.”⁵⁴⁰ Kirkpatrick was adamant in her insistence that there was a communist conspiracy to take over Central America; the U.S. must prevent yet another domino from falling in its own front yard. President Reagan agreed, noting that American credibility was at stake in the region and a victory for the Salvadoran guerrillas would signal a defeat for the United States in the Cold War.⁵⁴¹

In early 1981, the Reagan administration began increasing military aid to El Salvador in order to bolster anti-communist forces in the region. Unlike its predecessor, the administration’s support for the Salvadoran government did not hinge upon land reform or the improvement of the regime’s human rights record.⁵⁴² Washington’s determination to provide aid to the government of El Salvador despite its lack of progress in the curtailment of human rights abuses by its military led to much criticism. One of the most compelling statements of opposition to American aid to the government of El Salvador came from a man who was assassinated by the Salvadoran military – the Archbishop of San Salvador, Romero. Prior to his death in 1980, the prelate had written to President Carter, begging him to withhold aid to the Salvadoran military and to refrain from intervening in the civil war. Romero maintained that the struggle was an indigenous movement and thus not a part of the East-West conflict. “It would be unjust and deplorable if the intrusion of foreign powers were to frustrate the Salvadoran people,” he wrote,

⁵⁴⁰ NSC Meeting, February 2, 1982, “The Caribbean Basin”. From The Reagan Files: <http://www.thereaganfiles.com/19820210-nsc-40-on-cbi.pdf>. Last accessed: 4/5/14.

⁵⁴¹ NSC Meeting, February 11, 1981. From The Reagan Files: <http://www.thereaganfiles.com/19810211-nsc-2.pdf> Last accessed: 4/5/14.

⁵⁴² In a meeting with ARENA (The Nationalist Republican Alliance, a right-wing party associated with the Salvadoran military and oligarchy) party officials, Kirkpatrick maintained that winning the war against the guerrillas was the most important objective for the administration, much more important than land reform or other socio-economic issues. “Telegram from Caracas to the State Department”. Found at: <http://foia.state.gov/http://foia.state.gov/Search/results.aspx?searchText=Jeane+Kirkpatrick&beginDate=&endDate=&publishedBeginDate=&publishedEndDate=&caseNumber=> Last accessed: 4/6/14.

“to repress it and block its autonomous decisions about the economic and political path that our country ought to follow.”⁵⁴³ Romero then chastised the Salvadoran government, its military, and its security forces for reverting to repression and violence.⁵⁴⁴ The Catholic Archbishop of Washington, James A. Hickey concurred. He maintained that due to their work with the poor, members of the church in El Salvador were labelled as communists, a designation that resulted in their deaths by the hands of the government.⁵⁴⁵ “For attempting this renewed Christianization of their country,” the Archbishop said, “they have been called communists, subversives; and they have suffered persecution, even death... An Archbishop, eleven priests, thousands of lay people, and now four American missionaries are dead in that effort.”⁵⁴⁶

Both Romero and Hickey spoke of the importance of understanding the history of the Catholic Church and its role in Salvadoran society. Though historically the Church had maintained a socially conservative stance, the Second Vatican Council of the Medellin in 1968, the Puebla Conferences of Latin American Bishops in 1979, and the teachings of Pope John Paul II had brought about a change in the Church’s policies. Indeed, rather than supporting the status quo, the Church had become the leading voice for reform and social change. Essential elements of the new dogma included the defense of human dignity and the promotion of human rights, a position which Romero had died for in El Salvador. Kirkpatrick criticized the new role of the Church and associated its tenets with socialism. Moreover, the U.N. Ambassador accused the ‘Catholic Left’ of disrupting the traditional patterns of political participation in Central America.

⁵⁴³ *U.S. Policy Toward El Salvador*. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session, March 5 and 11, 1981. (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981), 16.

⁵⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 17.

⁵⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 51.

⁵⁴⁶ *The Situation in El Salvador*. Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 167.

“As for the Catholic Left,” she wrote, “its interest in revolution on this earth has waxed as its concern with salvation in heaven has waned.”⁵⁴⁷

The Catholic Church was not the only religious organization that objected to American support for the government and military of El Salvador. Representatives from the American Baptist Churches claimed that members of the Baptist Association within the small nation had suffered from government sponsored terrorism. Some had been arrested and tortured, while others had either been killed or had disappeared. In testimony before the U.S. Senate, the Reverend Robert W. Tiller maintained that Salvadoran government forces were responsible for violence against Christians, not the FMLN, and that those persecuted by the government were not guerillas, but ordinary persons. In addition, the reverend claimed that there was a government hit list of Salvadoran Baptists. “The Government of El Salvador has established a telephone number for reporting subversives who should be eliminated,” he testified, “All you need to do is call up and report that a certain person is carrying out subversive activity and that person will soon be executed. The process works swiftly and is not complicated by anything like verifying the initial report or investigating the person reported or holding a trial.”⁵⁴⁸ The Baptist minister insisted that it was immoral for the U.S. government to provide support for a regime that had a habit of violating the human rights of its citizens.⁵⁴⁹

Human rights groups, congressmen, and various nations around the world joined religious organizations in their protest against the administration’s support for the Salvadoran regime. Amnesty International condemned the Salvadoran military for its human rights abuses, noting that several thousand Salvadorans who had no proven affiliation with the leftist

⁵⁴⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, 68.

⁵⁴⁸ *The Situation in El Salvador*. Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 291-2.

⁵⁴⁹ *Ibid*, 292-3.

insurgency had died at the hands of the military and its death squads.⁵⁵⁰ Democratic Congresswoman Barbara Mikulski (D – MD) claimed that it was morally wrong for the U.S. to “lavish arms on a government that cannot or will not stop its own troops from making war against its own people.”⁵⁵¹ Kirkpatrick’s U.N. predecessor, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D – NY), a fellow neoconservative, also opposed the administration’s Central American policies. His assertion that the Salvadoran conflict was internal, and therefore not a threat to national security, caused many of his fellow neoconservatives, including Kirkpatrick, to accuse him of selling out to the left.⁵⁵²

In response to congressional criticism, the administration reiterated the importance of the region to American national security. In an address before Congress in April of 1983, President Reagan proclaimed that both national security and American credibility was at stake in Central America. The president implied in his speech that should Congress fail to provide the money and materials requested for the region then it would be responsible for losing El Salvador, and subsequently, Central America.⁵⁵³ Kirkpatrick maintained that there were certain persons in Congress who did not approve of the administration’s efforts to “consolidate the constitutional government of El Salvador and who would actually like to see the Marxist forces take power in that country.”⁵⁵⁴ Her statement angered many members of the House and Senate who demanded to know to whom she was referring. Kirkpatrick refused to answer, insisting that she had been quoted out of context.

⁵⁵⁰ Ibid, 100-103.

⁵⁵¹ Ibid, 4.

⁵⁵² *New York Times*, June 30, 1983, Section B, page 6.

⁵⁵³ LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 213-4.

⁵⁵⁴ Ibid, 214.

On top of domestic opposition, the administration's policies failed to find favor with many American allies. France, Mexico, Venezuela, Sweden, West Germany, and other Western European nations all maintained that the civil war in El Salvador was indigenous and that the U.S. should refrain from intervening in the war unless it wished to foster a negotiated political solution between the government and the leftist guerillas.⁵⁵⁵ Moreover, Europeans questioned why the United States was placing such a large emphasis on the tiny nations located in Central America.⁵⁵⁶ Kirkpatrick responded to such condemnation of American policies in two ways. First, she proclaimed that many of the foreign nations who opposed the administration's Central American policies were socialists. "A number of socialist leaders... unable to win popular support for peaceful revolution in their own countries," she wrote, "have grown progressively enthusiastic about revolution elsewhere and less fastidious about the company they keep and the methods utilized."⁵⁵⁷ Second, the U.N. Ambassador instructed Europeans to take a closer look at their maps. Given the region's strategic location in the Gulf area and near the Panama Canal, she maintained, it was vital to both American and European security. "If the Soviets can distract us here at home in our own front yard," she noted, "they can prevent us from supplying aid to our European allies."⁵⁵⁸

Due to advocacy of the Reagan administration's Central American policies, Kirkpatrick became a "lightning rod for campus protests".⁵⁵⁹ In several instances, the political scientist was either prevented from speaking due to concerns about her security in the face of student

⁵⁵⁵ Lundestad, Geir. *The United States and Western Europe Since 1945*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 218. See also: LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 97-99.

⁵⁵⁶ National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD. "Interview with Jeane Kirkpatrick", May 30, 1986. 306-ED-81, 5/30/1986, Row 24, Compartment 23, Shelf 6.

⁵⁵⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorships and Double Standards*, 67-8.

⁵⁵⁸ National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD. "Interview with Jeane Kirkpatrick", May 30, 1986. 306-ED-81, 5/30/1986, Row 24, Compartment 23, Shelf 6.

⁵⁵⁹ *New York Times*, March 30, 1983, Section A, page 1.

demonstrations, or booed off stage.⁵⁶⁰ The Georgetown professor viewed these protests in the same light that she had viewed student protests by the New Left in the 1960s. “Frankly, I do not know what the critics of our Central American policy want,” she wrote, “I fear they are charter members in the ‘blame America first club’ which is prepared to give everybody, except the United States, the benefit of the doubt about almost everything in the world.”⁵⁶¹

Though the administration acknowledged that the human rights situation in El Salvador was not ideal, it continued to provide support for the Salvadoran military in its struggle against the FMLN. When questioned about the Reagan administration’s support for the ‘bad, corrupt’ Salvadoran regime, Kirkpatrick stated: “The truth is that most of the governments in the world are, by our standards, bad governments. They are not democratic, never have been.”⁵⁶² Moreover, the ambassador insisted that the government was merely responding to the violence created by the guerillas. Because the insurgents hid among the people, it was only natural that violence would spill over into Salvadoran society.⁵⁶³ “The essence of their strategy is provocation,” she noted of the guerillas, “through persistent attacks which disrupt society and make ordinary life impossible, such revolutionaries challenge authority and force repressive countermeasures in the expectation that such repression will undermine the legitimacy of the regime.”⁵⁶⁴

In addition to blaming the guerillas for the violence perpetrated by the Salvadoran military upon its own citizens, Kirkpatrick refused to see the FMLN as anything other than a communistic, terrorist organization. The ambassador viewed the guerillas as the Salvadoran counterpart to the Nicaraguan Sandinistas and described them as a well-armed Marxist

⁵⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁵⁶¹ Ibid.

⁵⁶² *New York Times*, February 21, 1982, Section 4, page 2.

⁵⁶³ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*, 118.

⁵⁶⁴ Ibid, 120.

insurgency, a professional guerilla group directed from command centers in Nicaragua, armed with Soviet bloc weapons, and intent upon establishing a one party dictatorship.⁵⁶⁵ Thus, the administration refused to consider a negotiated settlement between the guerillas and the Salvadoran government. After all, Kirkpatrick declared, the Carter administration's attempts to include the Sandinistas in negotiations had led to a communist take-over in Nicaragua and the Reagan administration was determined not to make the same mistake. According to her, there were only two possible solutions for ending the civil war in El Salvador: either the guerillas surrendered their weapons, renounced violence, and participated in elections, or the war continued until the government achieved a military victory.⁵⁶⁶

Kirkpatrick and the Reagan Administration refused to allow the guerillas to shoot their way into power. Though the Salvadoran military had been able to fend off the guerilla's 'final offensive' in January of 1981 without much assistance from the United States, Reagan and company opted to dramatically increase military aid. Moreover, though the Salvadoran peasants had refused to take part in the insurrection, a fact utilized by the administration to prove that the guerillas lacked a mass following, the administration claimed that the danger of communist subversion had actually increased. Kirkpatrick insisted that the U.S. could not stand by "while a small nation, under-equipped and unsophisticated, succumbs to well-armed and well-trained guerilla forces."⁵⁶⁷ The well-armed and well-trained guerillas she referred to numbered approximately 6,000 in 1980, with only 3,000 taking part in the final offensive due to a weapons and ammunitions shortage. FMLN numbers peaked at between 10 and 13,000 in 1983, falling to approximately 5,000 by 1985 due to desertions. By contrast, the Salvadoran military in 1980

⁵⁶⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, 174.

⁵⁶⁶ National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD. "Foreign Policy Issues" Worldnet No. 225. July 23, 1986. 306-WNET-241, Row 24, Compartment 29, Shelf 7.

⁵⁶⁷ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*, 118.

numbered 7,000 with an additional 5,000 men in its security forces. In 1985, thanks to American military aid, the Salvadoran army had expanded to include 40,000 men. Furthermore, its security forces, which included the Treasury Police, the National Police, and the National Guard, claimed 13,000 men, giving the Salvadoran government approximately 53,000 men under arms. In addition to increasing the size of the Salvadoran military, the U.S. provided training, boots, uniforms, weapons, ammunitions, trucks, jeeps, and artillery. Moreover, in order to interdict arms shipments to the guerillas, the Salvadoran military was given a navy and a new air force base.⁵⁶⁸

Kirkpatrick's staunch support for the Salvadoran government and resistance to a negotiated settlement between it and the FMLN was matched by her relentless opposition to the Nicaraguan Sandinistas and unwavering advocacy on behalf of the Contras. Though the U.N. Ambassador had argued in NSC meetings that El Salvador should have first priority in the administration's Central American policies, she consistently argued for more support for the Nicaraguan Contras and increased pressure on the Sandinistas. Indeed the two nations were considered by government officials to be opposing sides of the same coin. In the minds of Kirkpatrick and other foreign policymakers, the American failure to thwart the Nicaraguan revolution had resulted in the birth of a communist regime allied with Cuba and the Soviet Union which then exported revolution to the neighboring state of El Salvador. Therefore, in order to stabilize El Salvador, the United States must provide not only military aid to the Salvadoran government, but also attempt to rollback communism in Nicaragua by supporting the Contras.

According to Kirkpatrick, failure to provide assistance to El Salvador and to the Contras would make the United States the tacit enforcer of the Brezhnev Doctrine which viewed

⁵⁶⁸ LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard*, 265. NOTE: Guerilla numbers are based on estimates as their numbers changed frequently.

communist revolutions as irreversible.⁵⁶⁹ The ambassador maintained that the Kennedy Administration had already enforced this doctrine through its unwillingness to support the anti-Castro forces in the Bay of Pigs invasion of 1961 and she frequently compared the situation facing the Reagan administration in Nicaragua to that of Cuba and Kennedy. Kirkpatrick contended that in both cases a broad coalition overthrew a dictatorship in the hopes of establishing democracy and progress. Following the coups, the communists “dissembled, hiding their identity, confusing the issues until they had driven democrats out of the government and into prison or exile”.⁵⁷⁰ At this point, both Castro and the Sandinistas had established political and economic relations with the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, well-meaning Western liberals turned a blind eye to their communist beliefs until it was too late. Nicaragua, she argued, was on the verge of being fully integrated into the Soviet empire just as Cuba had been two decades earlier. Should the U.S. stand idly by and let this happen, then Nicaragua would become part of the Castroite effort to take over the hemisphere – providing military bases for the Soviets in an area of high strategic importance, troops for communist insurgencies in Latin America and Africa, training for guerillas intent on overthrowing neighboring regimes – basically, wreaking havoc throughout Central America.⁵⁷¹

Had Kennedy acted more decisively, Kirkpatrick maintained, then the Bay of Pigs may have been successful and Castro would never have come to power. If Castro had been defeated, Cuba would be free and thousands of Cuban troops would not be stationed abroad causing problems in Africa. Moreover, if Castro had not been allowed to consolidate power, then Cuba would not be arming and training guerillas throughout Latin and Central America. In addition,

⁵⁶⁹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, 175.

⁵⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 187.

⁵⁷¹ *Ibid*, 191.

Central American nations would have been spared much of the bloodshed and destruction of the previous two and a half decades and there would have been peace and economic development in the region. Finally, the Soviets would not be able to threaten American national security in its front yard without Cuba. Unfortunately, the U.S. abandoned Cuba and was paying for it with increased security, military, and defense costs. According to Kirkpatrick, these costs would only increase if the U.S. abandoned the Nicaraguan freedom fighters or failed to adequately support the government of El Salvador.⁵⁷²

During and after her tenure as U.N. Ambassador, despite numerous allegations of wrongdoing on the part of the Nicaraguan freedom fighters and congressional opposition to funding their activities, the political science professor repeatedly defended the Contras and U.S. policy towards Nicaragua. When questioned about U.S. support for this mercenary group, Kirkpatrick responded with vitriol: “I think that calling the Contras mercenaries is like calling the mujahedeen in Afghanistan mercenaries... I think they are freedom fighters and anybody who calls them mercenaries is engaging in a really quite brutal and heartless kind of propaganda attack.”⁵⁷³ Moreover, Kirkpatrick identified the withdrawal of aid to the Contras by the U.S. Congress as part of the ‘tradition of abandonment’ in the region and again cited the Bay of Pigs.⁵⁷⁴ “If we don’t find the money to support the Contras,” the ambassador claimed, “it will be perceived as our having abandoned them, and this will lead to an increase in refugees in the region and it will permit Nicaragua to infiltrate thousands of trained forces into El Salvador.”⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁷² Ibid, 197-199.

⁵⁷³ National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD. “Interview with Jeane Kirkpatrick”, May 30, 1986. 306-ED-81, 5/30/1986, Row 24, Compartment 23, Shelf 6.

⁵⁷⁴ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, 192-195.

⁵⁷⁵ National Security Planning Group Meeting on Central America, June 25, 1984. From The Reagan Files: <http://www.thereaganfiles.com/19840625-nspg-91-central.pdf> Last accessed: 4/7/14.

Should the U.S. fail to get the funds needed for the Contras from Congress, the ambassador was adamant that the administration “find the money elsewhere.”⁵⁷⁶ In the meantime, Kirkpatrick maintained that the government should consider using the Contras in other areas, for example, in El Salvador to help defend against the guerillas there.⁵⁷⁷ Such support for the Nicaraguan freedom fighters resulted in the Contras naming a battalion after her – The Jeane Kirkpatrick Brigade.⁵⁷⁸

The Reagan Administration’s backing of the Contras, along with its support for covert operations against the Sandinistas, caused many to question whether or not the U.S. would send troops into Nicaragua should the Contra effort fail. In early meetings of the NSC, members were divided on that issue. Secretary of State Al Haig warned about the dangers of creating an insurgency in Nicaragua if the administration was not prepared to go all the way. The Department of State was at odds with the Department of Defense, with State initially supporting the use of unilateral force in Central America while the DOD stood in opposition. All members of the NSC, including the President, were worried that the introduction of American troops would result in a second Vietnam. Kirkpatrick rejected the Vietnam analogy, claiming that unlike Central America, Vietnam had not involved vital U.S. national security interests. Despite differing opinions on whether to put boots on the ground, NSC members agreed that covert operations should be a large part of the administration’s policies toward the Sandinistas, including the mining of Nicaragua’s harbors. President Reagan’s greatest concerns were whether

⁵⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁸ Collier, *Political Woman*, 155.

or not covert operations could be traced back to the United States and what kinds of operations would inflict more than just ‘flea bites’ onto the Sandinista regime.⁵⁷⁹

Though supportive of covert operations against the Sandinistas, Kirkpatrick repeatedly expressed her opposition to the dispatch of American troops. The ambassador claimed it was neither desirable nor necessary for the U.S. to become directly involved in the region. “I think that the Contras, who are Nicaraguans after all, and who believe in democracy for their country will be quite capable of bringing the kind of struggle to Nicaragua that may perhaps persuade the government of Nicaragua to do what the government of El Salvador has already done,” she said, “and that is offer dialogue, open the processes of government to all the citizens of Nicaragua.”⁵⁸⁰ Kirkpatrick maintained that the Contras could win as long as they were given the same amount of support that the Sandinistas were given by the Soviet Union and Cuba, and that the introduction of American troops should serve as a last resort. “I am against military solutions of problems,” she said, “Military intervention would only be a last resort in a situation where we judge the security of the U.S. and our most sacred values to be at stake.”⁵⁸¹

The political scientist’s ongoing criticism of the Carter Administration’s policies towards Nicaragua and El Salvador, along with her emphasis on American national security interests at stake in the region and her support for the Contras, caused many to doubt her professed opposition to military involvement. In an effort to clarify her stance, Kirkpatrick published an Op-ed piece in the *Washington Post* on June 20, 1983 entitled “Pardon Me, But Am I That Hard-

⁵⁷⁹ National Security Council Meeting, “Strategy Towards Cuba and Central America”, November 10, 1981. From The Reagan Files: <http://www.thereaganfiles.com/19811110-nsc-24.pdf> Last Accessed 4/7/14.

⁵⁸⁰ National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD. “Foreign Policy Issues”. Worldnet, No. 225 – Foreign Policy Issues, July 23, 1986 306-WNET-241, Row 24, Compartment 29, Shelf 7.

⁵⁸¹ National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD. “Interview with Jeane Kirkpatrick.” 306-ED-81, 5/30/1986, Row 24, Compartment 23, Shelf 6.

liner the Anonymous Sources are Talking About?" Kirkpatrick begins by noting that the media had created a political melodrama in which the administration's 'good guys', or the moderates, were pitted against its 'bad guys', or the hardliners, over Central American policy. According to the media, the good guys supported political solutions, negotiations, regional dialogue, and bipartisan consensus. Meanwhile, the bad guys opposed these good strategies and instead advocated military solutions and preferred political polarization. Because her name was frequently associated with the 'bad guys', Kirkpatrick wrote that she had decided to make clear what advice she had given the president. She wrote,

I have recommended humanitarian and economic assistance; bipartisan participation in developing a new policy; support for the Contadora process and regional dialogue. I took a very hard line on hunger, malnutrition, infant mortality, illiteracy, and economic underdevelopment. I have argued that the US should not stand in the way of Contadora and if the nations involved want us out of it, we should stay out. No one has proposed sending US troops into the region and no one has proposed abandoning them either. I have also argued for continued military assistance at levels adequate to meet and match guerilla arms. Above all, I have argued that the people in the region are important to the US. Our security and history bind us to the Americas just as it does to Europe. I have insisted that the fact that our neighbors have suffered under dictatorships is no reason to consign them to dictatorships affiliated with the Soviet Union, rather we should help them escape to freedom.⁵⁸²

Fears that American assistance to the Contras might lead to the involvement of the U.S. military in the region prompted the Nicaraguan government to file a complaint against the United States with the United Nations Security Council in 1982. Nicaragua claimed that the U.S. had violated the U.N. Charter by intervening in its internal affairs. Moreover, the Sandinistas claimed that the United States was preparing to launch a full-scale military attack upon their country. Nicaragua demanded that the U.S. desist in its attempts to destabilize its government, withdraw its financial and military support of the Contras, cease its utilization of Honduras as a training

⁵⁸² Article reprinted in: Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, 177-179.

area for anti-Sandinista paramilitary groups and as a base of armed aggression against Nicaragua, withdraw American naval vessels from the coastal waters of Nicaragua, and end overflights by spy planes which violated Nicaraguan air space.⁵⁸³

Nicaragua brought its complaints against the U.S. before the United Nations forcing Kirkpatrick to defend American actions in the region. In an address before the U.N. Security Council in 1982, she claimed that it was ridiculous of the Nicaraguans to think that the U.S. was going to invade their country.⁵⁸⁴ The ambassador admitted that the U.S. had sent unmanned planes over Nicaragua in order to verify reports of Nicaraguan intervention in El Salvador, but maintained that these flights did not represent a threat to regional peace and security. Moreover, Kirkpatrick pointed out that the United States had not opposed the Sandinista rise to power, nor had it attempted to prevent their consolidation of power. In fact, the U.S. under President Carter had provided more money to them in their first two years in power than it had to the Somoza regime throughout the 1970s. “Despite this aid,” she said, “the Sandinistas still claim the U.S. is the Yankee enemy of mankind.”⁵⁸⁵ Moreover, the ambassador stated that the U.S. had “repeatedly attempted to explore ways with the government of Nicaragua in which we could cooperate in alleviating tensions in the area.”⁵⁸⁶ Her government, she claimed, wanted only peace in Central America.⁵⁸⁷

⁵⁸³ Letter dated 19 March 1982 from the Permanent Representative of Nicaragua to the United Nations Addressed to the General Secretary. https://www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire/81-84/Chapter%208/81-84_08-10-Letter%20dated%2019%20March%201982%20from%20the%20Permanent%20Representative%20of%20Nicaragua%20.pdf Last accessed: 3/17/14

⁵⁸⁴ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, March 25, 1982, “Nicaragua’s Extravagant, Baseless Charges,” 110.

⁵⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁵⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁵⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 110.

According to Kirkpatrick, it was Nicaragua, not the United States, who sought to subvert neighboring regimes. “Nicaragua has accused the United States of the kinds of political behavior of which *it* is guilty,” she asserted, including “large-scale interventions in the internal affairs of neighbors, persistent efforts to subvert and overthrow by force and violence the governments of neighboring states, aggressive actions which disrupt the ‘normal conduct of international relations’ in the region.”⁵⁸⁸ The ambassador maintained that Nicaragua’s complaints against the U.S. were “an interesting example of projection, a psychological operation in which one’s own feelings and intentions are simultaneously denied and attributed... to someone else.”⁵⁸⁹ Moreover, she claimed that such charges were typical of communist states: “The familiar totalitarian assertion that they are surrounded by enemies internal and external has been heard again and again to justify the elimination of opponents and the concentration of power in a tiny, one-party elite.”⁵⁹⁰ Kirkpatrick concluded that Nicaragua’s assertions were part of the familiar pattern of doublespeak where “totalitarians assault reality in an attempt to persuade us that making war is keeping peace, that repression is liberation, etc.”⁵⁹¹

The American ambassador maintained that the major issue confronting the Sandinista regime was not the United States, but the Nicaraguan people. “It is a fact that there is very widespread unhappiness, even misery, in Nicaragua,” the ambassador stated, “Nicaragua’s problem is thus with Nicaraguans. In Nicaragua today, Nicaraguans fight other Nicaraguans for control of their country’s destiny.”⁵⁹² The ambassador insisted that U.S. interests in Central America were only to help poor, small, helpless, powerless peoples to resist being incorporated

⁵⁸⁸ Ibid, 103.

⁵⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁹⁰ Ibid, 104.

⁵⁹¹ Ibid, 105.

⁵⁹² Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, May 9, 1983, “The Right to Destabilize Neighbors,” 144-145.

into totalitarian regimes by violent minorities, trained and armed by remote dictators.⁵⁹³ She concluded that the most that the United States could be charged with was providing arms and advice to Nicaraguans fighting for their right to national self-determination against a pawn and proxy of Cuba and the Soviet Union.⁵⁹⁴

The deployment of American troops into Grenada in October of 1983, an act which, according to Nicaragua, demonstrated that the U.S. would utilize military force to overthrow leftist regimes in its front yard, only intensified the fears of the Sandinistas. On October 24, 1983, just one day after 271 American Marines were killed by a suicide bombing in Beirut, Lebanon, President Reagan and his NSC team opted to send U.S. troops into Grenada to rescue American nationals and stabilize the government of the small Caribbean nation. That same day, Nicaragua called for an emergency meeting of the United Nations Security Council in order to introduce a resolution condemning American action in Grenada as an act of aggression.⁵⁹⁵ Once the issue was broached at the U.N. it became Kirkpatrick's task to defend the administration's actions.

Allan Gerson, an international lawyer and Kirkpatrick's legal counsel at the United Nations, was charged with assisting the ambassador in drafting the United States' defense against charges of aggression. According to Gerson, both he and Kirkpatrick viewed U.S. actions in Grenada as justified under international law and the law of the U.N. Charter as an act of collective self-defense in response to an armed attack. Though there had not been an actual 'armed attack' on the U.S. or on any of the other states of the Caribbean, Gerson maintained that Operation Urgent Fury was a preemptive strike similar to the Israeli bombing of an Iraqi nuclear

⁵⁹³ Ibid, 144.

⁵⁹⁴ Ibid, 148, 170.

⁵⁹⁵ Gerson, *The Kirkpatrick Mission*, 223.

reactor in 1981.⁵⁹⁶ In addition, both Gerson and Kirkpatrick viewed the situation as being important to American national security. Since 1979, Grenada had been under the control of Maurice Bishop, a leftist who had forged ties with Cuba and the Soviet Union. The construction of a large airport on the small island, along with the presence of Cuban troops, had been a cause for alarm for the United States as the government believed that the air strip could be (or was being) used to funnel weapons to leftist revolutionaries in Central America. Following Bishop's overthrow and murder, the tiny island descended into chaos causing many American policymakers to fear that the island would fall under Soviet control thanks to the presence of Cuban troops and the power of the communists within the Grenadian military. Thus, U.S. national security interests were at stake in the region, as the United States could not afford to have another Cuba or Nicaragua in the Caribbean.⁵⁹⁷

According to Gerson, the State Department opposed using American national security interests as an argument to defend American actions in Grenada. The department feared that if the U.S. claimed an expanded notion of self-defense to justify preemptive strikes, then others might do so in order to justify their own preemptive 'military adventures'. In short, should the U.S. endorse self-defense as the rationale behind the Grenada action, it would be enlarging an exception to the U.N. Charter's prohibition on the use of force to the point that armies could 'march right through it'.⁵⁹⁸ Instead, State advised that Kirkpatrick argue that the U.S. acted due to a unique set of circumstances, including the need to protect American nationals living abroad

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid, 225-6.

⁵⁹⁷ Ibid, 227.

⁵⁹⁸ Ibid, 226.

and the desire to protect members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) who, feeling themselves threatened by the situation, had requested American intervention.⁵⁹⁹

Though Kirkpatrick acquiesced to the demands of the State Department, she did not shy away from mentioning Grenada's ties to the communist world. In a speech before the U.N. Security Council, the political scientist denied the charges that Operation Urgent Fury was a classic example of the invasion of a small country by an imperial superpower, or a case of intervention in the internal affairs of an independent nation. She pointed out that Grenada had been ruled over by Maurice Bishop, a man with strong ideological convictions that allied him with Cuba and the Soviet Union. Thus, Grenada's internal affairs had already fallen under the permanent influence of one neighboring and one remote tyranny.⁶⁰⁰ Moreover, Kirkpatrick maintained that the prohibitions against the use of force within the U.N. Charter were contextual, not absolute. "They provide ample justification for the use of force against force in pursuit of the other values also inscribed in the Charter – freedom, democracy, peace," the ambassador declared. "The Charter does not require that people submit supinely to terror, nor that their neighbors be indifferent to their terrorization."⁶⁰¹

Kirkpatrick acknowledged that such words might be dismissed as cynical by members of the U.N. who had grown accustomed to hearing similar justifications for the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan and Vietnam's invasion and occupation of Cambodia. However, there was an easy way to test the differences between U.S. actions in Grenada and communist actions elsewhere based on 'what came after'. She assured the council that unlike the communists, who

⁵⁹⁹ Ibid, 226-7.

⁶⁰⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, October 26, 1983, "Grenada: Why America Acted," 225-227.

⁶⁰¹ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two*, Address before the Security Council, October 27, 1983, "Grenada: The Lawfulness of Force," 228.

claim they will leave an area once order had been restored, the U.S. would leave Grenada as soon as law and order had been reinstated, and as soon as democratic rule had been put into place. “It should not be difficult for any people, especially any democratic people, which has ever suffered a reign of terror from either foreign or domestic tyrants, to discern the difference between the force that liberates captive people from terror,” she said, “ and the force that imposes terror on captive peoples.”⁶⁰²

Kirkpatrick declared that a unique combination of circumstances in Grenada and the Caribbean that had led the U.S. to deploy troops. The American government was concerned for the safety of U.S. nationals, specifically, American medical students who were living in Grenada. ‘Madmen’ had overthrown and killed Bishop, wiped out the Grenadian government, and imposed a 24 hour, shoot-on-sight curfew. With the airport shut down and American citizens denied the right to exit the country, the U.S. government was afraid that the American medical students might be taken hostage.⁶⁰³ In addition, there was a vacuum of power in Grenada with no responsible government. Terrorists were in control of the bureaucracy, in charge of the military, and had access to Cuban troops, all of which threatened neighboring states whose militaries were practically nonexistent. Finally, members of the OECS had asked the U.S. for help and had invoked their own regional collective security agreements.⁶⁰⁴

Kirkpatrick’s spirited defense of U.S. actions in Grenada fell on deaf ears in the United Nations. On October 28, 1983, the U.N. Security Council voted to condemn the American and OECS intervention in Grenada as a flagrant violation of international law and a transgression against the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Grenada. Only Kirkpatrick’s

⁶⁰² Ibid, 230.

⁶⁰³ Ibid, 231.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid, 232-3.

veto prevented the resolution from passing. A few days later, the General Assembly adopted a similar resolution. The Eastern Caribbean states, Israel, El Salvador, and the United States were the only nations that voted against the resolution.⁶⁰⁵

In an article written for the Council on Foreign Relations entitled “The Reagan Doctrine, Human Rights, and International Law”, Kirkpatrick and her U.N. legal adviser, Allan Gerson, provided further justification for U.S. intervention in Latin America and in other areas of the world and elaborated on the significance, intentions, and historical tradition of the Reagan Doctrine. Although both the former U.N. Ambassador and the international lawyer argued that American action in Grenada did not fall under the purview of the Reagan Doctrine’s assertion that support for freedom fighters constituted self-defense, both agreed that Reagan Administration policies towards El Salvador and Nicaragua did. The article began with a quote from John Stuart Mill which nicely summarized their view of American involvement in international affairs throughout the Reagan Era:

The doctrine of non-intervention, to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free States. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes but to this miserable issue, that the wrong side may help the wrong, but the right must not help the right. Intervention to enforce non-intervention is always rightful, always moral, if not always prudent.⁶⁰⁶

According to Kirkpatrick and Gerson, the Reagan Doctrine was rooted in the moral legitimacy of American support, including military aid, for insurgencies under specific circumstances. Such circumstances included instances where indigenous forces were opposed to a government maintained by force rather than by consent, where such a government relied upon

⁶⁰⁵ Gerson, *The Kirkpatrick Mission*, 229-230.

⁶⁰⁶ *Right v. Might: International Law and the Use of Force*. (New York: The Council on Foreign Relations, 1991), 19.

arms supplied by the Soviet bloc, and where the people were denied a choice regarding their government and their future. The Reagan Doctrine expressed America's solidarity with the struggle for self-government against one-party dictatorship and incorporation by force into the Soviet socialist world system. Though the doctrine allowed for the use of force, Kirkpatrick and Gerson maintained that armed revolt was only justified as a last resort in instances where the rights of citizens are systematically violated. According to them, the Reagan Doctrine did not require that the U.S. offer armed assistance to freedom fighters; it *permitted* such assistance under certain circumstances.⁶⁰⁷ Moreover, the policy mirrored American constitutional principles, namely that legitimate government depends on the consent of the governed and on its respect for the rights of citizens; the doctrine stood in opposition to traditional isolationism and post-Vietnam assumptions regarding the illegitimacy of U.S. intervention.⁶⁰⁸

The Reagan Doctrine was a response to changes in the global environment, namely the Soviets' objective of establishing a global empire and its efforts at incorporating Third World countries into the socialist world system. The authors noted that nine new communist dictatorships had been established between 1975 and 1981: South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia, Grenada, Nicaragua, and Afghanistan. In each nation where communism had spread, resistance movements had developed. In establishing the moral and legal right to provide aid to such indigenous resistance movements, Kirkpatrick and Gerson contended that the Reagan Doctrine constituted a form of 'rollback', a Cold War policy first articulated by the Eisenhower Administration.⁶⁰⁹

⁶⁰⁷ Ibid, 20-21.

⁶⁰⁸ Ibid, 21-3.

⁶⁰⁹ Ibid, 23-4.

Both Gerson and Kirkpatrick argued that the Reagan Doctrine was not at odds with the U.N. Charter and international law. Though one article of the U.N. Charter called on all members to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, the U.S. maintained that this had to be viewed within the context of the entire Charter. Article 51 acknowledged the right to individual and collective self-defense and allowed for the use of legitimate force. Moreover, numerous other articles guaranteed human rights to all citizens of member states. President Truman, they maintained, had recognized this in 1947 when he had declared that the policy of the United States must be to support free peoples who were resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures. Truman chose not to speak of ‘direct military attacks’; rather, he chose to place the issue within the “values of the Charter and of the Declaration of Independence.”⁶¹⁰

In addition to not violating international laws, Kirkpatrick and Gerson placed the Reagan Doctrine squarely within the American domestic and foreign policy tradition: commitment to the promotion of democracy, they argued, had served as the primary purpose of American foreign policy for decades. Thus, the Reagan policies were a continuation of the values expressed in the Declaration of Independence, in the American Constitution, in the Atlantic Charter signed between FDR and Churchill, and in the Truman Doctrine. Moreover, the American commitment to the promotion of democracy continued on throughout the following decades with the signing of the Rio Treaty, the Charter of the Organization of American States, and in the actions of American presidents from Truman to Johnson.⁶¹¹

Critics of the Reagan Doctrine charged the administration with appropriating the methods of the Soviet Union, but this, Kirkpatrick and Gerson argued, could not be further from the truth.

⁶¹⁰ Ibid, 26.

⁶¹¹ Ibid, 26-8.

There was no ‘moral equivalence’ between American aid to freedom fighters and Soviet aid to national liberation movements. “The latter countenances expansion of Soviet power,” they wrote, “the Reagan Doctrine permits assistance in self-defense. The Brezhnev Doctrine preserves foreign influence. The Reagan Doctrine restores self-government. It countenances counter-intervention, not intervention.”⁶¹² Furthermore, the Soviets intervened to deny the free expression of self-determination, making the only political, social, and economic choice a variation of socialism and the institution of one-party rule. The U.S. intervened to preserve and promote freedom.⁶¹³ Kirkpatrick and Gerson cited the philosopher Immanuel Kant, who suggested that republican government was necessary in order for perpetual peace to be established. According to them, in Kant’s view, intervention to bring down a despotic government should always be encouraged. Though the Reagan Administration did not go this far, its policies had the same philosophical underpinnings.⁶¹⁴

Conclusions

Upon assuming office, President Reagan and his foreign policy team were determined to both rectify the damage they believed had been inflicted upon the special relationship between the U.S. and Latin America by Jimmy Carter’s adherence to modernization theory, emphasis on human rights, and misunderstanding of Latin American politics and halt the spread of communism in its own front yard. As a Latin Americanist and part of the Reagan Administration’s National Security Council and National Security Planning Group, Kirkpatrick’s criticisms of Carter’s policies, along with her recommendations for the restructuring of American strategies towards the region, became official administration policy. The administration’s

⁶¹² Ibid, 31.

⁶¹³ Ibid, 33.

⁶¹⁴ Ibid.

unconditional support for the Salvadoran government, its steadfast defense of the Nicaraguan Contras, and its resolute hostility towards the Sandinistas and the Cubans were all endorsed by the U.N. Ambassador.

Such policies were based on the administration's emphasis on containing communism and buttressed by the Kirkpatrick Doctrine which sanctioned U.S. support for authoritarian regimes in the name of stability and anti-communism. The Doctrine's defense of authoritarianism grew out of Kirkpatrick's contention that such regimes were less oppressive and more open to reform than their non-democratic, totalitarian counterparts. Though authoritarian dictators sometimes infringed upon the human rights of their citizens, the ambassador maintained that such violations were minor when compared to those committed by totalitarians. Moreover, the ambassador claimed that in the cases of Nicaragua and El Salvador in the late 1970s, those acts which Carter regarded as human rights abuses were taken out of context as both states were under attack by communist guerillas whose terrorist actions required that the regimes utilize force in order to counteract the violence of the revolutionaries.

Consequently, the Reagan administration ignored the human rights abuses committed by the Salvadoran government and provided it with large amounts of military aid to put down the leftist insurgency that threatened its power, while continuously criticizing the human rights abuses of the communist Sandinista regime in Nicaragua. According to Kirkpatrick, communist totalitarian regimes, whose desire to create socialist utopias led them to control and transform all aspects of society, culture, and politics, were by definition the governments with the worst human rights records. Therefore, Reagan administration policies directed towards containing or rolling back communism were based on the desire to protect the human rights of peoples around the world.

Though often couched in terms of human rights and the American moral obligation to support freedom fighters such as the Nicaraguan Contras or the Afghan mujahidin in their struggles against communist totalitarianism, the administration's policies were heavily influenced by national security interests and the East-West conflict. This was especially true of Central America, an area considered by Kirkpatrick to be the fourth border of the U.S. The Soviets already had a foothold in the region and should the U.S. fail in its efforts to save El Salvador and overthrow the Sandinistas, American national security, along with the security of Western Europe, would be seriously compromised. In conclusion, Reagan policies that provided support for friendly regimes and freedom fighters, whether El Salvador or South Africa, the Contras or the mujahidin, not only served to reinforce national security, but, thanks to the Kirkpatrick Doctrine's distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, they were elevated to the status of human rights strategies, thereby freeing the government from any culpability for its support of right-wing dictators.

Conclusion

Kirkpatrick's position as a member of the Reagan foreign policy team allowed her to impart her own foreign policy ideas to a much wider audience. For example, after becoming U.N. Ambassador more persons read her article, "Dictatorships and Double Standards". Though her article was more widely circulated, political pundits tended to focus solely on her distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, or the Kirkpatrick Doctrine, and how such distinctions might affect American policies towards non-democratic states within the context of the Cold War. Such a narrow focus overlooked other components of the article including her astute appraisal of the difficulties inherent within the development of democracy, her critique of modernization theory, and the context from which her views had developed, reducing her doctrine to the simplistic dichotomy of 'authoritarian is acceptable, totalitarian is not'. Moreover, historians and commentators have largely ignored works that outlined the political scientist's comprehensive view of America's role in global politics.

As the product of a liberal, democratic tradition grounded in individual liberty and freedom, Kirkpatrick maintained that the United States was an extraordinary nation with a strong moral purpose dedicated to the preservation of democracy and the protection of human rights. Dating back to the signing of the Declaration of Independence in the late 18th century, the justification of the American government has been, according to Kirkpatrick, a doctrine of universal human rights. The conviction that the United States has a moral mission that flows from its identity and guides its policies was the very essence of American Exceptionalism.⁶¹⁵ Prior to World War I, this notion of American Exceptionalism had served as the foremost justification for an isolationist foreign policy; however, by the early 20th Century it became the primary

⁶¹⁵ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*, 146-148.

pretext for intervention and internationalism as President Woodrow Wilson and many others came to believe that an 'exceptionalist America' had both a moral duty to extend its superior political system to others and a mission to lead all of mankind to a new international society in the future.⁶¹⁶

The idea that Americans should transform and improve the world, that American foreign policy should serve universal, altruistic goals, had resulted in the creation of international organizations such as the League of Nations and the United Nations, along with American adherence to moral doctrines, such as containment and human rights, in U.S. foreign relations. According to Kirkpatrick, though a foreign policy that sought to expand and protect human rights was as American as the Declaration of Independence itself, the implementation of such a policy was not without difficulties. For one, there was a lack of consensus on which specific rights constitute 'human rights' and which rights should have priority over others. For another, American policymakers could not agree on which methods might be utilized to promote human rights abroad.⁶¹⁷ Moreover, in order to extend human rights throughout the world, the U.S. would have to engage with governments that were not democratic and whose practices were often not humane, a fact with which many Americans were uncomfortable with.⁶¹⁸

Should we try to change repressive regimes or should we dissociate ourselves from them? Do we 'dirty our hands' by supporting regimes that violate human rights or not? The political scientist pointed out that though isolationism might protect the U.S. from being involved with undesirable governments, it also precluded Americans from helping those in need. She maintained that denying aid to the least developed countries simply because they were

⁶¹⁶ Ibid, 148.

⁶¹⁷ Ibid, 149-50.

⁶¹⁸ Ibid, 152.

governed by autocracies and dictatorships that violated human rights prevented the U.S. from assisting the people who needed help the most. Should America deny food and other resources to a people suffering under a bad government just because they already suffer under a bad government, she queried? Should the U.S. deprive those already denied self-government of material independence by withdrawing American aid? Kirkpatrick's answer to these questions was a resounding 'no', especially as the withdrawal of aid might result in a communist takeover which would only increase the misery of a people already suffering under 'inefficient, home bred autocracies'.⁶¹⁹

Despite her insistence that the United States serve as the champion of human rights, Kirkpatrick was quite critical of the Carter Administration's human rights based foreign policies which she considered to be seriously flawed. For one, the ambassador maintained that the administration's conception of human rights was so broad, ambiguous, and utopian that it could serve as the grounds for condemning nearly any society. According to her, Carter's human rights policies lacked specific content except to demand that societies provide all the freedoms associated with constitutional democracy, all the economic security promised by socialism, and all the self-fulfillment featured in Abraham Maslow's theory of human needs.⁶²⁰ Furthermore, Kirkpatrick maintained that Carter demonstrated a reluctance to criticize totalitarian, communist regimes for their massive human rights abuses, but was not reticent to criticize right-wing authoritarian regimes, especially those who received economic or military aid from the United States. Carter made an operational distinction between authoritarianism and totalitarianism, she

⁶¹⁹ Ibid, 153.

⁶²⁰ Ibid, 137. Maslow saw human beings' needs arranged like a ladder. The most basic needs, at the bottom, were physical -- air, water, food, sex. Then came safety needs -- security, stability -- followed by psychological or social needs -- for belonging, love, acceptance. At the top of it all were the self-actualizing needs -- the need to fulfill oneself, to become all that one is capable of becoming. See: (<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aso/databank/entries/bhmasl.html> accessed 12/17/13)

proclaimed, and preferred the latter. Moreover, Kirkpatrick charged the Carter Administration with hypocrisy. Though the president claimed to have an ‘absolute’ commitment to human rights, the U.N. Ambassador pointed to several instances where such policies were selectively applied. For example, based on the annual human rights reports required by the 1976 Foreign Assistance Act, Carter had withheld economic and military aid from various right-wing authoritarian regimes including Chile, Argentina, Paraguay, Brazil, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. In addition to withdrawing aid from these American allies, Kirkpatrick charged, the administration “accompanied these decisions with a policy of deliberate slights and insults that helped delegitimize these governments and rendered them less susceptible to US influence.”⁶²¹ Meanwhile, despite their rather poor human rights records, Carter justified the continuance of aid to the nations of South Korea and the Philippines as serving the national security interests of the U.S.⁶²²

As further evidence of the biased nature of Carter’s policies, Kirkpatrick maintained that South American military regimes were judged much more harshly than African ones, while ‘friendly autocrats’ were treated less indulgently than hostile ones. Why was this? Kirkpatrick claimed that part of the reason for such policies was the administration’s exclusive concern with violations of human rights by governments. According to her, the administration refused to acknowledge the various violations of human rights by revolutionary guerrilla groups attempting to overthrow autocratic regimes. In the mind of the administration, she charged, the murders and terrorist actions executed by national liberation fronts and guerrilla groups failed to qualify as violations of human rights. Meanwhile, a beleaguered government’s efforts to eliminate such

⁶²¹ Ibid, 138

⁶²² Ibid, 143.

terrorism and to fight off revolutionary violence qualified as repression and abuse and resulted in loss of aid.⁶²³

According to the ambassador, certain distinctions must be made in order for the United States to have an effective human rights policy. These included the distinctions between ideas and institutions, recognition of the differences between rights and goals, and distinctions between intentions and consequences. Kirkpatrick noted that ideas and words were more easily manipulated than were institutions for ideas have only to be conceived in order to exist. The idea of a right was very easy to conceive; however, not everything that could be conceived of could be created. The ambassador utilized the unicorn as an example of the imagined versus the reality. A unicorn can be imagined and described in great detail, and mankind can destroy forests in an attempt to find it, but the unicorn will never be found.⁶²⁴ The belief that anything that can be conceived can be brought into being disregards the distinctions between ideas and institutions and leads to the expectations that declarations give rights existential reality. Unlike ideas which are easily envisaged, institutions are stabilized patterns of human behavior that involve millions of real people. They are shaped by experience and composed of habits and internalized values and beliefs. Because of this, institutions are extremely resistant to change. Yet in order for a right or idea to move from the imagined into reality, it must be translated through institutions into the reality of daily lives.⁶²⁵

In addition to recognizing the differences between ideas and institutions, Kirkpatrick maintained that policymakers must distinguish between rights and goals. One factor that had increased the difficulty in discerning between the two was the fact that rights had proliferated at

⁶²³ Ibid, 138.

⁶²⁴ Ibid, 129.

⁶²⁵ Ibid, 129-30.

a very fast pace in the mid to late 20th century. Kirkpatrick pointed out that the old 18th century rights of life, liberty, security of persons and property still existed, but had been joined by many more rights such as the right to privacy, equal rights in marriage, the right to an education, the right to leisure, the right to the full development of one's personality, the right to self-determination, and the right to adequate standards of living. According to her, such declarations take on the character of a letter to Santa Claus.⁶²⁶ The plethora of rights or, as Kirkpatrick described them, the 'lists of entitlements', that had been conceived of in the postwar era consisted of goals rather than rights. She argued that treating goals as rights was grossly misleading about the way in which goals were actually achieved in real life – through hard work over time.⁶²⁷

Finally, Kirkpatrick claimed that distinctions must be made between intentions and consequences. According to her, there were theories in political philosophy that emphasized motives and there were those that emphasized consequences. Political purists, such as President Carter, tended to be preoccupied with motives or intentions. For such persons, doing what one knows is right becomes more important than producing any desirable results. In human rights and foreign policy, the Carter Administration's focus on intentions caused a great deal of concern over the purity of American motives rather than the various consequences that might result from the implementation of such policies. In other words, because Carter believed his motives to be good, he failed to see how his human rights strategies might result in the loss of American allies like Nicaragua and Iran. According to Kirkpatrick, a human rights policy that emphasized intentions rather than consequences functioned only to make us feel good about

⁶²⁶ Ibid, 130.

⁶²⁷ Ibid, 130-131.

ourselves and she questioned whether or not ‘feeling good about ourselves’ was an appropriate goal for a foreign policy.⁶²⁸

Unlike the previous administration, Kirkpatrick claimed that the President Reagan and his government would take all of these distinctions under consideration in order to create a human rights policy that was both fair and based on global political realities. According to her, the Reagan Administration had a more accurate idea of the relationship between force, freedom, morality, and power, along with a more adequate conception of the relationship between abstract rights and concrete societies. Consequently, the administration would implement human rights policies that were less sweeping than those of its predecessor with the expectation that such programs could produce more progress in the arena of human rights.⁶²⁹ Thus, the Reagan team refused to criticize South Africa too strongly for its dismal human rights record in the expectation that over time, such restraint, combined with the continuance of American military and economic aid, might encourage Pretoria to end its racist apartheid policies.

According to Kirkpatrick, in addition to an emphasis on human rights, the protection and dissemination of democratic systems have constituted the core of American foreign policies. Due to this historic emphasis on ‘making the world safe for democracy’ the Georgetown professor spoke often about both the nature of democratic states, along with the many obstacles that hindered their establishment, and the role of the United States, a democratic superpower, in the world. Though in favor of promoting democratic ideals around the world, the political scientist remained a realist when it came to global politics, noting that autocratic systems were the political norm while democratic states remained relatively rare. According to Kirkpatrick, the paucity of democracy was due to the heavy demands placed upon a population by such a system.

⁶²⁸ Ibid, 131.

⁶²⁹ Ibid, 133.

For one, most societies lacked the appropriate patterns of social and political behavior that allowed for majority rule, opposition, accountability, and the protection of minority rights. She maintained that the establishment of a democratic political system was dependent upon certain social and cultural prerequisites, such as a citizenry which views itself as political participants rather than subjects, a population which has the ability to form voluntary associations based on shared interests and cooperation, leaders from various social groups who are willing to renounce violence and the threat of violence in politics, and the acceptance by the entire population of the legitimacy of the democratic processes for determining who should rule and to what broad ends.⁶³⁰ Her repeated emphasis on the various conditions necessary for democracy to thrive cautioned Americans against expecting instantaneous political change in nations around the world, even in those states, such as El Salvador and South Africa, that were American allies and recipients of U.S. economic and military aid.

In comparison with the plethora of non-democratic states, democratic political systems were scarce, and as such, required protection. The ultimate defense of democracy, according to Kirkpatrick and her fellow neoconservatives, was the maintenance of American power. Military supremacy was absolutely vital for the preservation of the political institutions and values of American democratic society and Western Civilization, especially in the face of communist expansion.⁶³¹ Throughout the 1970s, Kirkpatrick had bemoaned the decline of American military power in the face of Soviet expansion and criticized efforts towards achieving détente. The ambassador placed the blame for American decline on the New Left's assault of American political, social, and cultural domestic values and the attitude of defeatism that accompanied the American withdrawal from Vietnam. In order to counter the effects of these experiences, in

⁶³⁰ Kirkpatrick, *Legitimacy and Force, Volume One*, 10-11.

⁶³¹ *Ibid*, 35.

particular, the notion that the two superpowers were morally equivalent, Kirkpatrick maintained that Americans must recognize who they were, especially in comparison to the Soviet Union. By understanding who they were, Americans could then understand why American power was necessary for the survival of liberal democracy in the modern world.⁶³²

The citizens of the United States were, she pointed out on numerous occasions, the heirs of a long struggle against arbitrary power and part of a tradition that recognized that people have natural rights and that the central purpose of government was to protect those rights. Thus, as the inheritors of a liberal, democratic tradition rooted in freedom, Americans must preserve and protect these values. Such endeavors constitute the core of American national interest and the guiding purpose of the foreign policy of the United States. Identification with, and respect for, the American tradition and Western Civilization, along with understanding that the strength of the U.S. was crucial for the defense of democracy and freedom, would, according to Kirkpatrick, enable Americans to understand that it was morally legitimate to be concerned about the military power of the United States. Moreover, by acknowledging the exceptional nature of the United States and its role in the world, Americans could understand that it was both legitimate and important for the United States to be concerned with, and involved in, events that occurred in many remote regions of the world. Finally, an appreciation of American Exceptionalism would allow the American people to be more wary of democracy's greatest adversary – communism.⁶³³

Facing who the Soviets were – the nature of their government, their relations with other communist regimes, and their interactions with states outside of the Soviet bloc – was, according to Kirkpatrick, an “extremely unpleasant task.”⁶³⁴ For unlike the liberal, democratic tradition that

⁶³² Ibid, 399.

⁶³³ Ibid, 35-7.

⁶³⁴ Ibid, 37.

fostered the American political system, the Soviet system was structured by tsarist autocracy and imperialism. Despite their “artful manipulation of symbols and language”⁶³⁵ which often clouded Americans’ abilities to assess the true nature of communism, the Soviets had continued the work of their tsarist predecessors by expanding their totalitarian empire through the uninhibited and skillful use of violence, subversion, terrorism, and guerilla warfare. Kirkpatrick asserted that it was only through deception, violence, and subjugation that the Soviet Union was able to spawn governments based on one-party dictatorships. “The pattern is familiar,” she wrote, “choose a weak government, organize a national liberation front, weaken an already weak economy, and then intensify the violence.”⁶³⁶ Having come to power through violence, the new communist leaders sought to remain in power via military assistance from members of the communist bloc. Thus, resources and personnel from all over the Soviet bloc were brought to bear on ‘small, helpless countries’ of the Third World and their indigenous political rivalries. Meanwhile, due to concerns of interfering the in the internal affairs of others, or fears of being bogged down in a quagmire, Americans stood “passively by while another small, relatively helpless people succumbs to Marxist-Leninist tyranny and is ruthlessly incorporated into the Soviet empire.”⁶³⁷

As a democratic superpower, it was the duty of the United States to help prevent the incorporation of additional states, democratic or otherwise, into the Soviet Empire and to assist those nations under attack by the forces of communism. Kirkpatrick maintained that rather than worrying about quagmires or intervening in the internal affairs of others, Americans should act to help people trapped in tyranny to disengage themselves from the world’s only colonial empire. Unlike many of her fellow neoconservatives, the ambassador was opposed to the dispatch of

⁶³⁵ Ibid, 37.

⁶³⁶ Ibid, 39.

⁶³⁷ Ibid.

American troops in most cases, but she approved of sending the kinds of aid that the Soviets were delivering to their clients: helicopters, accurate missiles, intelligence, and logistical support. Moreover, she maintained that the United States should offer these people solidarity by letting the world know that America stands with those who stand for freedom. “Standing with freedom fighters,” she wrote, “is the only policy consistent with our values and our interests.”⁶³⁸ Furthermore, Kirkpatrick was adamant in her assertion that American aid to freedom fighters did not make the U.S. the ‘moral equivalent’ to the Soviet Union, noting that the force that liberates was not ‘morally equivalent’ to the force that subjugates.⁶³⁹ She wrote,

If client rulers have the ‘right’ to ask for foreign assistance to maintain themselves in power, citizens deprived of their rights can ask for external aid to reclaim them...A government which takes power by force, and retains power by force, has no legitimate grounds for complaint against those who would wrest power from it by force. So let us be clear about it: helping the contras, helping UNITA, helping the Afghans...is not only morally and politically permissible. It is morally and politically – and strategically – necessary.⁶⁴⁰

Woven throughout her foreign policy views, whether on the spread of democracy, human rights, or American support for freedom fighters was an emphasis on limitations. Though Kirkpatrick envisioned the U.S. as the protector of liberal democracy, she maintained that there were limits to the United States’ ability to spread democracy. Likewise, though she saw the American government as the champion of human rights, the ambassador pointed out that there were limits as to which rights a government could and should provide for their citizens, along with limits to the ability of the United States to successfully export human rights abroad. Moreover, though she advocated American aid to freedom fighters around the world, such aid should be limited and not involve the dispatch of American troops except in those instances

⁶³⁸ Ibid, 445.

⁶³⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁴⁰ Ibid.

where vital national security interests were at stake. Furthermore, the ambassador's stress on limitations can be found in her defense of authoritarian regimes – unlike totalitarian regimes, authoritarian governments are limited in power and allow limited contestation and opposition, and such limitations rendered them open to political evolution and change.

This emphasis on 'limits' can also be found in Kirkpatrick's view of domestic social policies. She held that the government's efforts to bring equality to women and minorities should be limited to the establishment of political equality. Once political equality was guaranteed by law, individuals' ambition and hard work would eventually bring social and economic equality to disadvantaged groups. The importance of limitations, along with distinctions between both ideas and institutions and rights and goals, caused Kirkpatrick to oppose the New Left's demands for radical social and cultural changes.

Of course, Kirkpatrick's hostility towards the New Left was not just a product of its domestic platform: the ambassador could not countenance its attacks on American foreign policy, specifically the New Left's rejection of the inherent morality of the Cold War. Indeed, rising criticisms of American actions in the name of anti-communism had forced Washington to adjust Cold War policies. The Nixon administration attempted to lessen the moral content and ideology in foreign affairs in its embrace of *realpolitik*. Meanwhile, Nixon and Kissinger hoped to relax tensions between the two superpowers by engaging in *détente*. In an effort to both bring back morality into foreign affairs and offset charges from the left that the U.S. supported dictators in the name of anti-communism, the Carter administration based its Cold War policies on human rights. Accordingly, the administration withdrew aid from autocratic regimes that failed to improve their human rights records. In the case of Nicaragua, the withdrawal of aid resulted in a communist takeover. The spread of communism along America's borders caused

Carter to embrace the morality of containment at the expense of human rights. His decision to increase military aid to El Salvador, an authoritarian regime battling against a leftist insurgency with ties to the Nicaraguan Sandinistas, resulted in a considerable amount of domestic criticism. The right claimed his human rights policies had facilitated the spread of communism and feared that American aid to El Salvador might be too little, too late. Meanwhile the left charged him with vacillating hypocrisy.

Ronald Reagan, a fervent anti-communist, believed that the containment of communism was morally correct; thus, the Great Communicator and his staff rejected détente due to its lack of ideological zeal. The administration maintained that the Soviet Union was the “Evil Empire”, and as such, Washington could not broker deals with Moscow. Moreover, America should do anything and everything in its power to prevent the spread of communism around the world, especially in its own front yard. However, by the time Reagan entered the White House, the president could no longer rely upon Congress and the American public to support Cold War policies, such as the backing of authoritarian dictators, based solely on the presence of the communist boogiemán. Thus, Reagan was forced to do something that previous Cold War presidents had not: provide moral justification for the support of dictators and non-democratic regimes that had nothing to do with anti-communism. Jeane Kirkpatrick provided this with her distinctions between authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. By investing authoritarian regimes with political legitimacy and presenting them as transformative systems, the political scientist moved away from the notion that the U.S. could only be safe if surrounded by like-minded political systems and provided a third option between democracy and totalitarianism.

Bibliography

Archives and Special Collections:

Library of Congress, Washington, DC

Foreign Affairs Oral History Collection of the Association for Diplomatic Studies & Training

National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, Maryland

CREST Files – CIA

Motion Picture, Sound, and Video Recordings

University of Arkansas, Special Collections

Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs

United Nations

<http://www.un.org/>

Government Documents, Committee Papers, and Digital Resources:

Central Intelligence Agency

<https://www.cia.gov/library/center-for-the-study-of-intelligence/>

Coalition for a Democratic Majority and the Committee on the Present Danger

<http://neoconservatism.vaisse.net/>

“The Quest for Détente”

“How the Committee on the Present Danger Will Operate”

“Common Sense and the Common Danger”

List of CDM Recommendations to Jimmy Carter for Ambassadorial Appointments

“Coalition for a Democratic majority members Joining Reagan in 1980”

“Executive Functions of CPD members in the Reagan Administration”

The Situation in El Salvador. Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session, March 18 and April 9, 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

Oklahoma Historical Society’s Encyclopedia of History and Culture

Duncan, Oklahoma

Segregation in Oklahoma

Missouri Digital Heritage Collection

Stephens College yearbooks: Stephensophia

Public Papers of the Presidents

Ronald Reagan, 1981-1989 www.reagan.utexas.edu/

Saltoun-Ebin, Jason. *The Reagan Files: Inside the National Security Council*, 2012. See also:

<http://thereaganfiles.com>

Tyroler, Charles, editor. *Alerting America: The Papers of the Committee on the Present Danger*. (Washington, DC: Pergamon-Brassey's International Defense Publishers), 1984.

The United States Department of State
<http://www.foia.state.gov/>

U.S. Policy Toward El Salvador. Hearing Before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Ninety-Seventh Congress, First Session, March 5 and 11, 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981.

Works by Jeane Kirkpatrick:

“An American Girlhood”, *The Weekly Standard*, Monday, February 5, 2007.

Dictatorships and Double Standards. New York: American Enterprise Institute, 1982.

Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society: A Study of Peronist Argentina. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press), 1971.

Legitimacy and Force, Volume One. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988.

Legitimacy and Force, Volume Two. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988.

Political Woman. New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Right v. Might: International Law and the Use of Force. New York: The Council on Foreign Relations, 1991.

The New Presidential Elite: Men and Women in National Politics. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1976.

The Strategies of Deception. New York: Farrar, Straus and Company, 1963.

Memoirs:

Carter, Jimmy. *Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President*. Fayetteville, AR: University of Arkansas Press, 1995.

Haig, Alexander. *Caveat: Realism, Reagan, and Foreign Policy*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1984.

Meese, Edwin. *With Reagan: The Inside Story*. Washington, DC: Regnery Gateway, 1992.

Morin, Ann Miller. *Her Excellency: An Oral History of American Women Ambassadors*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1995.

Reagan, Ronald. *The Reagan Diaries*. New York: Harper Collins, 2009.

Shultz, George P. *Turmoil and Triumph: My Years as Secretary of State*. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1993.

Periodicals:

Commentary Magazine

The New York Times

People Magazine

The Washington Post

Articles:

Camacho, J.A. Review of *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society*, *International Affairs*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (April 1973), 319-20.

Ciria, Alberto. "Argentina at the Crossroads", *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, Vol. 20, No. 2 (May, 1978), 211-20.

Coleman, Kenneth. Review of *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society*, *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (February, 1973), 249-50.

Hindell, Keith. "Madame Ambassador: An Appraisal of Jeane J. Kirkpatrick as U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations, 1981-1985" *Passport*, Vol. 39, Issue 3, January 2009.

Kanter, Rosabeth. Review of *The New Presidential Elite*, *American Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 84, No. 6 (May, 1979), 1489-91.

Kenworthy, Eldon. Review of *Leader and Vanguard in Mass Society*, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (March, 1974), 244-6.

LaFeber, Walter. "The Reagan Administration and Revolutions in Central America" *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 99, No. 1. (Spring, 1984).

Lasswell, Harold D. Review of *Political Woman*, *Signs*, Vol.1, No.2 (Winter, 1975) pg. 527.

Prostermann, Roy L, Jeffrey M. Reidinger, and Mary N. Temple. "Land Reform and the El Salvador Crisis" *International Security*. Vol. 6, No. 1 (Summer, 1981).

Sullivan, Denis S. Review of *The New Presidential Elite*, *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 72, No. 3 (September, 1978), 1068-9.

Books:

Arendt, Hannah. *On Revolution*. New York: Viking Press, 1965.

Arendt, Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.

Aronson, Ronald. *Camus and Sartre: The Story of a Friendship and the Quarrel that Ended It*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2004.

Ball, George W. and Douglas B. Ball. *The Passionate Attachment: America's Involvement with Israel, 1947 to the Present*. New York: Norton, 1992.

Caesar, James W. *Presidential Selection: Theory and Development*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979, 284-5.

Chomsky, Noam. *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1999.

Collier, Peter. *Political Woman: The Big Little Life of Jeane Kirkpatrick*. New York: Encounter Books, 2012.

Cooper, Frederick. *Africa Since 1940: The Past of the Present*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Davies, J. E. *Constructive Engagement? Chester Crocker and American Policy in South Africa, Namibia, and Angola*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2007.

Dreyer, Ronald. *Namibia and Southern Africa: Regional Dynamics of Decolonization, 1945-1990*. Geneva, Switzerland: Publication of the Graduate Institute of International Studies, 1994.

Ehrman, John. *The Rise of Neoconservatism: Intellectuals and Foreign Affairs, 1945-1994*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995.

Fasulo, Linda M. *Representing America: Experiences of US Diplomats at the UN*. New York: Praeger, 1990.

Finger, Seymour Maxwell. *American Ambassadors at the UN: People, Politics, and Bureaucracy in Making Foreign Policy*. New York: UNITAR, 1992.

Friedman, Murray. *The Neoconservative Revolution: Jewish Intellectuals and the Shaping of Public Policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Gerson, Allan. *The Kirkpatrick Mission: Diplomacy without Apology*. New York: The Free Press, 1991.

Gerson, Mark. *The Neoconservative Vision: From the Cold War to the Culture Wars*. New York: Madison Books, 1996.

Goodman, Louis W., William LeoGrande, and Johanna Mendelson Forman, editors. *Political Parties and Democracy in Central America*. Boulder, CO; Westview Press, 1992.

Hahn, Peter L. *Crisis and Crossfire: The United States and the Middle East Since 1945*. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, INC, 2005.

Harrison, Pat. *Jeane Kirkpatrick*. Part of the American Women of Achievement Series, New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1991.

Hoeveler, Jr, J. David. *Watch on the Right: Conservative Intellectuals in the Reagan Era*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991.

Kirkpatrick, Evron. *Target: The World: Communist Propaganda Activities in 1955*. Prepared by the Office of Research and Intelligence, United States Information Agency NY: Macmillan Company, 1956.

LaFeber, Walter. *Inevitable Revolutions: The United States and Central America*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1983.

LeoGrande, William. *Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.

Lundestad, Geir. *The United States and Western Europe Since 1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003,

McMahon, Robert J. *The Limits of Empire: The United States and Southeast Asia Since World War II*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Morgenthau, Hans. *A New Foreign Policy for the United States*. Published for the Council on Foreign Relations, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.

Morris, Stephen. *Why Vietnam Invaded Cambodia: Political Culture and Causes of the War*. CA: Stanford University Press, 1999.

Neumann, Franz. *Behemoth: The Structure and Practice of National Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Ostrower, Gary B. *The United Nations and the United States*. New York: Twayne Publishers/Simon & Schuster Macmillan, 1998.

Schoenbaum, David. *The United States and the State of Israel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Thomson, Alex. *U.S. Foreign Policy Towards Apartheid South Africa, 1948-1994*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Tribe, Keith, editor. *Social Democracy and the Rule of Law: Otto Kirchheimer and Franz Neumann*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1987.

Wilford, Hugh. *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.

Woods, Randall B. *LBJ: Architect of American Ambition*. New York: The Free Press, 2006.

Väisse, Justin. *Neoconservatism: The Biography of a Movement*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2010.