The Operational Code of Nikita Khrushchev Before and After the Cuban Missile Crisis

Shelli Keck

Abstract

This study examines whether or not the Cuban missile crisis affected the belief

system of Nikita Khrushchev to determine if he learned as a result of the event. Many

scholars have suggested the two superpower's relationship improved as a result of the

crisis. These suggestions warranted a study of how the crisis affected Nikita Khrushchev

to determine if his beliefs became more cooperative following the crisis. In this study,

learning is defined as a statistically significant change in operational code beliefs.

Changes in philosophical beliefs indicate diagnostic learning and changes in instrumental

beliefs indicate simple learning. Khrushchev's public speeches from before and after the

crisis were analyzed and the Verbs in Context System (VICS) was used to create

numerical data in order to determine if Khrushchev's operational code changed as a result

of the crisis. A difference in means test was performed from the VICS numerical data to

determine if the mean scores of each belief were different at a statistically significant

level. The results indicate that the majority of Khrushchev's beliefs before and after the

crisis were not significantly different. The stability of Khrushchev's beliefs following the

crisis can be attributed to retrospective rationality, his personality rigidities, and the

doctrinal nature of the Marxist/Bolshevik belief system.

The Cuban missile crisis is one of the most widely studied events of the 20th century and forty years later, it still interests scholars worldwide. This event has been used to evaluate crisis management, policy process, crisis decision-making, bargaining theory, and the use of nuclear weapons in foreign policy. In this research one of the main questions is what lessons the leaders and policy makers learned from the event. A number of studies, (Blight & Welch, 1989, Hopmann & King, 1980) have suggested that the crisis facilitated détente and sparked the beginning of arms agreements between the two superpowers, specifically with the signing of the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty ten months after the crisis. The development of a more cooperative relationship between the United States and Soviet Union following the crisis prompts speculation on how the crisis affected the beliefs of one of the main participants in the event, Nikita Khrushchev. In order to determine if Nikita Khrushchev's beliefs changed and if he learned as a result of the crisis, his operational code will be examined to determine if changes in his instrumental and philosophical beliefs occurred.

The Operational Code

A key to understanding political leaders' beliefs is their operational code. The operational code construct can be defined as "a political leader's beliefs about the nature of politics and political conflict, his views regarding the extent to which historical developments can be shaped, and his notions of correct strategies and tactics" (George, 1969, p.197). Operational code has been used as a tool to evaluate leaders' views of international politics. Nathan Leites (1951) conducted the first operational code analysis to determine how the Bolsheviks approached international conflict by analyzing their belief systems. Hired by the Rand Corporation, Leites (1951) sought to explain Soviet bargaining behavior, which perplexed Western policy makers. Operational code as

defined by Leites is a set of beliefs that influence a leader's perception of political events, which in turn influence the tactics and strategies they implement. Leites (1951, 1953) determined that consistent patterns of behavior in foreign policy could be found by examining ideology, socialization, and leadership pressures of policymakers and he focused on the cognitive, psychoanalytic, and psychocultural aspects of Soviet behavior. Many scholars found Leites's method complicated; especially the psychoanalytical aspect, the construct therefore was rarely implemented in further research (Young & Schafer, 1998).

Alexander George (1969) reformulated the operational code by excluding the psychoanalytical aspects and concentrating on cognition in order to decrease its complexity and increase its investigative potential as a tool for decision-making analysis (Young & Schafer, 1998). George derived a set of ten beliefs in the form of questions

Table 1. Alexander George's (1969) Ten Questions About Operational Code Beliefs

Philosophical Beliefs	Instrumental Beliefs
1. What is the "essential" nature of political life? Is the political universe essentially one of harmony or conflict? What is the fundamental character of one's political opponents?	1. What is the best approach for selecting goals or objectives for political action?
2. What are the prospects for the eventual realization of one's fundamental political values and aspirations? Can one be optimistic, or must one be pessimistic on this score; and in what respects the one and/or the other?	2. How are the goals of action pursued most effectively?
3. Is the political future predictable? In what sense and to what extent?	3. How are the risks of political action calculated, controlled, and accepted?
4. How much "control" or "mastery" can one have over historical development? What is one's role in "moving" and "shaping" history in the desired direction?	4. What is the best "timing" of action to advance one's interest?
5. What is the role of "chance" in human affairs and in historical development?	5. What is the utility and role of different means for advancing one's interests?
	George (1969, 201-217)

from Leites's research and the answers to these questions comprise the operational code.
The ten questions are further disaggregated into five questions that consist of
philosophical beliefs and five questions that pertain to instrumental beliefs. According to
George (1969), philosophical beliefs are defined as a leader's view of international
politics, such as the fundamental nature of politics as well as a leader's perception of
other political actors. Instrumental beliefs refer to political action regarding how a leader
plans to achieve his political goals (George, 1969). These ten questions have become the
basis for all operational code analysis (Young and Schafer, 1998). George (1979) further
clarified operational code by expanding the philosophical and instrumental beliefs.
George (1979) labeled the philosophical beliefs as "diagnostic" which guide the leader's
view of the political environment and help the leader diagnose the situation and
instrumental beliefs as "choice" which guide the leader's choices regarding the tactics
and strategies he employs to achieve goals.

Walker et al. (1998) made a theoretical change to the operational code construct
when they studied Jimmy Carter's operational code and determined that operational code
beliefs do not necessarily remain stable over time or over issue area. Following the
invasion of Afghanistan, Carter's operational code reflected conflictual beliefs toward the
Soviet Union; however, his beliefs toward human rights remained cooperative. Walker et
al. (1998) found that Carter's view of others (represented by his philosophical beliefs)
underwent a greater change then his view of self (represented by his instrumental beliefs).
In turn, Walker et al. (1998, p. 2) defined a leader's operational code "as a set of
alternative states of mind," which permits the operational code construct more flexibility
in its research applications. As a result, Walker et al. (1998) concluded that operational

code could be utilized to determine if a leader learned because of a particular event or experience.

Researchers, however, are limited in the number of options available to measure the belief systems of leaders. Unlike typical psychological analysis, it is difficult to study a political leader directly. Due to this, political science scholars have created new techniques to analyze the psychological characteristics of leaders "at a distance". Most operational code analysis requires discerning political leaders' beliefs through public and private statements, interviews, and memoirs. The use of the operational code as an analytical construct has primarily consisted of qualitative research with scholars combing through leaders' statements in order to answer George's ten operational code questions. Scholars such as Leites (1951, 1964), George (1979), and Hoagland (1978) have all studied the operational code of Khrushchev; however all of the studies have been conducted from a qualitative approach. Although qualitative studies are rich in detail they tend to be subjective, non-reproducible, have reliability concerns, and as a result, have produced a limited number of these types of studies (Young and Schafer, 1998).

The Verbs in Context System

A new quantitative at a distance approach to measure the operational code of leaders has been developed by Walker, Schafer, & Young (1998) referred to as the Verbs In Context System (VICS). The Verbs In Context System is a coding procedure that produces quantitative answers to Alexander George's ten operational code questions by creating indices to evaluate a leader's philosophical and instrumental beliefs. VICS examines representations of power by examining verbs in a leader's rhetoric indicating that power refers to the different types of control relationships between self and others in the political universe (Walker et al., 1998). Walker et al. (1998) concentrate on verbs

because they indicate action or the state of being of a subject. Transitive verbs are chosen because they convey actions that have an object; in other words, the action of the verb is transferred to the object directly.

The steps involved in identifying and coding verb constructions require the researcher to first identify the subject as self or other, identify the tense of the transitive verb as past, present, or future and identify the category of the verb as positive or negative and a word or deed (Walker et al., 1998). Once transitive verbs are identified, they are coded into one of six verb categories that are placed on a conflict and cooperative scale based on the World Event Interaction System (WEIS) (Young and Schafer, 1998). Coded verb constructs are created from these procedures that illustrate how the leader thinks about self and others in the political universe based upon his cooperative and conflictual verb attributions.

In order to provide answers to George's operational code questions, Walker et al. (1998) created seventeen indices (see Appendix A for indices) that correspond to each philosophical and instrumental belief. Each index contains a specific formula in which the coded verb constructions are calculated in order to define the leader's belief to each question. By using the results of the coded verb constructions, the data is placed into the respective indices in order to answer the operational code questions.

Walker et al. (1998) identify three aspects of the operational code indices known as diagnostic propensities, choice propensities, and shift propensities. Diagnostic propensities focus on the leader's diagnosis of the political universe by examining how the leader views others and they provide quantitative answers to George's philosophical questions. Choice propensities examine the leader's view of self and how self acts in the political universe and they provide quantitative answers to the instrumental questions that

identify the leader's approach to goals (I-1), tactics (I-2), and how they exercise power (I-5). Shift propensities include the remaining instrumental questions that identify a leader's risk orientation (I-3) and his timing of action (I-4a, I-4b).

The indices that are defined as diagnostic include (P-1) which defines the nature of the political universe, (P-2) the realization of political values, (P-3) which concerns the political future, (P-4) which concerns the extent the leader can influence historical development, and (P-5) which measures the leader's belief in the role of chance. The first question among the diagnostic propensities, (P-1) concerns how the leader views the political universe and his opponents. Walker et al. (1998) subtract the leader's positive attributions to others from his negative attributions to others, with a more positive outlook on the political universe resulting in more positive attributions to others while more negative attributions indicate a more conflictual view of the political universe. The scale for (P-1) ranges from -1 representing a conflictual view of the political universe to +1 which represents a cooperative view of the political universe.

The second diagnostic question, (P-2) examines the leader's prospects for realizing his political values. Walker et al. (1998) seek to determine if the leader is optimistic or pessimistic based on his belief that political conflict is temporary or permanent in the political universe. The (P-2) formula measures the mean intensity of conflictual and cooperative transitive verbs for others with values ranging from -3 punish to +3 reward and the mean is divided by three in order to place the score on a scale similar to other questions with -1 being pessimistic to +1 representing optimistic (Walker et al., 1998).

The third diagnostic question, (P-3) concerns the predictability of the political future. The leader's response to this question is measured by attributions of different

types of conflict and cooperative action toward others (Walker et al., 1998). Walker et al. (1998) use the Index of Variation to determine the variation of attributions to conflictual or cooperative acts. If the leader views the political action of others as unpredictable, more variation will occur, while less variation in attributions indicates the leader views the political action of others as predictable.

The leader's influence over historical development and his ability to control political outcomes in the political universe is represented by diagnostic question (P-4). Walker et al. (1998) implement locus of control research regarding perceptions of power in order to answer (P-4). In order to determine if the leader feels that self or others control political outcomes, self attributions are divided by self plus other attributions to determine the balance between them and the higher the net attributions to self compared to others represents greater control of the leader over political outcomes (Walker et al., 1998). The scale for (P-4) ranges from .00 which represents other locus of control to +1.0 which represents self locus of control. If the leader attributes more words and deeds to others, the locus of control is located in other and if more words and deeds are attributed to self, the locus of control is in self (Walker et al., 1998).

The fifth diagnostic question, (P-5) concerns the role of chance in determining political outcomes. Walker et al. (1998) state that (P-3) concerning the predictability of the political future and (P-4) concerning influence of historical development determines the answer to the role of chance. The (P-5) index is determined by subtracting 1 from the (P-3) result and multiplying it by the result for (P-4). The scale for (P-5) ranges from .00 indicating a low role of chance to 1.00 indicating a high role of chance in determining political outcomes. If the predictability of others (P-3) and the leader's control of political outcomes (P-4) are high then the role of chance is low and if the predictability of

others (P-3) and the leader's control of political outcomes (P-4) are low then the role of chance is high (Walker et al., 1998).

While diagnostic propensities examine others, choice propensities examine the leader's view of self and how self acts in the political universe. The choice propensity indices include (I-1) which indicates how cooperative or conflictual the leader believes he should act in the political universe, (I-2) which identifies the tactics the leader utilizes to achieve political goals, and (I-5) which identifies the utility and role of different means in which the leader exercises power.

The first choice propensity question, (I-1), identifies the strategies the leader employs in order to accomplish political goals. Walker et al. (1998) calculate the leader's positive and negative attributions to self and others and then subtract the totals of each from each other in order to determine if the leader has a cooperative or conflictual strategy. The scale for (I-1) ranges from −1 which indicates a conflictual strategy to +1 which indicates a cooperative strategy. Although (I-1) does not indicate the political goals the leader pursues, it does determine if the leader implements a cooperative or conflictual strategy in order to obtain his political goals.

Choice propensity (I-2) indicates how the leader's political goals can be most effectively met through the use of tactics and how tactics determine the intensity in which the leader pursues his strategy (Walker et al., 1998). The mean intensity of self conflictual and cooperative attributions are calculated and the scale ranges from −3 punish through +3 reward, however, in order to standardize the range, the mean is divided by 3 with −1 representing very conflictual tactics to +1 very cooperative tactics (Walker et al., 1998). If the leader's tactics are more cooperative, his cooperative self-

attributions will be greater and if the leader's tactics are more conflictual, his conflictual self-attributions will be greater.

Choice propensity (I-5) refers to the utility and role of different means in exercising political power. Walker et al. (1998) create different cooperative and conflictual transitive verb categories to determine if the leader, as an exercise of political power, implements words and deeds as positive or negative sanctions in order to control relationships with others. Each verb category is calculated as percentages, with a score of .00 representing a low utility to implement and .10 representing a high utility to implement (Walker et al., 1998). Transitive verb categories include punish and threaten which represent negative sanctions as the means of control and promise and reward which represent positive sanctions as the means of control (Walker et al., 1998).

The remaining instrumental questions, identified as shift propensities include (I-3), which represents the approach, calculation, control, and acceptance of political risk, (I-4a), indicating the timing of cooperative and conflictual acts, and (I-4b) measuring the timing of words and deeds (Walker et al., 1998). Shift propensities identify the risk and timing of tactics the leader implements.

The first shift propensity, (I-3) determines how the leader approaches and handles political risk. Political risks are defined as undesired outcomes associated with the risk of submission regarding a cooperative act and the risk of deadlock associated with a conflictual act (Walker et al., 1998). In order to determine how acceptant a leader is of submission or deadlock, Walker et al. (1998) use the Index of Variation to determine the variation of attributions the leader makes toward self. If the leader's self-attributions vary little and are concentrated in cooperative categories, the leader is acceptant to the

risk of submission to an adversary. If the self-attributions are concentrated in conflictual categories, the leader is acceptant to the risk of deadlock.

In order to determine how the leader times political action (I-4a), his positive and negative self-attributions are measured to determine how often shifts occur between cooperative and conflictual acts. Walker et al. (1998) calculate (I-4a) by subtracting 1 from the absolute value of the leader's percentage of positive self-attribution minus the percentage of negative self-attributions with .00 representing a low propensity to shift between cooperative and conflictual acts and 1.00 representing a high propensity. If timing of action is important to the leader, he has a high propensity to shift between cooperative and conflictual actions and a low propensity to shift indicates his strategic approach to goals is the dominant strategy (Walker et al., 1998).

The final shift propensity, (I-4b) measures a leader's propensity to shift between words and deeds and represents the leader's use of timing regarding political action. Walker et al. (1998) calculate the timing of words and deeds by subtracting 1 from the absolute value of the percentage of words minus deeds with .00 representing a low propensity to shift between words and deeds and 1.00 a high propensity. A low propensity to shift between words and deeds are more acceptant of risk while a higher shift represents an aversion to risk.

Political Learning

In order to determine if Khrushchev learned as a result of the Cuban missile crisis, it is important to examine the different conceptions of learning utilized by political scientists. Political science research regarding political learning focuses on three different aspects including who learns, what is learned, and when it is learned. Learning as a concept is implemented in political science research at various levels of analysis

including the individual, state, and organizational levels. Learning is also observed under various circumstances such as learning from direct experience, from historical events, as well as learning from international crises. There are also numerous definitions of political learning and methodologies for evaluating learning.

There is much debate among political science scholars regarding who or what learns. Organizational theorists argue that institutions and governments are just as capable of change as individuals. Learning at the organization level occurs collectively through communication by a group (Stern, 1997). Cognitive theorists such as Levy (1994) argue that learning can only occur at the individual level through a change in an individual's cognitive beliefs, and governments can only learn if the individual implements these new ideas at the institutional level. Levy (1994) notes that an individual may learn, but if they fail to institutionalize the lessons the organization or government procedures will remain unchanged.

Debate also centers on the situation in which learning occurs. One area of debate involves determining if leaders "learn" from historical events in order to prevent past mistakes or repeat past successes. Experience-based learning is also studied in order to determine if an individual learns as a result of political experiences. This research focuses on crises in order to determine if a crisis experience creates policy change or belief change among individuals. Researchers often attribute policy change after a crisis to learning at the individual, organizational, or governmental levels (Jarosz & Nye, 1993).

Scholars such as Stern (1997) argue that the experience of a crisis may create a cognitive openness that facilitates individual learning. A crisis experience can alter a leader's

beliefs about his adversaries as well as his view of the political environment (Stern, 1997).

The Cuban missile crisis is recognized as a classic example of a learning crisis. Scholars such as Blight and Welch (1990) argue that the Cuban missile crisis altered the participants understanding of the superpower relationship. Craig & George (1983) also argue that the crisis provided an awakening for both leaders, which led them to pursue a more cooperative relationship between the two powers. Hopmann and King (1980) suggest that the crisis facilitated détente and led to the passage of the Partial Test Ban Treaty ten months after the crisis.

An examination of learning produces several different definitions of learning in political science research. Tetlock (1991) identifies two conceptions of learning utilized in political science research; the neorealist approach and the belief system approach. The neorealist approach to learning focuses on the state as the unit of analysis and defines learning as a response to events in the international system. In contrast, the belief system approach to learning focuses on the individual, and argues that learning creates a change in the beliefs or belief structure of a particular leader. An examination of each definition is conducted in order to fully understand the concept of political learning.

In the neorealist approach, learning is regarded as a rational response to changes in the international system. Tetlock (1991) indicates that in the neorealist approach, the structure of the international system rather then the minds of particular individuals lead to learning. According to neorealists, the state is the unit of analysis and it can be treated as a rational actor that responds to changes in the international system. The state perceives changes in the international system and responds to those changes in order to maintain power. Jarosz & Nye (1993) indicate that the neorealism approach is based on the

assumption that states will respond to change in the international system and will adapt to changes in order to survive, which is classified as learning. Additionally, Jarosz & Nye (1993) note that most studies regarding learning in the Cuban missile crisis have implemented the neorealist approach in order to explain the Soviet Union's decision to remove the missiles from Cuba as a rational response by the state, classified as learning.

Unlike neorealism, the belief system approach (also known as the cognitive psychological approach) of learning focuses on how a political leader views events in the international system. Observations regarding the political universe and perceptions of other actors in the system make up a leader's belief system. The concept of learning in the belief system approach is not determined by the structure and laws of the international system, but rather through the beliefs of the political leader. Belief systems contain the leader's perceptions of the political universe, and help guide his policy decisions. Scholars disagree on how to determine the conditions and forms of learning within a leader's belief system. Learning within the belief system is defined in numerous ways including a change in the leader's beliefs, a change in the cognitive structure, and the efficiency definition of learning.

Levy (1994) defines learning as a change in beliefs or the development of new beliefs as a result of the observation and interpretation of experience. Unlike other definitions of learning, Levy (1994) restricts learning to belief change and he indicates that his definition does not require learning to involve policy change, an advanced understanding of the political universe, or a more complex cognitive structure. Learning can occur at different levels within the belief system and Levy (1994) indicates simple learning leads to a change in means and diagnostic learning indicates a change in beliefs regarding the political universe and the intentions of other political actors.

Using the cognitive approach to learning at the individual level and defining

learning as a change in beliefs, Walker, Schafer, & Marfleet (2001) tested their

contention that learning could be evaluated in operational code analysis by measuring the

changes in the beliefs of British leaders toward Hitler before World War II to determine

why Britain continued a strategy of appeasement under unfavorable circumstances.

Walker et al. (2001) applied learning defined by Levy (1994) as changes in beliefs rather

than changes in behavior. The authors, Walker et al. (2001) found that learning can

occur at three different levels within the operational code: simple learning which

indicates changes in the instrumental beliefs regarding political action, diagnostic

learning which indicates changes in the philosophical beliefs regarding the political

universe, and complex learning which indicates changes in beliefs regarding political

goals as well as the leader's perception of the relationship between self and others in the

political universe. Instrumental and philosophical beliefs can strengthen or weaken with

strengthening in beliefs indicating more cooperation while a weakening in beliefs

indicating more conflict (Walker et al., 2001).

Hypothesis

Applying Walker et al.'s (2001) theoretical model, this paper measures

Khrushchev's operational code in order to detect changes in his beliefs to determine if

simple and diagnostic learning occurred based upon a statistically significant change in

his beliefs following the Cuban missile crisis. Based upon scholars' observations

regarding the increased cooperation between the two powers following the Cuban missile

crisis, this study measures Khrushchev's instrumental and philosophical beliefs before

and after the crisis to determine if they were significantly different indicating that he

experienced learning at the simple and diagnostic levels respectively. The arguments by

these scholars create the hypothesis for this paper. The results of this study, however, indicate that Khrushchev only experienced a significant change in his operational code beliefs regarding his exercise of power in his use of appeals (I-5ap) and rewards (I-5re) following the Cuban missile crisis. Khrushchev's remaining operational code beliefs remained constant before and after the crisis.

<div align="center">Background on Khrushchev</div>

Khrushchev is remembered by many for his hare-brained schemes, de-Stalinization, and his decision to place nuclear weapons ninety miles off the coast of the U.S., bringing the world close to nuclear destruction. Khrushchev biographer Taubman (2003, p. 20) remarks, "Khrushchev is a study in unresolved contrasts, and in pathos." A discussion of Khrushchev's rise to power and his leadership of the Soviet Union provide insight into his success and failures as leader of the Soviet Union.

Nikita Khrushchev rose from a peasant to become the leader of one of the most powerful countries in the world. Khrushchev started his political career in 1918 when he joined the Bolsheviks and served in the Red Army as a junior political officer during the civil war. Following the civil war, Khrushchev was appointed party boss of the Petrovo Manivsky district in Ukraine and by 1928 he became head of the Ukraine's Central Committee Organization Department. Khrushchev was always concerned about furthering his education and in 1929 the party allowed him to attend the Stalin Industrial Academy in Moscow. While in Moscow, Khrushchev began a rapid rise up the party ladder, in part Khrushchev suggests, to Stalin's wife Nadezhda Alliluyeva, who brought Khrushchev to Stalin's attention while both attended the Academy. Zubok & Pleshakov (1996) indicate that during the purges Khrushchev rose to the number two position in the Moscow party organization. In 1938, he was back in Ukraine as first party secretary

which led to his appointment to the Politburo, the highest decision making body within the party. During World War II he was a political commissar and he spent a great deal of time at the battle of Stalingrad keeping Stalin and Presidium members informed of the battle's progress. After Ukraine's liberation in 1944, Khrushchev reassumed his position as first secretary of the Ukrainian party. In 1949 Stalin called him back to Moscow as head of the Moscow city party and he was appointed secretary of the Central Committee.

Following Stalin's death in March 1953, Khrushchev became leader of the party, although he had to overcome many obstacles in order to consolidate his power. A collective leadership was formed between Georgy Malenkov who became Prime Minister, Lavrenty Beria, who was head of the secret police, and Vyacheslav Molotov, a deputy prime minister. Malenkov, Molotov, and Khrushchev formed an alliance to eliminate Beria in the leadership due to his power as head of the secret police. Much of the blame of the Stalinist purges was attributed to Beria and he was tried and executed and a new collective was formed between Khrushchev, Molotov, and Malenkov.

Following the elimination of Beria, Khrushchev, as leader of the party and Malenkov, as head of government became the main contenders in the succession struggle. Both men began suggesting and implementing programs in order to outmaneuver one another. Malenkov set himself apart from Stalin's conservatism by suggesting the Soviet Union increase investment in consumer goods, which would decrease investment in the armed forces and heavy industry sectors. Khrushchev adopted a more conservative platform that increased investment in heavy industry, which won him the support of the powerful armed forces and heavy industry lobbies. Malenkov faced increasing criticism of his policies and Khrushchev took advantage of the situation by lambasting Malenkov at every opportunity. Malenkov, consequently, resigned as premier in February 1955.

Nikolay Bulganin became the new premier; however, he had very little influence, which made Khrushchev the most important member of the collective leadership.

Khrushchev still had many enemies on the Presidium including Malenkov who remained a member in spite of his resignation as premier. In order to advance his position in the party and to distance himself from Molotov and Malenkov, Khrushchev gave his Secret Speech at the Twentieth Party Congress in 1956 in which he denounced Stalin's use of terror and cult of personality and revealed his purging of party members. A campaign of de-Stalinization began in which there were attempts at returning rule of law to the country and reviving the Leninist utopian ideal. The speech created problems in Eastern Europe where citizens began to question Stalin's reign as well as the viability of the socialist system. The situation became volatile in Hungary, when Prime Minister Imre Nagy abolished one party rule essentially opening the way for multiparty elections. Khrushchev and other Presidium members agreed that Hungary had gone too far and responded with force to crush the revolt.

The revolt in Hungary led many Presidium members to question Khrushchev's de-Stalinization policies due to the reaction they created and the fact that the policies could expose members due to their complicity in the crimes. Khrushchev continued to provoke the Presidium by passing reforms and reorganizing the bureaucracy in order to strengthen his position within the party. He reformed the economic councils in order to put regional party members (his allies) rather than government ministers in charge of industry. In order to gain popular support, Khrushchev announced without prior approval from the Presidium that the Soviet Union would surpass the U.S. in per capita production of meat, milk, and butter within three years. This proposal would require increased

investment in light industry, one of the proposals made by Malenkov that received criticism from Khrushchev.

A majority of Presidium members were troubled by the reforms and they felt that Khrushchev and the party apparatus were becoming too powerful. In June 1957, an anti-Khrushchev group headed by Malenkov, Molotov, and Kaganovich held a Council of Ministers meeting in which the group criticized Khrushchev's reforms and called for Bulganin to replace him as party leader. According to the formal rules of the Party, the Central Committee was responsible for electing the Presidium and the party leader; however, the group assumed that the Central Committee would abide by the informal party rule, which allowed the Presidium to elect its own leader. Khrushchev was familiar with the rule and he demanded delay until all Central Committee members were present due to the fact that the majority of them were his supporters. Khrushchev succeeded in calling a Central Committee plenum with the help of the KGB and the military, led by Marshal Zhukov. The Central Committee overturned the vote by the Presidium and Khrushchev successfully defeated the "anti party group." In 1958, Khrushchev became the undisputed leader of the Soviet Union when he assumed the position of premier after Bulganin resigned. Fellow party members noted that after Khrushchev defeated the anti-party group his attitude changed. KGB chief Alekasnadr Shelepin observed that the defeat of the anti-party group, "gave him freedom of action," and he "began to display arrogance, to insist on the infallibility of his own judgments, and to exaggerate successes which had been achieved" (Taubman, 2003, p.365).

Unlike Stalin, Khrushchev never completely controlled the party even at the peak of his power. He continued to attack the "anti-party group" even after he had them exiled (departing from Stalin's execution method) which indicated that he still had opponents

within the party.   Tompson (1995) explains that Stalin ruled over the party through fear, however, Khrushchev essentially had to make the party his partner. By loosening the grip of fear that Stalin had used to control the party and his rivals, Khrushchev had a difficult time controlling critics in the party who opposed many of his reforms and his increasingly all-knowing attitude.

Crankshaw (1966) indicates that the same people that brought Khrushchev to the peak of power were the same people responsible for his ouster in 1964. He continued to promote reforms that threatened party members' positions. In 1962 he announced his plan to split the party apparatus into two entities, an agricultural section and an industrial section. Presidium members gave their approval; however, Taubman (2003) indicates that most members were appalled by his decision. His decision greatly angered provincial party bosses who lost a considerable amount of authority as a result of the reform. Khrushchev also alienated party members by proposing that agriculture management be centered in Moscow instead of at the local level, further eroding the party members' authority.

In October 1964, while Khrushchev was on vacation, party members met to complete plans for his removal. Unlike the "anti party group" in 1957, the plotters involved in 1964 took steps to ensure that Khrushchev could not retain his position. Leonid Brezhnev and the others secured the support of the Central Committee, whose members had been most affected by Khrushchev's reforms. Unlike in 1957, the KGB also supported Khrushchev's removal and ensured that he had no advance knowledge of the plotters' plans. Leonid Brezhnev phoned Khrushchev and insisted that he come back to Moscow in order to discuss his agricultural management reforms.   On October 13, Khrushchev returned to Moscow, where he faced a barrage of criticism from Presidium

members ranging from his creation of a personality cult, his rudeness, his unilateral actions, and his belief that his decisions were infallible. The Presidium suggested that Khrushchev "retire" due to his age and bad health. Khrushchev did not put up any resistance and agreed to retire per the Presidium's request.

<center>The Cuban missile crisis</center>

Khrushchev also made bold moves in foreign policy, the most noteworthy being his decision to place nuclear weapons in Cuba. Initially, following Fidel Castro's defeat of Batista's regime, Khrushchev and his colleagues were unsure of Castro's political inclinations. By 1959, however, Castro announced his support of Marxism and Khrushchev demonstrated the Soviet Union's approval by sending Warsaw Pact weapons to Cuba in 1959. Following the botched Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961 in which the United States sent exiled Cubans to try to topple Castro's regime, Khrushchev became more committed to protecting Cuba by increasing Soviet military aid. Cuba became increasingly important to Khrushchev and that he felt the loss of Cuba to the United States "would be a great blow to Marxist-Leninist teachings" (Taubman, 2003, p. 534).

A vacation to Bulgaria led to the most stunning decision of Khrushchev's career. While Khrushchev and Defense Minister Malinovsky walked along the beach, Malinovsky indicated that United States missiles based in Turkey were capable of striking Moscow and Kiev. This led Khrushchev to inquire into the placement of Soviet missiles off the coast of the United States and if they could be placed covertly. Malinovsky assured Khrushchev that the weapons could be deployed secretly and after much discussion and approval from all the Presidium members, the Soviet Union started shipping nuclear weapons to Cuba in September 1962.

The crisis became public on October 22, 1962 when President Kennedy revealed to the world that the Soviet Union had placed nuclear missiles ninety miles off the coast of the United States and he announced the United States would quarantine the island to prevent further deliveries from the Soviet Union. Khrushchev immediately responded by letter to Kennedy stating the actions proposed would violate international law, however Soviet ships were promptly ordered to turn back. The two leaders continued to correspond to one another in an effort to end the crisis. After three days of deadlock in which the Soviets continued to assemble the missiles on the island, Khrushchev, in response to reports that a U.S. attack on Cuba was imminent, wrote John F. Kennedy a letter on October 26, which hinted at an offer to remove the missiles. After the threat of an attack subsided, he wrote another letter on October 27 that talked about a settlement which involved the removal of U.S. missiles from Turkey in exchange for the removal of the Cuban missiles. The situation remained tense when Soviet forces, without authorization, shot down a U-2 over Cuba. On October 28, Khrushchev agreed to withdraw the missiles after Kennedy ensured him the U.S. would not invade Cuba. The United States also agreed to remove the missiles from Turkey; however, this was to remain secret from the public, which made Khrushchev's withdrawal look like a capitulation to many, including Castro and the Chinese.

Much of the research on Khrushchev's role in the crisis has centered on explaining why he made the decision to place nuclear missiles in Cuba. Taubman (2003) indicates that Khrushchev viewed placing missiles in Cuba as a cure-all that would alleviate his domestic troubles and prove to his colleagues that he was a worthy leader. The primary interest of this study is to determine if Khrushchev's beliefs changed as a result of the Cuban missile crisis. Scholars such as George (1969) and Leites (1951,

1953, 1964) have examined Khrushchev's general operational code by using qualitative methods. Hoagland (1978) used a qualitative method to examine Khrushchev's operational code before the Berlin Crisis and between the Berlin and Cuban crises in order to determine if his instrumental beliefs changed between the two events. This study measures Khrushchev's operational code using the Verb in Context System to determine if Khrushchev's beliefs changed following the Cuban missile crisis.

<p align="center">Method</p>

This paper examines Khrushchev's operational code to determine if his beliefs changed significantly due to the Cuban missile crisis indicating learning. In order to measure Khrushchev's beliefs, fifteen speeches in two samples were collected before and after the crisis. Eight speeches were selected before the crisis (1958-1962) and seven were selected after the crisis (1962-1963). (see Appendices B and C for a complete list of speeches). Speeches were selected from 1958 onward because Khrushchev did not consolidate his leadership as party leader and premier until March of 1958 when Bulganin resigned. The speeches were selected from the table of contents based upon their title, in order to determine if the speech pertained to Soviet foreign policy towards the United States. The speeches all met the 1,000 minimum word length that the Verbs In Context System requires for coding purposes.

All of Khrushchev's speeches analyzed in this study were obtained from the *Current Digest of the Soviet Press* (CDSP). *The Current Digest of the Soviet Press* was a news digest that was produced by an independent nonprofit organization affiliated with the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies and the American Council of Learned Societies. CDSP began publication in 1949 and in 1992, following the collapse of the Soviet Union; it changed its title to *The Current Digest of the Post-*

Soviet Press. The CDSP selected, translated, and abstracted articles from the press of the Soviet Union. The publication surveyed newspapers and periodicals that represented the most significant elements of the Soviet press. Much of its material was drawn from *Pravda*, the official Communist Party newspaper; *Izvestia*, the official government paper; and TASS, the official wire service. Coverage included "condensed text" reports, which may be long or short; ellipses indicate where material has been omitted, and "abstract" reports which summarized articles in whole or part, and "complete text" reports that contain the full text of speeches, official announcements, and appointments. All of the Khrushchev's speeches that were selected for this study were marked as "complete text" by the CDSP indicating that they were reprinted in their entirety.

<div align="center">Sample</div>

Khrushchev's public and prepared verbal material were used for the sample primarily due to their availability. There is argument among "at a distance" scholars regarding which type of public verbal material, prepared or spontaneous more accurately portrays a leader's psychological characteristics. Researchers who favor spontaneous material believe that prepared speeches are the product of speechwriters and they argue that the linguist patterns may portray the speechwriter's rather than the leader's attributes (Schafer, 1998). Many scholars that use prepared material disagree such as Crichlow (1998, p. 690) who notes that speechwriters are paid to portray the leader's policy preferences and the "leader's basic propensities should still be apparent in the general patterns that run through the text." Schafer (1998) notes that most leaders participate in the speechwriting process by providing ideas that they want to discuss, reading over the text, and making changes to the speech in order to make it their own.

A great deal of the secondary sources researched regarding Khrushchev indicated that he took an active role in compiling his speeches. Khrushchev never felt comfortable writing due to his lack of education so he would dictate his speech ideas to stenographers (Taubman, 2003). Taubman (2003, p. 366) also notes that Mikhail Kharlamov, Khrushchev's foreign ministry press aide, "shaped Khrushchev's speeches not so much as writing them as editing what he dictated." Fedor Burlatsky, a speechwriter and aide to Khrushchev indicates that Khrushchev would give a draft of his dictations to speechwriters, "which clearly set out what he thought and wanted and he carefully watched to see how scrupulously we had fulfilled his instructions (Burlatsky, 1988, p. 222).

<p style="text-align:center">Procedure</p>

After all the speeches were selected, they had to be transferred into the computer for analysis. Each speech was scanned into the computer and an optical character recognition program was used so the computer would recognize the speeches as text. Once all the speeches were scanned into the computer, they were each coded using Profiler +, an automated coding program created by Michael Young (Young, 2001). Profiler + contains a coding dictionary for VICS that identifies transitive verbs and places them in self or other categories based upon positive and negative valences. Profiler + produces numbers to self and other categories for each speech. Each self and other category contains a range from +3 to -3 which represent the positive or negative attributes the speaker makes to self and others which are used to calculate the operational code beliefs.

After the coding analysis produced numerical data for each self and other category, each philosophical and instrumental belief was calculated according to the

formulas created by Walker et al. (1998) for the Verbs in Context System (see Appendix D for a complete list of formulas). An excel spreadsheet created by Mark Schafer, one of the creators of VICS, was used to calculate each operational code belief. The data from Profiler + was placed into the corresponding self and other categories in the excel spreadsheet. The spreadsheet contains the formulas that are used in the VICS indices to create quantitative data for each philosophical and instrumental belief before and after the crisis.

Following the calculation of Khrushchev's beliefs, an average score for each belief was compared before and after the crisis. Khrushchev's VICS scores for his philosophical beliefs before the crisis were added together and divided by his eight speeches before the crisis, and his philosophical beliefs after the crisis were added together and divided by his seven speeches after the crisis. His instrumental beliefs before the crisis were added together and divided by eight speeches and his instrumental beliefs after the crisis were added together and divided by seven speeches. Following the calculations a difference in means test was performed using SPSS software with time (before and after the crisis) as the grouping variable in order to determine if learning occurred based upon statistically significant differences in his beliefs before and after the crisis.

In order to determine if Khrushchev's operational code indicates simple learning which refers to changes in his instrumental beliefs, the significance differences for each belief were examined before and after the crisis by a one-tailed difference in means test in order to determine if the difference was significant at the $p \leq .05$ level. Khrushchev's philosophical beliefs before and after the crisis were also examined before and after the crisis to determine if diagnostic learning occurred at the $p \leq .05$ significance level. If

Khrushchev's experienced no learning, his beliefs before and after the crisis would not

differ, HO: $\overline{\alpha_b} = \overline{\alpha_a}$.   If Khrushchev learned as a result of the crisis, his beliefs before

and after the crisis would differ, H1: $\overline{\alpha_b} \neq \overline{\alpha_a}$. In order to test the hypothesis that

Khrushchev learned as a result of the crisis, an independent sample difference of means

test $\mu_1 - \mu_2 = (\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2) \pm t_{.05} Sp \sqrt{\dfrac{1}{n_1} + \dfrac{1}{n_2}}$ was performed to measure the difference in

Khrushchev's beliefs before and after the crisis. In the study, a one-tailed test was

implemented with thirteen degrees of freedom, making the t critical value 1.77. A t-score

that is higher than the critical value of 1.77 for a particular belief indicates that learning

occurred and is statistically significant at the p≤.05 level.

<div align="center">Results</div>

The mean scores of Khrushchev's operational code before and after the crisis are

presented in Table 2. Observing the t-scores for each belief, it is apparent that none of his

philosophical beliefs differed significantly before or after the crisis. Khrushchev did not

experience diagnostic learning because the t-scores of his philosophical beliefs before

and after the crisis did not approach the critical t value of 1.77. Khrushchev's

instrumental beliefs before and after the crisis indicate that Khrushchev experienced

simple learning in his use of appeals (I-5ap) and his use of rewards (I-5re). The t-scores

for his use of appeals and rewards exceed the t critical value of 1.77, which makes them

statistically significant. The t-scores for his remaining instrumental beliefs indicate

simple learning did not occur because they failed to reach the critical t value of 1.77. The

only other index that approached significance was Khrushchev's pursuit of goals I-2,

with a t-score value of -1.67.   None of his other beliefs come close to being statistically

significant as a result of the difference of means test. Although Khrushchev's operational

code reveals that the majority of his beliefs did not change following the Cuban missile crisis, it still provides insight into his perception of his self and others from 1958-1963. An examination of his beliefs will help to determine his general operational code in which this study suggests nearly all of his philosophical and instrumental beliefs remained constant from 1958-1963.

Table 2. Operational Code Mean Scores for Khrushchev Before and After the Crisis

Philosophical Indices	Cuban missile crisis (mean scores)		
	Before	After	t
P1- Nature of the Political Universe	.16	.07	1.25
P2- Realization of Political Values	.03	.01	.381
P3- Political Future (Predictability of Others)	.08	.09	-.611
P4- Control over Historical Development	.12	.09	1.06
P5- Role of Chance	.99	.99	-.441
Instrumental Indices			
I1- Approach to Goals (Direction of Strategy)	.25	.41	-.812
I2- Pursuit of Goals (Intensity of Tactics)	.03	.30	-1.67
I3- Risk Orientation (Predictability of Tactics)	.21	.27	-.418
I4- Timing of Action (Flexibility of Tactics)			
a. Cooperative/Conflictual Shift	.67	.49	1.24
b. Word/Deed Shift	.45	.57	-.716
I5. Utility of Means (Exercise of Powers)			
a. Reward	.08	.32	-2.01*
b. Promise	.07	.09	-.417
c. Appeal	.47	.29	2.09*
d. Oppose	.16	.14	.259
e. Threaten	.07	.05	.670
f. Punish	.15	.10	.829

* Significant differences at the $p \leq .05$ level (one tailed) are asterisked.　　　　　　　　　n=15

Philosophical Beliefs

The philosophical beliefs measure how Khrushchev viewed the political universe as well as other leaders in the political universe. By including speeches that Khrushchev made regarding foreign policy towards the United States, this study seeks to determine if his views toward the political universe, specifically towards the United States, changed following the Cuban missile crisis. As the results in the Table 2 indicate, Khrushchev's philosophical beliefs did not differ significantly before or after the crisis. However, a

discussion of his philosophical beliefs reveals how he perceived the United States from 1958-1963.

Before and after the Cuban missile crisis, Khrushchev had a moderately conflictual view of the political universe (P-1) represented by his scores of (.16) and (.07) respectively. He was moderately pessimistic about the prospects for realizing his political values (P-2) with (.03) before the crisis and (.01) following the crisis. Khrushchev saw the political future (P-3) as unpredictable and he felt that he had little control over historical development (P-4) before (.12) and after (.09) the crisis. His view of the political future as unpredictable and his belief that he had low control over historical development influenced his belief regarding the role that chance has in affecting political events. Khrushchev felt that chance played a high role in the political universe with a (P-5) score of (.99) before and after the crisis.

Instrumental Beliefs

Khrushchev's instrumental belief mean scores before and after the crisis reveals his view of self in the political universe regarding his use of strategy and tactics he implemented in pursuit of his political goals. Khrushchev's approach toward his political goals (I-1) before (.25) and after (.41) the crisis indicates that he was moderately cooperative. He pursued his goals (I-2) with moderately cooperative tactics of (.03) before the crisis and (.30) following the crisis. Although the results were not significant, his mean score was higher following the crisis, indicating that he adopted more cooperative tactics. Khrushchev managed risk (I-3) by employing a somewhat unpredictable repertoire of tactics before (.27) and after (.21) the crisis. His timing of action indicates that he had a high propensity to shift between cooperative and conflictual

tactics (I-4a) with (.67) before and (.49) after the crisis. He also had a high propensity to shift between words and deeds (I-4b) with scores of (.45) before and (.57) after the crisis.

The utility of means indices (I-5) indicate Khrushchev's tendency to use particular cooperative and conflictual verbs, which represent the tactics he employed to exercise power. The conflictual verbs are represented by threaten, punish, and oppose with threaten being the most conflictual. The cooperative verbs range from reward as the most cooperative to promise and appeal. Khrushchev preferred the use of appeals (.47), oppose (.16), and punish (.15) for exercising political power before the crisis. Following the crisis he relied upon reward (.32), appeals (.29), and oppose (.14) as his primary utility of means. Two of Khrushchev's utility of means indices, including his use of reward and appeal exceeded the critical t value of 1.77 indicating that he experienced simple learning following the crisis regarding the tactics he employed to exercise power. Khrushchev's use of rewards before the crisis (.08) shows an increase to (.32) after the crisis with a t-score of -2.01. His use of appeals shows a decrease with a score of (.47) before and (.29) after with a t-score of 2.09.

Discussion

According to the results of this study, Khrushchev's operational code beliefs at the philosophical level did not change significantly, indicating that he did not experience diagnostic learning as a result of the missile crisis. Khrushchev experienced simple learning regarding his use of rewards (I-5re) and appeals (I-5ap); however his remaining instrumental beliefs remained constant. A number of explanations exist to explain why the majority of Khrushchev's beliefs remained stable following the crisis including the concept of retrospective rationality, personality rigidities, and the doctrinal nature of Bolshevik and Marxist belief systems. These explanations along with an overview of his

operational code will be examined to determine why the majority of his beliefs remained constant.

Following the missile crisis, one of the primary questions of interest to scholars was Khrushchev's motivation for placing missiles in Cuba. In all the sources researched, it is apparent that the initial decision to place missiles in Cuba was Khrushchev's idea. Khrushchev maintained that the missiles were placed in Cuba in order to prevent an attack from the U.S. In his memoirs, Khrushchev explains his decision regarding the crisis; "We shipped our weapons to Cuba precisely for the prevention of aggression against her! That is why the Soviet government reaffirmed its agreement to the removal of the ballistic rockets from Cuba" (Khrushchev, 1974, p. 514).

Many scholars of the crisis do not give credence to Khrushchev's explanation and feel that he was trying to preserve the Soviet Union's and his own reputation following the foreign policy defeat. Arnold Horelick, a scholar of the crisis, dismissed Khrushchev's explanation by noting, "to regard the outcome of the Cuban missile crisis as coinciding in any substantial way with Soviet intentions or interests is to mistake the skillful salvage of a shipwreck for brilliant navigation" (Horelick, 1964, p. 365). Following the crisis, Khrushchev faced criticism for his decision from other Socialist governments, particularly the Chinese, Cubans, and fellow Soviet party colleagues who felt that the missile removal made the Soviet Union look weak. Many also dismissed the "promise" from the United States not to invade as farcical, considering it was a verbal agreement that had no legal significance in international law.

Retrospective Rationality

While many others saw the Cuban missile crisis as a defeat for Soviet foreign policy, Khrushchev hailed the Soviet Union's retreat as a success (Taubman, 2003).

Taubman (2003) indicates that as late as June 1963, Khrushchev was still trying to convince himself that the crisis had ended in a victory for the Soviet Union. At a Presidium meeting in 1963, Khrushchev commented on the success of the crisis, "We attained our goal; so they lost and we won" (Taubman, 2003, p. 599). Even in his memoirs years after he was ousted from power Khrushchev expresses his satisfaction of his role in the crisis, "The Caribbean crisis was a triumph of Soviet foreign policy and a proud triumph in my own career as a statesman" (Khrushchev, 1970, p. 504). Khrushchev's beliefs regarding the success of the missile crisis mirrors a concept in psychology known as retrospective rationality which is implemented by Tetlock (1985) in his research regarding accountability. Individuals that are subject to high levels of accountability after a crisis will often try to defend their behavior through creative rationalizations and public defenses. Retrospective rationality is a type of defense mechanism utilized by individuals to rationalize past conduct (Tetlock, 1985). This type of behavior inhibits learning because the individual fails to self-criticize his decisions or engage in introspection (Tetlock, 1985). Justifications for the decision are made and the individual essentially starts believing in his own rationalizations.

<div align="center">Personality Rigidities</div>

In his research on the operational code, George (1969) observes that personality rigidities can also prevent belief change. It is obvious from Khrushchev's public statements and memoirs that he never questioned or admitted any type of error regarding the decision to place missiles in Cuba. Moscow party boss Nikolai Yeguychev reflects an interesting aspect of Khrushchev's personality regarding his belief that his decisions were infallible, "Even when Khrushchev made a mistake, even when he'd knew he had done so, perhaps especially then, he couldn't bring himself to admit it. This was partly

because he was a party boss and government leader, but it was also a part of his character" (Taubman, 2003, p. 540). Taubman (2003) also notes that a pattern emerged in Khrushchev starting in 1957 following his defeat of the "anti party group" in which he got conceited and started to believe that his own judgments were infallible. Upon his ouster from power in 1964, many of his colleagues noted his failure to include other members of the Presidium in the decision making process and accused him of creating a cult of personality; the same behavior that Stalin was criticized for in Khrushchev's secret speech (Taubman, 2003).

<div align="center">Marxist/Bolshevik Belief System</div>

Alexander George (1969) introduces another explanation as to why Khrushchev's beliefs remained the same following the crisis. In his research on reformulating Leites's (1951) original study on the operational code of the Bolsheviks, George provides some interesting insight into the structure of the Marxist belief system. George (1969, p. 217) indicates that in an elite group such as Marxists, belief systems can take on a doctrinal character in which political beliefs, "become part of the sacred political culture of the elite that is systematically transmitted to new leaders." In such belief systems, precautions may be taken to ensure that the beliefs remain safe from arbitrary change (George, 1969).

There is evidence to suggest that Khrushchev's belief system was based upon Bolshevik and Marxist doctrines. Zubok (1992) notes that Khrushchev's belief system still retained Bolshevik doctrines such as his belief in the aggressive nature of imperialism, and his belief in the responsibility of the Soviet Union to support wars of national liberation. Zubok (1992) argues that the Cuban missile crisis did not facilitate learning because it did not cause him to rethink such doctrinal aspects of Soviet foreign

policy. There is evidence to support Zubok's claim from the results of this study as well as comments made by Khrushchev following the crisis. In his speech on the international situation following the crisis, Khrushchev reiterated that the Soviet Union would continue to support national liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. In his memoirs Khrushchev retained his belief that socialism would become the dominant political system and the Soviet Union would be the driving force, "Our foreign policy is rooted in our convictions that the way pointed out by Lenin is the way of the future not only in the Soviet Union but for all countries and all peoples of the world" (Khrushchev, 1970, p. 507). Ulam (1974) indicates that Khrushchev pursued national liberation wars in order to prove the Marxist/Bolshevik doctrine that socialism would prevail over capitalism and to ensure the ideology did not become an empty promise.

Although Khrushchev altered his beliefs regarding the inevitability of war, George (1969) indicates that they were modifications rather then an abandonment or transformation of his Bolshevik beliefs. Khrushchev had to adapt the inevitability of war doctrine due to the destructive capabilities of nuclear weapons. Peaceful coexistence still upheld the doctrine that communism would triumph over capitalism; however, success would be measured economically, rather than militarily.

Another aspect of Khrushchev's rule that emphasizes his unwavering belief in Marxism/Leninism were his constant reforms to the party bureaucracy as well as his promise that a communist society would be built in the Soviet Union by 1980. Khrushchev made reforms to the system in order to quicken the pace of communism, which he believed the achievement of was the party's primary task (Taubman, 2003). In order to achieve this goal, Khrushchev realized that consumer goods and agricultural products needed to be more readily available. In order to achieve this objective,

Khrushchev created many programs, such as the Virgin Land Plan, and he made many reforms to the party in order to reach the goal of communism. His efforts were not successful and he began to alienate members of the party who were increasingly threatened by his reforms.

Khrushchev's Operational Code Beliefs

Following the Cuban missile crisis, scholars such as Blight and Welch (1992) and Hopmann and King (1980) suggested that the relationship between the two superpowers moved in a more cooperative direction. In order to determine if this cooperation could be attributed to learning on the part of Nikita Khrushchev, a measurement of his operational code was taken before and after the crisis. The results of this study indicate that Khrushchev's view of the political universe (P-1), (representing his view of others, particularly the U.S.) would be significantly different $p \leq .05$ indicating that he viewed the United States in a more cooperative light following the event. However, Khrushchev's mean scores regarding his view of the political universe indicate he maintained a moderately conflictual view before (.16) and after (.07) the crisis. Two statements made by Khrushchev in his speech on August 1963 indicate his continued mistrust of the West. In his statement, Khrushchev confirms that he still upholds the Soviet foreign policy doctrine, "Marxist-Leninist's understand that as long as imperialism exists the danger of war remains" (Khrushchev, 1963). Zubok (1992, p.19) indicates that under Stalin, Khrushchev "was trained to mistrust imperialism and its highest embodiment, the United States." It appears that the Cuban missile crisis was unable to alter Khrushchev's conflictual view of the United States.

The mistrust of the United States is also apparent in the scores of Khrushchev's beliefs regarding the realization of his political values (P-2). Khrushchev's score before

(.03) and after (.01) indicate that he was somewhat pessimistic that he would achieve his political goals, which indicates that he felt conflict in the world was more of a permanent rather than temporary condition. His uncertainties regarding the U.S. also extend into his view of the political future (P-3) and his scores before and after the crisis indicate that he felt the future was unpredictable due to his doubts regarding the policies of the U.S. In his election speech of 1963, Khrushchev comments on his uncertainty, "the world is divided into a commonwealth of socialist countries and an imperialist camp that opposes it, and international relations are full of open and hidden conflict" (Khrushchev, 1963). Khrushchev's highest mean score involves the role that chance plays (P-5) in political outcomes with (.99) before and after the crisis. The high role Khrushchev attributes to chance is due to the fact that he views the political future as unpredictable (P-3) and he felt that he had little control over historical outcomes and political development (P-4).

The scores from Khrushchev's philosophical indices indicate that overall he did not have a very cooperative view of the U.S. before or after the crisis. The results would seem to support Zubok's (1992) claim that Khrushchev continued to mistrust the U.S. following the Cuban missile crisis. In the midst of his negative views toward the U.S., how did Khrushchev still manage to coauthor the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty? Although his philosophical beliefs which reflect his perceptions of the United States remained constant, he experienced a change in his instrumental belief regarding how to advance his goals. Following the crisis, this study indicates that Khrushchev increased his propensity to use reward (I-5re) as a means of exercising power. Khrushchev experienced simple learning regarding his use of reward (I-5re) as a means to exercise power, which led him to apply positive sanctions in his relationship with the United States. The increase in his propensity to use rewards as a means of exercising power

offers an explanation as to why an agreement was reached on the Partial Nuclear Test

Ban Treaty ten months after the crisis.   He was more willing to use reward (.32) as a

means of exercising power following the crisis which led him to sign the Partial Nuclear

Test Ban Treaty. Although his use of appeals decreased following the crisis (.29), he

implemented appeals as an exercise of power more frequently than oppose (.14), threaten

(.05), or punish (.10), indicating that relied on positive exercises of power more often

than negative exercises.

Khrushchev's instrumental beliefs provide a portrait of his view of self in the

political universe regarding his use of strategy and the tactics he implemented in pursuit

of his political goals. Khrushchev's instrumental beliefs reflect the assertion made by

Leites's (1964) that he dropped Stalin's belief in the inevitably of war in favor of

peaceful coexistence. His approach to political goals (I-1) was moderately cooperative

before (.25) and after the crisis (.41), which reflects Zubok's (1998) observation that the

crisis reinforced his belief in peaceful coexistence. His tactics (I-2) before and after the

crisis also appear to be moderately cooperative. Khrushchev had a high propensity to

shift between cooperative and conflictual tactics (I-4a), which indicates that the timing of

action was important in assessing the risks of political action. It is apparent through

Khrushchev's foreign policy endeavors that he alternated between conflictual and

cooperative tactics. Zubok (1991) indicates that Khrushchev was always in flux

regarding his commitment to the national liberation doctrine of the Bolsheviks and his

peaceful coexistence policies, which helps explain why he vacillated between conflictual

and cooperative tactics.

Khrushchev's utility of means regarding his use of rewards and appeals provide

the only significant results in this study. Khrushchev's use of rewards before the crisis at

(.08) rose to (.32) following the crisis and his use of appeals decreased with a score of (.47) before and (.29) after the crisis.   The increase in Khrushchev's propensity to use reward indicates that following the crisis, he was more willing to use positive sanctions in exercising power. The rest of his utility of means scores remained constant. It does appear; however, that Khrushchev's more cooperative exercises of power were used more frequently than his conflictual ones. An interesting observation by Taubman (2003, p.348) indicates that Khrushchev intended to, "woo the West while at the same time undermine it." This might help explain why he relied on cooperative exercises of power more frequently than conflictual ones.

Steven Hoagland (1978) did a qualitative study on Khrushchev's operational code during the post Berlin/pre Cuban period to determine if the Berlin crisis altered his instrumental beliefs, representing the actions and tactics he implemented to achieve his foreign policy goals. Hoagland (1978) examined Khrushchev's written and verbal statements during his sample period and extracted the relevant responses that corresponded to the instrumental operational code questions and compared his responses to his past actions to determine if his past actions resembled his responses to the instrumental questions.   Hoagland (1978) concluded in his research that there was no significant change in Khrushchev's instrumental beliefs in the thirteen months that separated the Berlin and Cuban crises.   According to the results of this study, only two of Khrushchev's instrumental beliefs showed significant change during the sample period 1958-1963. The stability of Khrushchev's operational code beliefs provides support to the theory that Khrushchev had personality rigidities and that his belief system had doctrinal qualities due to its Marxist/Bolshevik base. Both of these factors contributed to his inability to learn following the Cuban missile crisis. As Zubok (1991) notes, the

Cuban missile crisis merely reinforced Khrushchev's beliefs that he had prior to the crisis and did not cause him to rethink the doctrinal aspect of Soviet foreign policy.

Conclusion

In this study, Khrushchev's operational code beliefs before and after the Cuban missile crisis were measured to determine if the event altered his perceptions of the political universe and his political tactics in a more cooperative direction. The results of this study indicate that the crisis did not alter the majority of Khrushchev's beliefs. Many scholars have suggested the two superpower's relationship improved as a result of the crisis. These suggestions warranted a study of how the crisis affected Nikita Khrushchev to determine if his beliefs became more cooperative as a result of the crisis. The results reveal that the crisis did not alter the beliefs of Khrushchev in a more cooperative direction; rather, Khrushchev's beliefs remained stable. Khrushchev's failure to learn can be attributed to his personality rigidities, which did not allow him to question and learn from his decisions. In order to protect himself and the image of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev engaged in retrospective rationality, in which he defended his decision to place missiles in Cuba as a success. He began to believe in his own rationalizations, which thwarted any retrospective or self-assessment that could have produced a change in his beliefs. Khrushchev's belief system was also mired with Marxist and Bolshevik doctrines, so much so that even an event such as the Cuban missile crisis could not alter his basic operational code beliefs. The Marxist and Bolshevik doctrine strongly influenced future Soviet leaders and many scholars argue that Gorbachev was the first Soviet leader who began to reconsider many of them.

This study provides valuable insight into a political leader's beliefs and how crisis can affect beliefs. Crisis will remain an issue in political science and as scholars, it is

important to understand the affect that crisis has on individual policy makers. The operational code and the Verbs in Context System provide belief system theorists with vital tools to determine if political leaders' beliefs change as the result of a crisis. This particular case study showed that Khrushchev's beliefs remained constant, however research by Walker et al. (1998) on former President Jimmy Carter's operational code indicate that he experienced a change in his philosophical beliefs in a conflictual direction following the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan. This model can be utilized to study other political leaders in order to determine the affect that crisis has on their beliefs which in turn can provide new insights into the perceptions and character of political leaders.

A further application of this study would involve comparing Khrushchev's operational code to other Soviet leaders such as Stalin and Brezhnev in order to determine how Marxist and Bolshevik doctrines affected each leader's beliefs. It would also be interesting to compare Khrushchev's operational code to Gorbachev's especially since scholars speculate on how Khrushchev laid the foundation for Gorbachev's subsequent policies. Gorbachev is recognized as the first Soviet leader to abandon some of the more stringent Bolshevik doctrines and a comparison of each leader's operational code might reveal to what extent each leader's beliefs differed. Applying this model to each leader of the Soviet Union would give scholars a more accurate portrayal of how Soviet policy and Bolshevik doctrines evolved and changed over the course of each leader's rule.

Further research could also be conducted on Khrushchev's operational code through the study of archival information during the rule of Khrushchev. The Russian government has already declassified quite a bit of material relating to the crisis including

Khrushchev's letters to Kennedy. Khrushchev's private statements made to the Presidium and Central Committee members during and after the crisis could be analyzed and compared with his public statements to determine if his beliefs differed based on source material. A study by Marfleet (2001) examined President Kennedy's public rhetoric during the crisis and his private rhetoric to the Executive Committee members and found that differences existed between his public and private verbal material. If the Russian government ever released private conversations between Khrushchev and Presidium members during the crisis, a similar study could be conducted to determine if Khrushchev's rhetoric varied between source material.

Operational code analysis is a valuable tool used to assess the psychological characteristics of political leaders. Through the use of the Verbs in Context System and automating coding programs such as Profiler +, operational code analysis has become easier to conduct and remains an important tool in assessing the beliefs of political leaders. Operational code analysis provides insight into a leader's beliefs and the Verbs in Context System now allows researchers to perform quantitative analysis in order for researchers to compare the operational codes of other leaders to one another. The model implemented in this paper is only one of several ways researchers can apply the operational code theory in order to gain a broader understanding of political leaders' beliefs.

References

Blight J. & Welch D. (1989). *On the brink*. New York: Hill & Wang.

Breslauer, G. (1991). What have we learned about learning? In G. Breslauer and P. Tetlock (Eds.), *Learning in U.S. and Soviet Foreign Policy,* (pp. 825-855). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Burlatsky, F. (1991). *Khrushchev and the first Russian spring*. (D. Skillen, Trans.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Craig, G & George, A. (1983). *Force and statecraft*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crankshaw, E. (1966). *Khrushchev: A Career*. New York: Viking Press.

Crichlow, S. (1998). Idealism or pragmatism? An Operational Code analysis of Yitzhak Rabin and Shimon Peres. *Political Psychology, 19*, 683-706.

George, A. (1969). The "Operational Code": A neglected approach to the study of political leaders and decision-making. *International Studies Quarterly,13*, 190-222.

George, A. (1979). The causal nexus between cognitive beliefs and decision-making behavior. In L. Falkowski (Ed.), *Psychological models in international politics* (pp.95-124). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Hoagland, S. (1978). *Operational codes and the analyses of international crises: A comparison of the Berlin Wall and the Cuban missile crises*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe.

Hopmann P. & King T. (1980). From Cold War to détente: The role of the Cuban missile crisis and the partial nuclear test ban treaty. In O. R. Holsti, R. M. Siverson, & A. L. George (Eds.), *Change in the International System* (pp. 163-188). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Horelick, A. (1964). The Cuban missile crisis: An analysis of Soviet calculations and behavior. *World Politics, 16*, 363-389.

Jarosz, W & Nye, J. (1993). The shadow of the past: Learning from history in national security decision making. In P. Tetlock, J. Husbands, R. Jervis, P. Stern, & C. Tilly (Eds.), *Behavior, Society & International Conflict* (Vol. 4, pp. 127-189). New York: Oxford University Press.

Khrushchev, N. (1970*). Khrushchev remembers*. (S. Talbott, Ed. and Trans.). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Khrushchev, N. (1974). *Khrushchev remembers: The last testament*. (S. Talbott, Ed. and Trans.). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Leites, N. (1951*). The operational code of the Politburo*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Leites, N. (1953). *A study of Bolshevism*. New York: Free Press.

Leites, N. (1964). *Kremlin moods*. (Memorandum No. RM-3535-ISA). Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Levy, J. (1994). Learning and foreign policy: Sweeping a conceptual minefield. *International Organization, 48*, 279-312.

Schafer, M., Gassler, A. (2000). Sadat takes control: A quantitative analysis of Anwar Sadat's operational code before and after the October War of 1973. *The Political Psychologist, 5,* 10-16.

Stern, E. (1997). Crisis and learning: A conceptual balance sheet. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management, 5,* 69-86.

Taubman, W. (2003). *Khrushchev: The man and his era*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Tetlock, P. (1991). Learning in U.S. and Soviet foreign policy: In search of an elusive concept. In G. Breslauer and P. Tetlock (Eds.), *Learning in U.S. and Soviet Foreign Policy*, (pp. 20-61). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Tompson, W. (1995). *Khrushchev: A political life*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Ulam, A. (1974). *Expansion and coexistence: Soviet foreign policy 1917-1973* (2nd ed.). New York: Praeger.

Walker, S., Schafer, M., Marfleet, G. (2000, September). *The British strategy of appeasement: Why did Britain in the face of negative feedback?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

Walker, S., Schafer, M., Young, M. (1998). Systematic procedures for operational code analysis: Measuring and modeling Jimmy Carter's operational code. *International Studies Quarterly, 42,* 175-190.

Young, M. & Schafer, M. (1998). Is there method in our madness? Ways of assessing cognition in international relations. *Mershon International Studies Review, 42,* 63-96.

Young, M. (2001). Building worldviews with Profiler+ in applications of computer content analysis. In M. West, (Ed.), *Progress in Communication Sciences, 17.*

Zubok, V. (1992) *The missile crisis and the problem of Soviet learning.* Problems of Communism, 41, 19-23.

Zubok, V., & Pleshakov, C. (1996). *Inside the Kremlin's Cold War.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.