

# Comparative Perspectives on the Cold War

National and Sub-National Approaches



# Comparative Perspectives on the Cold War

National and Sub-National Approaches

Edited by  
Lee Trepanier, Spasimir Domaradzki  
and Jaclyn Stanke



Editorial Council

Klemens Budzowski, Maria Kapiszewska, Zbigniew Maciąg, Jacek Majchrowski

Reviewer

Łukasz Wordliczek Ph.D.

Copyright© by Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University

Krakow 2010

Cover design

Joanna Sroka

ISBN: 978-83-7571-094-6

All Rights Reserved. No part of this publication or its entirety may be reproduced, transmitted or stored in any manner that allows repeated use in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, copying, recording or other without the express written permission of copyright owners.

Commissioned by

Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University

[www.ka.edu.pl](http://www.ka.edu.pl)

Publisher

Krakow Society for Education: AFM Publishing House

(Krakowskie Towarzystwo Edukacyjne sp. z o.o.

– Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM; e-mail: [biuro@kte.pl](mailto:biuro@kte.pl))

Kraków 2010

Print

K&K

## Table of Contents

Rob Verhofstad Introduction: Comparative Perspectives on the Cold War .....	7
Rob Verhofstad The Netherlands During The Cold War: an Ambivalent Friendship and a Firm Enmity .....	11
Spasimir Domaradzki The Polish Perspective of American Foreign Policy: Selected Moments from the Cold War Era .....	23
Maryna Bessonova Soviet Perspective on the Cold War and American Foreign Policy .....	41
Jaclyn Stanke The American Perspective of the Cold War: The Southern Approach (North Carolina) .....	59
Lee Trepanier Enemy Images, Evidence, and Cognitive Dissonance: The Cold War as Recalled by Michiganders .....	77
Contributors .....	91



Rob Verhofstad

Introduction:  
Comparative Perspectives on the Cold War

*We share the same biology  
Regardless of ideology  
What might save us, me, and you  
Is if the Russians love their children too<sup>1</sup>*

Introduction

Most students today taking classes on the Cold War were either very young or not yet born when the Berlin Wall fell. However, their lecturers and the authors of their textbooks remember this historical event very well. Furthermore, they most likely have an active recollection about the Cold War era preceding it. What this recollection contains—from what may be considered important events or defining moments to how they felt at a certain time—often depends on where the lecturer or author was born. For example, the Cold War perspective from a scholar born in the United States differs substantially from the recollection of a Ukrainian citizen. We can also find differences in perspectives within larger countries, as this collection of papers will show.

For more than 45 years the Cold War was an almost inescapable framework by which people everywhere viewed world events. Even taking into account many differences in time, place or location, the world was seen as divided into two camps: the west (countries with liberal, democratic, capitalist systems) and the east (coun-

---

<sup>1</sup> Sting, “Russians” in *The Dream of the Blue Turtles* (1985).

tries with a socialist system and a centrally-planned economy). The governments of both sides used various forms of propaganda and ideological warfare throughout the Cold War to depict the other as a dangerous enemy inimically opposed to its own way of life. Too much understanding for the point of view of ‘the other side’ was oftentimes considered politically incorrect and frequently interpreted as unpatriotic, if not downright illegal in some cases. Enemy images were created and used as a source of forming an opinion instead of real experience with, or knowledge about ‘the other side’.

However, the Cold War era cannot be seen as a monomorphous period. The forms of propaganda and ideological warfare in the early Cold War years were different from those in the period of *Détente* and again different from those at the end of the Cold War. Nevertheless, taking into account these developments, we can recognize a series of images of “the other side” which became almost second nature for people in societies on both sides and making it practically impossible for anyone to have an impartial perspective on the Cold War.

The project ‘Multilateral Comparison of Cold War Perspectives’ focuses on the inevitability of subjective biased perspectives on the Cold War depending on the origin and timeframe of the scholar studying the Cold War. Therefore we have started to bundle competing perspectives. This volume contains the Cold War perspectives from respectively the United States, the Netherlands, Poland and the Soviet Union. These articles served as the texts used for a Conference held at Radboud University Nijmegen in March 2009. Students who participated in this conference contributed to the project by presenting their results of the Conference assignment. All students analyzed an example of news coverage (article or video footage) about a Cold War event in their home country. They tried to place the news coverage in its political context and focused on the question how and to what extent the news was biased or not. Besides making this analysis, students interviewed a person from their home country about one or more Cold War event. Interviewees had different backgrounds, like a high school teacher, a diplomat, an air force pilot, or a peace movement volunteer. Students covered topics like: Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, the Iranian Hostage Crisis, Polish Propaganda Movies, French withdrawal from NATO in 1966, the Cold War through the eyes of the American Peace Movement, the 1956 Budapest Uprising, etc.

In total, 39 students participated, originating from 14 different countries (the United States, Spain, the Netherlands, France, Germany, Austria, Sweden, Denmark, Poland, Slovakia, Czech Republic, Romania, Hungary and Greece).

As part of its ongoing plans, the project will entail similar conferences in the near future, delivering more news analysis and more interview reports in order to enrich the project database. The project aims at a broad representation of perspectives. Therefore we will be looking for students and scholars from various countries to participate in this project.



This compilation of articles forms the basis from which we started. It is written by five scholars, each focusing on the Cold War from the perspective of their home country.

Jaclyn Stanke, Lee Trepanier and Maryna Bessonova (Soviet Union/Ukraine) focus on the perceptions of the Cold War's main participants, the Soviet Union and the United States (with Trepanier focusing on a Northern view with a study of Michigan and Stanke focusing on the Southern view). Spasimir Domaradzki and Rob Verhofstad take on the perspective of Cold War junior partners, with Domaradzki and Verhofstad focusing on Poland and the Netherlands respectively.



Rob Verhofstad

## The Netherlands During The Cold War: an Ambivalent Friendship and a Firm Enmity

The Cold War caused quite some fear in the Netherlands. Maybe not right after the end of the Second World War when the Dutch population was pre-occupied with rebuilding the country after five years of devastation. Poverty was the main enemy in these first years, and the fear of a reviving Germany. However, after the Berlin Blockade in 1948 and the overthrow of the Czechoslovakian government by the Soviets in the same year, the fear of the Communist enemy grew. The callous crush of the Budapest uprising revealed the seriousness of the eminent threats upon the Netherlands. Dutch foreign policy dangled between protecting its interests in their disengaging colonies and defending against new threats. The Dutch found the United States against them while it was finding a new relationship with its former colonies. At the same time they underestimated the indispensability of the United States as a leader of the Western bloc.

### How the Cold War arrived in the Netherlands

The Second World War made it clear to everyone in the Netherlands that pre-war foreign policy needed to be changed. Before Germany invaded the Netherlands in 1940, the Dutch relied on its neutral position in Europe. This position was based on the assumption that the balance of power between the United Kingdom, Germany and France would prevent any of these Great Powers from invading the Netherlands. After all, none other powers would grant another Great Power permission to acquire the Netherlands. It also became clear that the last line of Dutch defense: inundation of polders became practically worthless after the introduction of air force as a main military operation.

Already during the Second World War the United States proved to be the strongest nation in the world not only militarily, but economically as well. The Soviet Union posed itself as the other world power, whereas the European Great Powers had to acknowledge that their dominion had severely decreased.

Dutch neutrality had to be discarded. Instead, the Netherlands had to adopt a new foreign policy reckoning with the new balance of power. Clearly the Dutch were not keen on leaning towards the Soviet Union. Before the War broke out, the Dutch were very disapproving of the Soviet Union and of Communism in general. The critical attitude toward Communism was somewhat mitigated because of the eminent role Communists played in the resistance against the Nazis. This gave Communism and the Communist Party of the Netherlands (CPN) some credits. In the first parliamentary elections after the Second World War in 1946, the CPN got more than 10% of the seats in the Second Chamber. Never before and never again, would they have such massive support. Despite lenience toward Communism in the first years after the War, the preponderant feeling was that the Dutch had to rely on an Atlantic orientation, focusing on United States leadership. Parallel to this Atlantic orientation, the Dutch invested in European economic cooperation as they became one of the six founding fathers of European Integration.

Right after Germany and Japan were defeated there was no necessity for a coalition between the United States and the Soviet Union. The conflict of interest and the ideological contradistinction between the superpowers became increasingly apparent. Europe was divided into two spheres of influence with an Iron Curtain in between. The introduction of the Marshall Plan (officially the European Recovery Program) cemented the Netherlands distinctively into the western sphere of influence. In total the Dutch received more than 1,100 million dollars in aid from the United States. This economic assistance in addition to Dutch gratitude for the American role in liberating the Netherlands from the German occupation formed the basis of a long-lasting alliance.

The Berlin blockade of 1948 and the overthrow of the democratic government in Czechoslovakia by Communist one-party rule in the same year led to an increased fear of Communism in the Netherlands. Indeed, it fostered the support for the Treaty of Brussels as a bulwark against the Communist threat and it was a precursor to NATO in which the Netherlands participated since its foundation in 1949.

## Protection against the Red Threat

NATO was the main line of defense for the Netherlands ever since its foundation in 1949. The Netherlands seemed to have no problems with the leading role the United States took right from the start. Within the Netherlands there had not been

much discussion about joining NATO. With the exception of CPN all political parties supported ratification. The fact that the Dutch defense was now imbedded in a North Atlantic defense strategy did not mean that there were no disagreements.

The United States had decided in the late 40s that the western allies would not be able to hold off the Red Army in case they would start a conventional attack. Therefore, the U.S. proposed a strategy of 'Peripheral Defense'. This implied that the allied troops would gradually retreat behind the Rhine, and hold out until the moment the Red Army arrived. Conventional warfare would be avoided by a further retreating to the United Kingdom. The Netherlands did not want to sacrifice the entire country and thought that an alternative defense line had to be developed. In 1951 the Netherlands, therefore, started to build the IJssel-line: a large scale waterway infrastructure project using the well-tried technique of inundation. The idea was to dam the main rivers Waal and Neder-Rijn in case the Red Army attempted to undertake a conventional attack. By damming the main rivers, the water could be pushed through the river IJssel leading to the IJsselmeer. The river IJssel unable to absorb the enormous amount of water, would flood. The infrastructural project would imply numerous landscape interventions like dikes and inlets to materialize expanses of water of the right depth: on the one hand not too shallow so as to prevent tanks from crossing, on the other hand not too deep so as to prevent ships from sailing across.

The Soviet Union soon found out about this new defense structure while the large majority of the Dutch population only learned about the IJssel-line long after it was dismantled in the early 1960s.

## An ambivalent relation with the United States

The standard characterization of the Dutch post-war foreign policy is that they were very staunch allies of the United States. A good example of this is the information movie by Kees Stip that was broadcast by the Dutch Government in 1955. The movie was called: 'Wij leven vrij' ('we live in freedom'). In a somewhat cynical tone it holds up the fundamental differences between the Netherlands as a free country and 'certain other countries' evidently referring to the Soviet Union and its satellite states. At the end of the movie the conclusion is that the western countries had to unite to fight this threat explicitly referring to the Brussels Treaty and NATO. It also calls for understanding the need for major and long-lasting sacrifices for funding the military obligations the country had as a NATO-member.

Already from the start of NATO the Dutch share in NATO's defense expenditures was relatively high compared to that of other smaller member states. Furthermore, the Dutch always showed themselves as an opponent to the development of an European defense organization apart from NATO as wished by some of large

European nations. Rather, the Netherlands focused on a strong Atlantic alliance and was even prepared to fully hand over the decision on a nuclear attack to Washington. The Dutch were also one of the few nations that supported the United States in the United Nations operation during the Korean War.

All this points at a high level of trust in the new forms of international cooperation like NATO in order to turn the Soviet threat. But at the same time a very ponderous relation arose with the United States.

Diverging ideas about colonialism formed the origin of this controversy. After World War II had ended, the Dutch were very keen on regaining control over their colony, Dutch East Indies. The Dutch thought that this colony was pivotal for their economy. The slogan ‘Indie verloren, rampspoed geboren!’ (*‘Indies gone, prosperity done’*) was extremely popular in the Netherlands and describes well how strongly the Dutch people thought about keeping control over their colonies.

In 1945, when Japan was defeated, the nationalist leader Sukarno declared independence. In 1947–1948 the Dutch undertook military operations euphemistically referred to as ‘Politioele Acties’<sup>1</sup> in an attempt to regain control. The military operations were an enormous financial burden for the Netherlands. Furthermore, it led to an extremely isolated position since many countries disapproved of the Dutch position. The United States was very clear in criticizing the Netherlands and in supporting the Indonesian opposition. Moreover, the United States put much pressure on the Netherlands by linking the continuation of Marshall-help to their behavior in Indonesia. The Netherlands gave in to international pressure and agreed by signing the declaration of independence of Indonesia in 1949.

However, strife between the Netherlands and Indonesia continued even after the formal independence. One of the remaining conflicts was the status of New Guinea. The Netherlands refused to renunciate, which led an enduring diplomatic conflict with the United States<sup>2</sup>.

The Dutch position even hardened in 1952 when Joseph Luns became one of the two Dutch Ministers of Foreign Affairs<sup>3</sup>. Luns took a tougher stance by emphasizing that the Dutch interests in the East should not be squandered. The public opinion abundantly supported Luns in this and shared his critical attitude towards the United States. The relation even worsened when Indonesia’s President Sukarno received a most exuberant reception in Washington when he visited the United States in 1956.

---

<sup>1</sup> The term ‘Politioele Acties’ could be translated as ‘*police actions*’. This term is euphemistical because in fact there were many tens of thousands soldiers—not policemen—fighting the Indonesian Republican Troops.

<sup>2</sup> The dispute about New Guinea dragged on till 1962, when it became part of Indonesia.

<sup>3</sup> In 1952, the Netherlands had two Ministers dealing with foreign affairs. Beyen mainly focused on European politics, whereas Luns would take care of Atlantic affairs and former colonies. Reason for this unique construction was the fear of some parties that European politics would be dominated by Catholics only. Therefore they did not want the Catholic Luns on that post. Consequently Beyen was added to the team as a non-partisan.

The Suez Crisis in 1956 again led to tension between the United States and the Netherlands as the Dutch chose sides with France and the United Kingdom. The United States heavily protested against the military operations carried out by Israel, the UK and France in Egypt as a reaction to Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal. The United States blamed France and the UK of acting in a neo-colonial way and pressured them to withdraw. After the Suez Crisis had ended, the lesson could be drawn that old colonial powers like France and the UK were unable to independently steer international conflicts without the United States' consent. Throughout the conflict though, the Netherlands were staunchly at the side of the French and the UK. Reason for this outspoken position was the fact that the Dutch saw a clear link between what happened in Egypt and the developments in Indonesia. If nationalists like the Egyptian leader Nasser got their way with nationalizing assets, this would set the example for President Sukarno to do the same in Indonesia thereby harming Dutch interests.

### 1956: While Budapest burns, the Communists are dancing

Right at the moment the Suez crisis came to a climax, the Budapest uprising was crushed by Soviet troops. It became clear that the de-Stalinization process Khrushchev had started had clear limits. The Soviet Union did not allow its satellite states to disengage from the Soviet sphere of influence. The Hungarian intention to leave the Warsaw-pact was unacceptable for Moscow and led to a heavy-handed operation to restore the Soviet control over Hungary.

As in more West-European countries, this led to fierce indignation in the Netherlands. In several demonstrations many people loudly protested against Soviet actions. The anger of the protesters directed mainly toward the Dutch Communist party CPN and their newspaper, 'De Waarheid' (*'truth'*). The sharpest clash occurred on the November 4, 1956. Protesters gathered in front of the Communist Center in Amsterdam, 'Felix Meritis'. In this Amsterdam building not only the CPN had its base; it also housed the editors and the printing press of the newspaper 'De Waarheid'. Right at the moment the protesters arrived, they could hear the music playing at the weekly dance-evening of the ANJV, an organization for young Communists. This infuriated the protesters even more: "While Budapest burns, the Communists are dancing!"

After a few days the protests against Communism mitigated, but generally the Dutch attitude toward Communism hardened. Communist representatives were politically isolated. For a while many non-Communist members of Parliament ostentatiously left the Second Chamber of the Parliament when a member of the CPN took the word. The events in 1956 also stopped Communism from being fashionable. Before 1956 there were several intellectuals, artists etc. who would pose them-

selves as Communists, but most of them distanced from the events in Budapest and afterward stopped labeling themselves as Communists. Nevertheless, the hard-core members of the CPN entrenched themselves in defending the Soviet action against the reactionary anti-revolutionary forces in Budapest.

Despite massive indignation, there was not much the Dutch Government was doing to influence the international events taking place. It became clear that the Eisenhower Administration was not going to risk World War III over Budapest, regardless of their proclaimed strategy of Roll Back Communism. The Dutch government decided to boycott the Olympic Games in Melbourne taking place in that same year. Only two more countries (Spain and Switzerland) decided to do the same. Beside this boycott, however, there were no actions taken other than admitting approximately 3,400 Hungarian refugees into the Netherlands.

The Dutch government and its population came to the conclusion that the *Red Threat* was not to be underestimated. The events in Budapest showed the real face of Communism, and therefore precautions had to be taken. The Dutch civil defense organization 'Bescherming Bevolking' (*peoples protection*) already established in 1952 took a more prominent role after 1956. More than 160,000 volunteers participated in drills and preparations for a possible attack by the Red Army. They focused on a nuclear attack. At that time, but even more afterwards there was quite some criticism about the real effect these actions would have in case of an attack. Perhaps the actions of Bescherming Bevolking primarily functioned as a comforter rather than an effective defense or rescue method.

## Vietnam protests in the Netherlands: Johnson Miller!

In April 1966 a protest song 'Welterusten Mijnheer de President' (Goodnight Mr. President) written by Lennaert Nijgh and sung by a protest singer Boudewijn de Groot entered the charts. It is cynically addressed (to) President Johnson of the United States asking him if he slept well at night knowing what goes on in Vietnam. It became an extremely popular protest song and was a prelude to the massive protests against the U.S. war against North-Vietnam.

The Dutch government officially backed the United States in their Vietnam strategy, but never gave in to requests by the United States to send Dutch troops to Vietnam. The Dutch government and especially Minister of Foreign Affairs Luns had not forgotten about the American opposition in the debate about Indonesia. They surely were not keen on saving the Americans now in this other Asian country. The government kept an ambivalent attitude towards the United States.

The Dutch popular protest grew; more people resented the Vietnam War and especially the role that the United States played in it. The protests against Vietnam



coincided with the general protests by leftist people against the political establishment. A tide of political renewal changed the political landscape. New political parties appeared and the protest generation of the sixties made itself heard. The police did not know exactly how to deal with these protests. When protesters chanted that Johnson was a murderer, the police arrested protesters for insulting a befriended Head of State. Consequently, the protesters changed their slogan from Johnson Moordenaar (Johnson killer) into Johnson Molenaar (Johnson miller). This confused the authorities who had a hard time adjusting to the 60s anyway. Despite the sometimes spectacular demonstrations and cultural manifestations, there was only a very limited influence on the general public. The demonstrations were relatively small scaled with no more than 15,000 people at its peak. Furthermore, in 1968 there was still a vast majority (65%) of the Dutch population who thought that the American presence in Vietnam was justified.

The second wave of anti-Vietnam demonstrations occurred in 1972 as a reaction to the 'Christmas Bombardments' as they were called. On that occasion more than 50,000 people demonstrated against the Nixon Administration.<sup>4</sup> This second wave of demonstrations coincided with a new generation of Foreign Ministers. Luns had been the Foreign Minister from 1956 until 1971. Throughout these years, he embodied the ambivalence felt toward the United States. He had had fierce disputes with the United States about Indonesia, New Guinea and the Suez Crisis. At the same time, however, he was always very clear in his position that the Netherlands needed the United States as an ally. Despite the conflicts he had with the United States, he made it very clear that ultimately the Dutch would support them. This was also the reason for him to refuse more than once to convey the protest of the Dutch Parliament about the Vietnam War to the U.S. President. Luns' successors at Foreign Affairs, Mr. Schmelzer and even more Mr. van der Stoel, changed the Dutch relationship with the United States. These Ministers were not very hesitant in voicing the Dutch Parliament's widespread disapproval about Vietnam. Furthermore, the Social Democratic Minister van der Stoel alienated the Americans even more by the decision to provide development aid to countries, like Cuba, regarded as unfriendly towards the United States.

### Rather a Russian in my kitchen...

Despite President Carter's original point of departure, the arms race increased during his Presidency. Around 1976 the Soviets had installed numerous SS-20 nuclear missiles on several missile sites spread over Eastern European countries. These missiles were aimed at Western Europe. In 1979 NATO decided to deploy missiles

---

<sup>4</sup> Some estimates even assume there were up to 100,000 protesters participating in the demonstrations.

in Western Europe in attempt to counter these Soviet SS-20 missiles. The NATO asked the Dutch government to allow missiles to be placed on the Dutch territory as well. The Dutch government had no objections, but the public protests were of an unprecedented scale, more than 550,000 demonstrators at its peak on October 29, 1983. More than 3.75 million people, a quarter of the population, signed the petition against the missile placements. These demonstrations did not necessarily protest against the United States, but more against the Dutch government blindly following a NATO-request, rather than listening to its citizens. However, despite the criticism about the missiles deployment, the Dutch population still backed NATO-membership. Even in 1983, when the protests peaked, no more than 20% of the population favored leaving the alliance.

Contrary to the anti-Vietnam protests in the 60s and 70s, public opinion now deviated strongly from the position the government took. The massive protests resulted in a very long decision-making process. The Dutch consensus style prevented the Dutch government from simply making a decision against the will of a majority of the population, but on the other hand did not want to let down the other NATO-members either. They were particularly sensitive to the disapproval from the United States. The Dutch Government announced that they would need much time to make a final decision. The NATO granted the Netherlands 2 more years to come to a conclusion.

Domestically the decision about placing the missiles caused quite some political turmoil. Formerly, especially before the 70s, foreign policy had not been a prominent politicized issue. But more and more a distinction between 'right' and 'left' positions emerged when it was about foreign policy. The 'right' political parties inclined toward warm relationships with the United States and strong support for NATO, whereas the 'left' political parties were far more critical of the Atlantic alliance. This demarcation line sometimes even split political parties, like the Social Democratic party where the more Atlantic oriented members fiercely disagreed with the more progressive wing. Within the newly merged Christian Democratic Party the conservative party line clashed with the more evangelical branches linked to the Peace Movement. Ever since the 70s the Parliament took a more proactive role in the foreign policy of the Netherlands.

Beside the heated discussions in the political discourse, it also had its manifestation on a cultural level. Protest singer, Armand, wrote a song in which he proclaimed he would rather share his country with the Russians (Soviets) than live in a garrison state. His slogan 'Liever een Rus in m'n keuken dan een raket m'n tuin' (*rather a Russian in my kitchen than a missile in my back yard*) was often used in the numerous peace-demonstrations in the 80s. Then by the end of 1982 pop group 'Doe Maar' had a number 1-hit with 'De Bom' (*The Bomb*) with the underlying message: 'What's the point of making a career, doing your homework when a nuclear bomb can drop at any moment?' These songs reflect the grim world view many people

tended to have those days because of the dead-end arms race taking place between the super powers. The hit 'Over de Muur' (*Across the Wall*) by 'Klein Orkest' in 1986 points at the absurd division of Berlin by a wall and claims that both sides are kept hostage by their own system. In most of the cultural expressions of the eighties, the anger and incomprehension did not focus on the Soviets as the declared enemy but rather on the undefined systems that kept the Cold War going on. Songs and other cultural outlets, express the fear that mankind will not be able to control the enormous and ever increasing armory which one day might destroy us all.

Nevertheless, public opinion surveys show that in the late 70s and 80s nuclear weapons and East-West relations in general had little priority.<sup>5</sup> Domestic problems in the field of social and economic policy scored (a) far higher on the list of priorities.

Due to this complex domestic debate, two years were not enough to find a consensus in the Netherlands. This frustrated the other NATO-members who called this inability to make a decision 'Hollanditis.' Finally, Ruud Lubbers, the Dutch Prime Minister at the time, came up with the solution: the Netherlands would reject the NATO missiles in case the Soviets did not increase their number of SS-20 missiles by 1 November 1985. Only if the Soviets had increased their number of missiles, the Netherlands would have placed the cruise missiles. This led to disbelief and incomprehension among the western allies as this meant that it was now Moscow who would decide if the Dutch would place NATO-missiles or not. Thanks to the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty signed by Reagan and Gorbachev in 1987 the missiles were never actually placed.

By the time it became clear that the Eastern European nations were disengaging from the Soviet Union (1989) succeeded by the implosion of the Soviet Union itself (1991), the Netherlands was solidly back to its irrefutable Atlantic orientation. Once more the Dutch posed themselves against a European defense organization loose from NATO. This was a prelude to the Dutch foreign policy in the post-Cold War period.

## Conclusion: A policy of fear

One main characteristics of the Cold War was that it divided the world into two spheres of influence. Throughout all the Cold War years it was clear that the Netherlands always belonged to the western camp, with the United States as its hegemonic leader. Nevertheless, this did not mean that the Netherlands uncritically followed the United States in all cases. During the period right after World War II until the beginning of the 50s, there had been many serious disputes about the decoloniza-

---

<sup>5</sup> R.C. Eichenberg, *The Myth of Hollanditis*, "International Security" 1983 (Vol. 8, No. 2), referring to NIPO-surveys for public opinion 1977 to 1982.

tion of Indonesia and New Guinea, and about the position the Dutch took in the Suez crisis.

However, these disputes were always overshadowed by a more serious hazard: the threat of a Red Army invasion. For the Dutch it was very clear that without the support of the United States Europe was defenseless against the Soviet Union. Therefore, the Atlantic Alliance was indispensable. Additionally, the good relationship with the United States was also supportive for the power balance in Europe. Logically, a small nation like the Netherlands was afraid of domination by the great European powers. In respect of this, a powerful friend overseas was most instrumental. Lastly, the Dutch never forgot their gratitude toward the Americans for playing a pivotal role in liberating their country in World War II and for their Marshall Help.

Through the years, the fear of a Communist conquest increased and with it the fundamental choice of the Western camp, while the consensus about Dutch foreign policy decreased. From the 70s onward, the Dutch foreign policy became a domestic political issue. Discussion about the Atlantic Alliance mounted, and the discord split the public and it even split political parties. Nevertheless, even during the peak of protests against the placement of missiles in 1983, the public support of the Atlantic Alliance was never fundamentally questioned by the majority of (the) population, not even by the sizeable minority.

At times the Dutch government must have signed for the complex decisions that had to be made concerning their foreign policy. But the real foreign policy brain twisters emerged only after Moscow stopped being a conceivable threat to the West. It then became clear that the Dutch foreign policy throughout the Cold War had been guided by fear: fear of the Soviet Union, and that new guidelines had to be found or developed for the Post Cold War period.

## References

Ambrose, S.E., D.G. Brinkley. *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy since 1938*. (New York: Penguin Books, 1997).

Andeweg, R.B., G. A. Irwin. *Governance and Politics of the Netherlands*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

Crockatt, R. *The Fifty Years War, The United States and the Soviet Union in World Politics, 1941-1991*. (London: Taylor and Francis, 1996).

Dunbabin, J.P.D. *The Cold War, The Great Powers and their Allies*. (New York: Longman, 2008).

Eichenberg, R.C. "The Myth of Hollanditis in International Security," 1983, Vol. 8, No. 2: 143–159.

◀ The Netherlands During The Cold War: an Ambivalent Friendship and a Firm Enmity ▶

Hanhimaki, J., O.A. Westad. *The Cold War, A history in Documents and Eyewitness Accounts*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

Harbutt, F.J. *The Cold War Era*. (New York: Wiley, 2002).

Hellema, D. *Negentien zesenvijftig, De Nederlandse houding ten aanzien van de Hongaarse Revolutie en de Suezcrisis*. (Amsterdam, 1990).

Jaquet, L.G.M. *Minister Stikker en de Soevereiniteitsoverdracht aan Indonesië*. (Den Haag, 1982).

Jong, L. de *Het Koninkrijk der Nederlanden in de Tweede Wereldoorlog: Deel 12 Epiloog eerste helft + tweede helft*. (Den Haag, 1988).

Kossmann, E.H. *De Lage Landen 1780–1980, Twee eeuwen Nederland en België, Deel II: 1914–1980*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Levine, P., H. Pappasotiriou *America since 1945, The American Moment*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005).

Loeber, H. *Dutch–American Relations 1945–1969, A partnership illusions and facts*. (Assen–Maastricht, 1992).

Luns. 'Ik herinner mij'; *vrijmoedige herinneringen aan Mr. J.M.A.H. Luns zoals verteld aan Michiel van der Plas*. (Leiden, 1972).

Noort, W. van *Bevlogen bewegingen, Een vergelijking van de anti-kenrenergie-, kraak- en milieubeveging*. (Amsterdam, 1988).

Pijpers, A.E. *The Netherlands: The weakening pull of Atlanticism?* in: Ch. Hill (ed.) *The actors in Europe's Foreign Policy*. (London, 1996).

Sas, N.C.F. van, ed. *Internationale positie en buitenlands beleid in historisch perspectief*. (Bloemendaal, 1991).

Van Staden, A. "The Role of the Netherlands in the Atlantic Alliance" in: J. H. Leurdijk (ed.) *The Foreign Policy of the Netherlands*. (Alphen aan den Rijn, 1978).

Van Staden, A. et al. *De Herontdekking van de Wereld; Nederlands Buitenlands Beleid in Revisie*. (Den Haag, 2004).

Verhofstad, R. "David and Goliath; Dutch Foreign Policy: Its History and Future" in: *Yearbook Sipan* 2005, 211–224.

Verhofstad, R. "The Netherlands and European Integration: From 'Pro' to 'No,'" *Krakowskie Studia Międzynarodowe* 2007, No. 2: 207–219.

Voorhoeve, J.J. C. *Peace, Profits and Principles: A study of Dutch Foreign Policy*. (The Hague, 1979).

Wiebes, C., B. Zeeman. "I don't need your handkerchiefs'; Holland's experience of crisis consultation in NATO," *International Affairs* 1990, Vol. 66, No. 1: 91–113.

Wesseling, H.L. "Post-Imperial Holland," *Journal of Contemporary History*. 1980, Vol. 15: 125–142.

Zubok, V.M. *A Failed Empire: The Soviet Union in the Cold War from Stalin to Gorbachev*. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

Spasimir Domaradzki

## The Polish Perspective of American Foreign Policy: Selected Moments from the Cold War Era

### Introduction

Bipolarity in international relations was the main characteristic of the Cold War Era. The world was divided between two opposing political, economic and military blocs. The Soviet Union installed communist regimes in most of the European countries after the Second World War in Central and Eastern Europe. This process was condemned by the United States and its Western European allies, but little was done to oppose the process of installment of pro-Soviet governments. Eventually, in 1947, President Harry Truman initiated the policy of containment which aimed at preventing Greece and Turkey from falling into the sphere of Soviet influence. This policy also included a significant financial contribution for the reconstruction of a destroyed Europe. Though the range of the Marshall Plan was intended to include Poland and Czechoslovakia, these two countries rejected the offer. In this decision they had been strongly influenced by Moscow which offered financial and material contributions for the reconstruction of countries from Central Europe. Steadily the world was splitting into two parts, divided by different political, ideological, economic and social approaches.

Who rules in Poland?

Or, how the country became a Soviet satellite

During the process of formation of the post World War II order, Poland's destiny became one of the elements in the geopolitical puzzle. The situation on the battle-

field in Europe directly influenced the negotiations between the allies. Although the Third Reich was defeated on all fronts, it appeared that even the issue of who would enter Berlin first became an important strategic goal. It was perceived as an argument for stronger claims concerning Europe's future.

The Soviet army went through Poland on its way to Berlin. In July 1944 Joseph Stalin promoted the installment of the Polish Committee of National Liberation.<sup>1</sup> The structure of this Communist-appointed provisional government was created in Moscow. Stalin's idea was to establish a new status quo, one which would weaken the position of the Polish government in exile (in London) and give Moscow a stronger position during the negotiations on the future of Europe. On August 1, 1944, the Warsaw uprising led by the Home Army (*Armia Krajowa*) began.<sup>2</sup> Its aim was to liberate the Polish capital from German forces before the arrival of the Soviet army. In order to prevent its success, Stalin ordered the Red Army to stop on the right bank of the Vistula River and to wait until the defeat of the last Home Army units. The consequences for the city and its inhabitants were terrifying. The Germans ruined approximately 90% of the city and the casualties are estimated at around 150,000–200,000.

During the “Big Three” meeting in Yalta, the Polish question was one of the important issues concerning the postwar future.<sup>3</sup> The final declaration revealed the compromise made between Winston Churchill, Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin on that matter. The provisions of the declaration concerning Poland started with the statement that Poland was liberated by the Red Army, but also required the establishment of a Polish provisional government broader in its scope than the already existing Polish Committee of National Liberation.<sup>4</sup> The Commission of Good Services (as W. Roszkowski calls it), consisting of representatives from the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain (Viacheslav Molotov, Averell Harriman and Sir Archibald Clark Kerr), was supposed to oversee the changes in the PCNL such that the provisional government would include Poles in exile and those from the territories to be liberated. Stalin agreed to free elections (which were never held).<sup>5</sup> Upon Soviet request it was decided that only democratic and anti-Nazi parties could participate.

---

<sup>1</sup> The first official headquarters of the Polish Committee of National Liberation (PCNL) was established in Lublin on August 1, 1944. The PCNL claimed to be the only legal representative of the Poles and proposed radical social, economic and political changes.

<sup>2</sup> More information about the Home Army and the Warsaw uprising can be found at: <http://www.warsawuprising.com/> (accessed March 3, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> W. Roszkowski, *Półwiecze. Historia polityczna świata po 1945 r.* (Warszawa: PWN, 2002), 14.

<sup>4</sup> Provision VII of the Yalta Conference Declaration. The whole text is available at: <http://www.taiwandocuments.org/yalta.htm> (accessed March 3, 2009).

<sup>5</sup> In 1947, parliamentary elections were held in Poland, but they were never recognized as free and fair by the United States and Great Britain. More on this issue below in text.



This vague description later allowed the Soviets to manipulate the political situation in Poland.<sup>6</sup>

These arbitrary decisions were in clear violation of the principles of the Atlantic charter, signed by W. Churchill and F. D. Roosevelt on August 12, 1941, two of which directly concerned the situation of countries like Poland.<sup>7</sup> The provisions stated that no territorial changes were to be made without the consent of the countries concerned and that the rights to self-determination and form of government should be respected.<sup>8</sup> This idealistic approach was subsequently replaced by the Western allies with a much more pragmatic stance.

The idea behind the establishment of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity was that it would receive the recognition of all the members of the “Big Three”. Although all the participants at Yalta agreed to this, each interpreted the conclusions in its own way. The Soviet Union had achieved *de facto* control over Poland by diminishing the role of the Polish government in exile. The relations between them were cold since the discovery of the mass graves of Polish police and army members in the Katyn Forest in 1943. The Polish government-in-exile requested an international commission of the Red Cross to examine the case. The final report suggested that the mass murder was committed by the Soviet NKVD (Peoples Commissariat for Internal Affairs). Bearing in mind the importance of relations with Moscow at the time, Washington and London estimated that it was more important to decrease the level of support for the Polish government in London than to confront Stalin on that particular matter. Since a new effective power appeared in Poland with the introduction in 1944 of the PCNL, the Soviet Union managed to decrease further the role of the Polish government in exile—even in the eyes of the Western allies. The fact that the PCNL was created in Moscow was less important.

With the recognition of the *fait accompli* in Eastern Europe, Washington and London paid the price for the involvement of the Red army in the war with Japan.<sup>9</sup> Yalta became the symbol of the new world order. It was based on the tacit consent of the establishment in spheres of influence around the world. The lack of clarity in the Yalta decisions was useful for the Soviet Union, which interpreted the agreements instrumentally.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> M.K. Kamiński, *W obliczu sowieckiego ekspansjonizmu. Polityka Stanów Zjednoczonych i Wielkiej Brytanii wobec Polski i Czechosłowacji 1945–1948*. (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2005), 34.

<sup>7</sup> W. Roszkowski, *op. cit.* 14.

<sup>8</sup> Articles. 2 and 3 of the Atlantic Charter. Text of the document can be found at: <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/wwii/atlantic.asp> (accessed August 3, 2008).

<sup>9</sup> W. Roszkowski, *op. cit.* 14.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* 15.

## The territorial issue or the milestone of Polish dependence

Slightly over two weeks after the beginning of the Second World War with the invasion by Germany of Poland in accordance with the agreements of the secret German–Russian pact (Ribbentrop–Molotov) on September 17, 1939, the Soviet Union invaded Poland from the East. The Polish troops were ordered not to fight against the Soviet Army. Still, random clashes between Polish and Soviet forces took place. With the end of the war activities Poland was *de facto* divided between Hitler and Stalin. The German invasion of the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941 invalidated the German–Soviet agreement on Poland.

In the course of the war in Europe it became clear that the shape of Poland after the war would be an open issue. Again the principles laid in the Atlantic Charter were left aside. During the conference in Teheran (November 28–December 1, 1943) “the big three” decided the shape of the Eastern Polish border on the so called Curzon line without the consent of the Polish government in exile.

This concession to Stalin’s demands was the price paid for his commitment in other parts of the world and his obligation to support Turkey against possible Bulgarian attack. Stalin was aware that the results of the war on the Eastern front strengthened his position during the meetings with the western allies. In October 1944 Stalin proposed that the influence of the great powers in Central Europe be shared among the big three in percentage. The Soviet Union was supposed to obtain 90 % in Romania, 75 % in Bulgaria, 50 % in Yugoslavia and Hungary. As Wojciech Roszkowski points out rightly “...the future of Eastern Europe was determined long before Yalta...” The words of Churchill “...we need to remember that on the occupied territories the Soviets will do more or less what they want...” are the most clear example of the awareness of the western allies of the real Soviet intensions.<sup>11</sup>

During the Potsdam Conference in 1945 the post war status quo in Europe was settled. Among the priorities were two issues: the future of Germany and the shape of the post war Polish state. In first place The Soviet Union, United States and Great Britain recognized the existing Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, though it was already controlled by the communists. Thus the Polish government in exile was passed over. Stalin proposed establishment of the western Polish border on Oder–Neisse line and was supported by the Polish government, which argued that this acquisition is needed compensation for the eastern territorial losses and was an indispensable area for the resettlement of 4,000,000 Poles from the territories gained by the Soviet Union.

Throughout 1945 the United States and Great Britain started to recognize the danger of Stalin’s actions. Although Soviet involvement in the war against Japan

---

<sup>11</sup> J.F. Burnes, *Roosevelt, Truman and the Origin of the Cold War*. (Chapel Hill: 1982), 42. See also: N. Davies, *God’s Playground: A History of Poland*. (Oxford University Press 2005, Vol. 2).

was needed, Truman and Churchill and later Clement Atlee steadily decided to decrease the amount of concessions to Stalin. Thus, Poland's western border issue became one of the first omens of the Cold War. The Brits, in agreement with the Polish government in exile, conditioned the recognition of the border on two issues: free elections in Poland and safe return for the Polish soldiers from the Western front. The Soviet Union adhered to these conditions aware of its full control over the situation in Poland. Truman though, saw Germany as the dike that could stop the Soviet invasion in Europe. From his point of view too weak Germany would not be able to hold the line. Therefore, the U.S. delegation refused to recognize the Polish–German border.

Eventually, it was decided that the final shape of the Polish–German border be settled in the peace treaty between the two countries. This decision pushed Poland into the sphere of Soviet influence due to the fact that the only guarantee of Polish territorial integrity was Stalin and his communist principles. It also determined the negative attitude of the new Polish authorities toward the United States. Probably the most permanent priority of Warsaw for the next over forty years was to achieve irrefutable international recognition of its western border. This became an inseparable element of the Polish foreign policy until 1989.

It would be naïve to believe that the territorial uncertainty was the only matter to push Poland into the arms of Stalin. The Polish communists needed more than three years to stabilize the power in their hands. They used all the methods of repression already tested in the Soviet Union to defeat the political opposition. In 1946 a referendum was held with three questions constructed by the communists in a manner that would request approval of all three issues. The questions considered the abolition of the Senate (higher chamber of the Polish parliament), consolidation in the future constitution of the economic system through agricultural reform and nationalization and the consolidation of the western border. The communists promoted the answer yes to all three questions.<sup>12</sup> The referendum was held on June 30, 1946. The results were falsified by the communists who by that time already controlled most of the government structures and had the support of the Polish Army and the Red Army on Polish territory. The government announced the official results which gave legal basis for structural and ideological changes in Polish society.

A year later parliamentary elections were held. The elections can hardly be called fair and democratic since the right–wing political parties were banned from participation under the accusation of being pro Nazi. This rule at least supposedly, was in accordance with the provisions of the “big three” conferences in Yalta and Potsdam. The various parties were gathered in the so called “Democratic bloc” controlled by the communists. According to the official results more than 80% voted for that bloc.

---

<sup>12</sup> The referendum is known in Polish history as 3xYES.

In 1948 the communists completed the process of elimination of all political opposition with the composition of the Polish United Workers Party (PUWP) which ruled the country until 1989. Only two other parties United Agrarian Party (*Zjednoczone Stronnictwo Ludowe*) and Democratic Party (*Stronnictwo Demokratyczne*) were allowed to exist as a screen for the preservation of the slogan of democracy. Though different in name they unanimously supported the line of PUWP.

In the peak of the Stalinism new Polish constitution was passed on July 22, 1952 and the People's Republic of Poland was established. The constitution was based on the Soviet Constitution of 1936 and introduced totally new political, social and economic principles in accordance with the communist ideology. The constitution of 1952 was only confirmation of the status quo established by the communists from 1945. With the third biggest army in Europe, Poland was one of the closest Soviet satellites and important factor in the Eastern bloc.

Apart from the question about the ideological orientation of Poland the post war shape of the country became the primary topic of concern for the Polish authorities. No other Eastern European country suffered so strongly the consequences of Stalin's aspirations for territorial gains. As a result of the II world war Poland lost approximately one fourth of its territory to the Soviet Union and was moved westwards without any international recognition.<sup>13</sup>

## Polish–American relations as derivative of the Cold War

As it was previously mentioned, the bilateral relations between Warsaw and Washington during the Cold War were directly linked to the climate in the relations between the East and the West. The apogee of the Cold War led to the most difficult and gloomy relations between the United States and Poland in their history.<sup>14</sup>

Although on April 24, 1946, Poland and United States signed an agreement of economic and financial cooperation, the bilateral relations were deteriorating. In September of the same year, Secretary of State James Byrnes declared that the German borders were still to be settled and represented the view that the territory east of the Oder–Neisse line was only temporarily under Polish administration.<sup>15</sup>

The process of eliminating the opposition in Poland was officially condemned in the United States. Neither the referendum of 1946 nor the elections of 1947 results were recognized. In response, the government in Warsaw used every occasion to emphasize the attempts to interfere in the Poland's internal matters. During the

---

<sup>13</sup> In comparison to 1938 Poland lost 77,700 sq. km. W. Bonusiak, *Historia Polski 1944–1989*. (Rzeszów: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, 2007), 15.

<sup>14</sup> L. Pastusiak, *Stosunki polsko-amerykańskie 1945–1955*. (Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek, 2004), 12.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*

conviction of members of the Home Army and other anti-communist underground movements, one of the often used accusations was subversive activity and cooperation with Western imperialism. As a result, the economic cooperation between Poland and the U.S. almost disappeared. In 1951, Washington broke off the treaty on the basis that Warsaw had obtained the Most Favored Nation clause in 1931.

Probably the most remarkable international initiative in which Poland was involved during the period of Stalin's rule was the selection of Poland (together with Czechoslovakia) to participate in the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission established on the basis of the Korean Armistice Agreement in July 1953. Since the sides in the Korean War had the right to nominate two neutral states, the Korean People's Army and Chinese People's Volunteers chose the People's Republic of Poland. Obviously, the notion of neutrality was sifted through the sieve of ideological similarity.

Stalin's death in 1953 led to the beginning of a new era. After few years of internal fights Nikita Khrushchev gained absolute control over the Soviet empire. After the twentieth Congress of the Soviet Union Communist Party which started the process of destalinization and the thaw between the U.S. and the USSR, Poland proposed at the United Nations the establishment of a denuclearized zone in Europe (Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany – Deutsche Demokratische Republik, also DDR) and West Germany (Bundesrepublik Deutschland, also FRG). This initiative, though idealistic, also had a practical propaganda application. If accepted by the West, NATO would not be able to deploy nuclear weapons in Germany. Since the West refused to comply, the communists underlined one more time the militarist and aggressive attitude of NATO.

The thaw in the relations between the East and the West created the needed background for dialog between Warsaw and Washington DC. Nevertheless, communist propaganda continued to explain every action of the United States in conformity with the Soviet interpretation. The *novum* was that the Soviet bloc substituted the concept of confrontation with the concept of peaceful coexistence. This boosted the bilateral relations which led to a new era in the seventies. In general, the seventies were the détente decade and this led to an intensification of the contacts between Warsaw and Washington. Nixon's visit to Poland in 1972 resulted in enhancement of economic, cultural, scientific and technological cooperation. The subsequent visits of high level officials (Edward Gierek to United States in 1974, Jimmy Carter to Poland in 1977) were unprecedented examples of the realization of the policy of peaceful coexistence.<sup>16</sup> Although Poland did not miss a chance to declare its devotion to Moscow, the financial difficulties of the Soviet Union were interpreted in Warsaw (and also in other satellite capitals) as permission to search for other possibilities to overcome the economic disturbances.

---

<sup>16</sup> Edward Gierek was the First Secretary of the Polish United Workers Party 1970–1980.

The Soviet invasion in Afghanistan interrupted the trend and stiffened the positions of both sides.

The implementation of martial law in Poland in December 1981 and the condemnation of this act by the Reagan administration led to the end of the process of cooperation. During the eighties, Washington applied the dual track approach toward Poland. On the one side the U.S. condemned the introduction of martial law and announced an embargo on Poland. The other supported the repressed and prosecuted opposition and sympathized with the Poles. This policy was changed only after the end of communism and the creation of the first non-communist government with Tadeusz Mazowiecki as prime minister.

## The meaning of the words

According to communist propaganda, the defeat of the West in the ideological clash was dependent on the solution of the eternal fight of good and evil. All initiatives of the Soviet bloc were described in bright, friendly and trustful words leading to a conviction that the good had finally ruled part of the world. Though optimistic, the propaganda constantly emphasized that there was still an enemy to defeat, an enemy who wished to destroy and annihilate the achievements of the quest for equal rights and a brighter future. In the words of the famous Soviet newspaper *Izwestija* from June 22, 1972 “...Between the Soviet Union and the United States as between socialist and capitalist states, even if best international relations exist, axiomatic ideological war will be held... Between the USSR and the U.S. just like between socialism and capitalism, there is an unavoidable rivalry in many fields—in economy, science and technology etc.”<sup>17</sup>

In order to understand the perception and interpretations of American foreign policy by the communist regime in Poland, it needs to be emphasized that the regime used specific vocabulary. The notion of the external enemy played a pivotal role in “communist slang,” which was an indispensable element of the communist perception of the world. Mariusz Mazur enumerates the imperialism, the Western German threat, Zionism, the hostile Western mass media (Radio Free Europe, Voice of America etc) and the anti-democratic, anti-socialist and anti-peace forces.<sup>18</sup> The ideological threat of American imperialism was present constantly in communist propaganda.<sup>19</sup> As Mazur accurately points out, “...the imperialism was often used

<sup>17</sup> *Wizyta Nixona w Moskwie i Warszawie, Centralny Ośrodek Dokumentacji Prasowej PAP, Rok 7.* (Warszawa: sierpień, 1972), 61–64.

<sup>18</sup> M. Mazur, *Propagandowy obraz świata. Polityczne kampanie prasowe w PRL 1956–1980.* (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio, 2003), 176.

<sup>19</sup> Mariusz Mazur writes that the ideological threat of the American imperialism was present only during the strong anti-Zionist campaign in Poland in 1968. My research on different speeches of communist leaders in the

together with the notions of revenge-seeking and Zionism.” During the apogee of the Cold War, imperialism was the key motive to explain all kinds of failures and defeats in the socialist system.

In the Polish mass media campaigns of the sixties, imperialism occurred separately only as an explanation of distant events (i.e. the War in Vietnam). Nevertheless, the sole appearance of this concept was supposed to evoke the impression of an extremely dangerous situation, threatening the sole existence of statehood and requiring immediate and radical reaction.<sup>20</sup> Still though, imperialism was excessively vague and abstract for Polish society. Furthermore, it was associated with the United States, which despite the efforts of the propaganda not necessarily had to evoke unequivocally negative emotions.<sup>21</sup> This statement receives support in the research of Piotr Ostaszewski, who in the last decade of the twentieth century examined the opinions of two generations of Poles on the Vietnam War.<sup>22</sup>

According to him, although the Polish communist propaganda tried to create positive perceptions of the Vietnamese communists, the reverse result was achieved. “...the perception of the Vietnamese communists was rather negative and the research data show that most of the Polish society was impervious to the model promoted by the official communist propaganda... The ultimate conclusion of Ostaszewski is that regardless of official communist propaganda Polish society preserved pro-American attitude.”<sup>23</sup>

Another example of the unclear meaning of official propaganda was the depiction of the rising German revisionism. On the basis of the concrete unsolved question of the Polish western border, the propaganda created the myth of the new alliance between Hitlerism and American imperialism. Yet, this was not an achievement of the Polish communists. It was only an adjusted version of Joseph Stalin’s words during the early days of the anti-West campaign in 1946 when he said “Imperialism is the second next to fascism enemy of the progressive humanity...”<sup>24</sup>

Though the notion of German revisionism was difficult to define, the communists didn’t have to look far for delivering examples of that threat. It was enough just to quote every speech from the West undermining the shape of the Polish western

---

context of the Vietnam War indicates continuous reach for this argument. See: *O pokój i bezpieczeństwo w Europie, Dokumenty narady partii komunistycznych i robotniczych Europy w Karlowych Warach, kwiecień 1967*. (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1967) or W. Góralski, *Aktualne problemy konfliktu wietnamskiego*. (“Problemy i Wydarzenia” No. 43, Komitet Warszawski PZPR, Wydział Propagandy i Agitacji, czerwiec 1969).

<sup>20</sup> M. Mazur, *op. cit.* 177–178.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>22</sup> The research focused on two groups. The first one consisted of people, who were already adults during the Vietnam War and the second was consisted of people in their twenties during the time of the research. The results are published in: P. Ostaszewski, *Amerykańska wojna w Wietnamie 1965–1973, w opinii dwóch pokoleń społeczeństwa polskiego*, Vol. 5. (Rozprawy i Materiały Ośrodka Studiów Amerykańskich Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, Warszawa: 1999).

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.* 29.

<sup>24</sup> W. Roszkowski, *op. cit.* 32.

border. Also the meaning of the word “West” was not unambiguous. This vast term often meant contradictory things. Sometimes it meant the whole “West” in terms of Western Europe and the United States or NATO, but other times it meant only the United States. This was made with the hope that the countries around the world and from Western Europe not supporting American policies would take the chance to distinguish themselves and join the “progressive world.”<sup>25</sup>

The language used by communist propaganda was specific in terms of meaning and in terms of usage. Once it could describe a particular example, case or story, another time it could reflect an unclear, vague and difficult to locate threat. Although dubious, it became the most efficient tool in the process of the creation of an atmosphere of constant threat and emergency.

## The priorities of Polish foreign policy

The emergence of the Cold War left Warsaw and Washington on both sides of the iron curtain. Since the announcement of the policy of containment, the main priority for the United States was active involvement around the globe in order to prevent the spread of communism. Thus, the bilateral relations between Poland and United States became derivative of the main stream tensions between Moscow and Washington. As Anna Mazurkiewicz mentioned “...undoubtedly, between 1947 and 1989 the relations between Warsaw and Washington in general perspective remained a function of the American–Soviet relations...”<sup>26</sup>

Polish foreign policy had its specifics during the Cold War. Although completely dependent on the priorities set up in Moscow, Warsaw’s foreign policy was in accordance with “the spirit of the time”. The main aim, according to L. Pastusiak was “...to fight in order to prevent the eruption of a new war...” The rest of the priorities concerned the recognition of the Polish western border as definitive; prevention of the rebuilding of the German revisionism, the remilitarization of Germany and settlement of the German issue in accordance with the interests of the European

---

<sup>25</sup> The final declaration of the meeting of the communist and working parties in Europe at Karlovy Vary (Czechoslovakia) in 1967 it was declared: The European allies of the United States no longer accept the contradictory to their national interests and national dignity, role of a satellite to the American imperialist gendarme, which attempts to stop the course of history and tries to stifle the independence movements around the world. The American allies see clearly that the American policy does not take into account their national interests. That Washington by making dangerous decisions about aggressions and interventions puts them at fait accompli. This creates the threat of drawing them to rows in the name of alien interests. *O pokój i bezpieczeństwo w Europie, Dokumenty narady partii komunistycznych i robotniczych Europy w Karlovych Warach, kwiecień 1967*. (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1967), 12–13.

<sup>26</sup> A. Mazurkiewicz, *Dyplomacja Stanów Zjednoczonych wobec wyborów w Polsce w latach 1947 i 1989*. (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Neriton, 2007), 282. Also L. Pastusiak, *op. cit.* 13.



security; prevention of the deterioration of the relations with western countries; protection of Polish economic interests in its relations with the West; and, last but not least, protection of the citizens of Polish descent in the West who became victims of political repressions.<sup>27</sup>

The priorities enumerated by Pastusiak reveal not only the stated issues of concern but also the ideological background. The American perception of Polish priorities was reduced to collaboration with the Soviet bloc, maintenance of present borders (i.e. along the Oder Neisse rivers in the West), and weakening the influence of the United States and its allies.<sup>28</sup>

The developments of the fifties brought the Soviet bloc to the conviction that the evil West would not be defeated easily. Therefore, the priorities were slightly modified. Richard Staar quotes Adam Rapacki's article from 1960 "Three principles of Foreign Policy" where the proletarian internationalism and unity in relations with countries of the Socialist camp has been reconfirmed.

Simultaneously, bearing in mind the process of decolonization Poland declared "solidarity with liberation and emancipation movements of nations striving to free themselves from colonial dependence..." This "friendly" position was directly linked with the fact that the process of decolonization meant decrease of the western control over vast territories in the Third world.

Finally, Rapacki underlined the "constructive struggle for peaceful coexistence in relations with all countries having different system..."<sup>29</sup> Leaving aside the logical contradiction in this sentence, it depicts the tendency to accept the achieved status quo in international relations and to search out possibilities for cooperation, where available, with the West.

The idea of cooperation had two elements: real and propaganda. The real intention was to obtain financial support for the inefficient and often utopian efforts to continue the idea of a planned economy. Whereas the propaganda element was to underline the good will and open spirit of the Communist regimes in comparison to the negative and hostile approach of the West, the communist regime in Poland quickly learned how to make use of its official propaganda from all the contacts with the United States.

The peaceful communist propaganda was not altruistic. Behind the slogans of peace, friendship, help, brotherhood and solidarity, practical goals were expected to be achieved. Władysław Gomułka's words from 1960 reveal that

The strategic goal of peaceful coexistence is the victory of socialism over capitalism on a world scale. Socialism can defeat capitalism without the

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid.

<sup>28</sup> R.F. Staar, *Poland 1944–1962: The Sovietization of a Captive People*. (Louisiana State University Press, 1962), 107.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. 108.

catastrophe of a world war. Ten to fifteen years of peace will be sufficient for socialist states to overtake the highly industrialized and economically developed capitalist states...<sup>30</sup>

Thus, the communists reached the conclusion that open war is not a possible solution of the ideological confrontation, whereas peaceful coexistence will eventually lead also to victory over capitalism.

After another decade the voice of the official Polish propaganda was even milder. During President Richard Nixon's visit to Warsaw in 1972 Polish official publications interpreted the visit as the most convincing proof for the acceptance of the status quo by the West.<sup>31</sup>

The 1960s brought about a visible improvement in Polish–American relations based on the principle of coexistence of states with different socio-economic systems.<sup>32</sup> The idea of the final victory of the communism was replaced by the notion that even official recognition of the status quo (the Polish western border and the communism in Poland) was sufficient achievement of communism. From the official statements one can easily get the impression that the Cold War was over. “But as the international tension decreased and the Cold War died down, the cooperation gradually began to be extended...”<sup>33</sup> Also, the words of the Polish Ambassador in Washington, published in the same brochure were in the same style: “President Nixon's visit to Poland was a demonstration of the practical implementation of the principle of peaceful coexistence between states with different socio-political systems, which is the basis of Polish foreign policy...”<sup>34</sup> However, the priorities remained the same and they were constantly repeated by the official propaganda with the hope that this would make the status quo stronger.

The postwar period has given Poland a new image. Poland is now a state with fixed and inviolable frontiers and an ethnically homogeneous population—a state with an active foreign policy whose voice is reckoned with in the international arena.<sup>35</sup>

During Nixon's visit in Warsaw a number of bilateral agreements concerning economic, scientific and cultural cooperation were signed. The establishment of new Consulates in Krakow and New York was agreed upon and a direct airline

---

<sup>30</sup> Gomulka was the First Secretary of the Polish Workers Party 1943–1948 and of the Polish United Workers Party 1956–1970. Władysław Gomulka's speech at Katowice on July 6, 1960 in: R.F. Staar, *op. cit.* 65.

<sup>31</sup> *President Nixon's 24 hours in Warsaw*. (Warsaw: Interpress Publishers, 1972), 16.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.* 21–22.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* 17.

was opened from Warsaw to New York. The improvement of the bilateral relations between the U.S. and Poland was possible due to the general improvement in the atmosphere between the East and the West. The intensification of the contacts between Warsaw and Washington led to the visit of Edward Gierek to the United States in October 1974. Prior to the visit the official newspaper of the Polish United Workers Party *People's Tribune* (*Trybuna Ludu*) emphasized that

This visit is a part of the larger process of relaxation, which became dominant tendency of the contemporary world. This process was initialized by the Soviet Union, Poland and other countries from the socialist commonwealth. It is simultaneously integral part and result of the policy of peaceful coexistence. In this policy the Soviet Union plays a leading role....Over the ocean the leader of our party will represent socialist Poland, bound by inseparable alliance with the Soviet Union, important cell of the socialist commonwealth, state with dynamic economic growth, active and respected on the international arena.<sup>36</sup>

The constant confirmation of the close relations with the Soviet Union was needed not only in order to emphasize the strength of the Eastern bloc but also to preventively calm down Moscow. In that respect Edward Gierek's interview for Time Magazine delivered irrefutable arguments. First of all "...the *only country that helped us* [Poland–S.D.] *after WWII was the Soviet Union...*" However, in the context of the CSCE conference and the East–West relations, the Polish leader emphasized that "...we are not afraid of anything that will come from the West with the exception of some moral phenomenon like drug addiction etc..."<sup>37</sup>

The Polish priorities in bilateral relations seemed unchanged. Poland was pressuring for closer economic cooperation. Under the cover of the American fascination with Polish achievements, Gierek hoped to receive strong financial support.<sup>38</sup> The propaganda emphasized that Poland was the second biggest economic partner to the U.S. after the Soviet Union from the Eastern bloc and the only country from the bloc to obtain the most preferable nation clause in trade with the U.S. The

<sup>36</sup> *Gierek's visit to US*, Centralny ośrodek dokumentacji prasowej przy PAP, Rok 14. (Warszawa: 1974), 7/100, 15.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* 19–23.

<sup>38</sup> In this respect the Polish Information Agency (PAP) quoted the NBC program „Today”: "...In times when we are facing difficulties caused by the inflation, Poland under E. Gierek's rule experiences unusual development. E. Gierek was depicted as "the architect of Poland's recent development." GDP in Poland rises 11% per year" ...the striking modernity of Warsaw, which was almost totally demolished during WWII. Well dressed Poles, compliments about the Polish girls. Pictures of growing industry (shipyards), motor industry and the willingness to possess own car by most of the Poles, youth disco clubs. Mentioning about the policy of raising salaries and simultaneously keeping the prices low. It is a fascinating country! Vast possibilities for the Poles to travel abroad! Underlying the democratic character of Poland by constant mentioning about the fact that Gierek is supported by the almost full majority of Poles and the close relations with Moscow..." *Gierek's visit to U.S...*, 7.

Polish delegation constantly underlined the predictions that trade turnover would reach two billion dollars until 1980.<sup>39</sup>

Yet, the improvement of bilateral relations did not mean any concessions in the sphere of the ideological clash. Poland was a staunch ally of the Soviet Union and Gierek did not skip the occasion to make it clear during his speech at the United Nations General Assembly. While ascribing to the socialist countries the success for the CSCE conference, Gierek repeated the principle of peaceful coexistence among countries with different political systems. The aim of that principle was “making the détente irreversible in order to defeat the imposed by the imperialist forces political and military confrontation, which is the main reason for the arms race, tensions and threats to the international peace...”<sup>40</sup> Simultaneously, Poland continued the policy of open criticism toward U.S. actions in Vietnam, Palestine, Cyprus and Chile in accordance with the Soviet position.

## Poland's Propaganda and the Vietnam War

The Vietnam War was another possibility to accent the unity of the socialist world and the decisive stand in international affairs. In Poland, as in other socialist countries, the war was depicted as

...part of their [United States–S.D.] struggle to continue their influences in South East Asia and on the whole Far East. It is also an important element of the resistance against the national-liberating movements fighting against the neocolonial forms of imperialist ruling in Asia and other parts of the world.”<sup>41</sup>

Additionally, the war attempted to destroy the socialist achievements of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV) or also was a holy war against the American imperialism.<sup>42</sup>

Such a picture of the War delivered justification for the direct involvement of the Eastern bloc. It would be impossible to quote all the documents and statements of Moscow and its satellites on that matter, but some examples clearly unveil the intentions.

---

<sup>39</sup> *Gierek's visit to U.S...*, 37.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* 46–49.

<sup>41</sup> W. Góralski, *op. cit.* 4.

<sup>42</sup> B. Kołodziejczak, E. Wójcik, *Wojna USA w Wietnamie*. (Warszawa: 1979), 55. This is excerpt from the Ho Chi Minh statement in *ibid.* 61.

In the declaration of the Warsaw Pact from July 6, 1966 condemning the ongoing bombardment and other acts of aggression by the U.S. in Vietnam we read:

...to provide and will continue to provide DRV constantly growing moral-political support and various help, i.e. material and defense related means, materials, technical and specialists indispensable for the victorious repulse of the American aggression, taking into consideration the needs stemming from the new phase of the War in Vietnam.<sup>43</sup>

The final declaration of the 1967 European meeting of the European communist parties in Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia included an Appeal of support for the Vietnamese nation.<sup>44</sup> A year later during their meeting in Budapest, representatives of sixty seven communist parties declared among others:

We, the communists, consider the solidarity with the fighting Vietnam for our most viable internationalist responsibility. On behalf of our parties, on behalf of millions of our supporters, once again we firmly declare our will to give our indispensable support to the Vietnamese nation, which stands on the frontline of the armed fight with the imperialism.<sup>45</sup>

The American atrocities in Vietnam became a constant element in communist propaganda. The publications on that subject in Poland from the late sixties and early seventies as one mention the fact that United States dropped over four times more bombs than during the air raids over Germany during World War II.<sup>46</sup>

American actions were described as "...village pacification and penal expeditions on daily basis and use of guns against demonstrators."<sup>47</sup> The existence of concentration camps, thousands of prisons and the commission of such acts as rapes, deliberate murders and were inseparable elements of every analysis. The South Vietnamese leaders were protégés to Washington and were presented as cruel and vicious.

---

<sup>43</sup> W. Góralski, *op. cit.* 27.

<sup>44</sup> The text of the final declaration of the 1967 European meeting of the European communist parties in Karlovy Vary is available in English at <http://www.ena.lu/> (accessed March 14, 2009) The text of the appeal was published in the Polish version of that document. *O pokój i bezpieczeństwo w Europie, Dokumenty narady partii komunistycznych i robotniczych Europy w Karlovyh Warach, kwiecień 1967.* (Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza, 1967), 35–37.

<sup>45</sup> W. Góralski, *op. cit.* 28.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.* 56, as well as S. Wilkosz, *Wietnam—anatomia zrywania i klęski.* (Warszawa: Czytelnik, 1977), 309.

<sup>47</sup> W. Góralski, *op. cit.* 5–8.

Leaders of the hunta in Southern Vietnam from the early 60s—Nguyen Cao Ky whose best hero is Hitler and slightly more moderate Nguyen Van Thieu were perpetrators of ... political repressions against not only communists, but every progressive person and even against the “neutralists.”<sup>48</sup>

In the aftermath of the Paris accords defeat of the United States was announced.

“In the Vietnam war winning were not only the interests of the Vietnamese nation and its heroism, but triumphant were also the basic rules of political logic, strategy and justice. Those who stubbornly broke these rules—had to loose...” and further...” The [American–S.D.] mistakes grew from the strong imperialistic ambitions, neocolonialist intentions and the doctrines of the police kind of style of subordinating the world.”<sup>49</sup>

This defeat had far-reaching consequences which the Communist propaganda could not miss to emphasize. Stanisław Wilkosz delivered a brilliant example.

By signing the Paris accord USA recognized their defeat in Vietnam and understood the mistakes that have been made. However, there were also other reasons for signing the treaty. During these 8 years when the war lasted the political situation around the world has changed radically. There is a new arrangement in the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, in Asia a new situation has been established, the position of the Third world countries has been strengthened and the American doctrines ceased to be in force. Neither help nor the size of American investments decided anymore about the policies of the young Asian and African countries. The ice age of the Cold War was over. United States had to adjust its global policy concepts with the new proportions of power, they had to agree to thaw, to relaxation, to détente.<sup>50</sup>

In other words, it was the United States that faced total defeat. This defeat was possible because of the continuous efforts for peace of the Eastern bloc. The defeat also forced the United States to accept the new reality. Whatever happened for good was achieved by the Eastern bloc. Remarkably, although prepared only two years after the Helsinki accords, the need for financial support and credits from the West were passed over in this analysis.

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid. 38.

<sup>49</sup> S. Wilkosz, *op. cit.* 311; 231–232.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. 307.

## Conclusion

Although highly selective and incomplete, this paper aimed at emphasizing some important and lesser known elements of Polish–American relations which must be taken into consideration in the process of evaluating the developments during the Cold War.

Poland became part of the Soviet bloc as a consequence of mainstream international politics and in defiance with its own willingness. From the moment when the communists obtained absolute control over the country, Warsaw became a faithful ally of the Soviet Union who constantly supported and executed the dispositions from Moscow. This paper does not analyze the role of Polish society, its attitude toward the communists and the internal developments. There were many examples in Polish history during the Cold War (1956, 1968, 1970, 1976, 1980) when the western world received signals of dissatisfaction and protests against the system. However, until 1981 this was not an issue seriously considered in Washington. Despite the disappointment among the Poles from the fact that they had been left behind the iron curtain, the society preserved its pro–American attitude.

Until the late seventies the Polish government's perception of American foreign policy was based on two pillars. The first one was the ideological struggle in which Poland was a constant propagator of socialist principles which led to the inevitable clash with Western values. The second one was the need for financial support which forced the countries from the Soviet bloc to seek cooperation with the West. They implemented at the beginning of the sixties a theory of peaceful coexistence which was the practical attempt to incorporate these two contradicting pillars.

In conclusion, the Polish perspective of American foreign policy was derivative of the East–West mainstream relations. At the same time, it did not take into consideration the opinion and sympathy of Polish society. Therefore, from the end of World War II until the establishment of Solidarity, Polish–American relations were inconsistent because of ideological differences.





Maryna Bessonova

## Soviet Perspective on the Cold War and American Foreign Policy

Ukraine gained its independence in 1991, when the Soviet Union was dissolved and former Soviet republics became sovereign states. Since that time Ukraine started its own policy, with the Ukrainian point of view on history, international relations, and politics differing greatly from the Russian perspective. But during the Cold War period, Ukraine was also a part of the USSR, which is why we can talk about Ukrainian perspective of that time as the Soviet one.

The better way to understand the specific features of the Soviet interpretations of the Cold War era is first to describe some basic facts about the Soviet Union. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [USSR] (official full name of the Soviet Union) came into being in 1922 after a long period of the civil war, which started at 1917. Many different political parties and groups were struggling for power in the former Russian empire, but soon the only one remained in the political arena: the Bolsheviks (later called the Communists). Since 1920s the government and the political organization of the country were defined by the single party: the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Communist's philosophy of history was one where the history of mankind is a process of revolutionary changes based on social-economic formation for the next stage of more progressive civilization. According to this philosophy, capitalism would be changed into communism. In global politics, this result was a continuation of the class struggle between the regressive capitalists and the progressive working classes.

As Communists considered themselves as a vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat, their "aim" was to build socialist society in the whole world. At the beginning of 1920s it became clear that it would be impossible to spread the revolutionary

movement all over the world, especially in those regimes where communists came to power<sup>1</sup>. The idea of world socialist revolution was postponed, but it remain as one of the main ideas of Soviet foreign policy.

Another important note about Soviet policy and politics was connected with internal situation in the Soviet Union. Communists came into power in Russia by force and their domestic policy in first years failed. One of the ways for the Communists to keep power in their hands was to consolidate society around them by “finding an enemy” and to hold them responsible for any defeats.

From Soviet history one can find many attempts to finding “enemies” inside as well as outside the regime. Struggle with those enemies was a way to keep society “busy”. While struggling with enemies, less attention was paid to the failed reforms. For example, in 1917–1920s the main “fight” was with the external and internal enemies of the socialist revolution; in 1920–1930s the political struggle with inside enemies of the Communist party; and in 1941–1945 fight with fascist Germany (World War II).

The semantics of the Soviet politics from the very beginning was full of such words as “fight,” “struggle,” “war,” “antagonism,” “implacable foe,” “camp,” and other military terms. The leaders of the country considered the USSR as the first socialist state against a blockade of capitalist powers and felt they were in constant danger, fearing a new war was possible and expected. The Soviet approaches towards historical descriptions of the twentieth century showed that with the emergence of the new type of state – socialist one – it became a target for capitalist aggression. According to this perspective, all possible conflicts in international relations with the Soviet Union were interpreted as attempts by capitalist powers to suppress the young socialist state. That was a reason why throughout the pre-WWII history the Soviet Union was a certain outsider of international relations.

Under the Stalin’s rule, Soviet society was extremely consolidated, being involved into the constant struggle with internal and external enemies. Many Soviet citizens under different circumstances were repressed with a charge “the enemy of the people” and even during the World War II when the external enemy was more than clear, new victims for the strengthening of the socialist state were surprisingly large in number. With the end of the World War II that kind of “fighting mood” did not disappeared; and only after the Stalin’s death in 1953 did some changes occurred in Soviet foreign and domestic policy. One of the best examples of such

---

<sup>1</sup> For example: *The Alsace Soviet Republic*, November 10–22, 1918 (A short-lived Soviet republic created during the German Revolution at the end of World War I in the province of Alsace, which had been part of Germany since 1871); *The Bavarian (Munich) Soviet Republic*, April–May 1919 (The short-lived attempt to establish a socialist state in form of a council republic in the Free State of Bavaria. It sought independence from the also recently proclaimed Weimar Republic); *The Hungarian Soviet Republic*, March–August 1919 (a Communist regime established in Hungary under the leadership of Béla Kun); *The Persian Socialist Soviet Republic*, June 1920 – September 1921 (widely known as the Soviet Republic of Gilan, a short-lived Soviet republic in the Iranian province of Gilan) It was established with the assistance of the Red Army.

approaches was so called “Zhdanov’s doctrine” – a conception declared in September 1947 that after the World War II the world was divided into two main camps – socialist and capitalist – with each of them with contrary but similar aims of foreign policy: to crush the other side.<sup>2</sup> This point of view became dominant not only in the politics of the Soviet Union, but in the other socialist countries as well. In his *The economic problems of the socialism in the USSR* (1952), Stalin once more underlined that crises and collapse of the world capitalist system is inescapable: wars were inescapable which is why the Soviet Union had to annihilate imperialist and capitalist countries<sup>3</sup>.

After Stalin Khrushchev came into power and soften the Soviet approach towards different issues, especially towards idea of the world socialist revolution. It was finally moved to the background of primary Soviet interests and was replaced by the new idea of competition of two different social-political systems: socialism and capitalism. That is why fight with world bourgeoisie turned into more constructive emulation. Formerly struggle with capitalism and imperialism was aimed on its complete destruction, but since new approach was declared in 1950s Soviet policy was targeted on the “fight to be first” and to built new socialist world as proof of the advantages of the Soviet system. A great number of examples can be found of such contest in sport, culture, science, technologies, medical care, and education and so on. At least within the Soviet Union each development was declared as the unique achievement of the socialist system. The brightest model of attempts to implement that competition was slogan: “overtake and surpass America,” which became very popular in the USSR after Khrushchev’s speech in 1957, when he proposed to overtake and surpass America in all economic indicators and to build communism until 1980.

The idea of competition between two social-political systems played some kind of integration role for the Soviet society: the enemy was defined, and it was clear how to achieve victory in all spheres of life in order to show that the socialist way of life is better than capitalist one. At the same time the idea of peaceful coexistence was reborn, but it was revised as the specific form of class struggle.

During Brezhnev’s era, Khrushchev’s approaches were not changed radically. The idea of peaceful coexistence remained as the important one, but Brezhnev modified it: the idea of consolidation of all socialist countries and newly independent countries-former colonies. This modification was combined with so-called Brezhnev’s doctrine, according to which nobody had a right to interrupt the Eastern bloc’s processes of building a socialist community.

Real changes in the Soviet foreign policy occurred only when Gorbachev came into power. The main ideas of so called “new political thinking” Gorbachev described

---

<sup>2</sup> Andrei Zhdanov was Chairman of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet July 15, 1938–June 20, 1947.

<sup>3</sup> *Міжнародні відносини та зовнішня політика (1945–70-ті роки): Навчальний посібник [The International Relations and Foreign Policy (1945–1970s)]* ЛНБІАБ, Київ 2003, 32.

in his book *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World* (1988), which was translated to many foreign languages and published in many countries. The new approach meant first of all the cancellation of the idea of class struggle and was built on the concept of universal values of mankind and the mutual peace interests of different nations, cultures, societies and types of states. On that political background the idea of peaceful coexistence was once more reborn and the ideas of the world socialist revolution and class struggle were finally given up.

We can summarize, that Soviet domestic and foreign policy were defined by combination and piecemeal replacement of few main ideas: find and fight the enemy, the idea of world socialist revolution, the idea of competition of two social-political systems, and peaceful coexistence.

## Origins of the Cold War: Who was guilty?

It's a well known fact that Cold war was a period of enormous confrontation between USSR and US. After the World War II these two countries changed their status of "great powers" to "superpowers" and a new bipolar system of international relations was formed. As the US became the leader of the world bourgeoisie after the World War II, it became the main enemy for the Soviet Union in post-war period. According to the Soviet interpretations the Cold War was provoked by the policy of the US and other imperialistic countries towards socialist states, first of all towards the USSR<sup>4</sup>

Soviet explanations of the background of the Cold War were presented as following:

(1) *The Cold War was an attempt of the United States to change the results of the World War II.* One of the main results for the Soviet Union was the appearance of the "socialist camp": the number of countries with the similar socialist system. It was first positive move towards realization of the Soviet foreign policy main idea: the world socialist revolution and creation of the socialist society in the whole world. So those who wanted to change this result of the World War II wanted to destroy the socialist system.

(2) *The US had plans to dominate in the entire world.* After the World War II the US became a leader in the West, which used its chance to present their own interests as the interests of the whole capitalist world, while other countries were dealing with their economic recovering after the war. That is why American post-war foreign policy was interpreted by the Soviets as attempts to build "*Pax Americana*" and

---

<sup>4</sup> *Дипломатический словарь [Diplomatic Dictionary]*, Издательство Наука, Москва 1986, Vol. 3, 536.

that idea was seen as a threat. The Soviet state had its own idea to build a socialist world oriented on the benefits of all mankind and especially for the working class all over the Earth, while US was oriented only for their own purposes.

(3) *All US post-war foreign policy doctrines were aimed on the struggle with socialism.* After the victory of allies in the World War II a new and more global threat of international communism led to the appearance of new approaches in American foreign policy. The majority of US foreign policy doctrines emerged during the Cold War, and mainly they all were oriented against Soviet Union and its satellites.

Let's make a brief review of Soviet interpretations of those doctrines. *The Containment Doctrine* (1946) was aimed on justification of the US's aggressive foreign policy, which was provided for active interruption of American imperialism into the internal affairs of the socialist countries, the maintenance of reactionary political regimes in all part of the world, and the weakening of the USSR by military, political and economic pressure.<sup>5</sup> The Containment strategy was featured in the Truman doctrine and Marshall Plan. *The Truman Doctrine* (1947) was seen as first official implementation of strategy of containing communism by active financial involvement into the internal affairs of Greece and Turkey under the reason of "communist threat" and "national security interests of US". As it was mentioned in Soviet publications, the treaty provisions on American assistance in Greece and Turkey led to the creation of the springboard for attack on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries as well as to the US penetration to the Middle East.<sup>6</sup> *The Marshall Plan* (1947) was another manifestation of American expansionism in Europe directed on active involvement into the economic recovering of European countries and widening of American presence on the continent. The USSR agreed with economic assistance propositions of the US, but was against American interference in the internal affairs of other countries.<sup>7</sup> That is why none of socialist countries was allowed to join that program.

The next one was *the Liberation Doctrine* (1952) created by J. Dulles who meant first of all the liberation from the communism because on his opinion "we (US) shall never have secure peace or a happy world so long as Soviet communism dominates one-third of all of the peoples that there are, and is in the process of trying at least to extend its rule to many others."<sup>8</sup> The main idea was to disintegrate socialist

---

<sup>5</sup> *Современные Соединенные Штаты Америки. Энциклопедический справочник [The Contemporary US; the Encyclopaedic Handbook]*, Политиздат, Москва 1988, 263.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> В.В. Александров (1988), *Новейшая история стран Европы и Америки (1945-1986 гг.)* [V.V. Alexandrov, *The Modern History of Countries of Europe and America (1945-1986)*], Высшая школа, Москва, 15.

<sup>8</sup> J. Dulles, *Statement on Liberation Policy*, January 15 1953, full text at <http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=1613> (last accessed: 17.07.2009).

unity which was interpreted as a monolithic structure. Dulles was author of other doctrines as well and he was one of the pioneers of massive retaliation and brinkmanship strategy, tactical task of which was with blackmail and threat to get different concessions from the Soviet Union and its satellites.<sup>9</sup> *The Eisenhower-Dulles Doctrine* (1957) showed further open interference of the US into the Middle East region while other capitalist countries were loosing their position there. The US Congress decision to let American president deal with military help almost independently alerted Soviet Union because the main reason of giving military help was to struggle with the aggression of those countries, which were controlled by the world communism.<sup>10</sup>

Kennedy's "*Flexible Response*" Strategy (1961) was considered as the next anti-communist method to use war as the tool to achieve American foreign policy tasks aimed on local wars as the suppression of world revolutionary and national-liberation movement.<sup>11</sup> But after the Cuban missile crisis a new emphasis became manifest in American foreign policy: more attention was paid to economical, political and ideological actions focused on improvement of the capitalism in developing countries and thereby creating a positive image of the US. One of the new features of that policy was creation of the Peace Corps (1961) which activity was used by CIA and was directed on the strengthening of American ideological, political and economic penetration into the developing countries. At the same time usage of so called "quiet counterrevolution" methods became more often to prevent escalation of local conflict into the global one. That is why at that time in the Soviet Union Kennedy's policy was evaluated as inconsistent and contradictory because it combined aggravation with the USSR and some realistic steps towards diminishing of international tension, such as the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water signed by Soviet Union, US and Great Britain (1963).<sup>12</sup>

*The Mann* (1964) and *Johnson* (1965) *Doctrines* contained ideas about support of authoritarian regimes in Latin America, further economic and political isolation of Cuba and organization of collective actions against communist threats. Both doctrines were ideological "cover" for military intervention of the United States into the interior of that region.<sup>13</sup> *The Johnson Pacific Doctrine* (1966) as it was called in the Soviet Union reserved for the US national interests not only Western hemi-

<sup>9</sup> *Современные Соединенные Штаты Америки: Энциклопедический справочник [The Contemporary US; the Encyclopaedic Handbook]*, Политгиздат, Москва 1988, 264.

<sup>10</sup> *История дипломатии [The History of Diplomacy]*, Т. 5, Москва 1979, 562–569.

<sup>11</sup> *Современные Соединенные Штаты Америки: Энциклопедический справочник [The Contemporary US; the Encyclopaedic Handbook]*, Политгиздат, Москва 1988, 266.

<sup>12</sup> *Советский Союз в борьбе за разоружение: Сборник документов. [Soviet Union in the Struggle for Disarmament: Collection of Documents]* Москва 1977, 31–34.

<sup>13</sup> *Дипломатический словарь [Diplomatic Dictionary]*, Издательство Наука, Москва 1986, Vol. 1, 306.

sphere, but South-East Asia, where Vietnam became the most significant example. Soviet interpretations of *the Nixon Doctrine* (1969) underlined that it had attached American right to support their allies and friends (the capitalist-oriented states), but with the division of tasks: “America cannot – and will not – conceive all the plans, design all the programs, execute all the decisions, and undertake all the defense of the free nations of the world...”<sup>14</sup> In 1970 that point of view was repeated – and extended from Asia to the other regions of the world.<sup>15</sup> That meant that the US policy in Vietnam failed and American government simply wanted to find exit from that situation by sharing “obligations” with allied states.

*The Ford Doctrine* (1975) was some kind of variation of the Nixon strategy of lessening of American responsibility and military presence in Asia and other regions. New feature of the Ford Doctrine was proclaimed task to consolidate on new “boundaries” (that meant defensive position to which US were forced to retreat in the Vietnam War) for the following attack on socialist countries and progressive forces of the Asia region.<sup>16</sup>

The next idea in American foreign policy was Carter’s idea to unite capitalist highly developed countries of Western Europe, Japan and United States to resist world socialism, the Soviet Union, and national-liberation movements. According to Soviet interpretations, the *Trilateral perspective* (1977) was announced because of attempts to overcome crisis in capitalist economy and to strengthen international positions of imperialism.<sup>17</sup> *The Carter Doctrine* (1980) declaring the willingness of the United States to use military force to protect its interests in the Persian Gulf was interpreted more widely and was evaluated in the Soviet Union as renewal of expansionism and aggressiveness of American foreign policy. At the period of last escalation of the Cold War *the Reagan Doctrine* (1985) was announced. Its main idea was to enlarge American military potential to be able to resist Soviet influence in the world with such tools as arms race and economic war against USSR.

We can summarize – that on Soviet point of view all American presidents of Cold War period were creating their own doctrines, and all of them were anti-communist and anti-Soviet, even if they were dealing with such regions as Middle East, South-East Asia or Latin America.

(4) *Western countries (with US) were first who started the Cold War confrontation.* Winston Churchill’s speech in Fulton March 5, 1946 was interpreted by the Soviet

<sup>14</sup> E.R. Wittkopf, Ch.W. Kegley Jr., J.M. Scott (2003), *American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process*, Thomson Wadsworth, 51.

<sup>15</sup> *Современные Соединенные Штаты Америки: Энциклопедический справочник [The Contemporary US; the Encyclopaedic Handbook]*, ПОЛИТИЗДАТ, Москва 1988, 268.

<sup>16</sup> *Дипломатический словарь [Diplomatic Dictionary]*, Издательство Наука, Москва 1986, Vol. 3, 517.

<sup>17</sup> В.В. Александров (1988), *Новейшая история стран Европы и Америки (1945–1986 гг.) [N.V. Alexandrov, The Modern History of Countries of Europe and America (1945–1986)]*, Высшая школа, Москва, 207.

Union as the character assassination to the address of the USSR. That speech declared a crusade against socialism and pronounced the program of British-American world domination not only after the World War II, but for further centuries<sup>18</sup>.

According to Soviet concept first vivid steps, which signaled about the start of the confrontation between East and West, were steps made by the West. In all Soviet historical textbooks (they usually presented official interpretation of history) the first event of the Cold War was Winston Churchill's speech in Fulton.

An interesting fact is that in Western interpretations, the Soviets were perceived as the aggressors, with the main role played by Stalin's speech February 9, 1946; but that speech had its own pre-history. A few days before, February 2, 1946, according to one of the Communist party documents, cooperation with allies in the World War II was determined as the main feature of post-war order. But the next day, February 3, 1946, the United States started, propaganda campaign started, aimed against Soviet nuclear espionage. That is why it could be considered that Stalin's speech was mostly caused by American mass media campaign against Soviet Union, and was not planned as program speech against capitalism. Its rhetoric contained nothing especially new, but for the West it seemed a direct signal for confrontation. The main theses of Stalin's speech contained following: (1) Inner conflicts within capitalist world would led to new wars; (2) New wars would led to the weakening of the capitalist system; (3) New wars would speed up crush of capitalist system because of socialist revolutions; (4) Soviet social system is more viable; (5) the Soviet system is better than other systems<sup>19</sup>. This speech was considered on the West as claiming war against capitalist countries.

If well try to summarize the Soviet point of view on the origin of the Cold War – the main idea can be named as following: bipolar confrontation had *western roots* and the Cold War was the policy of the US and other imperialistic countries *against* socialist countries.

What was a role of the USSR? According to its own interpretations, the Soviet Union was the only power in the world able to stop American ambitions of superpower. The area of the Soviet Union occupied 22,402,200 sq. km (while US occupied 9,826,630 sq. km); different natural resources were available; a population 170 million, more than in US at that time (about 140 million); and even after World War II part of Soviet industry remained so economic potential was present. The Soviet Union considered itself as the only defender of the interests of the working class all over the world because it was the first socialist state in history.

---

<sup>18</sup> *История внешней политики СССР 1917–1985 [The History of the Soviet Foreign policy, 1917–1985]* Издательство Наука, Москва 1986, Vol. 2, 120.

<sup>19</sup> *Міжнародні відносини та зовнішня політика (1945–70-ті роки): Навчальний посібник [The International Relations and Foreign Policy (1945–1970s)]* ЛНІБІАБ, Київ 2003, 30.



## Two lines in the World Politics since World War II

According to Soviet interpretations, one of the main results of the World War II was the formation of the two new “lines” in the world politics: the “line of peace” presented by Soviet Union, and the “line of war” presented by US.<sup>20</sup> This is why events in the international relations were interpreted by two ways: (1) all Soviet foreign policy acts were seen as peaceful even if they were military interventions; (2) American foreign policy was interpreted as aggressive and militaristic.

That kind of division became vivid just after the end of the World War II. After Churchill’s speech, it was clear that capitalist world started preparations to the next world war. This idea is in the analytical report of Soviet ambassador in the US, N. Novikov’s “American Foreign policy in the post-war period” (1946). The Soviet ambassador prepared that report on the demand of Soviet minister of international relations, V. Molotov, and it was presented to the members of Soviet delegation on the Paris peace conference 27 September 1946. According to Novikov’s observations, post-war US foreign policy was aimed on achieving of world dominance and the maintenance of military potential signaled American preparations for a future war that was designed against the Soviet Union<sup>21</sup>.

The American’s policy was in contrast to the Soviet Union’s peaceful initiatives, e.g., the peaceful coexistence of countries with different political systems (socialist and capitalist); the continuance of cooperation between the winners of the World War II; the strengthening of UN as the organization where all participants are equal; the withdrawal of troops from the territory of UN states; general arms cut; and the elimination of nuclear weapons. It was underlined in the Soviet mass media and then repeated in historical and political science interpretations that they “were out of plans” of United States and other capitalist countries.<sup>22</sup>

According to communist point of view the Cold War was the time when two different system of international relation emerged: Democratic and Imperialistic. The Democratic was the system of socialist countries, which had very close economic, cultural, political ties with the USSR as the leader. Within this system all nations tried to help each other in all spheres of life and developments with no competition: only fruitful cooperation existed. The Imperialistic was the system of capitalist countries: they had a lot of contradictions in their “camp” where each wanted to solve their problems and to defend their own interests by using the others. This

---

<sup>20</sup> All definitions are used as they were used in Soviet time.

<sup>21</sup> В.Л. Мальков, *Первые письма с «холодной войны»: «Длинная телеграмма» Кеннана и аналитический обзор Новикова «Внешняя политика США в послевоенный период»*. // *Международная жизнь* 1990. №11. С. 154. [V. Mal'kov, *First Letters from the Cold War: Kennan's "Long Telegram" and Analytical Report of Novilov "American Foreign Policy in the Post-war Period"*, “International Life” 1990, Vol. 11, 154.].

<sup>22</sup> *История внешней политики СССР 1917–1985 [The History of the Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917–1985]* Издательство Наука, Москва 1986, Vol. 2, 123.

bipolar world was also presented in American textbooks, where post-war world was described as divided into two blocks – Democratic in the West and Communist in the East. It is vivid with each side confronting the other and taking for itself the name “Democratic,” while the other side was titled by “abusive” one (Imperialists/Communists).<sup>23</sup>

The entire world was separated into two main categories: friends and enemies. Such black and white world-view was a distinctive feature of Stalin’s way of seeing the world (outside as well as inside the USSR), but even after his death, this remained as one of the characteristic approach towards international relations. Among friends of the USSR you can find such categories as: (1) brother nations in the Eastern Europe; (2) nations in the third world countries; (3) working class in the capitalist countries. The enemy was the imperialistic circles in the capitalist states.

The explanation of international relations was very simple according to such approach: everything that was undertaken by the representatives of the own bloc/camp was aimed on positive developments of the mankind, on the defence of all-human values, on the support of national-liberation movements and democracy and achieving of main goal with the opposite side trying to build military tools and interference into the domestic affairs of other countries. Such ideas were supported by all possible means of Soviet propaganda.

From the secondary school education level to universities, the Soviet people were informed about main events of domestic and international affairs, especially about American imperialism, counterrevolutionary forces, world capitalism and their aggressive plans to destroy socialist system and not to let newly liberated countries (former colonies) to join brotherhood of socialist states. In the secondary schools, the historical part of educational program and the number of special so called humanitarian and social science disciplines, as well as in the activities of Pioneer and Komsomol organisations, such approaches were originally “put into the minds” of Soviet people.<sup>24</sup> Anti-American propaganda continued at university level within obligatory program in the courses of “The History of the CPSU,” Marxism-Leninism, Historical materialism, Dialectical materialism, Political economy, etc.<sup>25</sup> A lot of different propaganda posters were produced and centrally spread at schools, universities, jobsites, public places. For example poster “Two worlds – two plans: We (the USSR) are spreading new life. They (the US) are sowing death”, on which two different ways of life and main tasks of the society were depicted. The Soviet was peaceful planning to raise crops, while American had fatal plans to build new military bases. Even in American studies and scientific research in that field everything

---

<sup>23</sup> For example: W.O. Kellog, *American History: the Easy Way*, Barron’s Educational series, 1995.

<sup>24</sup> The type of organizations for children and youth operated by a Communist party in the USSR and other socialist countries. See for example: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pioneer\\_movement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pioneer_movement).

<sup>25</sup> CPSU – the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

was subordinated to such aims as to criticize negative aspects of bourgeois society in US and American imperialistic foreign policy and to give positive evaluation of all types of struggle for rights and liberation: woman's, working class, ethnic groups (Afro-Americans, Indian-Americans).

A great number of researches are already made all over the world in the field of Soviet-American relations. Current investigations give us an opportunity to revise events of the Cold War according to new facts and documents. In that case communist point of view which was presented in the Soviet studies is very interesting because it shows us huge role of propaganda. Among specific ideas of the Soviet viewing of the American policy towards the USSR we can mark out next main ideas: (1) The whole American post-war policy was aimed on blocking Soviet peaceful initiatives; (2) The United States initiated and forced the arms race; (3) The US de-facto blocked the normal activity of UN; (4) All aggravation of the international situation were caused by the US policy. Of course Soviet policy was viewed as the opposite. And such approaches were showed not only in the sphere of international relations but in the domestic policy within the Soviet Union. Propaganda, brain-wash and agitation within the Soviet society made it possible that even in the cases when USSR were demonstrating aggressive and tough policy it was justified as necessary and indispensable in the conditions of struggle for the better world.

The situation in Afghanistan in the late 1970s can be presented as good example. The only accessible version of events in that country contains a story about the victory in April 1978 of the national-democratic revolution and the formation of Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The USSR was the first country which recognized the new state, and Soviets were the first who proposed all kind of support and assistance for young democratic society. An agreement between two countries was signed in December 1978 based on friendship, good neighbourly relations, and cooperation. But new democratic system "was met with unconcealed hostility in the US, and in such neighbours as Pakistan and China."<sup>26</sup> Those countries organized subversive activities and that led to destabilization of situation. In September and December 1979 *coups d'état* took place and Afghan government asked the Soviet Union for military help. If pro-Soviet government would fail, this would be a big blow for the Soviet foreign policy. That is why in December 1979 the Soviet government, according to the 1978 Agreement between Afghanistan and USSR and to UN Charter, decided to send Soviet troops (it was warily called limited military contingent just to stress that it was small troops and not a big army, although between 25 December 1979 and 15 February 1989, a total of 620,000 soldiers served with the forces in Afghanistan). The conflict involved different countries – the US, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom, PRC and others, contributed to Mos-

---

<sup>26</sup> *История внешней политики СССР 1917–1985 [The History of the Soviet Foreign Policy, 1917–1985]* Издательство Наука, Москва 1986, Vol. 2, 495.

cow's high military costs and strained international relations. But for the Soviet soldiers this conflict was presented as the international duty, and their participation was propagandized as help to the brother people of Afghanistan, who only started building of socialist society.

The Cuban missile crises can be presented as another good example. For the Soviet Union the Cuban revolution was a great achievement because it was a first socialist state in Western hemisphere and that fact was certain prove of vitality of the world socialist revolution idea. That is why American policy towards Cuba, especially economic blockade, diversions, military provocations (such as April 1961 the Bay of Pigs Invasion) were considered as aggressive policy towards new socialist state. When in February 1962, US claim Cuba was excluded from Organization of American States gave an opportunity for the USSR to show its support towards Cuba. On February 19, 1962 the USSR declared its first statement as a supportive one towards Cuba and denouncing towards US. In the summer of 1962, Cuba asked USSR for military help to prevent American invasion. We can say that Cuban crises as geopolitical situation was in some point built in the frame of next items: a young socialist state in the blockade of capitalist countries asked for the help the only defender of peace and democracy - the Soviet Union. That is why Soviet Union position was within main ideas of Soviet foreign policy described earlier. It was simply help and assistance to the brother nation, but not aggression or own initiative.

## American policy towards Eastern Europe

East European countries occupied a unique place in the bipolar system of international relations. American policy towards that region was completely determined by US-USSR relations. It was one of the arenas of real struggle between superpowers. For the Soviet Union it was very important to keep new democratic countries (as Eastern European states were called after the post-war elections) within the socialist camp as the proof of successful Soviet policy, as an example of correct way of building society under the socialist ideas, and to show how to spread of socialist system in the world. For the US, Eastern Europe was important for the opposite meaning: it was proof of the wrong way of the Soviet policy as well as of socialist type of society and state.

Now the approaches towards interpretations of the US policy towards communist countries in the Soviet sphere of influence changed. But it would be interesting to figure out main features of them. First of all we have to underline that in the Soviet political science and historical studies a number of American special doctrines and tools towards Eastern Europe were determined. Let's make a short outlook of them in chronological appearance.

Just after the occupation of Germany and the end of the World War II it became clear that future development of Europe would be in between few main participants: the Soviet Union, the United States and Great Britain. But as it happened Great Britain did not manage to keep the position of the superpower, and only two main actors were left. The division of Europe became visible on the example of Berlin: when the de facto eastern and western parts of that city symbolized the division of the whole Europe. Soviet control of Eastern Berlin as well as of East Germany and other Eastern European countries showed that possible future of the whole region. In the second half of 1940s the main task for the United States was to prevent the complete transition of those countries to the “socialist camp.”

American policy at that time was directed on three main issues: support of non-communists leaders; counteraction/resistance for “sovietization” of the region; keeping Eastern European countries as “opened” for the West and American influence. The Marshall Plan was considered as one of the possible ways to fulfill these tasks. The situation in Europe was very crucial because of combination of economic problems and political instability. According to the Soviet point of view, the post-war devastation might lead to the deepening of exploitation of the working people, a decline in living standards, and social outburst. Western interpretations describe the beauty of Marshall’s plan as it did not appear on the surface to be directed against the Soviet Union. The Secretary of State never mentioned the dangers of communism or the Soviet Union, and he opened the program to all European nations. But Soviets saw it as the tool to save capitalist economy and to stop the rise of revolutionary movement towards world socialist revolution. Thus, the participation of Eastern Europe in proposed European recovering program was prohibited by Stalin and the Western influence in that part of the continent was minimized.

As soon as coalition governments in East European countries transformed into socialist/communist, American policy changed. A new tool of US policy towards the whole regions was created: “the economic blockade.” It started in 1949 with the adoption of a special law which had not only to control the export but to sanction special limits to the trade relations with Eastern European countries. Trade acts with Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary were canceled. Since January 1, 1949 a Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls (COCOM) started its activity, and it ceased to function only on March 31, 1994. In 1949 it united 15 most developed western countries, but soon some other neutral states joined it as well. Among them were Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. In addition there were a number of cooperating countries, such as Austria, Finland, Ireland, New Zealand, Sweden and Switzerland. The main aim of COCOM was to control the export to the socialist countries: an extensive list of restricted or prohibited trade items was developed. COCOM had to control it to stop the transfer of sensitive technologies to communist states.

In October 1951 a new law (it was called the Battle law) was adopted. According to it the export had to be limited to those countries that considered being a threat to US or its allies. A list of 217 groups of goods was created and similar lists of prohibited items Western European countries, Canada and Japan were forced to adopt it as well<sup>27</sup>. Soon Poland and Hungary lost their “most-favorite-nation status.” Some number can illustrate the results of that policy: within 1948–1953 American export to Eastern Europe decreased in 200 times, East Europe export to US – in 5 times.<sup>28</sup>

New feature in American policy towards communist countries was the appearance of so called “doubled diplomacy”: a combination of official contacts with communist/socialist governments and non-official/quiet relations with opposition and emigration groups. For example in 1949 the US Department of State tried to unite all the representatives of East European Diasporas in order to organize their activity in Eastern Europe. National Committee of Free Europe and a number of different assemblies were created.

A lot of other examples can be named here to show the broad picture of American policy towards the East European countries. In 1949 a report to the President known as NSC 58/2 drafted a document “US policy toward the Soviet Satellite states in Eastern Europe” (this document was discussed since May till December 1949). Eastern Europe was considered to be the “weakest link” within the Soviet empire. The main aim of the American foreign policy in that region was declared as the abolishing of “soviet power” and adoption of non-communist governments. The US even negotiated with France and Britain in May 1950 during the summit of Ministers of foreign relations in London and on that meeting an American variant of the act “Policy towards soviet satellites in Eastern Europe” was adopted. The main purpose of that document was to coordinate policy towards socialist countries of the East European region. Another well known document NSC 68/2 (September 30, 1950) that proclaimed usage of “secret measures” in economic, political, “psychological” war, aimed on rising up and supporting of displeasure in Eastern European states. Its practical realization was \$100 million which were given in 1951 for organizing of “army of liberation” (formed of emigrants from the East Europe) to act in their countries. Partly these funds had to be used for the support of illegal anti-soviet organizations in the region. The main role in the “psychological” war was played by radio “Freedom” and “Free Europe” (existed since the 1950s). The very clear description of that gave Senator W. Fulbright, who referred to the activity of these radio stations as to the essential part of American foreign policy towards Eastern Europe and USSR<sup>29</sup>.

<sup>27</sup> Большая Советская энциклопедия он-лайн [Big Soviet Encyclopaedia] // <http://bigsoviet.org/Bse/A-GOGO/0361.html>

<sup>28</sup> *Современные Соединенные Штаты Америки: Энциклопедический справочник [The Contemporary US; the Encyclopaedic Handbook]*, ПОЛИТГИЗДАТ, Москва 1988, 279.

<sup>29</sup> С.М. Голяков *Специальные каналы радиопропаганды США на службе психологической войны (к истории деятельности радиостанций “Свободная Европа” и “Свобода” 1949–1972 гг.): Автореф. дис... канд-та истор. наук.*

After 1953 the “liberation concept” was proposed by Secretary of State Dulles and supported by Eisenhower. According to Soviet interpretation that meant the further interference into the events, which took place in Eastern European region. But in practice the US did not interfere while in mid 1950s there were a number of opportunities to do this: in 1953 there was no reaction from the US to support the protests of East Berlin workers against their communist leaders; 1956 attempts of Hungarians to overthrow Stalinist-type authorities. The Hungarian events were a real possibility for US to show the “liberation” concept in practice: but Eisenhower was busy from: (1) the re-election presidential campaign; and (2) the involvement into the Suez crisis. The only thing was done was the expression of support on the radio “Free Europe”<sup>30</sup>.

The next decade for American Eastern European policy was in the context of disunity of western alliance. De Gaulle’s France started its own policy towards Eastern Europe to “build bridges” to the East. De Gaulle sent his foreign affairs minister to several East European countries; and de Gaulle even made official visits to the Soviet Union (June 1966), Poland (September 1967), Romania (May 1968). There were even planned visits to Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria. De Gaulle’s aim was to break the “hegemonic” hold of both the Soviet Union and the United States and to establish a “community of European states” from “Atlantic to the Urals”. In this global design, France would be able to reassert its central role in European politics.

Soon the United States showed similar strategy of “building bridges,” which was oriented on more flexible methods dealing with East European socialist countries. The strategy of “building bridges” was aimed on supporting of local national movements to result in the soft gradual isolation from the Soviet Union. It was considered that country, where national movements would win, already started its moving out of Soviet dominance and endorsed/joint Western countries. The main tool of this concept was the policy of “differentiation.” It was created at Kennedy’s presidency, but completely was formed in Johnson’s times. The US policy of differentiation had for many years meant “rewarding,” mainly through trade concessions or political gestures, Eastern European countries that either distanced themselves from Soviet tutelage and embarked on a path of international liberalization. The most revealing example in this context was US policy towards Yugoslavia: as USSR-Yugoslav relations deteriorated, US granted financial assistance to Yugoslavia<sup>31</sup>.

The 1960s as well as the previous decade had brought a number of crisis for USSR in their relations with Eastern European countries, as well as increasing of

---

[S. Golyakov, *The Special Channels of the US Radio Propaganda on the Serve of Psychological War (to the History of Radio Stations Free Europe and Freedom Activity)*], Moscow., 1974, 22.

<sup>30</sup> R. Schulzinger, *American Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*. N.Y.–Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, 249.

<sup>31</sup> Ю.Б. Качура, *Югославия в концепциях и внешней политике США в 60-е гг.*: Автореф.дис... кан-та истор. наук. [Kachura Yu. *Yugoslavia in American Concepts and Foreign Policy in 1960s*] Kiev., 1989, 11.

confrontation with the US. There were Berlin crisis and the building a Berlin wall, the Cuban crisis, Czechoslovakia (Prague spring) and others. But we have to mention that the Berlin wall was considered as a result of deteriorating of US-USSR relations, but not as a reaction on American policy towards Eastern Europe. US reaction on the Prague spring and its suppression by the Soviets was the same as in 1956 on Hungarian events. The reasons (internal and external) were similar: election campaign and Vietnam War.

In the 1970s a new approach towards Eastern Europe was created: the so-called connection principle. It was aimed on the connection to the inside ideological, social and political problems, which already sharpened in Eastern European countries. As the US turned down their own attempts to create “problems” for the Soviets in the region, and was looking for opportunities “created” by Eastern Europeans by themselves. Theoretically American East European policy was concentrated on further “erosion” of the socialist camp and used to be a tool of influence on the USSR. In practice it was supporting of groups of dissidents (those who were openly critical about the political system and spoke about necessity of “pluralistic” society in Eastern Europe).

A détente policy influenced American policy towards Eastern Europe as well. One of the ways to improve relations with the Soviet Union was so called Sonnenfeldt doctrine, according to which Eastern Europe was recognized as a “sphere of natural interests of the USSR.”<sup>32</sup> But the Carter administration turned down this doctrine: Eastern Europe was considered as a “buffer zone” (nobody’s zone): so USSR as well as US had a right to interfere to the politics of the region.

One more tool of American policy towards socialist countries was so called Jackson-Vanik Amendment to the Trade Act of 1974. According to this amendment, those countries who supposed to be US trade partners and seek for “most-favorite-nation” trading status had to conduct free emigration policy. In that case domestic politics had to be subordinated to the requirements of international politics. According to this amendment communist countries had an opportunity to: apply for the “most-favorite-nation” status and to receive American credits. But they had to change their domestic policy. This tool of American foreign policy is used even after the end of the Cold War.

In the 1980-s “crisis diplomacy” was the realization of the connection principle. The great example was support the Polish opposition trade-union Solidarity. This trade union was organized by Polish people by themselves, and US used only to support their activity in order to have a source of uncertainty in the center of Soviet empire. The Carter administration assisted to Solidarity by sending literature and copying equipment. The main problem was to keep this support invisible for Moscow, because Solidarity would be proclaimed as CIA-tool, and as interference of US into the domestic affairs of the foreign country. At the beginning of Reagan administration in 1981, martial law was declared in Poland and Solidarity became an illegal organiza-

---

<sup>32</sup> Helmut Sonnenfeldt – State Department Counselor 1974–1977.



tion. In that case “doubled diplomacy” was used in practice: (1) US’s official policy towards Polish communist government was economic sanctions (2): US’s unofficial support to Solidarity (equipment to print newspapers, radio Free Europe, money and so on). Even economic sanctions against USSR were announced, such as flights of Soviet airlines “Aeroflot” to the US were cancelled; access of Soviet ships to the seaports were limited; Soviet trade agency in New York was closed; export of high technologies to the USSR was blocked; American companies were prohibited to sale oil and gas equipment to the USSR. All these facts once more prove that American policy towards Eastern Europe was determined by US policy towards USSR. As Peter Schweizer in his book *Victory* summarized: the secret policy towards Poland was one of the reasons of the dissolving of the socialist camp and break of the USSR<sup>33</sup>.

## American policy towards third world countries

The Soviet interpretation of American policy towards third world countries was similar to that one, shown in Eastern Europe. As the world was divided into two main parts – socialist and capitalist – former colonies were supposed to join one of two main camps. The desire of the nations which got a right to build their own independent states and not to be involved into the conflict of two superpowers became the main reason of the appearance of the Nonaligned Movement. But in the bipolar system of international relations it was mostly impossible. In Soviet approaches to the international relations those countries became the scene of battle between US and USSR. According to that concept the newly liberated nations had two options: (1) to be liberated completely, meaning to join socialist countries; (2) to be enslaved in a new form: formally independent but really dependent from imperialistic countries (former masters). That is why Soviet involvement to the third world countries was interpreted as the assistance and help, American involvement was intervention and enslavement.

## Conclusion

The Cold War period was a time of very complicated relations between two systems – socialist and capitalist – when a great number of different conflicts developed between military alliances, economic unions, international organizations, and nations themselves. But the much greater influence of Cold War era was made on the outlook of the Soviet people, because, until now, the Cold War point of view is dominated in some post-Soviet societies. Unfortunately the image of living in the fortress, which is surrounded by enemies, is still very prevalent in these countries.

---

<sup>33</sup> P. Schweizer, *Victory: The Reagan Administration's Secret Strategy That Hastened the Collapse of the Soviet Union*. 1994.

That is why attempts to describe what was the origin of such attitudes to the outside world is not only of interest for the people outside the former Soviet, but of more importance for post-Soviet nations themselves to understand why it happened and to make sure it does not happen again.

Jaclyn Stanke

## The American Perspective of the Cold War: The Southern Approach (North Carolina)

More than any other event in the second half of the twentieth century, the Cold War affected international affairs and societies around the world in countless ways. Given that, we continue to study it twenty years after its end. For the most part, we know quite a bit about the official, governmental views and policies of the two main adversaries, the United States and the Soviet Union (with the latter more mystery remains, but the opening of archives from the once communist world has uncovered much in the past two decades). The Cold War, however, was not just a contest between the United States and the Soviet Union. It involved allies and client states on both sides, not to mention nations around the world that tried to stay out of the fray but were still drawn into or affected by it.

Over the past several decades, scholars have looked at the actions of the superpowers' so-called partners—how they aided the larger cause (defending capitalism or communism, depending on which side of the Iron Curtain they fell) or even shaped Cold War events and policies, sometimes in opposition to what their superpower ally desired. Still, more needs to be done in this direction as frequently the focus is on either the “more important” allies (e.g. Great Britain or France on the Western side; the German Democratic Republic or East Germany on the Eastern side) or specific “flashpoint events” that bring in the “lesser” partners' stories (e.g. the Italian elections of 1948; the Hungarian Revolution of 1956). In many respects, a sustained look at how the Cold War shaped the everyday lives of the superpowers' allies and their perspectives is uncharted territory. This set of articles offers an opportunity to begin exploring, and then comparing, such multilateral experiences of the Cold War.

Also missing in the scholarship are perceptions of the Cold War within regions of the United States and the Soviet Union. While it is necessary to understand the

general outlines of an American or Soviet perspective, the peoples of these nations certainly never possessed any uniform viewpoint. Differences existed across place and time. Given that, this paper will provide an introduction to the American perspective of the Cold War from the Southern point of view, with attention centered on the state of North Carolina where possible.

Perhaps the two most important things which shaped the Southern approach to the Cold War were a belief in a limited role of the federal government and race. Not surprisingly, these two elements were present among Southern views at the United States' founding. Since the American Revolution, most Southerners held a states' rights position vis-à-vis the proper role of the national government (this is still true with regard to certain issues, albeit at times only in rhetoric). The Revolution had been fought to protect and preserve individual liberties from abridgment by a distant, central government that exercised its power by armed force. Though the revolutionary-era government under the Articles of Confederation proved ineffectual, it still took some convincing, especially among Southern states, that the new (and stronger) federal government proposed under the U.S. Constitution would not infringe upon individual liberties and rights. Hence, to secure ratification a Bill of Rights was required.<sup>1</sup> Also to ensure Southern acceptance, the Constitution contained compromises on the matter of slavery. Most notably, the words "slave" and "slavery" do not appear in the document, but is implied with respect to the so-called three-fifths's clause and the twenty-year prohibition on banning international slave trade.<sup>2</sup>

Many would argue the Constitutional compromises made on slavery, or perhaps the refusal to deal with the matter at the time, eventually led to the American Civil War. For a variety of reasons this conflict has been called the Second American Revolution. Among them is the fact that the federal government of the United States emerged from the war as a stronger, more powerful government. The so-called Civil War Amendments (sometimes called Reconstruction Amendments) *gave additional powers to the federal government to guarantee* individual rights and liberties (the Thirteenth abolished slavery, the Fourteenth provided "equal protection of the law,"

---

<sup>1</sup> The Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union served as the United States' first constitution. Drafting of it began shortly after the Americans declared their independence from Great Britain in 1776. Ratification of the document by the thirteen states took place between 1777 and 1781. The government established under the Articles lasted until the second American constitution, simply called the Constitution, was adopted by the thirteen states during 1787–1788. This constitution has lasted until the present, though it has been amended twenty-seven times. The first ten amendments are known as the Bill of Rights and were adopted by the First United States Congress in 1791.

<sup>2</sup> The three-fifths clause refers to the compromise made at the Constitutional Convention in 1787 regarding enumeration of representation and apportionment of taxes. Slaves were not considered citizens, but they were counted as three-fifths of a person when figuring a state's population. This was important because representation (and tax apportionment) was determined by population. The greater the population, the greater number of representatives a state had. The adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment after the Civil War (abolition of slavery) nullified the effects of this clause.

and the Fifteenth allowed black males the vote). This was a reversal in principle from the Bill of Rights which had *placed limits on the federal government's powers* with respect to individual and states' rights. Also, thanks to the Civil War Amendments a revolution in race relations, such that liberty and equality without regard to skin color, now seemed possible.

During the period of Reconstruction which followed the Civil War, the federal government sought to ensure the newly-granted rights of former slaves. Many Southerners opposed this federal intrusion into their lives, not only on the basis of ensuring equality of blacks with whites, but on the principle that the federal government was overstepping its boundaries, abridging the rights of (white) individuals and usurping powers which had previously belonged to state governments. Once Reconstruction ended in 1877, these amendments, though not removed from the Constitution, were ignored and "home rule" returned in the South. In other words, states' rights, especially with respect to race, prevailed until the Second Reconstruction of the modern civil rights movement (which itself occurred right at the moment when the Cold War was going global in dimension).

The Southern position that national or central governments were something to be watched closely as they could usurp power to the detriment of individual liberties (a position reinforced in the minds of many white Southerners during the period of Reconstruction), helped shape the image held of the Soviet Union. Prior to the Cold War, Southerners like other Americans saw the Soviet Union as the opposite of what the United States was. Its form of government and early policies under Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin (especially its one-party rule, centrally-planned economy, forced collectivization of agriculture, and Purges of the 1930s) illustrated to many that this closed society did not respect individual rights and liberties or have a truly representative system of government. While the Soviet Union seemed inimical to the interests of the United States, it did not appear to be a real threat until the waning days of World War II when it imposed its form of government and way of life upon the peoples of Eastern Europe. Now it seemed as if the Communists were implementing their stated plans for worldwide socialist revolution and needed to be stopped. Given that, many Americans, including Southerners, quickly gave their support to President Harry Truman's containment policy. Moreover, they saw the Cold War as a struggle between competing political and economic systems in which the very existence of human liberty was at stake. Many Southerners held this view for the duration of the Cold War.

Southern views of federal power likewise structured the support given to the national government to wage the Cold War. Unlike race relations, national security was within the accepted purview of federal power. Hence, throughout the Cold War many Southerners consistently favored hard-line policies toward the Soviet Union and supported numerous measures designed to stop the spread of commu-

nism around the world.<sup>3</sup> When the Soviet Union crumbled in 1991, Southerners believed themselves vindicated. The policies of containment and constant pressure upon communism had proven correct as the Soviet system crumbled and the United States “won” the Cold War.

Having outlined the elements which shaped Southern views in general, and thus what the South brought to the table when the Cold War broke out, this paper will subsequently explore how the Cold War affected Southern society. It will also broach the question of how this phenomenon affected Southern perceptions of the Cold War. The author, however, is left with the distinct feeling that while the Cold War changed Southern life (particularly its economic, political, and social development), the Southern approach to foreign affairs, including the Cold War, remained largely untouched.

The American South consists of twelve states: Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas.<sup>4</sup> Since World War II, this region of the United States has undergone significant changes in its population, economy, and politics. In many ways, the Cold War helped propel these changes.

Perhaps one of the most notable changes has been demographic. Since the end of World War II, the population of the South has grown, whereas other regions like the Midwest have declined. Some of it has been due to natural increase, but most is due to in-migration from other states.<sup>5</sup> Initially much of the migration was due

---

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Fry, one of the few historians who have specifically studied the Southern approach to foreign affairs, makes this point in his introduction and presses it home in his chapters on the Cold War. See his *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789–1973* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002), p. 4 and chapters 7 and 8. Fry notes the Cold War mentality was particularly prominent during the Vietnam War, though his study concludes with 1973 (the end of U.S. involvement in that conflict). He further argues a Southern approach to foreign affairs, including the Cold War then, was less distinct after this conflict. This paper, however, will suggest just the opposite—a Southern approach continued until the very end of the Cold War, if not in fact beyond. Fry identifies several themes which structured the Southern approach to international affairs. Among those which concern this paper are: a commitment to regional interests, especially economic; partisan politics and loyalty; a deep sense of honor, duty, and patriotism; strong support for defense measures and executive power in foreign affairs; a proclivity to respond with force or violence; and an activist, interventionist approach to the world following the election of Woodrow Wilson to the presidency, a Southern Democrat, though a shallow commitment to Wilsonian internationalism (thus, a tendency to respond unilaterally and support the use of force). This essay draws heavily on the strands of thought identified by Fry.

<sup>4</sup> The twelve states here consist of the Confederate South from the Civil War, plus Kentucky which did not secede from the Union in 1861. Some might include other states, or parts of other states, but the designation here could be considered the “traditional South.” The U.S. Census Bureau considers the Southern region to be these states plus Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, West Virginia, and Oklahoma. The Bureau does, however, break up the Southern region into four sub-regions. See *Census Regions and Divisions* listed at [http://www.census.gov/popest/geographic/estimates\\_geography.html](http://www.census.gov/popest/geographic/estimates_geography.html) (last accessed July 7, 2009).

<sup>5</sup> Bruce Schulman reports that since World War II, non-native whites accounted for larger and larger proportions of the Southern population, doubling the numbers in most places, but tripling it in Georgia and the Carolinas. He further notes new arrivals made up 12% of Southern states’ population growth between 1965 and 1970 and 51% between 1970–75. Also during the 1970s, the South drew twice as many in-migrants than all other regions of the nation. See his *From Cotton Belt to Sunbelt: Federal Policy, Economic Development, and the*

to the expanding military and defense needs of the Second World War, which then continued with the burgeoning Cold War. The advent of air-conditioning and the emergence of high-technology industries, driven in many cases by the demands of the Cold War, further propelled many American companies, families, and in some cases retirees, to move to the Sunbelt regions of the Western and Southern United States. The economic downturn of the 1970s also fueled migration from the former Industrial Belt—now Rust Belt—of the Midwest (like Michigan).<sup>6</sup> Thus, many so-called Yankees, ended up in the South. This population shift from the North to the South has resulted in a cultural effect which some call, “the Americanization of the South,” suggesting the South is less distinctive in character than it was twenty or thirty years ago (though in some ways that is debatable, especially as it concerns the Southern approach to U.S. foreign policy in the post-Cold War world).

Another demographic change has been the South’s racial and ethnic composition (though much of that has occurred in the last 10-15 years, or the post-Cold War period). From the colonial period to almost the present, the region was populated by white Anglo-Saxon Protestants (WASPs). Blacks also made up a portion of the population with the introduction of slavery during the colonial period, though the distribution of slaves varied from state to state (on average, slaves never made up more than one-third of the South’s population, though South Carolina and Mississippi had black majorities). Many remaining Native Americans were forced west of the Mississippi River under the 1830 Indian Removal Act. Thus, for most of the nineteenth century, the racial demographic of the South, including North Carolina, was primarily white and black. Because the South remained tied to agriculture, it experienced limited industrialization and consequently saw little urbanization or immigration until after World War II. Only recently has the region experienced immigration. Like other parts of the United States, the South has witnessed an influx of Hispanic immigrants. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2007 North Carolina’s ethnic and racial demographic was: 74% white, 21.7% black, 7% Hispanic (though many speculate the percentage is higher if illegal immigrants are included), with various other groups, including Native Americans, garnering about 2% each.<sup>7</sup>

---

*Transformation of the South, 1938–1980* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 159–160. In discussing these numbers, Schulman also notes that much of the in-migration was due to changes in the Southern economy and that many of these in-migrants came for high-paying, professional positions, whereas blacks and poor whites that held low-wage jobs made up most of the out-migration during this period.

<sup>6</sup> Though migration to the Sunbelt can be attributed to many factors, the fact that some states benefited and others were hurt raises the question of whether the Cold War created “winners” and “losers” just within the United States during its duration (and possibly after, as the Sunbelt regions continue to grow while the Midwest population’s is shrinking).

<sup>7</sup> These percentages add up to over 100% because individuals may check off more than one race. See U.S. Census Bureau State and County Quick Facts (North Carolina), <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37000.html> (last accessed June 29, 2009).

It is worthwhile to point out the above demographic information because alongside the perceived proper role of the federal government, race was the most important factor that shaped the Southern response to a multitude of things in the twentieth century, including its Cold War perspective. Until the modern civil rights movement, many Southerners viewed blacks as well as other racial and ethnic groups not from Northern or Western Europe as inferior. With respect to the former, the attitude was shaped by the institution of slavery, with the latter it was due to the unfamiliarity with other ethnic groups given the paucity of immigration to the region.<sup>8</sup> During the Cold War, racial and ethnic assumptions were often the lens through which Southerners viewed developing nations (whether client or non-aligned states) in the decolonizing world. The Southern paternalistic attitude toward “lesser races” manifested itself in several ways. First, rather than taking into account the domestic or national concerns of its allies, Southerners frequently disliked cooperation and instead favored an American-led unilateral plan of action (e.g. Vietnam). Second, as the Cold War moved into the third world, Southerners oftentimes strongly supported foreign interventions to defend against the communist threat (e.g. Guatemala, Vietnam). Some of this was due to Southern assumptions that these nations were either unable to defend themselves properly against communism or they were unable to recognize the presence of communism subverting their system. Naturally, it can also be noted that Southerners, along with other Americans prior to the Vietnam conflict, oftentimes confused national liberation movements and their accompanying social reforms with communist infiltration when there was little to none. Finally, as membership in the United Nations by newly decolonized nations from Asia and Africa grew in the 1960s, Southerners who had already demonstrated qualified support for the institution became even less supportive of its efforts to secure peace in the Cold War age.<sup>9</sup>

A factor related to the South’s population growth and in-migration from other regions following World War II, has been its increased urbanization (though this may also be attributed to the changing nature of the South’s economy; see below). In 1930, most Americans lived in urban areas, but only one-third of Southerners did. This changed after World War II and continued through the duration of the Cold War, such that in 1960, 58% of the South’s residents lived in cities, and by 1980 75% did.<sup>10</sup> Still, one may find deep rural pockets where life has experienced fewer changes over the last few decades (though this too is changing, there are still many

---

<sup>8</sup> Of note, in the 1920s, the South was considered the most nativist (or anti-immigrant) part of the nation and gave overwhelming support to immigration restriction laws that introduced the quota system, favoring Northern and Western Europeans. The system lasted until the 1965 Immigration Act, which Southerners opposed. See J. Fry, *op. cit.* 196-197 (1920s) and 255-256 (1965 law).

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* 259 and 262 (regarding ethnic assumptions), and 226 and 252 (regarding the United Nations).

<sup>10</sup> B. Schulman, *op. cit.* 3; and J. Fry, *op. cit.* 224.



rural areas, even some not far from metropolitan centers like Chatham County near Raleigh, the capital of North Carolina, where broadband internet is unavailable).<sup>11</sup>

North Carolina reflects the general trends the South's economy underwent after World War II. Prior to it, as far back as the end of the American Civil War when Southern agriculture and hence its economy was completely devastated, the South became in many respects a colonial economy—extracting raw materials and producing agricultural products to be used or manufactured into finished goods elsewhere (other parts of the United States or abroad). After World War II, the Southern economy became more mechanized, diversified, and productive. Like other Southern states, North Carolina farms now produce soybeans and have expanded their livestock, poultry, and dairy production (not to mention its food processing industry, also like other Southern states). For a long time, North Carolina remained strong in tobacco and cotton production, but even that has changed and jobs related to these industries have seen heavy declines in the past several decades. The connection between smoking and cancer-related illnesses, along with the recent rescinding of tobacco allotments from the New Deal era, has solidified a move away from tobacco cultivation. Similarly, though North Carolina still produces cotton, it is no longer a prime region for textiles as mills have closed and jobs have gone overseas where cheaper labor conditions prevail. All in all, the move away from agriculture in the South's economy has resulted in a decrease of those living on farms (by 1980, only 3% did).<sup>12</sup>

These economic changes affected Southerners' outlook on foreign policy matters, most notably the issue of tariffs. From the late nineteenth century until the Cold War era, Southerners consistently favored low tariffs and free trade principles in order to find markets for their goods abroad. Given the economic changes, though, Joseph Fry has noted Southerners increasingly became some of the strongest proponents of American protectionism in the post-World War II era. This change, however, did not come overnight and is instructive as to why the South gave overwhelming support to the Marshall Plan of the early Cold War. The Marshall Plan played on Southerners' strong sense of national honor and patriotism as the United States sought to prop up a free and democratic Western Europe, fearing that without American help this area could succumb to communism. However, Southerners also recognized the benefit the Marshall Plan provided them—markets for their agricultural goods. As agriculture played less of a role in the South's economy, a re-

---

<sup>11</sup> F. Morgan, *Chatham's Information Highway is Made of Dirt: Life in the Slow Lane*, "Independent", February 18, 2009. Available online at <http://www.indywekk.com/gyrobase/Content?oid=oid%3A287743> (last accessed, June 29, 2009). Similarly, another article reported that the U.S. Census Bureau placed North Carolina 42 out of the 50 states in home internet access. See J. Drew, *Census Bureau: North Carolina Ranks Low for Accessing Internet*, "Triangle Business Journal", 3 June 2009. Available online at <http://triangle.bizjournals.com/triangle/stories/2009/06/01/daily48.html> (last accessed June 29, 2009).

<sup>12</sup> J. Fry, *op. cit.* 224.

versal in attitude took place. Southerners now favored higher, even at times protectionist, tariffs. Ironically enough, they often did so out of the same sense of national pride and patriotism.<sup>13</sup>

While World War II brought many economic changes to the South, the Cold War solidified them. Fry has found that from the nation's founding, Southerners in general have been suspicious of centralized government, higher taxes, and strong executive action, fearing such things abridged personal liberty and states' rights. He further notes that while this proposition held true for domestic matters in the twentieth century (especially where social reform or civil rights was concerned), Southerners were more likely to support a foreign policy that enhanced such things.<sup>14</sup> As a result, both Washington policymakers and Southern politicians were able to use the security needs of the early Cold War not only to protect the nation but also advance the economic development of the South, historically the nation's number one economic problem since the Civil War. The federal government which had been trying to promote economic change in the South since the New Deal, and rather unsuccessfully, finally found a way via "military Keynesianism," for as Schulman rightly notes, "military spending, understood broadly, offered development without political reform and social change."<sup>15</sup> In other words, to meet the Communist threat of the early Cold War period, the federal government was willing to spend a lot of money, and Southern politicians for a variety of reasons were eager to accept it despite the fact that in doing so they somewhat compromised their stance regarding federal involvement in states' affairs (something they would deny). First, the South accepted the money because it would help advance local and state economies. Secondly, out of duty, honor, and patriotism Southern politicians believed it was necessary to support a strong American defense posture to meet the Communist threat. And finally, the federal government did not attach strings to the money regarding social change in the South (i.e. workers' and civil rights). Washington most likely did not because doing so might draw Southern resistance and thus hinder America's national security, but also because advancing civil rights was not yet a high national priority (though it would become one as the Cold War continued on; see below).

During the Cold War, the South consistently supported large defense budgets and the region often witnessed more defense monies coming in than taxes paid out. The region was home to seven of the ten largest defense contractors; and defense-related industries frequently spurred economic growth as new industries vital to the Cold War emerged (e.g. space program installations in Houston, Texas, and Cape Canaveral, Florida). The Cold War fueled the Southern economy so much so that

---

<sup>13</sup> J. Fry, *op. cit.* 229-230 (Marshall Plan) and 267-268 (protectionism).

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid. passim.*

<sup>15</sup> B. Schulman, *op. cit.* 109 and 133.

by 1973, Schulman reports, “more Southerners worked in defense related industries than textiles, synthetics, and apparel combined.” Interestingly enough, while the Southern share of military contracts expanded from 7.6% in 1951 to 24.2% in 1980, the South received the lowest amount of funds for weapons development than other parts of the nation, which at least made it less dependent upon the so-called weapons roller-coaster.

North Carolina differed from other parts of the South in that it did not receive a large volume of defense work. Still, defense monies made up 10-20% of the state’s income growth between 1952 and 1962. Instead of serving as the weapons arsenal or innovative center of America’s national security state, North Carolina provided a significant portion of its fighting forces, housing two air force bases (Pope and Seymour Johnson), three Marine Corps air stations (Camp Lejeune, Cherry Point, and New Hill), and the army base at Fort Bragg (the largest military installation in the world by population). Thus, North Carolina had a place in the so-called military-industrial complex, but benefited more from its position in what some have called the military-payroll complex. Indeed, by 1970, the South was drawing one and a half times the national average in defense salaries. However, as Schulman notes, while military bases stimulated local economies, they did not necessarily foster economic growth in the form of new industries with high-paying, professional positions. Such was the case with North Carolina. To rectify that situation, local government, business, and university leaders in the Raleigh area decided to establish the Research Triangle Park in 1959 as a way to draw innovative and collaborative research, as well as government contracts, to the area. It succeeded with the former, but with the latter it failed to obtain significant amounts of defense monies over the course of the Cold War.<sup>16</sup> Nevertheless, the attempt to lure such funds radically changed the Triangle area (Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill). It went from an economy dominated by textile mills and farms to one driven by high-technology, such that today the Triangle usually shows up on lists identifying it as one the most educated areas in the United States (which includes percentages of the population with bachelor and advanced degrees; indeed, the area possesses one of the highest concentrations of individuals with master’s and doctoral degrees in the nation).

Like other Southern states, North Carolina gave vigorous support to presidents who favored large defense budgets to wage the Cold War. Along with the rest of their Southern brethren they tended, however, to favor budget monies that were directed at military items, such as weapon systems and military training, over foreign aid. The South was suspicious of foreign aid to developing nations but also disliked military aid to Western allies. In both cases, Southern traditional fiscal conservatism played a role as did additional factors. Regarding developing nations, racial

---

<sup>16</sup> B. Schulman, *op. cit.* chapter 6 (especially 139–150 for statistical information in the above two paragraphs; 167–170 for information on the Research Triangle Park).

and ethnic assumptions again came into play, questioning whether or not these nations were worthy of the aid and if they would use it properly in the fight against communism (and even if they were able to defend themselves from succumbing to communism).<sup>17</sup> In the case of military aid, it is possible this suspicion existed, especially in the later Cold War, because many of its Western allies had instituted social reforms and government sponsored programs like national health care, items which strengthened the hand and power of central governments. In that case, some Southerners questioned whether some of their European allies were vigilant enough in seeing socialism infiltrate their political systems or were in fact not Reds themselves. Such views were consistent with Southern sensibilities regarding the proper role of national governments. It was one thing to support a strong government for reasons of national security, but quite another to let it acquire power in the form of a welfare state.

While Southerners generally favored defense spending during the Cold War, they were less approving of efforts to accept the Cold War as a permanent, ongoing structure of international relations. Rather, in keeping with a strong tradition of national honor and duty, the Cold War was to some extent viewed like other, regular wars—something to be waged vigorously and won outright. Hence, they were suspicious of efforts to tone down tensions or accept arms control measures. Southerners consistently opposed the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty, the 1968 Nonproliferation Treaty, and SALT I and II. Likewise, they favored building an ABM (antiballistic missile system), but opposed the restriction of being limited to one.<sup>18</sup> Hence, they welcomed Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI or "Star Wars").

Over the last forty years, the South has undergone a dramatic change in its political affiliation as well. At the start of the Cold War, the South was firmly Democratic in national elections and had been since the end of Reconstruction. Today, the South usually votes Republican at the national level (especially with respect to presidential and Senate candidates). However, the reasons behind the change in political allegiance have more to do with domestic affairs than matters of foreign policy.<sup>19</sup> Whenever the national Democratic Party took strong stands with respect to labor rights, social reform, or civil rights, it could not count on the support of its Southern brethren. The sea change, of course, came in the 1960s when President Lyndon Baines Johnson (a Texas Southerner himself) pushed for great social changes in American life via the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and the various pieces of legislation which made up his Great Society program (ten-

---

<sup>17</sup> J. Fry, *op. cit.* 227, 230, and 251–254.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* 240–243.

<sup>19</sup> While this is a complicated issue, in writing this essay, the author has come to believe that perhaps the Southern change in political allegiance from the Democrats to the Republicans, or at least its solidification, may have more to do with foreign affairs than previously thought. Further study would help clarify whether, and to what extent, any connection exists.

sions, however, were already evident with the 1948 Dixiecrat revolt from the party after President Harry S. Truman sought to move forward on civil rights).<sup>20</sup> Indeed, Johnson foresaw the possible damage done to the party as he signed these pieces of legislation into being, predicting the Democrats had lost the South for at least a generation. Sure enough, following the social and civil rights reforms of the 1960s, Southerners began leaving the Democrat Party.<sup>21</sup> By 1972, Richard Nixon swept the South. Ronald Reagan, George H. Bush, and George W. Bush repeated this feat (although Jimmy Carter did take his home state of Georgia in the 1980 election, while Bill Clinton and Barack Obama were able to pick off a few Southern states in 1992, 1996, and 2008).

By the 1960s, civil rights had become an issue in the Cold War and, according to Mary Dudziak, forward movement on it increasingly became a Cold War imperative. Simply put, the existence of black inequality, segregation, and voter disfranchisement especially in Southern states highlighted the contradictions between what the United States claimed it stood for and therefore what the Cold War was supposedly about. Inequality and restrictions on freedom for African Americans made it difficult to proclaim American leadership of the Free World. Moreover, such things cast doubt on whether or not the Cold War was truly an ideological struggle between Western democracy and liberty and Soviet totalitarianism and oppression. Indeed, the Soviet Union frequently highlighted the disparities in the American system in its propaganda.

Dudziak argues President Truman recognized the problems civil rights raised in waging the Cold War and took steps to eliminate them. Because he faced strong opposition from the Southern wing of the Democrat Party, he took action where he could through executive orders (like desegregation of the military). He also had his Attorney General's office file *amicus curie* (friend of the court) briefs in civil rights legal cases like *Brown v. Board of Education*, which eventually dispelled the "separate but equal" doctrine and led to desegregation in schooling. She further notes that as decolonization proceeded, more advanced progress on civil rights at home was required. Hence, President Johnson went ahead with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in part because it was necessary to wage and win the Cold War on several fronts: to make true American claims on being the

---

<sup>20</sup> Dixiecrat denotes a Southern Democrat who left the national party during the 1948 election and supported the States' Rights Party candidate, then governor of South Carolina Strom Thurmond. The word, Dixiecrat, is a combination of Democrat with Dixie, a colloquial name for the South. Thurmond, by the way, started out as a Democrat and later became a Republican in 1964.

<sup>21</sup> Schulman attributes the increasing number of Southern Republican votes after 1950 to more than just race. Given his focus on economic change in the South, he notes the increasing number of businesses, their employees, and native Southern politicians hoping to attract new industries to the region affected the turn toward the Republican Party, the traditional party of business. What also stands out, however, is the fact that by 1980, the South witnessed the highest number of young voters choosing the Republican Party. See R. Schulman, *op. cit.* 214–216.

Free World leader as well as to entice newly decolonized nations in Asia and Africa to throw their support to the Free World side. Thus, the Cold War played a role in helping to bring about the progress made in civil rights during the 1960s.<sup>22</sup>

From the presidencies of Truman to Johnson, Southerners fought their Democratic Party leaders on civil rights, revealing again the importance that race played in shaping the Southern Cold War perspective.<sup>23</sup> Southerners were quick to hurl the epitaph of Communist at anyone who protested or favored civil rights,<sup>24</sup> a fairly effective weapon used to silence the opposition since the McCarthy era. Indeed, such allegations had been suggested even before the Cold War when the Communist Party of the United States had occasionally taken up the cause of black rights. By the early Cold War, however, many civil rights organizations were suspicious of communist motivations and, as Brenda Gayle Plummer has shown, frequently tried to distance themselves from any radical links to the past. Rather, many groups fell in line with the emerging anticommunist consensus in order to advance their cause with Washington.<sup>25</sup>

Though less effective by the late 1960s, there were still serious consequences of such charges. For example, privacy rights were infringed upon when Reverend Martin Luther King Jr., along with other civil rights leaders and activists, had FBI files on them, looking into whether or not they were communists or associated with com-

---

<sup>22</sup> It should be noted that Dudziak has been unfairly criticized by those studying the modern civil rights movement in America. She argues the Cold War did play a role and it did have an impact on the course of civil rights progress, but she in no way makes the argument that the Cold War alone was responsible for this progress. She acknowledges that without the efforts of civil rights activists putting the issue on the agenda, much of it could not have been done. See M. Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000).

<sup>23</sup> It should be noted that this discussion of Southern attitudes is centered on white Southerners. Black Southerners obviously had different views on the matter. Moreover, this difference affected black Southern attitudes toward Cold War policies. For example, black Southerners were often less anticommunist in their attitudes, frequently less supportive of American foreign interventions in developing nations (often identifying a sense of solidarity in the struggle against racism and oppression), and more opposed to American involvement in the Vietnam War. See B. Gayle Plummer, *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960* (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996), especially: 177, 184–187, 206, 223, and 316–318.

<sup>24</sup> J. Fry, *op. cit.* 249.

<sup>25</sup> In her work, Plummer examines the African American response to foreign affairs, refuting the notion that when compared to white Americans, black Americans in general held a much more isolationist view. She sees a much more complex picture (and connection) between African American domestic concerns regarding segregation, inequality and racism and their attitudes toward foreign events in the twentieth century. In doing so, she examines many different African American organizations throughout the period, noting any communist pasts or associations of some of the individuals involved, but also noting that like other Americans who flirted with communism in the 1930s, many had already distanced themselves from Soviet communism by the time the Cold War began. What is of particular interest, is her examination of how the U.S. government actively sought to tame or eradicate the more radical elements within civil rights groups, thereby co-opting the groups and bringing them into the liberal anticommunist consensus which was being forged. See B. Gayle Plummer, *op. cit.* chapters 5 and 6 (especially 196–199 and 214–216 for U.S. government actions to tame the more radical elements).

munists. In 1963, the state of North Carolina enacted the so-called Speaker Ban Law which prohibited public colleges and universities from allowing speakers on their campuses who were known members of the Communist Party. Moreover, this ban extended to anyone who had “taken the Fifth” in response to questions posed by a state or federal body regarding any communist associations and subversive activity against the U.S. government.<sup>26</sup> William Billingsley has shown the real targets of the Speaker Ban were not communists, but civil rights activists. University students around the state, but especially those at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, led the fight against the law and brought suit against the state. In 1968, the federal district court in Greensboro, North Carolina found the law violated the First Amendment’s freedom of speech rights and ruled the law unconstitutional (though it was not officially repealed by the state until 1995).<sup>27</sup>

Southern attempts to use anticommunism to resist civil rights reform at home were ultimately unsuccessful. Having lost the battle over this matter within their traditional party, many abandoned the Democrats and became Republicans. Even though the South’s political allegiance changed after the 1960s, what remained consistent was its stand on America’s Cold War policy. With the onset of the Cold War, a bipartisan consensus emerged, such that both Republicans and Democrats were committed to the policy of containment in all its permutations. Communism was seen as a dangerous threat to individual liberties everywhere and had to be contained wherever it existed, by whatever means necessary. Vietnam shattered this Cold War consensus, though Southerners continued to adhere to its main tenets, albeit as members of a different political party.

The Vietnam conflict was both the pinnacle and watershed moment for the United States’ commitment to the containment doctrine. It was the pinnacle in that the idea of confronting communism in such a far off place which many Americans had never heard of before went unquestioned initially. It was the watershed moment in that, as mentioned, it shattered the bipartisan Cold War consensus that had been established after World War II.

When the United States first became involved in Vietnam, giving military aid and training under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower, Southerners were wary of such involvement. This may seem somewhat strange, but not really when one remembers they had always been suspicious of military and foreign aid. As the conflict truly became an American one under President Johnson, Southerners went

---

<sup>26</sup> This refers to the Fifth Amendment in the American Constitution’s Bill of Rights which states no person “shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself.” During the era of McCarthyism in the 1950s, many individuals who were called before state or federal bodies investigating communist infiltration “took the Fifth” and remained silent. At the time, and obviously even after in North Carolina, this was looked upon as an admission of guilt of either being a communist or having associated with communists and supported the overthrow of the American governmental system.

<sup>27</sup> See W.J. Billingsley, *Communists on Campus: Race, Politics, and the Public University in Sixties North Carolina* (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1999).

along with other members of Congress in passing the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964, granting the president almost unlimited power to wage the Cold War in Vietnam. The following year, Southerners provided strong support for the introduction of American ground troops. In direct troop numbers, the South provided one third of all American soldiers who served in the conflict, whereas the region only made up 20% of the American population as a whole. Some of this may be due to the fact that compared to the rest of the nation, Southerners were more likely to be poor and unable to obtain an exemption based on university enrollment status. However, Fry has noted the numbers also fit in well with Southerners' strong sense of honor, both personal and national, and devotion to duty and country.<sup>28</sup>

Throughout the war, the Southern people and their Congressional representatives repeatedly supported presidential policies to ratchet up the means used to combat the North Vietnamese. Thus, they supported the insertion of American ground troops, the heavy bombing campaigns, and the mining of North Vietnamese waters. If anything, Southerners had a preference for military solutions and loathed the constraints the Cold War put on American power and its ability to wage war against the communist threat, something that became extremely acute during the Vietnam conflict. Because of Johnson's decision to wage a limited war here, the South was the section of the nation most critical of his handling of the war. They preferred Nixon's initial policies and supported his plan to leave Vietnam with honor, though they rejected calls to withdraw from the conflict. When Congress finally made the decision to cut off funds, making it impossible for Nixon to continue the effort, Southerners voted against the decision in great numbers.<sup>29</sup>

As the war became more and more unpopular at home and around the world, protests grew on college campuses and outside defense-related industries which made the weapons of war. Though the South was home to a number of defense contractors, the ones located here experienced considerably fewer demonstrations compared to those situated elsewhere. Likewise, while there were student protests on Southern college campuses, in comparison to the size and numbers elsewhere, they were rather small. Many student protests on American college campuses were

---

<sup>28</sup> J. Fry, *op. cit.* 263 and 268–269.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* 231 and chapter 8 on Vietnam (especially 262, 269, 271–274, 287, and 289).

A big debate exists within Southern history regarding the region's proclivity toward violence, especially in the nineteenth century. If one accepts the proposition that for a variety of reasons Southerners were prone to solving problems by use of force, the logical next step is that during the Cold War, the South often supported military force in meeting the communist threat. Though the connection is still problematic, on several occasions during the Cold War, Fry notes the South argued for the use of nuclear weapons (Korean War, Taiwan Straits Crises) and favored either the threat or use of military force (securing Western access to Berlin, Bay of Pigs invasion attempt). It should be noted here that not all Southerners or their representatives were in favor of continuing the war in Vietnam. Senator William Fulbright, an Arkansas Democrat, was probably the most vocal opponent of doing so. Moreover, to a great extent, this introduction to the Southern Cold War perspective is providing overarching generalities regarding the general Southern opinion. Differences existed both within and between Southern states yet on nearly most Cold War matters.



directed at ROTC programs (Reserve Officer Training Corps) that provided future military leaders. While many universities dismantled their ROTC programs either during or immediately after Vietnam, Campbell University in Buies Creek, North Carolina, actually established its in the midst of the conflict. The University president at the time was himself a man of strong Southern honor and a veteran of World War II.<sup>30</sup>

American music from the 1960s is filled with anti-war songs, but even in popular culture, Southerners showed their difference. Country music stars Tom T. Hall and Merle Haggard, though not necessarily coming out in favor of the Vietnam War, demonstrated more sympathy for the soldiers and veterans coming home than they did with what many considered the hippie, dope-smoking student protesters. As Merle Haggard sang in "Okie from Muskogee," "We don't smoke marijuana in Muskogee/We don't take our trips on LSD/We don't burn our draft cards down on Main Street/We like livin' right, and bein' free." Rather he was "proud to be an Okie from Muskogee," where they still waved "Old Glory down at the courthouse, and white lightnin'" was "still the biggest thrill of all."<sup>31</sup>

Once the Vietnam conflict was over, many Southerners took the position that the war had been honorable and winnable. Many claimed that had civilian policy, and especially the doctrine of limited war, not tied the hands of the military, the United States could have won.<sup>32</sup> When Ronald Reagan proclaimed these very same sentiments in his 1980 run for president, he solidified the South's new-found commitment to the Republican Party.

Vietnam shattered the bipartisan Cold War consensus, though the South still clung to its main tenets. Following Vietnam, Democrats were often considered Doves. They tended to be wary of foreign interventions and supportive of policies that brought a modicum of détente in the Cold War. Republicans, on the other hand, were considered Hawks, suspicious of détente by the late 1970s, favoring arms buildups to regain military superiority in the Cold War, and supportive of foreign interventions to contain communism, especially in the Western hemisphere. Hence, with respect to foreign policy and waging the Cold War, it makes sense that many Southerners

---

<sup>30</sup> For defense contractor protests, see B. Schulman, *op. cit.* 146; for Southern college protests see J. Fry, *op. cit.* 271–272; for Campbell University, see J. Winston Pearce, *Campbell College: Big Miracle at Little Buies Creek, 1887–1974*, Vol. 1 (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1976), 226.

<sup>31</sup> An Okie is a colloquial, somewhat derogatory, name for someone from Oklahoma, but in this song Haggard makes it one full of pride and honor. Muskogee is a town in Oklahoma. White lightnin' refers to homemade moonshine, which is illegal due to its high alcohol content as well as its maker not paying taxes on its production or sale. "Okie From Muskogee" first appeared on Merle Haggard's 1969 album, *Okie From Muskogee* (Capitol ST-384). Tom T. Hall's song, "Mama Bake a Pie (Daddy Kill a Chicken)," tells the story of a wounded Vietnam veteran, now troubled by alcohol, coming home to a nation that thinks "the war is just a waste of time." The song appeared on his 1971 album, *100 Children* (Mercury SR 61307). Earlier Hall songs spoke in favor of the war, noting the Americans were fighting for the freedom of the Vietnamese from communism. See J. Fry, *op. cit.* 270–271.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* 292–293.

permanently left the Democrat Party in favor of the Republicans by the 1980s, for they represented Southern views. After all, Reagan was man who initially dismissed the détente process, sought to regain American military superiority vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, and argued for a strong defense budget to do so (he also promised to turn back the clock on federal involvement in domestic policy, also pleasing to Southern ears).<sup>33</sup> Again, the South showed consistency in its views on the national government—giving strong support to the national security state created by the Cold War and wanting to turn back the tide of the New Deal/Great Society’s welfare state.

## Conclusion

The Cold War had a dramatic impact on the South, resulting in significant economic, social, and political changes. Without a doubt, the second half of the twentieth century saw the Southern economy move away from one based on agriculture and being labeled the nation’s number one economic problem to one dominated by new service and high-tech industries related to the Cold War and leading the nation in economic growth.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, the Cold War helped propel changes in the southern social system in which blacks were previously left out. While the Cold War did not give birth to the civil rights movement, it did aid it such that by the 1960s the issue of racial equality became enveloped in the larger superpower struggle. Without advancement on true liberty and equality for African Americans, the United States could not stand as the leader of the Free World, especially as the Cold War moved into the third world. Subsequently, the domestic reforms of the 1960s, especially civil rights, altered the political allegiance of many white Southerners as they turned away from the Democratic Party and joined the Republican fold.

Despite these outward changes, the South remained fairly consistent on what the proper role of the federal government was (limited with respect to individual liberties and rights, which translated into a limited role for the promotion of social change; stronger on matters of national security and defense). This then affected the Southern approach to the Cold War. Throughout it, the Soviet Union and com-

---

<sup>33</sup> It should be noted that as Reagan began to work with Mikhail Gorbachev in the mid-1980s on arms reduction, Southerners criticized his détente-like moves. However, when the Berlin Wall fell in November 1989 and the Soviet Union dissolved in December 1991, many Republicans, among them Southerners, claimed it was due to Reagan’s policy to step up the arms race in order to bankrupt the Soviet system, thus finally bringing about the end of communism and winning the Cold War. One still hears echoes of this claim, as witness the most recent Republican National Convention in 2008. A work that disputes the idea that the Reagan arms build-up was designed with the intention of bankrupting the Soviet Union and ending the Cold War is B. Fischer, *The Reagan Reversal: U.S. Foreign Policy and the End of the Cold War* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1997).

<sup>34</sup> B. Schulman, *op. cit.* 152. However, he also notes that while the South’s economy changed dramatically, with respect to average worker income the South still led the nation in lowest wages paid by the late-Cold War period.

munism were consistently viewed as dangerous threats that needed to be stopped. By the later Cold War, consistent support for American military action or unilateral action still garnered large support in the South. In other words, constant pressure not diplomacy was what was needed to wage the Cold War. Even Reagan's efforts to reach agreement with Mikhail Gorbachev in the 1980s were pilloried by Southern voices. Ironically enough, once the Soviet Union crumbled to pieces in 1991, Southerners went back to Reagan as the man who destroyed communism by breaking the Soviet Union's ability to compete militarily (and economically) with the West.

Thus, the author is left with the feeling that while the Cold War brought many significant changes to the South, in terms of perspectives and views held of the Soviet Union, communism, etc. very little changed over the course of nearly fifty years. This then raises questions concerning the Southern view of America's post-Cold War foreign policy and approach to the so-called War on Terrorism. Some of the loudest calls for the unilateral use of force in Iraq and elsewhere have come from the South. Furthermore, support for such actions has at times established a litmus test of one's patriotism such that not supporting a military action is conflated with a lack of support for American troops and therefore one's patriotism.

## References

Bartley, N.V. *The New South, 1945–1980*. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1995).

Billingsley, W.J. *Communists on Campus: Race, Politics, and the Public University in Sixties North Carolina*. (Athens and London: The University of Georgia Press, 1999).

Borstelmann, Th. "The Cold War and the American South," in *Local Consequences of the Global Cold War*, ed. J.A. Engel. (Washington, D.C. and Stanford: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Stanford University Press, 2008).

Cassels, L. *The Unexpected Exodus: How the Cold War Displaced One Southern Town*, with a new introduction by K. Frederickson. (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 2007).

Christensen, R. *The Paradox of Tar Heel Politics: The Personalities, Elections, and Events that Shaped Modern North Carolina*. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2008).

Dudziak, M.L. *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy*. (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000).

Fry, J.A. *Dixie Looks Abroad: The South and U.S. Foreign Relations, 1789–1973*. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2002).

Grantham, D. *The South in Modern America: A Region at Odds*. (New York: Harpers Collins, 1994).

McWilliam, T.S. *The New South Faces the World: Foreign Affairs and the Southern Sense of Self, 1877–1950*. (Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press, 1988).

Plummer, B. Gayle. *Rising Wind: Black Americans and U.S. Foreign Affairs, 1935–1960*. (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1996).

Powell, W.S. *North Carolina Through Four Centuries*. (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1989).

Schulman, B. *From Cotton Belt to Sunbelt: Federal Policy, Economic Development, and the Transformation of the South, 1938–1980*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

Terrill, Th.E. *The American South: A History*. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1996).

Wilson, J.R. *Landing Zones: Southern Vietnam Veterans Remember Vietnam*. (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990).

Lee Trepanier

## Enemy Images, Evidence, and Cognitive Dissonance: The Cold War as Recalled by Michiganders

### Introduction

This chapter is a summary of Michiganders' view of three Cold War events: the communist infiltration of labor unions in the 1940s, McCarthyism in the 1950s, and the Cuban Missile Crisis in the 1960s. Fifteen Michiganders from the Flint and Tri-city area in March 2009 were shown articles about a Cold War event and then were interviewed for approximately an hour about their recollection of the events. In the interviews, I explore three specific questions: 1) do Michiganders' perceptions of Communists subscribe to an "enemy image"?; and, on what basis do they make such perception, if they possess it?; 2) do Michiganders have confidence in their leaders to meet the global challenge of communism?; and 3) do Michiganders suffer from cognitive dissonance in their perceptions of Cold War and personal events? And if they do, how do they reconcile themselves with it?

The concept of enemy image—a set of negative beliefs or perceptions that a person has about another's country's capabilities, motivations, political system, and culture—can lead to exaggerated fear of that country as well as create a self-image of innocence where one's own actions are not perceived as aggressive. Often individuals who subscribe to an enemy image and have an innocent self-image have confidence in their own political leaderships: a set of positive beliefs or perceptions about their political leadership being able to confront international crises. However, cognitive dissonance may result when new information becomes revealed that conflicts with a person's existing beliefs and perceptions.

This chapter will see whether Michiganders had these experiences during the Cold War. But before we look at this, I will provide the political demographics of

the Flint and Tri-city area as well as a history of the Labor Movement in the United States, since this topic is not as well known as the other Cold War events: McCarthyism and the Cuban Missile Crisis.

## Political Demographics

Michigan is the eighth most populous state in the United States with an approximate population of 10 million residents. It has a large white population (81%) and a sizable African-American (14%) and Arab (Lebanese) populations. Its economy is dominated by the automobile industry, with education, agriculture, and tourism playing secondary roles. Although it has voted for a Democratic presidential candidate since 1992, the state continues to be a “swing” state with Democrats strong in Detroit and Ann Arbor and Republican strength in Grand Rapids and the rural regions.

The Flint and Tri-City area (Saginaw, Bay City, and Midland) is a racially and economically diverse region and is one of the places in Michigan that determines the state’s electoral outcomes, i.e., it is a “swing” region of the state for presidential elections (the Detroit suburbs is the other region). It is the birthplace of the so-called “Reagan Democrat”: the traditional Democrat voter, a white working-class Northerner, who defected from their party to support Republican President Reagan in both the 1980 and 1984 elections. A smaller but substantial number supported President George H.W. Bush in 1988, but they returned to the Democratic Party by a slight margin since then. Reagan Democrats no longer saw Democrats as champions of their working class aspirations, but instead viewed them as working primarily for the benefits of others: the very poor, the unemployed, minorities, and feminists.

Flint metropolitan population is approximately 400,000 and economy is dominated by the automotive industry, as expected being the birthplace of General Motors (GM). Within Flint proper, the population is divided evenly between whites (53%) and blacks (41%). The 2008 median household income is \$31,424.00. Because of the decline of GM since the 1970s, Flint has suffered from a decline in population and a rise in crime, with racial tensions exacerbated as the local economy continues to suffer. Flint traditionally is a bastion of Democratic voters but now is a swing city in the state, as discussed above with the “Reagan Democrats.”

The Saginaw metropolitan population is approximately 200,000 and economy also is dominated by automotive industry, specifically Delphi, which is one of the primary parts suppliers for GM. Within Saginaw proper, the population is divided evenly between whites (47%) and blacks (43%) with a growing Latino population (9%). The 2008 median household income is \$26,485.00. Like Flint, because of the

decline of the automotive industry, Saginaw has suffered from both high unemployment and crime. Residents who live in Saginaw City vote overwhelming Democratic, while those in the suburbs tend to vote Republican.

The Bay City metropolitan population is approximately 108,000 and economy is dominated by light industries and tourism. Within Bay City proper, the population is predominantly white (91%), mostly of Eastern European descent and of working-class origins. The 2008 median household income is \$30,425.00. Bay City residents tend to vote Democratic.

Midland, the last and smallest of the tri-cities, has a metropolitan population of 82,000 and economy is dominated by Dow Chemical and Dow Corning, where both companies' corporate headquarters are located. Within Midland proper, the population is predominantly white (93%) and well-educated. The 2008 median household income is \$48,444.00. Midland residents tend to vote Republican.

## Labor History in the United States

Although the first local unions were formed in the late eighteenth century, the first effective labor organizations—the Knights of Labor and the American Railway Union—appeared in the second half of the nineteenth century. However, both the Haymarket Riot (1866) and the Pullman Strike (1894) provided the federal and state governments an excuse to repress these labor movements. From these events emerged the American Federation of Labor (AFL) which favored local union autonomy, limited membership to workers, and excluded minorities and women. A rival union, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), was established in 1905 and supported anarcho-syndicalism, while a new political party, the Socialist Party, emerged as a political power in the Midwest in the 1910s with the objective of overthrowing capitalism. But a series of events—the Danbury Hatters' Case and the War Labor Administrator during World War I in particular—provided the federal government the authority to crush the IWW and relegate the Socialist Party as a minor regional power.

In the 1930s the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) established the United Steel Workers of America (UWA), the United Automobile Workers (UAW), and other industrial unions throughout the United States. The CIO and the AFL attempted a merger between the two organizations but it failed. Nonetheless, both the AFL and CIO supported Franklin Roosevelt in 1940 and the war effort in June 1941, when Germany invaded the Soviet Union. The unions agreed to a no-strike policy during World War II except in November 1943 when the CIO went on a twelve-day strike for higher wages, causing a conservative coalition in Congress to pass anti-union legislation that ultimately led to the Taft-Hartley Act (1947).

This Act amended the National Labor Relations Act that prohibited “unfair labor practices” on part of unions, such as jurisdictional strikes (pressure employer to assign particular work to a union representative) and common situs picketing (unions refuse to handle goods of a business which they have no primary dispute but associated with a targeted business). The Act also outlawed closed shops, permitted states to pass “right-to-work” laws, and forced unions to give a sixty-day’ notice to employers of a potential strike. It also required unions to come to the negotiating table during a “cooling-off” period, as authorized by the President.

Both the AFL and CIO supported President Truman’s Cold War policies, including the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, and NATO. Left wing elements protested and were forced out by the unions, with Walter Reuther of the UAW purging all Communist elements. Reuther also was active in expelling eleven Communist-dominated unions from the CIO in 1949. As a prominent figure of the anti-Communist left, Reuther founded the Americans for Democratic Action (1947) and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (1949) in opposition to the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions. He left the Socialist Party in 1939 and became an ardent supporter of the Democratic Party.

Since 1955, when the AFL and CIO merged into the AFL-CIO, the American labor movement actively supported the Civil Rights Movement and the organization of public sector (government) unions, which now surpasses private sector unions in terms of membership. The UAW is an example of the decline of union membership in manufacturing: there were approximately 1.6 million members of the UAW in 1970; now there is approximately a little more than half a million. Perhaps the biggest and most recent blow against the American labor movement was President Reagan’s firing of the PATCO (Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization) and replacing them with scabs in 1981. Thousands of employees lost their jobs, wages remained stagnant, and, most important of all, the nation’s airplane service resumed without any glitches, giving the public the impression that unions impeded efficiency and best management practices. This negative perception of unions continued with the passage of NAFTA, the flooding of imported foreign goods and services, the rising attraction of right-to-work states for corporations, and the disproportion blame placed on unions for the recent federal government bailout of GM and Chrysler.

## Labor History in Michigan

The history of labor in Michigan is the history of the United Automobile Workers (UAW), or formally known as the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America. This organization now



represents workers in the United States, Canada, and Puerto Rico; and, although originally represented workers in the automobile manufacturing industry, it currently includes industries as diverse as health care, casino gaming, and higher education. It has approximately 800 local unions and headquarters is located in Detroit.

The UAW was founded in 1935 in Detroit under the auspices of the AFL but left the AFL when the CIO was established in 1936. The UAW was the first major union that was willing to organize African-American workers and found success in organizing with the sit-down strikes, first in Atlanta in 1936 and, more famously, in Flint on December 29, 1936. That strike ended in February 1937 after Michigan Governor Frank Murphy negotiated recognition of the UAW by GM. The next month the UAW was established at Chrysler as workers engaged in a sit-down strike. However, at Ford, the UAW was not established until 1941, after the Battle of the Overpass (1937), when labor organizers clashed with Ford security guards.

After the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, the UAW agreed to a no-strike policy to ensure the war effort would not be hindered by strikes. After World War II, the UAW elected Walter Reuther at their 1946 convention. Reuther ousted Communists from positions of power, especially at the Ford local, and used the strategy of negotiating a contract with one major auto maker and applying to others to secure a number of new benefits for automobile workers, including fully paid hospitalization and sick leave benefits at GM and profit-sharing at American Motors. Soon the UAW became one of the best paid groups of the industrial workers in the country—placing them solidly in the middle class.

By the end of the 1960s, changes in the global economy, specifically competition from European and Japanese automobile makers, and management decisions by U.S. automakers started to significantly reduce the profits of the U.S. automakers. Membership in the UAW declined over this period as did the profits and market share of the U.S. automakers to the point where General Motors and Chrysler (its second time) requested a bailout from the federal government in 2008-2009. The American public, and Congress, blamed the UAW for the automotive crisis, pointing out the high benefits of its members when compared to workers for foreign automakers, i.e., a UAW worker receives \$74/hour compared to a Toyota worker's \$44/hour. The Union also has come under criticism for setting up the controversial job bank program and refusing to cut its salary to match the salaries of workers in competitors, such as Toyota.

## Communist Infiltration

Five interviewees from the Flint and Tri-City area were given two articles to read for their reactions. The articles and a summary of each one are below:

*"AFL Denounces Labor Disruption," New York Times, 20 June 1941, p. 9*

Representative Woodruff of Michigan wanted the President of the CIO, Philip Murray, to quit the National Defense Mediation Board because of communist infiltration. Because he has been doing everything he can to keep the Communists out of the unions, Representative Woodruff called for Murray to quit if the President of the CIO refuses to purge subversive agents from the labor movement. According to Woodruff, the Nazi-Communist alliance is attempting to overthrow the American labor and union system: "their purpose is to sabotage defense production, stir up industrial strife, undermine trade union movement, and organize a revolution against the United States . . . They betray the million of loyal, hard-working American union members."

*"Red Charge Fly in Flint Strikes," New York Times, 20 January 1946, p. 8.*

The UAW membership was concerned about communist infiltration in their own membership as well as in the membership of the local teachers unions. By not purging the communist influence in these unions, members worried about a divided organization. However, members also were concerned that the accusations of certain union leaders as being communists were part of a "Red Scare" tactic by government and business to split the union. Both the leadership and its members were opposed to communist infiltration in their unions but also wary of accusations of their leaders being communist.

After reading the articles, the five people were interviewed for approximately an hour about their recollection of communist infiltration in the UAW. All five signed consent-release forms for the academic use of their interviews.

The demographic information about the interviewees is below:

Interviewee #1 Male, 88, Roman Catholic, High School Education, Democrat, Flint  
Interviewee #2 Male, 76, Roman Catholic, High School Education, Democrat, Saginaw  
Interviewee #3 Male, 85, Protestant, Doctorate Education, Republican, Midland  
Interviewee #4 Female, 74, Roman Catholic, High School Education, Democrat, Saginaw  
Interviewee #5 Female, 80, Protestant, High School Education, Republican, Midland

A summary of all the respondents' interviews is below:

All interviewees recall a negative impression of communists, specifically the Soviet Union and Stalin: "It was a scary time. We were getting all our information

from the radio, and we heard all the terrible things that Stalin was doing over there to the Russians and all other countries . . . just bad things . . .” (#1). Stalin is often referred to as “an evil man” (#2), “a threat to the United States” (#4), and “someone who was dictator and wouldn’t stop until he had all of Europe” (#1).

When asked about communist infiltration in the UAW, only interviewees #1 and #2 answered, since they were members: “We were worried about them infiltration, not just the unions but the United States as well.” (#2). However, they were skeptical about charges that either specific members or their union leaders were communists: “A lot of things were said, but I didn’t know any Communists” (#2). “There was a lot of fear, but I didn’t know any [Communists]. I think you have to have evidence first before you can say someone’s like that.” (#1). Both interviewee #1 and #2 heard rumors of someone in their unions being a communist, but, as far as they could recall, nothing was done about it. The other respondents didn’t know any communists either, with interviewee #3 making the point that “I lived in a fairly wealthy neighborhood and things around seemed as if all were well. I didn’t know any communists, nor did I think any of family knew any.”

All respondents had confidence in the leadership of the United States to confront the communist challenge. “I had complete faith in the United States and the president” was a typical refrain from the interviewees (#1-2, 4-5). All interviewees believed that the United States’ leadership would be able to meet the communist challenge.

Michiganders subscribed to an enemy image, with all of them having negative impressions of communists, Soviets, and specifically of Stalin, who was referred to an “evil man” and “doing the terrible things over there to the Russians and all other countries.” Michiganders also had confidence in the political leadership in the United States to confront the communist challenge. “I had complete faith in the United States and the president” was a typical refrain from the interviewees. However, when asked about communist infiltration in the unions, Michiganders were skeptical about the charges and wanted to see evidence before making judgment. This is a form of cognitive dissonance: Michiganders were suspicious of communist infiltration as reported nationally, but, when specific leaders or members were charged, Michiganders wanted to see evidence furnished. In other words, union cohesion and the rule of law were higher values among Michiganders than a fear of communist infiltration.

## McCarthyism

McCarthyism was a period of intense anti-communist suspicion in the United States from the late 1940s to the late 1950s. During this time thousands of Americans were accused of being Communist or communist sympathizers and became subject of aggressive investigations and questioning before government or private-industry panels and committees. Perhaps the most famous example was the speeches, investigations, and hearings of Senator McCarthy and the Hollywood blacklist, associated with the hearings conducted by the House Committee of Un-American Activities. Ultimately, public and political support turned against McCarthyism, with Murrow's *See It Now*, Army-McCarthy Hearings, and a series of Supreme Court rulings playing critical roles.

Five interviewees from the Flint and Tri-City area were given two articles to read for their reactions. The articles and a summary of each one are below:

*"Movies to Oust Ten Cited for Contempt of Congress," New York Times, 25 November 1954*

Members of the Association of Motion Pictures Producers voted unanimously to refuse employment to any known members of the communist party and discharge or suspend without compensation the ten men cited for contempt to the House of Representatives. Major heads of Hollywood studios got together in a hotel for two days and vote to keep fear out of Hollywood.

*"Mr. M'Carthy as a Symbol," New York Times, 11 November 11, 1954*

McCarthyism is defined as "the invasion of personal rights, the irresponsible attacks on individuals and institution, the disregard of fair democratic procedures, the reckless shattering of mutual trust among the citizens of this country, the terrorization of local civil servants—these are all elements of McCarthyism. It is the destruction of orderly government process; it is the destruction of the constitutional relationship between the equal branches of our Government; it is the assault of federal agencies most intimately concerned with the actual "cold war" or the potential "hot" one; it is the contempt for the Bill of Rights and for the ordinary rules of public and policy decency. It is the encouragement of fear, the undermining of self-confidence, the pandering of emotionalism; it is the diverse force of accusation, recrimination, and suspicion."

After reading the articles, the five people were interviewed for approximately an hour about their recollection of McCarthyism. All five signed consent-release forms for the academic use of their interviews.

The demographic information about the interviewees is below:

Interviewee #1 Male, 75, Roman Catholic, High School Education, Republican, Midland  
Interviewee #2 Male, 81, Roman Catholic, High School Education, Independent, Bay City  
Interviewee #3 Male, 81, Protestant, Bachelor Degree, Democrat, Saginaw  
Interviewee #4 Female, 72, Protestant, High School Education, Independent, Bay City  
Interviewee #5 Female, 62, Protestant, High School Education, Republican, Flint

A summary of all the respondents' interviews is below:

Most of the interviewees knew about McCarthyism, particularly how it affected Hollywood, but were suspicious about the charges that Americans were Communists. Some excerpts from the interviews are below:

“It was a time of confusion, especially for me and my family growing up with the war and really wanting to trust our leaders, we expect them to steer us in the right direction and really they were filling our minds with bullshit, like McCarthyism. It made me feel betrayed, like I had no one to trust. He [McCarthy] wasn't the governor of Michigan, so I think we were being represented all right, but if this man could pull a damn cover over all these people's eyes, I just didn't want to think what else could be done. It was a shady time, because real communists were out there . . . Look at the way Bush made all of us afraid of terrorists, and not just terrorists, but Muslims. We can't even walk down the street today without looking at a guy with a towel on his head, saying he's got a bomb or on an airplane. McCarthyism is not really all that uncommon or hard to make happen.” (#1)

“A lot of people were frustrated because he was out there accusing people for wrongdoing when he had no proof . . . If someone told you that your ticket holds the winning lottery numbers, you want to make sure you have proof first. You don't want to get all squalled up over the situation until you see the proof for yourself. It is the instinct of human nature, we want evidence for everything.” (#3)

“I was a member of the U.S. Army. I was supposed to represent my country. I signed up with the army for one purpose and one purpose only: I felt I wanted to do good for my people . . . Many people were against McCarthy but were careful what they said. I was concerned about my family, friends, and army buddies. They were confused and wanted evidence. It reminds one of the Salem Witch trials. It was only when Edward Murrow's *See It Now* that McCarthy had the tables turned on him. That man did not have good intentions.” (#3)

“I don't know anyone that was touched by communism directly or indirectly. No one in my circle was effected. I read a lot about it, especially in Hollywood. Most

of it was bogus, just suspect, but not actually genuine. It was a shame how many of those careers were ruined by it. I was busy raising a family. The Soviets were tyrants and was opposed to the idea. People sharing everything is a bad idea. A person should work for what they should always have a free enterprise.” (#4)

Michiganders subscribed to the enemy image of communists, however, they were skeptical about Senator McCarthy’s charges that certain Americans were communists unless evidence was furnished. Still, the perception of communists as enemies did not change since the 1940s. Michiganders also suffer cognitive dissonance as they did in the 1940s: they knew of the communist threat as reported nationally but personally did not know any communist and therefore wanted to see evidence if someone was accused of being a communist. Interestingly, the contempt and distrust of Senator McCarthy did not translate into a lack of confidence in the Michigan political leadership or President Eisenhower.

## Cuban Missile Crisis

The Cuban Missile Crisis was a confrontation between the United States, the Soviet Union, and Cuba that occurred in the early 1960s during the Cold War. On October 14, 1962, the United States reconnaissance saw missile bases being built in Cuba. The crisis ended two weeks later on October 28, when President Kennedy and U.N. Secretary-General U Thant reached an agreement with the Soviets to dismantle the missiles in Cuba in exchange for a no invasion agreement. Khrushchev’s request that Jupiter and Thor missiles in Turkey be removed was ignored by the Kennedy administration and not pressed by the Soviet Union. Along with the Berlin Blockade, the Cuban Missile Crisis is regarded as one major confrontations of the Cold War which the Cold War came closest to a nuclear war.

Five interviewees from the Flint and Tri-City area were given two articles to read for their reactions. The articles and a summary of each one are below:

*“President Grave,” New York Times, 23 October 1962*

President Kenny imposed naval and air quarantine on shipment of offensive military equipment to Cuba. The President makes two claims: 1) the Soviets were responsible with “false intentions in Cuba”; and 2) the U.S. will act alone against Cuba, if necessary. Kennedy makes an appeal to Khrushchev for peace and calls for a meeting of OAS.

*“US Get Soviet Offer to End Cuba Bases, Rejects Bids to Link It to Those in Turkey; U-2 Lost on Patrol, Other Craft Fired on,” New York Times, 28 October 1962*

Khrushchev offered an acceptable solution to the United States in a private communication. The Soviet Union will remove the missiles in Cuba. However, the U.S. brushes aside demands to remove missiles in Turkey. As the crisis was escalating, a U-2 reconnaissance aircraft went missing.

After reading the articles, the five people were interviewed for approximately an hour about their recollection of the Cuban Missile Crisis. All five signed consent-release forms for the academic use of their interviews.

The demographic information about the interviewees is below:

Interviewee #1 Male, 84, Protestant, Bachelor Degree, Republican, Midland  
Interviewee #2 Male, 78, Roman Catholic, Bachelor Degree, Democrat, Bay City  
Interviewee #3 Male, 66, Protestant, Associate Degree, Democrat, Saginaw  
Interviewee #4 Male 56, Protestant, High School Education, Independent, Flint  
Interviewee #5 Male, 78, Protestant, Law Degree, Republican, Midland

A summary of all the respondents' interviews is below:

“It was a contest between capitalism and communism. One of the points of high ground that I felt we took was the position we do not occupy and take over by force other countries. The Soviets were going into country after country: Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria: a series of them where they would install their own government and leave their troops there. We were essentially the knight in shining armor. Now that may be an exaggeration, but that was the feeling I had. Now whether that was fueled by what was released by our government, I can't say. I've always tried to hear all the different sources so I can weigh in and make my own decision.” (#1)

“During the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, I was aboard the USS Wasp CVS 18, an anti-submarine aircraft carrier. We were employed down by Cuban waters in-between Cuba and the U.S. and our vessel's purpose was to stop Russian ships keep them from to Cuba. We were down there for about a month and we stopped certain vessels and we didn't find any missiles. We were close to all-out nuclear war. Real close. We had the 'hands on the button' so to speak. Russia was ready at a moment's notice to fire their nuclear weapons, and so was the U.S. Most people in the country had no idea of actually how close it really was. It was very scary.” (#3)

“I had big faith in President Kennedy at the time. He knew what was happening more than anything else. I had a lot of faith in Kennedy. He was a navy guy and he knew what was happening and was directly involved in the situation. Presidents nowadays do not have the courage that I believe that President Kennedy had. He was ready to protect the U.S. at all costs.” (#3)

“I thought that the United States was able to handle the situations. The American public had a lot of pride. I had faith that President Kennedy and his team of political advisors would handle the matter, but at the same time I didn’t seem to care much if it was resolved peacefully. Looking back on the event with the knowledge that I have now, I feel that President Kennedy handled the situation better than anyone else probably could have handled it. But, it really wasn’t my concern: I knew that the Soviet Union was a threat, and that there was a good chance that military force would be necessary to contain the problem.” (#4)

As before with the communist infiltration of labor unions and McCarthyism, Michiganders continue to subscribe to the enemy image of communists in the Cuban Missile Crisis and had confidence in the American political leadership to handle the crisis. But, unlike the previous two events, Michiganders did not suffer from cognitive dissonance in their national and personal perceptions of Cold War events. Because of the nature of nuclear war, Michiganders felt directly threatened and therefore affected by Soviet missiles.

## Conclusion

Michiganders suffered from cognitive dissonance in two of the three Cold War events: communist infiltration of labor unions and McCarthyism. In spite of national claims by the media and prominent politicians, none of the interviewees knew any Communists. This dissonance was reconciled in the first instance with the value placed of union cohesion over accusations of communist infiltration; and, in the second event, the value of skepticism over Senator McCarthy’s charges of communist infiltration. In both cases, interviewees wanted to see evidence according to the rule of law to see whether such charges were legitimate. The values traditionally associated with the United States judicial system of fairness, use of evidence, and the assumption of innocence before guilty were preferred by Michiganders over the values of suspicion, slander, and insinuation.

With respect to the questions of enemy image and confidence in their leaders, Michiganders perceived the Soviet Union as a threat to the United States and to its way of life and had confidence in its leaders, especially during the Cuban Missile



Crisis. In this event, both personal and public experiences coincided for Michiganders. This would be expected, since a nuclear war would impact everyone in the United States. Although none of the interviewees knew any Communists, they still perceive the Communists as enemies as told by the U.S. government and media. In other words, the basis of Michiganders' enemy is national and public in nature, as opposed to local and personal.

When confronted with the events of the Cold War, Michiganders clearly base their beliefs on the national organizations and public institutions. However, when these messages began to conflict with their own personal and local experiences, Michiganders resorted to rules of evidence, common sense, and skepticism to reconcile their cognitive dissonance. It would seem, at least in the Flint and Tri-City region, the local and personal ultimately triumphed over the national and public during the early stages of the Cold War.

## References

Barnard, J. *American Vanguard: The United Auto Workers During the Reuther Years, 1935–1970*. (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2004).

Boyle, K. *The UAW and the Heyday of American Liberalism*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995).

Blight, J.G., D.A. Welch. *On the Brink: Americans and Soviet Reexamine the Cuban Missile Crisis*. (New York: Hill and Wang, 1989).

Brody, D. *In Labor's Cause: Main Themes on the History of the American Worker*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

Chayes, A. *The Cuban Missile Crisis, International Crisis and the Role of Law*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974).

Cummings, M.S., R. Tillman, eds. *The Transformation of U.S. Unions: Voices, Visions, and Strategies from the Grassroots*. (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishing, 1999).

Fausold, M., A. Shank, eds. *The Constitution and the American Presidency*. (Albany: SUNY Press, 1991).

Fine, S. *Sit-Down: The General Motors Strike of 1936–1937*. (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1969).

Griffith, R. *The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate*. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1970).

Jervis, R. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).

Lichtenstein, N. *State of the Union: A Century of American Labor*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003).

Michigan Government. <http://michigan.gov>.

Rovere, R. *Senator Joe McCarthy*. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959).

U.S. Census Bureau. <http://www.census.gov>.

Zieger, R., G.J. Gall. *American Workers, American Unions: The Twentieth Century*. (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2002).

Zieger, R. *The CIO, 1935–1955*. (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).

## Contributors

Maryna Bessonova is an Associate Professor of History, Faculty of World History and International Relations, Zaporizhzhya National University, Ukraine.

Spasimir Domaradzki is Associate Professor of International Relations at the Andrzej Frycz Modrzewski Krakow University, Krakow Poland.

Jaclyn Stanke is an Associate Professor of History at Campbell University in North Carolina, United States of America.

Lee Trepanier is an Associate Professor of Political Science at Saginaw Valley State University in Michigan, United States of America.

Rob Verhofstad teaches American Foreign Policy and Dutch Politics at Radboud University in Nijmegen, Netherlands.

