

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

Chapter 1 : Foreign relations of the Soviet Union - Wikipedia

American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe John C. Campbell Published by University of Minnesota Press
Campbell, C.. *American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe: The Choices Ahead.*

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: H E fate of the captive nations of Eastern Europe has been an important concern of American foreign policy ever since those nations came under the sway of the Soviet Union in the aftermath of the Second World War. It has also been something of a football of American domestic politics, kicked most vigorously at four-year intervals when presidential elections occur. For many years, regardless of the volume of American oratory, the lines of the cold war were so rigidly drawn that there was little we could do about Eastern Europe. More recently, changes within the Soviet empire itself, some of them sparked by the split between Moscow and Peking, have brought new, though still limited, opportunities for Western statesmanship. Above all, they have given the United States greater possibilities of choice. They have put Eastern Europe in a position where decisions concerning it are pertinent to the main directions of American foreign policy. In the past few years Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson have espoused a policy of treating Communist countries in different ways according to their different circumstances, of "building bridges" to Eastern Europe, and of seeking areas of agreement with the Soviet Union while maintaining necessary defense strength. In any case, it will surely continue to be debated, and the question of precisely what should be done concerning Eastern Europe remains before the administration, the Congress, and the people. The terms in which that question must be answered will not remain static. They will depend in many ways on decisions taken outside this country: The fall from power of Nikita Khrushchev and the uncertainty over the directions in which his successors will push, or be pushed, point in striking fashion to the wide gaps always present in any assessment of Soviet policy we may make. Yet uncertainty does not justify a retreat from thought or from action. There is all the more reason to look carefully at the background of the problem before us, and especially at those elements of it likely to transcend the comings and goings of individual actors on the stage. The Troubled Past of a Borderland Historically, Eastern Europe—the nations between Germany and Austria on one side and Russia and Turkey on the other, and from the Baltic to the Black, Aegean, and Adriatic seas—has been a borderland of empires and a battleground between them. Its peoples have been objects rather than subjects in the great sweep of history. Yet in this amorphous region have lain many points of contention affecting the balance of power in Europe and the peace of the world. Over the centuries the nations of Eastern Europe—Baltic peoples, Poles, Czechs and Slovaks, Hungarians, Rumanians, Croats and Serbs, Bulgarians, Albanians, Greeks—did not develop strong and enduring state structures or firm political institutions, although each at one time or another enjoyed a period of glory which later became a symbol and stimulus to nationalist aspirations. They lived submerged, without strong leaders of their own, or enjoyed a precarious autonomy or fleeting independence on the fringes of great empires. When the age of nationalism arrived, and leaders of the awakening in each nation translated ethnic differences into political and territorial demands, the stage was set for a series of struggles against neighboring empires and among the nations of Eastern Europe themselves. Nationalism did not remedy the basic fact of weakness in relation to outside powers, for whom the area continued to be one of contention, but added to it through the intensity of the internal conflicts which set the various nationalities against one another. During the nineteenth century most of the Balkan nations won their independence from the Ottoman empire, generally with You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

Chapter 2 : Project MUSE - American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe

American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe Book Description: Perhaps no aspect of American foreign relations has been in greater need of clarification and understanding than our policy toward the Communist nations of Eastern Europe, both as to what has happened in the past and what is possible for the future.

It set forth the dual nature of Soviet foreign policy, which encompasses both proletarian internationalism and peaceful coexistence. On the one hand, proletarian internationalism refers to the common cause of the working classes of all countries in struggling to overthrow the bourgeoisie and to establish communist regimes. Peaceful coexistence, on the other hand, refers to measures to ensure relatively peaceful government-to-government relations with capitalist states. Both policies can be pursued simultaneously: Marxist-Leninist ideology reinforces other characteristics of political culture that create an attitude of competition and conflict with other states. After Mikhail Gorbachev became general Secretary of the Communist Party in 1985, for instance, some Western analysts discerned in the ranking of priorities a possible de-emphasis of Soviet support for national liberation movements. Although the emphasis and ranking of priorities were subject to change, two basic goals of Soviet foreign policy remained constant: These analysts have assessed Soviet behavior in the 1950s and 1960s as placing primary emphasis on relations with the United States, which was considered the foremost threat to the national security of the Soviet Union. Third priority was given to the littoral or propinquitous states along the southern border of the Soviet Union: Regions near to, but not bordering, the Soviet Union were assigned fourth priority. Last priority was given to sub-Saharan Africa, the islands in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, and Latin America, except insofar as these regions either provided opportunities for strategic basing or bordered on strategic naval straits or sea lanes. In general, Soviet foreign policy was most concerned with superpower relations and, more broadly, relations between the members of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, but during the 1970s Soviet leaders pursued improved relations with all regions of the world as part of its foreign policy objectives. International relations with the United States and Germany-Soviet Union relations before There were three distinct phases in Soviet foreign policy between the conclusion of the Russian Civil War and the Nazi-Soviet Pact in 1939, determined in part by political struggles within the USSR, and in part by dynamic developments in international relations and the effect these had on Soviet security. Indeed, Lenin set out to "liberate" all of Asia from imperialist and capitalist control. His immediate priority was no longer a worldwide revolution, but protection of the revolution in Russia, which provided the basis for all future developments. The Bolsheviks seized power in Russia in November but they could not stop German armies which advanced rapidly deep into Russia. In early March 1918, after bitter disputes among Bolshevik leaders, they agreed to harsh German peace terms at Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. With Brest-Litovsk the spectre of German domination in Eastern Europe threatened to become reality, and the Allies now began to think seriously about military intervention [in Russia]. In April 1918 Britain sent in money and some troops to support the anti-Bolshevik "White" counter-revolutionaries. However, the Bolsheviks, operating a unified command from a central location, defeated all the opposition one by one and took full control of Russia, as well as breakaway provinces such as Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan. Bainbridge Colby, the American Secretary of State, in 1918 announce an American policy of refusing to deal with the new regime. It is their [Bolshevik] understanding that the very existence of Bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevik rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries. They changed to a new policy of both seeking pragmatic co-operation with the Western powers when it suited Soviet interests while at the same time trying to promote a Communist revolution whenever possible. After the failure of these efforts, Lenin, assuming that capitalism was not going to collapse at once as he had hoped, made a major effort in the early 1920s

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

to lure German corporations into investing in the Soviet Union as a way of modernizing the country. These facilities operated until The foreign policy counterpart of Socialism in One Country was that of the United Front , with foreign Communists urged to enter into alliances with reformist left-wing parties and national liberation movements of all kinds. The high point of this strategy was the partnership in China between the Chinese Communist Party and the nationalist Kuomintang , a policy favoured by Stalin in particular, and a source of bitter dispute between him and Trotsky. The Popular Front policy in China effectively crashed to ruin in , when Kuomintang leader Chiang Kai-shek massacred the native Communists and expelled all of his Soviet advisors, notably Mikhail Borodin. After defeating opponents from both the left led by Trotsky and Grigory Zinoviev and the right led by Nikolai Bukharin , Stalin began the wholesale collectivization of Soviet agriculture, accompanied by a major program of planned industrialization. Attack social democratic parties[edit] This new radical phase was paralleled by the formulation of a new doctrine in the International, that of the so-called Third Period , an ultra-left switch in policy, which argued that social democracy , whatever shape it took, was a form of social fascism , socialist in theory but fascist in practice. All foreign Communist parties â€” increasingly agents of Soviet policy â€” were to concentrate their efforts in a struggle against their rivals in the working-class movement, ignoring the threat of real fascism. There were to be no united fronts against a greater enemy. The Third Way and social fascism were quickly dropped into the dustbin of history. Popular Front Communists and parties on the left were increasingly threatened by the growth of the Nazi movement. Hitler came to power in January and rapidly consolidated his control over Germany, destroyed the communist and socialist movements in Germany, and rejected the restraints imposed by the Versailles treaty. Stalin in reversed his decision in to attack socialists, and introduced his new plan: The new slogan was: Under this policy Communist Parties were instructed to form broad alliances with all anti-fascist parties with the aim of both securing social advance at home and a military alliance with the USSR to isolate the fascist dictatorships. The Popular Front approach played a major role in Resistance movements in France and other countries conquered by Germany after After the war it played a major role in French and Italian politics. The new policy led to the Soviet Union joining the League of Nations in and the subsequent non-aggression pacts with France and Czechoslovakia. In the League the Soviets were active in demanding action against imperialist aggression, a particular danger to them after the Japanese invasion of Manchuria , which eventually resulted in the Soviet-Japanese Battle of Khalkhin Gol. Ignoring the agreement it signed to avoid involvement in the Spanish Civil War , the USSR sent arms and troops and organized volunteers to fight for the republican government. Communist forces systematically killed their old enemies the Spanish anarchists, even though they were on the same Republican side. In the face of continually dragging and seemingly hopeless negotiations with Britain and France, a new cynicism and hardness entered Soviet foreign relations when Litvinov was replaced by Vyacheslav Molotov in May Diplomats purged[edit] In , Stalin took total personal control of the party, by purging and executing tens of thousands of high-level and mid-level party officials, especially the old Bolsheviks who had joined before The entire diplomatic service was downsized; many consular offices abroad were closed, and restrictions were placed on the activities and movements of foreign diplomats in the USSR. About a third of all foreign ministry officials were shot or imprisoned, including 62 of the most senior officials. Key ambassadorial posts abroad, such as those in Tokyo, Warsaw, Washington, Bucharest, and Budapest, were vacant. The effort failed, and the last stage unfolded to the astonishment of the world: Stalin and Hitler came to terms. It was presented as an alliance and not just a nonaggression pact. Stalin quickly came to terms with Britain and the United States, cemented through a series of summit meetings. Militarily it was one of the two major world powers, a position maintained for four decades through its hegemony in Eastern Europe see Eastern Bloc , military strength, involvement in many countries through local Communist parties, and scientific research especially into space technology and weaponry. The military counterpart to the Comecon was the Warsaw Pact. The Soviet Union concentrated on its own recovery. It used trading arrangements deliberately designed to favor the Soviet Union. Moscow controlled the Communist parties that ruled the satellite states, and they followed orders from the Kremlin. Historian Mark Kramer

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

concludes: In addition to military occupation and intervention, the Soviet Union controlled Eastern European states through its ability to supply or withhold vital natural resources. The KGB "Committee for State Security" , the bureau responsible for foreign espionage and internal surveillance, was famous for its effectiveness. A massive network of informants throughout the Soviet Union was used to monitor dissent from official Soviet politics and morals. The Middle East[edit] Main article: This was the first breach in diplomatic relations that Israel had experienced with a superpower. The new Soviet Prime Minister, Vyacheslav Molotov , presented a new policy of openness and peacefulness. Moscow began to support the Arab states in the Arab-Israeli conflict in order to use this conflict for its own confrontation with the West. The United Arab Republic. The Suez Crisis occurred in the second half of By June 10, the Soviet Union threatened to intervene militarily if Israel did not stop its advance towards Syria. At this point, Egypt was neutral towards the Soviet Union and made the deal to manipulate the United States into giving it financial aid. In spite of his alliance with the Soviet Union, Nasser would not sign a military alliance pact with the nation; made efforts to prevent the spread of Communism and other foreign influences throughout the Arab region by forming a civil union with Syria known as the United Arab Republic UAR "a nation which he had hoped other Arab states would eventually join as well" in ; and was a founding father of the Non-Aligned Movement in ; though the union with Syria collapsed in , Egypt would still be officially known as the United Arab Republic for a while longer. The attacks were directed at an Israeli tractor working land in the demilitarized area on the Syrian-Israeli border. At the end of the battle, Israel had shot down seven Soviet-made Syrian aircraft. Syria did not hesitate to act because it believed that the other Arab states would support it and Israel was not capable of defeating it. Syria believed that, with the help of the UAR, it could beat Israel. During the war, the UAR asked the Soviet Union for more arms, but the Soviet Union denied its request because it wanted the war to end. Once the war was over, though, the Soviet Union was satisfied with the state of the Middle East and gave weapons to the Arabs in order to repair relations with them. For the Soviet Union, defeat meant that its position in the Middle East was impaired and its weapons and military training were given a poor reputation. Though Sadat sought to maintain good relations with the Soviet Union, he was also willing to consider economic assistance from nations outside the Arab region and the Eastern Bloc as well. In , however, the direction of Soviet-Egypt relations changed dramatically when Sadat ordered Soviet military personnel to leave the country. The Soviet Union now focused on building relations with its three other principal allies in the Middle East: In September , however, Soviet influence over the Arab-Israeli peace progress weakened significantly after Egypt and Israel agreed to make peace with one another during the Camp David Accords. In January , the Soviet government criticised the Iraqi government decision to join the Baghdad Pact , which led to Iraq cutting diplomatic relations with the Soviets. In February , Syria signed a peace and security pact with the Soviet Union as a means to strengthen its defense capability. The Soviet Union was among the first group of nations to recognize the Yemen Arab Republic following its independence from Britain in On December 27, , two treaties were concluded between the two countries, for setting up a study for economic projects and using soil and ground waters. Unaccepted by Muslim nations in the region, South Yemen relied on aid from Communist nations and allowed the Soviets to keep naval bases in the country. In , after a war broke out between the two neighboring Yemen states, [52] the Yemen Arab Republic and South Yemen agreed to eventually unify.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

Chapter 3 : Catalog Record: American policy toward Communist Eastern | Hathi Trust Digital Library

American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe was first published in Minnesota Archive Editions uses digital technology to make long-unavailable books once again accessible, and are published unaltered from the original University of Minnesota Press editions.

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. The better way to understand the specific features of the Soviet interpretations of the Cold War era " is first of all " to describe some basic facts about the Soviet Union. 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 " Bolsheviks later name" Communists. Since s the government and the political organization of the country were defined by the single party: 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. At the beginning of s 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 [1]. 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 is connected with internal situation in the Soviet Union. Communists came into power in Russia by force and their domestic policy in first years failed. While struggling with enemies, less attention was paid to the failed reforms. 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. In his *The economic problems of the socialism in the USSR* , Stalin once more underlined that crises and collapse of the world capitalist system is inescapable: 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 new idea " competition of two different social-political systems: That is why fight with world bourgeoisie turned into more constructive emulation. 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: The idea of competition between two social-political systems played some kind of integration role for the Soviet society: At the same time the idea of peaceful coexistence was reborn, but is was revised as the specific form of class struggle. The idea of peaceful coexistence remained as the important one, but Brezhnev modified it: Real changes in the Soviet foreign policy occurred only when Gorbachev came into power. *New Thinking for Our Country and the World* , 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: Origins of the Cold War: According to the Soviet interpretations the Cold War was provoked by the policy of the USA and other imperialistic countries towards socialist states, first of all towards the USSR [4] Soviet explanations of the background of the Cold war were

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

presented as following: It was first positive move towards realization of the Soviet foreign policy main idea: So those who wanted to change this result of the World War II wanted to destroy the socialist system. 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. 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. 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. 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. The next one was the Liberation Doctrine created by J. 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. 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. One of the new features of that policy was creation of the Peace Corps which activity was used by CIA and was directed on the strengthening of American ideological, political and economic penetration into the developing countries. Soviet interpretations of the Nixon Doctrine underlined that it had attached American right to support their allies and friends the capitalist-oriented states, but with the division of tasks: The Ford Doctrine was some kind of re-reading of Nixon strategy of lessening of American responsibility and military presence in the Asia and other regions. According to Soviet interpretations, the Trilateral perspective was announced because of attempts to overcome crisis in capitalist economy and to strengthen international positions of imperialism. At the period of last escalation of the Cold War the Reagan Doctrine 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. 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 [18]. 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 speech in Fulton. A few days before, 02 February, 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. Its rhetoric contained nothing especially new, but for the West it seemed a direct signal for confrontation. This speech was considered on the West as claiming war against capitalist 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, sq. 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. That kind of division became vivid just after the end of the World War II. This idea is in the analytical report of Soviet ambassador in the US, N. 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. 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: The Imperialistic was the system of capitalist countries: This bipolar world was also presented in American

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

textbooks, where post-war world was described as divided into two blocks – Democratic in the West and Communist in the East. Among friends of the USSR you can find such categories as: The enemy was the imperialistic circles in the capitalist states. The explanation of international relations was very simple according to such approach: 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. We the USSR are spreading new life. 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 was subordinated to such aims as to criticize negative aspects of bourgeois society in USA and American imperialistic foreign policy and to give positive evaluation of all types of struggle for rights and liberation: 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. 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, brainwash 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 s can be presented as good example. The only accessible version of events in that country contains a story about the victory in April 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 based on friendship, good neighbourly relations, and cooperation. If pro-Soviet government and would fail, this would be a big blow for the Soviet foreign policy. That is why in December the Soviet government, according to the 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 and 15 February , a total of , soldiers served with the forces in Afghanistan. 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 the Bay of Pigs Invasion were considered as aggressive policy towards new socialist state. We can say that Cuban crises as geopolitical situation was in some point built in the frame of next items: 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. 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: Now the approaches towards interpretations of the US policy towards communist countries in the Soviet sphere of influence changed.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

Chapter 4 : Containment and the Marshall Plan [calendrierdelascience.com]

Perhaps no aspect of American foreign relations has been in greater need of clarification and understanding than our policy toward the Communist nations of Eastern Europe, both as to what has happened in the past and what is possible for the future.

News magazine shows the beginnings of American containment policy. Communism was on the march. Soon communist forces dominated the governments of Romania and Bulgaria. By the fall of , it was clear that the Soviet-backed Lublin regime had complete control of Poland, violating the Yalta promise of free and unfettered elections there. It was only a matter of time before Hungary and Czechoslovakia fell into the Soviet orbit. Yugoslavia had an independent communist leader named Tito. When Harry Truman approved the Marshall Plan in , his official statement said, "Few presidents have had the opportunity to sign legislation of such importance. How many dominoes would fall? United States diplomats saw a continent ravaged by war looking for strong leadership and aid of any sort, providing a climate ripe for revolution. Would the Soviets get all of Germany? Or Italy and France? President Truman was determined to reverse this trend. Greece and Turkey were the first nations spiraling into crisis that had not been directly occupied by the Soviet Army. Both countries were on the verge of being taken over by Soviet-backed guerrilla movements. Truman decided to draw a line in the sand. Within two years the communist threat had passed, and both nations were comfortably in the western sphere of influence. A mid-level diplomat in the State Department named George Kennan proposed the policy of containment. Since the American people were weary from war and had no desire to send United States troops into Eastern Europe, rolling back the gains of the Red Army would have been impossible. In July a majority of the American public had never even heard of the Marshall Plan. But to win passage in Congress, the Truman administration needed strong public support, so it launched a massive public relations campaign. But in places where communism threatened to expand, American aid might prevent a takeover. By vigorously pursuing this policy, the United States might be able to contain communism within its current borders. The policy became known as the Truman Doctrine, as the President outlined these intentions with his request for monetary aid for Greece and Turkey. The war had ruined crop fields and destroyed infrastructure, leaving most of Europe in dire need. To avoid antagonizing the Soviet Union, Marshall announced that the purpose of sending aid to Western Europe was completely humanitarian, and even offered aid to the communist states in the east. Marshall proposed that a post-war European aid program be initiated. Less than a year later, the Marshall Plan was a reality. The Marshall Plan created an economic miracle in Western Europe. By the target date of the program four years later, Western European industries were producing twice as much as they had been the year before war broke out. Some Americans grumbled about the costs, but the nation spent more on liquor during the years of the Marshall Plan than they sent overseas to Europe. The aid also produced record levels of trade with American firms, fueling a postwar economic boom in the United States. George Marshall devised a plan for long-term economic and industrial recovery for most of Europe. This website has a summary of all the parts of the Marshall Plan and its results. Select from the many titles in the index to find an overview and a link to each document. Like the Monroe doctrine, the Truman doctrine states the American stance on potential aggression and what the consequences might be. This webpage offers the full text of the March 12, , speech Harry Truman gave to a joint session of Congress. Although Tito died in , his cohorts were able to maintain control for another 12 years.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

Chapter 5 : Soviet Perspective On The Cold War And American Foreign Policy - VoegelinView

We use cookies to distinguish you from other users and to provide you with a better experience on our websites. Close this message to accept cookies or find out how to manage your cookie settings.

The University of Minnesota Press, Somewhat in the vein of a classical diplomatist, the author of this unpretentious volume thinks that the strains now vexing the once monolithic Communist realm make this the right time for the United States to reappraise its policies toward Eastern Europe. Much to the regret of those interested in the Baltic states, the term "Eastern Europe" here excludes Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. This kind of "recognition" that those states are incorporated into the USSR is becoming more and more fashionable in journalism, scholarly research, and popular usage. For the sake of convenience, if for no other reason, the Baltic states are simply associated with the Soviet Union proper. Campbell hopes that his book, which originally was a basis for discussion at the Seventh Midwest Seminar on United States Foreign Policy, will spark an instructive debate on our official attitude toward that area. It will surely take another series of lectures over the B. But the author should not be dismayed by the limited effectiveness of his analysis, because the book itself is a creditable accomplishment. One should keep in mind that this survey was not intended to and does not recommend a definite course toward Eastern Europe; rather, it was to serve merely as a basis for discussion. In preparing that basis, the author was eminently successful. Both in reviewing the factual background about the various aspects of United States policy toward Eastern Europe and in outlining the alternative courses that this nation might choose to follow, Dr. Campbell — with an impartiality fit for a Speaker of the House of Commons — managed to produce a concise, systematic, and well-informed paper. It will surely be a candidate for required reading in colleges offering courses on Eastern Europe. In his last chapter the author weighs, among other things, the alternative American policies for Eastern Europe. The general lines of policy that he envisages are three: One aspect of the problem, however, deserves more attention than it receives here: Campbell is quite right in concluding that "the trend toward autonomy and self-assertion on the part of the Eastern European states is a fact of international life, not easily reversed. How it will develop in the future depends in large measure on events outside the area itself. Needless to say, rapprochement would invite an adjustment of differences on Eastern Europe. Campbell should have examined more exhaustively this possibility of an understanding between the two Powers, as well as the implications of such an action for Eastern Europe.

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

Chapter 6 : Book review: John C. Campbell, AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

John C. Campbell, American Policy Toward Communist Eastern Europe: The Choices Ahead. (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1954). Somewhat in the vein of a classical diplomatist, the author of this unpretentious volume thinks that the strains now vexing the once monolithic Communist realm make this the right time for the United States.

After the need to unite to defeat Germany and Japan had disappeared, the differences between the capitalist West and communist East came to the fore once more. Britain and America wanted to transform the defeated Nazi Germany into a capitalist democracy that they could trade with, and establish stable, democratic governments in the Eastern European countries. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, wanted to destroy Germany, the way Germany had tried to destroy it. The Germans knew that once they lost the War, the USSR would come looking for revenge - many of their soldiers tried to surrender to the Americans, rather than the Russians, because they knew the dangers they would face as fascist prisoners under a communist regime. As well as wanting to crush Germany, the Soviet Union wanted to create more communist countries on its western border so it would never again be vulnerable to attack and invasion from the west. The Yalta Conference took place in February when Germany still had not been defeated. The three leaders - Franklin D. Roosevelt, Joseph Stalin, and Winston Churchill - discussed the future of Europe. See image 3 Russia was still keen to establish a buffer zone on its western border and wanted a communist government in Poland - the USA and Britain did not. By the Potsdam Conference in July, the political landscape had changed dramatically. One almost immediate reaction to the horrors that right-wing Nazism and fascism had unleashed in Europe, was a new left-wing shift in European politics. In some of the countries that had suffered under Nazi occupation, communism was seen as the best safeguard against the possibility of a revival of fascism in the future. Eastern Europe did not have a good track record when it came to stable democratic governments and the economic and political circumstances in the post-war years were fertile ground for communist leaders and policies. Apart from the fact that many of the Eastern European countries were liberated from Nazi Germany by the Russians, who then stayed, countries like Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary were in extreme financial hardship and communist policies would definitely have been attractive to them. Many historians believe that Stalin was openly planning the takeover of Eastern Europe. Others believe that he merely took advantage of the situation after the War was over. Either way, Eastern Europe fell country by country. Firstly, it fell into communist control and then into the hands of the USSR and central government from Moscow. American policy In two pieces of American policy became key to how Europe would look in the future. When the British announced they could no longer maintain their commitment to fighting Soviet-backed communists in Greece, America stepped in. This policy of containment became known as the Truman Doctrine. It can be said, therefore, that through the policies of the Truman Doctrine, America was paving the way to its involvement in the wars in Korea and Vietnam. Then, in June, the Marshall Plan was conceived. General George Marshall visited Europe and saw how poverty there was leaving an open door for communists to recruit supporters. At first, Congress was unwilling to act, but when communists seized power in Czechoslovakia in the Marshall Plan was put into action. The Soviet Union also provided economic and agricultural aid to Eastern Europe as part of its plan to influence those countries towards the benefits of communism. The Marshall Plan was a part of the Truman Doctrine - it was intended to stem the tide of communist expansion in Europe, but it really only made a difference in Western Europe. Eastern European countries were, by this stage, so completely under the influence of Stalin that they were actually forbidden by him to take Marshall Plan money. Eastern Europe falls to communism In Albania and Bulgaria both became communist. East Germany also became a Soviet zone, but did not have its own communist government until when it became the German Democratic Republic. Romania, Poland and Hungary all fell to communist rule in 1947 and Czechoslovakia in 1948. Although, theoretically, these countries were now under central rule from Moscow, they were independent nation states with their own governments. By the face of Europe, especially in the East, had changed. It would remain this way until the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991. In Stalin went so far as to

DOWNLOAD PDF AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNIST EASTERN EUROPE

disavow the war-time alliance between the Soviet Union and America. He also said that the US was now a bigger threat to world peace than Nazi Germany had been.

Chapter 7 : Eastern Bloc - Wikipedia

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.