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Part I: Historiography-Origins of the Cold War

Tensions and hostilities grew out of the closing stages of World War II, which would lead to a massive economic, ideological and militaristic confrontation. On April 25, 1945, Soviet and American soldiers embraced each other along the Elbe while they made their final thrust into the heart of Nazi Germany, the Grand Alliance was beginning to tear apart. Both the Soviet Union and United States had differing viewpoints on what the post-World War II should look like. As a result the “Cold War” and its ramifications would guide the entire world for much of the remainder of the second millennium and the possibility of destruction on the level of biblical proportions existed.

While the Cold War developed as a result of the volatile conditions within Europe, its roots lied within the ideologies of capitalism and communism. Two conflicting economic principles that would combine with the scramble by the Soviets and Americans to assert their strength, interest, and ideology over every continent on the face of the earth. The Soviet Union saw the United States as the aggressor and charged the Americans with seeking global domination and threatening the security of the U.S.S.R. The United States claimed that they were only trying to stop the Soviets from grabbing territory, subduing their neighboring countries, and pushing for their communist revolution to enslave the world.

Since the origins of the Cold War, a plethora of historians have researched the conditions which led the Soviets and Americans to engage in a global war for over

---


four decades and have come to different conclusions. Which country was the true aggressor, and how did the economic, social, and political conditions of the era play into the rise of the Cold War. What happened? How could such a promising time after World War II lead to a state of brinkmanship between the Soviets and Americans. How have historians viewed and interpreted the origins of the Cold War overtime? This historiography will primarily focus on the revisionist viewpoint of the late 1950s and 1960s that exploded onto the scholarly world stage. The revisionist perspective contradicted the orthodox or traditional position, which was that the Soviets were the true aggressors. Upon the in-depth look at the revisionist movement I will shift the historiography towards the perspectives of scholars who have done research on the origins of the Cold War since the fall of the Soviet Union. Moreover, I will also review the literature from the Soviet perspective of the post 1991 world.

The revisionism of the 1950s and 1960s questioned the actions of the United States and targeted American foreign policy as being the key factor in the development of the Cold War. Revisionist historians looked at the previous history of the United States and the expansion and empire building that it had undertaken through the majority of the nation’s existence. Questions which were researched and discussed by revisionist historians and those who opposed this new outlook led to many scholars looking for the truth to the beginning of the Cold War.

Was it truly fair to make such statements against the United States at the time of Cold War revisionism of the 50’s and 60’s? Professors and scholars of the United States did not have access to the archives of the Soviet Union. They did not have all of the intentions of Stalin and his views on the world after World War II. Right or
wrong the revisionists propelled further research into the field of the origins of the Cold War. With the demise of the Soviet Union and the fall of the “Iron Curtain” in Europe came an explosion of research due to the available documents within Eastern Europe. Would the eastern bloc documents now available to the people of the world agree with the revisionist viewpoint or reflect a different tale to the evolution of the Cold War and support the traditionalists such as Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr.

Yet, were there clues which would lead to such a conflict that inspired Robert McNamara to say, “Cold War, Hell it was a Hot War,”³ in the documentary Fog of War. Clearly the Secretary of Defense for Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Baines Johnson saw the Cold War as an extremely intense period between the two superpowers. Furthermore, prophetic quotes made by two colossal figures of history are as follows;

“There are now two great nations in the world...the Russians and the Anglo-Americans...[E]ach seems called by some secret design of Providence one day to hold in its hands the destinies of half the world.”

-Alexis de Tocqueville, 1835⁴

“With the defeat of the Reich...there will remain in the world only two Great Powers capable of confronting each other-the United States and Soviet Russia...both these Powers will sooner or later find it desirable to seek the support of the sole surviving great nation in Europe, the German people.”

-Adolf Hitler, 1945⁵

At the height of the Cold War a book entitled, The Tragedy of American Diplomacy by William Appleman Williams, was published in 1959. The ground-

³ The Fog of War, DVD, directed by Errol Morris (2004; Sony Pictures Classics)
⁴ John Lewis Gaddis, We Now Know: Rethinking the Cold War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1.
⁵ Ibid. 1.
breaking work put a unique perspective on the outlook on the origins of the Cold War and is seen as the beginning of a scholarly approach to looking at the Cold War with a revisionist method. Some scholars would even claim it to be “radical.” Within *Tragedy*, Williams’ theme centers on the “persistence of expansionism” and points to the “open door imperialism” of the United States.

Professor Williams maneuvers *Tragedy* at the onset of the post World War II era towards the United States looking to its former Democratic presidents Woodrow Wilson and his protégé Franklin Delano Roosevelt and their principles in the capitalistic economy. In 1914 President Wilson stated to the corporation leaders of America that, “[t]here is nothing in which I am more interested than the fullest development of the trade of this country and its righteous conquest of foreign markets.”

The Americans had the monopoly of the A-Bomb and an economy ready to transition from wartime to peacetime with scores of men and women ready to go back to work or school through the G.I. Bill. Economic prosperity would not be hampered and Williams proposed that the leaders of America were ready to “thwart the evil designs of Russia and to rehabilitate the rest of the world for the beneficent application of American leadership.” “Williams, emphasized the economic expansion of American capitalism and the search for foreign markets as the primary

---

7 Ibid. 2.
9 Ibid. 17.
cause of the Cold War.”

Williams reminded Americans in 1959 that the Soviet Union emerged from World War II in a weakened state and that many Soviet policies were defensive. Additionally, Professor Williams viewed the actions by Marshal Stalin and the Soviets were solely a response to American aggressiveness. “The vacillation of Eastern Europe governments laid bare the internal fragility of the Soviet alliance structure when subjected to the pressures of U.S. economic might. The imposed Sovietization of Eastern Europe ensuing the summer of 1947 was a product of the Cold War and not its cause.”

In continuing with his “open door policy” Williams proclaimed that the United States would try to thwart its dominance over the globe because of the pure strength, which lied within the country. “[I]n fact, negotiation from strength meant no negotiations, because it defined negotiation as the acceptance of American proposals.” Yet Williams initiates that because of this policy of American assertiveness that it spawned a forceful conflict and resistance by the Soviet Union. Even though for a time the United States had a monopoly on the Atomic bomb it could not propel the Soviets into following the role of a nation kowtowing to the Americans.

The ensuing details given by Professor Williams would fuel critics of Tragedy and charge him with producing a pro-Soviet tract and a sympathizer of Stalin

---


11 Perkins. 10.


13 Williams. 151.
Die-hard revolutionists did propose that the Soviet Union should "secure a base for militant revolutionary activity throughout the world." According to Williams, Stalin would side with the conservatives and their cautious proposal for a post World War II Soviet Union and Communist expansion. Stalin looked at two factors for success: "(1) limiting and controlling revolutionary action by foreign communists, which otherwise would antagonize the United States, and (2) reaching an economic and political understanding with America, an agreement that would enable Russia to handle the problem of recovery and at the same time relax certain controls and pressures inside the country...He was confident that if given a peaceful opportunity to develop its program in Russia, communism would gradually appeal to more and more countries of the world." 

With the above affirmations by Williams and the following statements made by the Undersecretary of State Dean Acheson such as "it is a problem of markets...You must look to foreign markets..." His Congressional audience would concur on Acheson’s proposals. Williams stressed that "the philosophy and practice of open door expansionism had become, in both its missionary and economic aspects, the view of the world."

*Tragedy of American Diplomacy* was written in the year 1959 only two years removed from the launching of *Sputnik* and a bit over a decade since the beginning of the Cold War. In addition to the achievement of *Sputnik*, the Soviet Union had developed the A-bomb and the H-bomb, China had turned to Communism, the

---

14 Perkins. 10.
15 Williams. 155.
16 Ibid. 155.
17 Ibid. 167.
18 Ibid. 180.
Korean War ended up a stalemate, and there was increased involvement of the United States in Vietnam. It was clear that the Soviets and Communism would not be contained and thwarted as the United States had desired. “The Soviet Union neither surrendered nor collapsed nor embarked upon an effort to remodel itself in the image of Western liberalism.”

William A. Williams would ignite other historians to look into the alternative reasons geared toward the origins of the Cold War. Many historians would look closer at the economic factors that they saw attributed to the involvement of the United States, however, they did not approve of the sympathetic outlook on Stalin’s Soviet Union. “And they agree with Williams in placing policies aimed at trade expansion within a broader context...[T]hey almost unanimously argue that Soviet leaders, though grasping and brutal, had no blueprint for world revolution.”

Throughout the 1960’s the revisionist historical outlook was still raging and was most commonly applied to the study of foreign policy. Moreover, the term revisionism was associated within a Marxist context and had “come to mean the questioning of established interpretations of history and the presentation of new interpretations...where the revisionists are willing to admit the impurity of American motives and the possibility that ‘the other side’ has a valid case.” Shortly after Williams’ groundbreaking work, Tragedy, Professor D.F. Fleming of Vanderbilt published The Cold War and its Origins. Fleming looks back to the Russian Revolution and centers his work on the concept that the Cold War began in 1918,

---

19 Ibid. 205.
20 Perkins. 13.
when the West supplied the White Army who backed the Czar and intervened in their Civil War. The Marxist inspired revolution struck fear into the hearts and minds of the leaders of the powerful and industrialized nations of the West and East, as Japan also supplied troops. Furthermore, Fleming stated that the war had been ‘lost,’ by 1960 by the West. Fleming made a bold statement fueling the revisionist outlook on the Cold War. It was quite obvious at the time the Cold War was far from over, but the Communist camp was spreading at an alarming rate. But did Fleming truly mean the West had lost or did he see that the United States had fueled the Cold War and inflicted the wounds upon itself.

Looking back to post World War I and Fleming’s premise that the Cold War started during this time it was obvious that the West was fearful of Bolshevik expansionism. Winston Churchill, who was the Secretary of State for War in 1919, reflected on the Bolsheviks and their advancement into the Ukraine. “[t]he Bolsheviks were taking Nicholiev and Kherson, and were advancing on the Black Sea. Odessa might soon be invested...It was idle to think we should escape by sitting still and doing nothing. Bolshevism was not sitting still. It was advancing, and unless the tide were resisted it would roll over Siberia until it reached the Japanese...”

Professor Fleming was inspired to look into the origins of the Cold War, when he began to examine what, the “architect of containment” himself, George F. Kennan had stated about the derivations of Soviet demeanor. Fleming believed that we were on the offensive side and “…made the Soviets suspicious, hostile, and sometimes

---

22 Ibid. 169.
aggressive.” 24 Yet Fleming also argued that had Roosevelt survived his fourth term he would have cooperated with Stalin. "Fleming accused Truman of attempting to intimidate Stalin by curtailing Lend-Lease aid to the Soviet Union, and he also argued that Stalin had not broken his pledge to hold free and fair elections in Poland." 25

In the infamous "Long Telegram," written by George F. Kennan on February 22, 1946 in the U.S. embassy in Moscow, Kennan cynically contemplated the post World War II Soviet Union. This telegram would lead to Kennan working as head of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff and developing the policy of "containment" as a Cold War doctrine. 26 Within the telegram Kennan believed that, "...we have here a political force committed fanatically to the belief that with US there can be no permanent *modus vivendi*, that it is desirable and necessary that the internal harmony of our society be disrupted, our traditional way of life be destroyed, ...if Soviet power is to be secure." 27

Possibly upon reflecting on his original viewpoint on the Soviet Union and feeling that the policy of containment had become too drastic Kennan shows a different attitude later on. Kennan stated in his book, *Kennan: Memoirs 1950-1963*, [w]hen World War II came to an end, the leaders of the Soviet Union had no desire to face another major foreign war for a long, long time to come...[the war] had meant a

---

24 Seabury. 170.
26 Merril. 203.
27 Ibid. 211.
setback of approximately a decade in the effort of the Soviet leaders to make out of the traditional Russian territory a powerful military-industrial center.”

The year 1965 saw the publication of David Horowitz and his book entitled, *Free World Colossus*. Horowitz continued on with the revisionist point of view and he saw the United States opposing any threat against the determination of the United States government. According to Horowitz the foreign policy of the American government was to “crush any movement anywhere in the world that threatens radical change against the will of the United States government.”

Horowitz was a clearly a follower of the movement proposed and pushed forward by Williams and Fleming and deemed the West led by the United States ignited the Cold War. The Soviet Union had no choice but to become distrustful and aggressive in its reaction to the policies of the United States. Prior to the revisionist movement of the origins of the Cold War, the actions taken by the Soviet Union such as the rejection of the Marshall Plan, the creation of Cominform, Czech coup, and the Berlin blockade were the result of the US containment policy. Had the Americans looked to a post World War II world without the fear of Soviet expansionism, Fleming pursued that the Cold War could have been avoided.

Revisionism continued to develop during the 1960’s and the historical revisionist camp continued to push aspects of the Cold War began with the aggression of the United States. Yet by the mid-60’s the statement that the U.S. had lost the Cold War had begun to deteriorate. The United States was clearly not leaving the

---

30 Ibid. 129.
Soviets behind, however by 1965 the U.S. stood up against the Soviets in the Cuban Missile Crisis and were beginning to pull out ahead in the missile gap. Furthermore, the Socialist camp was beginning to break down and the construction of the Berlin Wall was a loud statement that communism was not working.

Gar Alperovitz’s *Atomic Diplomacy: Hiroshima and Potsdam*, proposed that the Americans could not penetrate the Soviet sphere through their own economic power. Alperovitz sides with the three revisionist leaders of Williams, Fleming, and Horowitz, yet pushes forth the concept that Truman looked to the newly created A-Bomb to display the new style of foreign policy of the United States. With the show of such force the Soviet Union would be reluctant to influence Eastern Europe after the war. Moreover, Alperovitz suggested that, “Truman delayed his trip to Potsdam until the bomb had been developed.”

At the Potsdam conference, after the Atomic weapon had been used on Japan, President Truman stated the following in a speech, “[h]aving found the bomb, we have used it. We have used it against those who attacked us without warning at Pearl Harbor... We shall continue to use it until we completely destroy Japan’s power to make war... The Atomic bomb is too dangerous to be loose in a law-less world. That is why Great Britain and the United States, who have the secret of its production, do not intend to reveal the secret...” With the use of the bomb on Japan, the showdown over Eastern Europe never came.

---

31 Ibid. 130.
32 Ibid. 130.
33 Learning Curve. *How strong was the wartime friendship between Britain, the USA and the USSR 1941-1945?* http://www.learningcurve.gov.uk/coldwar/G2/default.htm
34 Graebner. 130.
The year 1966 would witness the traditionalist viewpoint strike back at the revisionists. Stalin’s paranoia and rigidity were at the core of the orthodox stance on the origins of the Cold War. Arthur M. Schlessinger, Jr. wrote a letter to the *New York Review of Books* and stated that, “[s]urely the time has come to blow the whistle before the current outburst of revisionism regarding the origins of the Cold War goes much further.”\(^35\) According Professor Schlesinger, the revisionist thesis was that:

> “after the death of Franklin Roosevelt and the end of the Second World War, the United States deliberately abandoned the wartime policy of collaboration and, exhilarated by the possession of the atomic bomb, undertook a course of aggression of its own designed to expel all Russian influence and to establish democratic-capitalist states on the very border of the Soviet Union.”\(^36\)

Commenting on the case of the Atomic bomb being used to deter the Soviet problem, which was emphasized by revisionists? Schlesinger stated that, “the revisionist argument that Truman dropped the bomb less to defeat Japan than to intimidate Russia is not convincing [although] this thought undoubtedly appealed to some in Washington as at least the advantageous side effect on Hiroshima.”\(^37\)

The debate between the revisionists and the traditionalists would become bitter and heated by the end of the 1960’s. Yet the two dominating different schools of thought, one led by Williams and the other by Schlesinger would begin to be counteracted by a new school of thought. Post revisionism grew out of the revisionist movement in the sense that, “postrevisionsists often stressed many of the same points

\(^{35}\) Ibid. 131.


\(^{37}\) Ibid. 113.
made previously by revisionists, including the emphasis on economic factors and the United State’s expansionist postwar agenda." 38 However, post revisionists would not accept the conclusions that were being made by the revisionists.

The “father” of post revisionism is considered to be John Lewis Gaddis who wrote *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War: 1941-1947*. This innovative work was published in 1972 and sided with the traditional belief that “…Soviet expansionism was the primary cause of the Cold War” and “that American officials worried more about the Soviet Union than about the fate of capitalism in designing the policy of containment.” 39 Gaddis would make the declaration that post revisionism exceeded the orthodox explanation in four different areas. According to Gaddis the new synthesis was based on:

1. Post revisionist historians accept that the United States used economic instruments to secure political ends.

2. They emphasize that Stalin had no ideological blueprint for communist world revolution. Instead he is seen by post revisionists as an opportunist who exploited any opening to advance Russian national influence.

3. Post revisionists confirm the revisionist contention that the United States government did at times exaggerate the external danger of Soviet communism in order to achieve certain internal political objectives.

---


39 Ibid. 258.
4. They accept the existence of an American empire, although they contend it was primarily a defensive empire, erected by invitation and not through coercion.\footnote{Ibid. 259.}

The final point by Gaddis is where the post revisionists separate themselves from the traditionalists.

The year 1991 would see the crumbling of the Soviet Union and mark the end of the Cold War. Could the traditionalists, revisionists, or post revisionists have imagined that the Cold War would end in the fashion that it did? A plethora of factors went into the Soviet Union collapsing, which included the massive amounts of dollars spent on developing an absurd nuclear arsenal and other weapons to keep on track with the United States for over four decades. In addition, the policies of glasnost and perestroika set by Mikhail Gorbachev just to name a few. The principal factor for the end of the most powerful communistic nation lay in the core aspects of communism itself. Eastern Europeans and Soviets pursued freedom and independence from the totalitarian governments they lived under, and the people were the foremost reason for the end of the "Evil Empire."

With the "Iron Curtain" gone, crucial documents would become available to historians to determine who was at fault for the Cold War. Continuing on with John Lewis Gaddis and his school of thought, post revisionism, this historiography will focus in on the post Cold War era and what historians were determining with their new found knowledge.

Professor Gaddis published the appropriately titled book, \textit{We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History}. Moreover, would Gaddis still stand by the four points
he pointed out in 1972 and his definition of what a post revisionist was? Dr. Gaddis alludes to some discontent towards historians who were writing the end of the Cold War, before it was actually over. In his work, *We Now Know*, Gaddis stated that “...until recently their real histories resembled our imaginary histories of the two world wars: they lacked equivalent access to archives on each side, and they were written without knowing how it would all come out. Despite divergent and often discordant interpretations, all Cold War historians—whether of orthodox, revisionist, post-revisionist, fell into the unusual habit of working within their chosen period rather than after it. 41 Professor Fleming is the key example of an historian working within their period, when he stated the west had “lost” the Cold War. A major turning point in the Cold War indicating that the west was bound to win the Cold War was in 1961 with the creation of the Berlin Wall. A system that has to build a wall to keep its people in is bound to lose. Unless you believed the communist camp, when they referred to the wall as a way to keep capitalism and imperialism out.

Gaddis clearly looks at the “old” history of the Cold War with a very critical eye. As stated above, he is critical of historians looking at the events and making predictions, before all of the facts are in. But also, Gaddis points out that the amount of scholarship of the Cold War was disproportionately geared towards the United States, its allies, or its clients. The reasons for this are quite simple. The Marxist-Leninist camp was very careful not to expose its documents and its intentions and historians of the west had little access. “[U]ntil the late 1980’s none had even begun to open the kind of archives routinely available in the west. “Realist” and

41 Gaddis. 282.
"neorealist" theorists of international relations regarded what went on inside people’s heads as hard to measure, and therefore easy to dismiss.”

Throughout We Now Know Gaddis revisits aspects of the Cold War from the Origins to the Cuban Missile Crisis. His most brilliant work in the book is when Gaddis proposes questions to correct and help historians and novices grasp the new knowledge that historians were gathering to connect the pieces of the complex puzzle known as the Cold War. John Lewis Gaddis proposes hypotheses and explanations based on the “new” found historical data and records. One of these hypotheses is centered on that “the United States and the Soviet Union built empires after World War II, although not of the same kind.”

In regards to the above stated hypothesis, Gaddis, twenty-five years after his publication of The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947 was answering two of the four areas he proposed in his accounts of what post revisionism is. Gaddis uses “new” Cold War history to back the point that Stalin was an opportunist and would exploit anything to advance Russian national influence. With the victory of Mao Zedong in China, Stalin looked to Asia to continue with the expansion of the communist revolution. Stalin pushed for the Chinese to save Kim Il-Sung during the Korean War. Furthermore, Gaddis suggested “…that Stalin appears also to have hoped for an invitation, especially in Germany, perhaps elsewhere in Eastern Europe, possibly even Japan.” As the United States and its NATO allies began to show loyalty and commitment the Soviet Union recognized that its presence in Eastern Europe did not have the same effect. According to Gaddis, with much

42 Ibid. 282.
43 Ibid. 284.
44 Ibid. 285.
confidence, "...is why free elections within Moscow's sphere of influence ceased to be held." 45

In *We Now Know*, Gaddis insinuates that the Americans did indeed create an empire after World War II. However, it was out of a "by-product of having rushed to fill a power vacuum in Europe, a reflex that would cause Americans to meddle wherever else in the world they thought there might be a Soviet threat...credibility became the currency in which the United States, like most empires in the past, counted its assets. 46 "The Americans constructed a new kind of empire-a democratic empire-for the simple reason that they were, by habit and history, democratic in their politics...The Russians, coming out of an authoritarian tradition, knew of no way to deal with independent thinking other than to smother it. The slightest signs of autonomy, for Stalin, were heresy, to be rooted out with all the thoroughness of the Spanish Inquisition." 47

In concurrence with John Lewis Gaddis, Campbell Craig of the University of Canterbury, New Zealand proposed the viewpoint that the Cold War was the result of the hostility of Joseph Stalin and the insecurity it caused in the United States and the west. Dr. Craig embodies the role of a true post-revisionist as he uses the line of reasoning that the United States was expanding its economic influence throughout the globe since 1890. With all of the major global markets shattered from World War II,

---

46 Ibid. 285.
47 Ibid. 289.
“... the United States sought to fill the vacuum left by the reduction and retrenchment of its economic rivals.”

Campbell focused on three key events that influenced Truman and his aides to look at the Soviet Union as a serious long-term threat and with the intentions to expand its power therefore threatening the security of the United States. “On February 9, 1946 Stalin delivered a public address in which he revived a form of volatile communist rhetoric that had been suppressed during war...On February 16, 1946 the U.S. government announced the discovery of a spy ring in the United States: agents of the Soviet Union...infiltrating U.S. atomic facilities...” A week later the infamous “Long Telegram” was received by the American diplomat, George F. Kennan, in Moscow.

The “father” of post-revisionism does have his critics and is seen by some as more of a traditionalist if anything. Professor Ronn Pineo of Towson University alleges that John Lewis Gaddis continues to support the orthodox view of the origins of the Cold War even with the new found evidence within the post 1991 Cold War documents. In the words of Dr. Pineo, “...most Cold War scholars (if clearly not all of them) have come to individual conclusions that the new evidence undercuts several essential assumptions of the orthodox view of the Cold War.”

Professor Pineo contends with the traditionalist point of view that Stalin did set up communistic regimes between the Soviet Union and Germany, primarily to

---


49 Ibid. 261.

protect the Soviet Union from a possible future invasion. However, the new
documents reveal that Stalin did not share the belief that the Soviet Union would
press for a world wide revolution in the name of communism, especially in Latin
America where he accepted that that particular region of the world fell within the
American sphere of influence. Stalin also believed that socialism would ultimately
prove the victor over capitalism without the need for all out war to inflict it upon the
people of the world.\textsuperscript{51}

Another giant of Cold War history is Walter LaFeber who first published
America, Russia, and the Cold War: 1945-1967, in 1967. LaFeber falls under the
classification of “[t]he New Left diplomatic historiography that first emerged in the
1960’s and 1970’s nearly reversed the picture, portraying the Soviets on the
defensive and American “aggression” as responsible for the near catastrophe and
bitterness that marked the postwar era.”\textsuperscript{52} Since then, LaFeber has had his book
published six more times to the latest seventh edition which brought his continuing
work to 1992. LaFeber’s work, when it was first published in 1967 as “very
revisionist; today it is widely perceived as the best survey of its subject, an indication
of how much of revisionism (and William’s Tragedy’s spirit) has been absorbed.”\textsuperscript{53}

Professor LaFeber directs his attention towards the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century when
“…they first confronted one another on the plains of North China and
Manchuria…That meeting climaxed a century in which Americans had expanded

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid. 3.
\textsuperscript{52} Joseph M. Siracusa, “The “New” Cold War History and the Origins of the Cold War.” \textit{The
\textsuperscript{53} Perkins. 11.
westward over half the globe and Russians moved eastward across Asia."54 From the beginning of the book LaFeber’s work is very much in the revisionist fashion, albeit not as radical as William Appleman Williams, *Tragedy*. The center, to the origins of the Cold War is based primarily around economic factors, which pushed for “open doors.”

LaFeber mentioned the viewpoint of Harry S. Truman in 1941, shortly after the invasion of Nazi Germany into the Soviet Union. Truman stated, “If we see that Germany is winning we should help Russia and if Russia is winning we ought to help Germany and that way let them kill as many as possible, although I don’t want to see Hitler victorious under any circumstances.”55 Did American forces land in Africa first so they could drive towards the belly of Europe and strike the Nazis by going through Italy? Or did American forces want to force their Russian allies to fend for themselves and exhaust their physical and human resources as much as possible during the war?

In persisting with the economic opportunities that America needed, LaFeber pointed out that, “By 1945 the Red Army stood astride Eastern and much of Central Europe. Roosevelt and Churchill, moreover, would have to discuss Stalin’s demands in a strikingly different world, for the allies were destroying Germany and Japan, two nations that historically had blocked Russian expansion into Europe and Asia.”56

These two nations stood at each end of the Russian empire and blocked it from spreading further.

---


55 Ibid. 6.

56 Ibid. 9.
LaFeber’s work in progress from the 60’s-90’s is strikingly different from that of Gaddis. To LaFeber, the United States feared a return to the Great Depression after World War II unless the American government could influence the world economy to that of “open doors.” With the availability of new documents on the Cold War LaFeber continued to see and had more reason to believe that the economic policies of the United States helped foment the origins of the Cold War.

Like Gaddis, LaFeber also has those historians who do not look to the “open doors” as the core root of the Cold War. Professor William R. Forstchen of Montreat College proposed the viewpoint that Stalin needed the Cold War in order to justify repression in the U.S.S.R. and Soviet control of Eastern Europe. The Red Army sacrificed millions to ensure the continuation of the U.S.S.R. as they defended their nation and then defeated the greatest threat to civilization during the twentieth century, the Nazi war machine of Germany. But as Eastern Europe was freed from Nazi tyranny it was replaced with Soviet rule. Because of the nuclear monopoly of the United States, Stalin was paranoid of an atomic strike on the Kremlin. Forstchen proposed that “[t]he only alternative then for maintenance of control in the occupied territories, the continuance of an Orwellian warlike mentality in the homeland, and the expansion of power was a war of nerves: the Cold War. It served all three purposes well...Communists governments were installed, which immediately received the backing of Soviet troops in the name of communist solidarity.”

When looking at a spectrum of Gaddis and LaFeber, you would find that Gaddis would be a bit right of the center and LaFeber would be much more to the left.

---

end of the spectrum. H.W. Brands, the author of *The Devil We Knew: Americans and the Cold War*, promotes the idea that aspects of the Cold War began during the rise and rule of Lenin. Brands really focuses in on the Yalta conference as the major turning point in the development of the Cold War. Four main issues evolved around the Yalta conference; first, the entrance of the Soviet Union into the war in the Pacific within three months of the defeat of Germany. Second, the partition of Germany among the Big Three and France. Third, postwar international security organization (United Nations), and finally the crux of the Yalta conference, the Polish question.58

According to Brands, "[h]ere the divergence between the Soviet and American views became clearest...Stalin [inferred] that Poland for the Soviet Union was more than a matter of honor: "It is also a question of the security of the state, not only because we are on Poland's frontier but also because throughout history Poland had always been a corridor for assaults on Russia."59 Roosevelt pushed for free elections to be held in Poland, but a democratic Poland would not be friendly to the Soviet Union. For the mere reason that Stalin knew the previous statement to be true, Stalin did not allow for free and open elections in Poland. To H.W. Brands there was the Polish question and also the German question. Yet, the post World War II world could be remade to enable the Americans towards "...remaking of the world political economy in the image of the American political economy."60

Henry Kissinger, the former National Security Advisor and Secretary of State under President Nixon published a book in 1994 entitled, *Diplomacy*. Kissinger
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proposes more a traditionalist point of view on the subject matter. "Truman inherited Roosevelt’s top advisers, and he began his presidency intending to pursue his predecessor’s conception of the Four Policemen."\(^{61}\) Stalin is presented by Kissinger as a diplomat returning "to his old ways of conducting foreign policy, and demanded payment for his victories in the only currency he took seriously—territorial control."\(^{62}\)

The fall of the Soviet Union led to the opening up of countless resources for historians to study and come to conclusions based upon the Cold War. However, agreement between the traditionalists, revisionists, and post-revisionists on how and why the Cold War started has still not occurred. Access to a wealth of knowledge, which Cold War historians now have, have led to many historians, such as John Lewis Gaddis and Walter LaFeber, to finding resources that further back their claims on the origins of the Cold War. The debate will continue between all of the schools of thought and a clear concise answer to the question of who started the Cold War will most likely never be truly determined. Nevertheless, this is a boon for history as it will keep historians of the past, present, and future continuing to research and expose information that has not yet been encountered.


\(^{62}\) Ibid. 427.
Part II-Original Research

"The great day of victory over Germany has come. Fascist Germany, brought to its knees by Red Army and Allied forces, has recognized its defeat and announced unconditional capitulation...From now on, over Europe will fly the great flag of freedom for the nations, and peace between the nations...The time of war in Europe has come to the end. The time of peaceful development has begun..."

-Marshal Josef Stalin

The question of who started the Cold War has been an issue of bitter debate among historians and policymakers for more than five decades. In the first years of the Cold War most of what was written in the late 1940s and 1950s about the origins of the Cold War came to be defined as “orthodox” or “traditional.” One of the preeminent traditional historians was Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. who focused on the Soviet Union as the instigator of the Cold War.

In the late 1950s and 1960s a new interpretation of the sources of the Cold War emerged and was referred to as “revisionist” because of its dispute with the orthodox analysis. By the late 1970s a reaction towards revisionism would take place, headed by John Lewis Gaddis. Professor Gaddis would lead the way as the “father” of the post revisionist movement throughout the 1980s and into the post Cold War era. As the archives in the Soviet Union and Soviet-bloc countries opened to Western scholars, the post-revisionist interpretation of the origins of the Cold War blazed even brighter.

Traditionalists put the blame for the Cold War on the Soviet Union. They argued that the Soviets’ denial of free elections in Poland and Czechoslovakia, their

---
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interference in Greece, Turkey, and Iran, their assistance to Communist forces in China, and their opposition to the United States sponsoring postwar plans for controlling weapons and promoting economic development, such as the Marshall Plan, caused the Truman administration to take a hard line stance towards communism. There are differences among traditionalists regarding the driving motivation behind Soviet conduct, but traditionalists squarely place the blame on the aggressive actions taken by Stalin and the U.S.S.R. at the end of World War II and after.

Revisionists argue that Soviet behavior was largely defensive in nature. After the devastation of World War II, the Soviet leadership was interested in rebuilding its country and addressing justifiable security concerns, especially making sure that the countries of east and central Europe would no longer be used as a corridor of invasion into Russia. Furthermore revisionists stress that it was the United States, driven by a capitalist need for markets and raw materials that adopted a confrontational, bullying tone toward the Soviet Union, leading to the outbreak of the Cold War. William Appleman Williams would open the door of revisionism and inspire other scholars such as Walter LaFeber to question the motives of the United States over the ones of the Soviet Union. Professor Williams clearly posed the theory that the United States was an empire, which naturally needed to expand its influence and increase its wealth and power. Through the market system the U.S. would push for dominating the marketplace on an international scale.

Post revisionists reject the revisionist interpretation to an extent, but they also challenge what they consider an excessive emphasis by traditionalists on the role of
Communist ideology in guiding Soviet foreign policy. Post revisionist analyses emphasize geopolitical considerations and strategic realities to suggest a more balanced view of responsibility for the Cold War. Each side was vying for their spheres of influence throughout the world and it was a race for each of the super powers. In their writings, however, there is a return to traditionalist themes, as they point to proactive Soviet actions and to an exceedingly belligerent Soviet rhetoric as major contributing factors in the breakdown of cooperation between the two countries and the onset of the Cold War.

My original research will continue to look at the historical debate of the scholars of the Cold War. However, I will be conducting my own research of primary sources related to the origins of the Cold War. The primary sources will be an array of information that focuses on the three major conferences between the “Big Three” during the Second World War. Issues that were left unresolved would directly play a part in heightening the Cold War. I will also be examining news articles from the New York Times and Pravda, a Soviet controlled paper, to comprehend how these historic events would be reported to the people of the United States, Soviet Union, and the world. Furthermore, there have been many documents that have been declassified, which were once considered Top Secret and are now available to the public. This will lead myself to deem a personal perspective on the origins that led to this social, political, and economic vie for power within the post World War II era. Additionally, I want to develop new questions, which could be posed towards the three schools of thought on the origins of the Cold War. Would the Cold War have developed or been averted if President Roosevelt had lived longer? How did the
relationships change between the leaders of the Grand Alliance during the three major conferences; Teheran, Yalta, Berlin? If Poland chose Communism during free elections, what would the United States have done? Was the Cold War unavoidable from the time the system of capitalism was developed and the philosophy of communism? What if the Grand Alliance left with the Poland and German Question answered and solved?

Traditional questions, which have guided historians as they research the Cold War, focus on an international context. Such as: "[w]as postwar conflict inevitable because of the wrenching changes wrought in the international system by the Second World War? How was power redistributed in that system, and which nation held most? What restraints and opportunities did the state of the world present to the United States and the Soviet Union? Which of the two was more responsible for the Cold War—or must they share responsibility?...[d]id the Cold War evolve because the two sides simply misunderstood one another?...[w]as the Cold War inevitable...?"64

Out of necessity World War II would bring two economic systems, which were poles apart from each other, together out of necessity. The capitalists of Great Britain and the United States would forge an alliance with the communist nation of the Soviet Union. The ardent conservative Churchill was not thrilled with the coalition with the Soviets and in the British Prime Minister's sarcastic sense of humor stated that, "If Hitler invaded Hell, he [Churchill] would at least make a favourable
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reference to the Devil!” However, Roosevelt did not have the same reservations that Churchill held against the Soviets and Stalin.

In the late fall of 1943 the first of three major conferences would take place in Tehran, Iran. Ironically, the conferences that would lead to the end of the World War would also sow the seeds of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. President Roosevelt would show a sign of immense gratitude towards Marshal Stalin by staying at a Soviet lodge during his conference in Tehran. To demonstrate his trust and thanks Josef Stalin had the room Franklin Roosevelt “bugged” during his stay.

The Tehran conference, which was held from November 28-December 1 in 1943, brought together the President of the United States Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Great Britain’s Prime Minister Winston Churchill, and was hosted by the Premier of the Soviet Union Josef Stalin. In 1943 Iran was a common ally to all three major powers and “[t]he common understanding which we have here reached guarantees that victory will be ours.”

Agreements reached at this conference indicate a strong forging of powers, which would destroy the Nazi regime, and the language which is used deemed that it would be possible to set up a post World War II era filled with peace and understanding of the United Nations of the world. “We recognize fully the supreme responsibility resting upon us and all the United Nations to make a peace which will command the goodwill of the overwhelming mass of the peoples of the world and
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banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations." Diplomatic language that resonated the movement of the world in a positive direction, which would be led by a new world order of the Soviet Union and the United States. It was quite clear by this time that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. would be replacing the traditional dominate world powers, especially the British, and the world would be within their spheres.

"With our Diplomatic advisors we have surveyed the problems of the future. We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them, as they may choose to come, into a world family of Democratic Nations...[W]e look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives, untouched by tyranny." The term democratic nation was used in the discussion, yet both the United States and the Soviet Union believed that the nations free from German tyranny would each democratically choose their political and economic system.

This would be one of the major causes of the Cold War, as many nations "liberated" from the Nazi’s by the Soviets in Europe were poised to choose government officials who were more sympathetic to the United States. Ironically, the nation which held the Tehran Conference, Iran, later would choose a socialist leader Mohammad Mosadeq. The Eisenhower administration would have no part of the Moscow leaning leader and used this instance to wage a “low-intensity conflict” by the Central Intelligence Agency and topple the regime. Shah Pahlavi would replace
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the former Iranian leader and be a key United States ally until the Iranian revolution of 1979.\textsuperscript{70}

Yet at the Tehran Conference the “Big Three” stated that, “the Government of Iran [it is in] their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Iran. They (the Big Three) count upon the participation of Iran, together with all other peace-loving nations, in the establishment of international peace, security and prosperity after the war, in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter…”\textsuperscript{71}

The conference in Tehran was not one that was held in secret from the world. A New York Times article reported that a Berlin radio station had heard and broadcasted the information of the “Big Three” meeting, “somewhere in the Middle East…and that Premier Stalin on his way to meet them, had arrived at Teheran, Iran.\textsuperscript{72}

Tadeusz Romer, the Polish Foreign Minister was looking forward to hearing about the agreements at the Tehran conference. According to an article, “[h]e said it was imperative that such an understanding should be reached before the Soviet troops entered Polish territory, which he pointed out, might happen soon.”\textsuperscript{73} Poland had grave concerns on the encroaching Soviets as they knew it was Poland, which was the gateway of the Germans on their way to invading the Soviet Union twice in the last thirty years.
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According to the agreements made at the conference Poland would have nothing to fear, as all nations would have sovereignty following the war. In addition, democracy and choices of the citizenry would guide the future of the world with the three powers ensuring these rights. Yet, this was not to be as the Soviets would simply replace the Nazis as a brutal occupying force and some of the concentration camps would change into gulags for the U.S.S.R. Most importantly the country of Poland would play a major role in the origins of the Cold War. The Poles were to be allowed to choose their own system of government, yet when the people were willing to accept the American model of government the U.S.S.R. enforced communism and turned the nation into a satellite within their “buffer zone.”

With the Tehran conference also came the realization that the tide was in fact turning against the Nazis. The “Grand Alliance” was coming together and strategically defeating the Axis powers and it was only a matter of time before the maliciousness of the Nazis would be dealt its final blow. According to an article titled, Allies Achieve Unity For War And The Peace, “[t]he presence of military advisers in Teheran suggests that the problem of coordinating the Russian attack in the east with an Anglo-American invasion in the west was undoubtedly under review.” 74 Finally the Anglo-American alliance would open up its offensive against Germany and the Soviets, upon the defeat of Germany, would declare war on Japan and look to gain revenge for the humiliating loss to Japan in the early portion of the 20th century.
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Finally in looking at the historic Teheran conference did Stalin have a great respect for President Roosevelt and vice versa. "It was a great concession, and a spectacular bid for Russian friendship, for Mr. Roosevelt to take the long, hard and risky journey...to fulfill his desire to meet the Soviet leader face to face...[I]t was also a great concession for Mr. Stalin to travel even a short distance beyond the bounds of Russia to meet the President of the United States. It was widely predicted that he never would. It is more than he has done for any reason for thirty years. It is more than he did for Mr. Churchill." 75 Was Franklin Roosevelt the binding force of the Grand Alliance? Was this someone Josef Stalin felt he could work with and could trust? "[T]he most significant thing about the Teheran conference is that Stalin was there."76 Not only was Stalin there, he was considered "the life of the party."77 The boisterous Bolshevik "Toasted Him (President Roosevelt) and Churchill as 'Fighting Friend'... There is no doubt that all got on excellently. The day after Mr. Roosevelt had moved into the Russian Embassy, Premier Stalin gave a dinner for him there with a colossal Russian menu, including plenty of caviar." The time spent between the three leaders was not purely diplomacy and meetings; the Grand Alliance was making strides towards a peaceful post World War II world with the first meeting of the 'Big Three'...what happened?

Marshal Stalin was the leader of a totalitarian state in which he made all of the final decisions, including many of the battle decisions during the war. Traditionally the Soviets/Russians were islolated and mistrustful of the West and would be seen
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throughout the Cold War. Furthermore, he was the face of the Bolshevik Revolution and his propaganda posters were everywhere, even though many Soviets had never seen him in person.78 Would there be an “enduring peace”79 that could be constructed and respected?

From February 4th-11th of 1945 the Grand Alliance would reconvene for the second of the three major conferences deciding the fate of the Axis powers and the future of the world. Much had changed since the meeting in Iran, such as the expansion of the Soviet Union into Eastern Europe and the historic D-Day invasion; it was only a matter of time until V - E Day would take place.

There was a feeling of optimism surrounding the Yalta Conference and avoiding the mistakes of World War I. By February 15, of 1945 the meeting in the Crimea was being reported and also the plans for the San Francisco meeting for the United Nations. “It has long been certain that the United Nations would win a military victory. Now we can reasonably hope that they will also be able to create a just, secure and lasting peace...The last Nazi will not have been disarmed by April 25...But this conference, if it is as successful as it promises to be, will be as decisive as a great military victory. It can make peace and freedom the way of the future. It can put a final period to the German-Japanese conspiracy to destroy civilization.”80 Unfortunately this would not be the state of affairs in the post war world.

This would also be the last meeting of the original Big Three as President Roosevelt was in failing health. Nevertheless, FDR traveled many miles to push his
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ideas upon Stalin about a post war world. The conference was held at a lavish white granite palace overlooking the Black Sea, which Tsar Nicholas II had built in 1911. It seems that Josef Stalin did not mind living like the Tsar's and the ideals that the Bolshevik Revolution fought against.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt knew it would not be wise for the United States to hold back its power as it did after World War I. Yet did and could Roosevelt have predicted the conflict, which evolved into the Cold War? President Roosevelt knew of the natural opposing forces of capitalism and communism, but with the United Nations coming to fruition it could be possible that these nations could coexist peacefully. The world body organization, which FDR’s mentor Woodrow Wilson pressed for after World War I, would bring the nations together to prevent the horrors of another world war.

The World Organization coming together was at the top of the agenda for President Roosevelt for the post war world. Woodrow Wilson pressed for the United States to join the League of Nations following World War I, but met stiff resistance from the Republican dominated senate. At the Yalta conference, the date for the United Nations was set for April 25th of 1945. Did FDR see the future as a time of coexistence where problems and crises could be presented and solved at the United Nations? The diplomacy among the “Big Three,” though not perfect, was progressive and must have been encouraging when seen on paper.

“The Government of the United States of America, on behalf of itself and of the Governments of the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and

the Republic of China and the Provisional Government of the French Republic invite the Government of ------- to send representatives to a conference to be held on 25 April, 1945, or soon thereafter, at San Francisco, in the United States of America, to prepare a charter for a general international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security."82 Finally, the mentee of Woodrow Wilson was bringing to life a world body where the United States would be a crucial component and host the world body on U.S. soil.

The Yalta conference also included the treatment of Europe once the Nazis were completely defeated. "The Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of the United States of America have consulted with each other in the common interests of the people of their countries and those of liberated Europe. They jointly declare their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three Governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems...democratic institutions...of their own choice...a principle of the Atlantic Charter-the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live..."83

With the destruction of Germany would come the end to a nation which within fifty years had been on the losing side of two world wars. Germany had also caused destruction on an immeasurable scale, especially in the Soviet Union. Yet the
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British and the Americans both realized that the oppression of the German people through extreme reparations could lead to disaster once again. France and the Soviets had different viewpoints and would have settled on a much more destructive treatment of Germany. At Yalta, the dismemberment of Germany would be decided upon to create peace and stability, yet the nation would play a crucial part throughout the Cold War. “The United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall possess supreme authority with respect to Germany. In the exercise of such authority they will take such steps, including the complete dismemberment of Germany as they deem requisite for future peace and security.”

Traditionalists and post-revisionists will point to Poland very promptly when placing the blame for the Cold War on the Soviet Union. At the Yalta conference the people of Poland, like the rest of the nations liberated from Nazi tyranny, would achieve the right to choose their government through democratic means. “A new situation has been created in Poland as a result of her complete liberation by the Red Army. This calls for the establishment of a Polish Provisional Government which can be more broadly based than was possible before the recent liberation of the western part of Poland. The Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. This new Government should then be called the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity.”

At the time of the meeting there were six to seven million Poles living in the United States and President Roosevelt felt, that they would play a major role in the
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elections back home. Many of the Poles pressed for what land would be given to Poland after the end of the war. However, the most important issue being brought up by the U.S. President, influenced by the Poles, was “A government which would represent all five major parties is what is wanted.”\textsuperscript{86} During the meeting with Stalin and Churchill it was evident that Roosevelt wanted a freely elected Poland, but he also specifically mentioned to Stalin, “[w]e want a Poland that will be thoroughly friendly to the Soviet for years to come. This is essential.”\textsuperscript{87} Prime Minister Winston Churchill was vocal in the freedom of Poland. He stated, “...I am more interested in the question of Poland’s sovereign independence and freedom...we drew our sword for Poland against Hitler’s brutal attack.”\textsuperscript{88}

Prior to the Yalta Conference there were concerns within the Polish Government in London, a group of Poles dedicated to keeping the realization of Polish sovereignty after World War II. In January of 1945 Polish representatives “handed to United States Secretary of State Edward R. Stettitus Jr. and British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden documentary particulars of alleged deportations and transfers of Polish populations by the Soviet government.”\textsuperscript{89} As the Soviets pushed the Nazis out of Poland, the Polish government ordered the Polish Home Army to cooperate with the Red Army. The Soviet Union took drastic steps and actually had commanders arrested and began to disarm the Polish home army. Soviet expansionism was beginning before the war was over and it is very likely Soviet
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Union knew they had to infiltrate their occupied territory with pro-Stalin and pro-
Soviet representatives in Eastern Europe. According to the article, "[b]y Oct. 10 in
the Lublin area, at least 21,000 Poles had been arrested, it was alleged, and the
liquidation of the Home Army and underground personnel was being carried out by
imprisonment and deportation." 90

During the Yalta Conference President Roosevelt wrote a personal letter to
Marshall Stalin stating his personal concerns over Poland. On February 6, two days
into the conference Roosevelt stated in his letter, "...so far as the Polish Government
is concerned, I am greatly disturbed that the three great powers do not have a meeting
of minds about the political setup in Poland. It seems to me that it puts all of us in a
bad light throughout the world to have you recognizing one government while we and
the British are recognizing another in London...Surely there is a way to reconcile our
differences...I have to make it clear to you that we cannot recognize the Lublin
government as now composed...It goes without saying that any interim government
which could be formed as a result of our conference with the Poles here would be
pledged to the holding of free elections in Poland at the earliest possible date. I know
this is completely consistent with your desire to see a new free and democratic Poland
emerge from the welter of this war." 91

Roosevelt knew the Soviets were paranoid of a possible revival of Germany
and rightfully so. Historically, it was Poland which the French led by Napoleon
Bonaparte and then the Germans, twice in less than thirty-five years, used as a
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corridor to attack the heart of the U.S.S.R. The Soviets lost twenty million men and women of its population during the brutal Second World War, which was obviously prevalent at the Yalta conference. Marshal Stalin referred to his future satellite nation by stating, "Russia today is against the Czarist policy of abolition of Poland. We have completely changed this inhuman policy and started a policy of friendship and independence for Poland." 92

Two months removed from the Yalta Conference Marshal Stalin was such good "friends" with the "independent" Poles that he and the Soviet Union posed a request that the Soviet sponsored Polish Provisional Government be invited to the San Francisco Security Conference. The United States and Great Britain stood firmly together against inviting the Soviet backed Polish government, and the jovial “Uncle Joe” Stalin of the Tehran conference must have seen so far removed. Ambassador Sir Archibald, "made inquiries of the Russians concerning the whereabouts of the "missing Polish underground leaders," but the only thing the Ambassador was able to report back to the British Government was that inquiries were being made." 93

With the protests of the Polish, how could President Roosevelt not take a stronger stance against Josef Stalin? Did FDR believe that taking a strong stance against the Soviet Union and their actions in Poland could lead to the break up of their now shaky relationship? As the war came to a close could we coexist in a post World War II world?

The Polish question would not be resolved and would play a major role in the development of the origins of the Cold War.
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The Red Army "liberated" the nation of Poland but the Polish citizens soon saw the Soviet army as another brutal occupying force simply replacing the Nazis and their wickedness. Stalin believed that Poland would elect the Soviet implanted communist leaders to guide their nation towards the socialist state of a workers paradise. However, whether the Poles chose communism or not Stalin believed that "[t]his war is not as in the past; whoever occupies a territory also imposes on it his own social system. Everyone imposes his own system as far as his army can reach. It cannot be otherwise." This example of realpolitik by Stalin was not the intentions of the post war agreement and certainly not what President Roosevelt envisioned in a world led by the United Nations.

When total victory was achieved in Europe by the Grand Alliance, the Soviet Union would enter the war against Japan in return for territory it had lost dating back to the Russo-Japanese War. "The leaders of the three great powers-the Soviet Union, the United States of America and Great Britain-have agreed that in two or three months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe is terminated, the Soviet Union shall enter into war against Japan on the side of the Allies..." From July 17 to August 2, 1945 the Potsdam Conference would take place between the "Big Three." However, the faces of the leaders of the Grand Alliance had changed quite a bit. "Uncle Joe" Stalin would still be in charge of the Soviet Union and therefore representing the U.S.S.R. Prime Minister Churchill was in attendance at the Potsdam Conference, yet during the conference his party was voted out of power from the British Parliament and Clement Atlee would come to represent
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Great Britain. Harry S. Truman took over for President Roosevelt upon his death completing the new look Grand Alliance. President Truman kept personal notes while he attended the Potsdam Conference and well into the meeting of the three major powers Truman was demonstrating how distraught he was over the Soviet Union and its tactics. On July 26th of 1945 he wrote, “The Communist Party in Moscow is no different in its methods and actions toward the common man than were the Czar and the Russian Noblemen (so called: they were anything but noble) Nazis and Fascists were worse. It seems that Sweden, Norway, Denmark and perhaps Switzerland have the only real peoples governments on the Continent of Europe. But the rest are a bad lot from the standpoint of the people who do not believe in tyranny.”

So far into the conference it would have been unlikely that Truman could have had a positive feeling about the outcome of the rest of the meeting and the post war world.

President Truman would be at the Potsdam Conference knowing that the Soviet Union would be getting ready to join the British and the Americans against the Japanese in the Pacific War. A major achievement by the United States government had taken place with the success of the “Manhattan Project.” Harry S. Truman did tell Josef Stalin about the Atomic Bomb, which was successfully tested on July 16, 1945. On a personal note attached to a picture of a meeting Truman wrote down the following line, “This is the place I told Stalin about the Atom Bomb...He didn’t
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realize what I was talking about!..." With the development of the A-bomb the Soviet Union would not be needed in the final offensive against Japan.

At the Potsdam Conference Germany dominated the talks of agreements between the Allies. "[S]upreme authority in Germany is exercised; on instructions form their respective Governments, by the Commanders-in-Chief of the armed forces of the United States of America, the United Kingdom, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the French Republic, each in his own zone of occupation." 98

"To prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful cooperation in international life by Germany...During the period of occupation Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit." 99 General Eisenhower recognized the sacrifices made by the Soviet Union in defeating the Nazis of Germany and because of this the Soviets would be allowed to enter the city of Berlin as the conquerors of Germany. The Red Army had defeated a wicked foe and would relish by showing the people of Germany that the nation, which Hitler wanted to destroy had survived and was now walking down the streets of Berlin in control.

While the Soviets were in Berlin, they took advantage of the time to begin to infiltrate the city with communists and also would take control of all outlets of media and place pro-Soviet workers within the city. Berlin was to be communist if the Soviets had their way.
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The Polish question at the Potsdam Conference seemed to be under control by the allies. “The Three Powers note that the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, in accordance with the decisions of the Crimea Conference, has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates, and that representatives of the Allied press shall enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Poland before and during the elections.”  

With the end of the war the final of the “Big Three Meetings” should have been a time where the conditions of peace for the post World War II world should have been set between the United States and the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, there were still uncertainties between the nations, which brought an end to the most destructive war ever witnessed on the face of this earth. James Reston wrote about the “new order” which was being formed in contrast to Hitler’s dream. “A “new order” is finally being worked out for Europe as Adolf Hitler predicted...The great difference is that it is being planned not by the German Fuehrer and his Italian Henchman but by the leaders of three nations which Hitler helped bring into coalition almost against their will.”  

It was prevalent throughout the war that the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union was one based on necessity and there was great mistrust amid the two new superpowers of the world.
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Victory had been achieved in Europe but Reston reported on the concerns of the post world. At the Potsdam conference there was a fear of uncertainty, "others here are afraid that this very rigidity of the Russians, backed by geographical position and strength, will impose on Europe a system which neither the peoples of Europe nor of Britain and the United States will be prepared to sustain." Other major concerns were over the commitment of the Soviet Union to allowing the people of Europe, under their sphere of influence, to actually freely choose their leaders and live by their own free will, Poland being the perfect example. Of course the German Question would still also be unresolved by the end of the third meeting of the "Big Three."

Marshall Stalin and the Soviets would agree to allow the nations of Eastern Europe to choose their own governments in free elections. Stalin agreed to the condition only because he believed that these newly liberated nations would see the Soviet Union as their savior and create their own Communist governments. When they failed to do so, Stalin violated the agreement by wiping out all opposition to communism in these nations and setting up his own governments in Eastern Europe. The Cold War had begun with these actions. The world would be divided into opposing camps by the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Each would accuse the other of having plans to take over the world and impose their will on the people of the world. The Soviet Union accused the United States as being imperialists and exploiting the resources of the world for their own benefit. Josef Stalin pushed forth the idea that it was the Soviet Union which would continue on with the crusade of the peasants and workers of the world. President Truman spoke
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of two spheres one free and the other bent on subjugating struggling nations. The United States and other democratic nations accused the Soviets of imposing their ideologies on emerging nations to increase their power and sphere of influence. Western nations envisioned themselves as the champions of freedom and justice, saving the world for democracy. Or were both nations working for their own security and economic advancements?

It is my opinion that both the United States and the Soviet Union were both influenced by a national agenda. The United States needed Europe to rebound from the war for its own economic gain. America could not have prospered if the Europeans were held down by a depression or communistic aggression. The system used by the Soviet Union was considered to be a world wide revolution. There is no denying that communists wanted to spread their system around the world. At the same time the Soviet Union had faced much destruction from two World Wars and wanted security from any possibility of a future attack.

I also believe that if the Poland and German questions were resolved by the end of the Potsdam Conference the potential for both the United States and the Soviet Union were too great for both countries to sit idle and take their place in the world as Alexis de Tocqueville had predicted. With the official demise of the British Empire the markets of the world were ready to be tapped into by the United States. With the weakening of the Colonial powers the third world nations of the world were also vulnerable as they sought sovereignty but also economic assistance. The perfect recipe was created for both the United States and the Soviet Union to infiltrate and expand their spheres of influence.
A plethora of circumstances led to the heating up of the Cold War following World War II. The natural opposing economic and political systems of the Americans and Soviets were prevalent prior to the Three Major Conferences. Amid the issues that would at first divide Europe would clearly go onto dividing the rest of the world. The two superpowers that arose after World War II were poised militaristically, socially, and economically. The tensions and engagements would be unprecedented as the conflict was fought on every continent of the world and the competition would drive the governments and the people themselves against each other to the brink.
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Part III: Curriculum Development-Option 1-Essay

Origins of the Cold War

On December 31, 1991 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics came to a cease and dissolved as a world superpower. For much of the 20th century the world witnessed the United States and the Soviet Union square off against each other politically, economically, and of course militarily. Each power pushed each other to the brink during the Cold War and the tension between them almost led to a nuclear holocaust in October of 1962. The Cold War did end with an American victory, however, the crises that face the United States today can be directly correlated back to the era of the Cold War.

To be able to make a positive change, citizens of today must have an understanding of what is going on in the world around them. In addition, people must also comprehend the origins of the problems and situations within our global community that we all are facing currently. The subject of social studies allows for people to learn about the past and the effect it has on the world today and will have on them in the future.

The Cold War and its origins occurred over a span of time and at the core of the conflict were the economic systems of the United States and Soviet Union. Historians have debated which nation actually started the Cold War since the evolution of the severe tension between the two superpowers that emerged after World War II. Did capitalism drive the Americans to create an empire based around acquiring natural resources and markets for their goods? Or was the Soviet threat one
that truly would endanger the entire world if the United States did not keep the Soviets contained?

Teaching about the origins of the Cold War requires the educator to present a plethora of information which must be understood by their students. There are numerous books, journals, museums, and websites which have an enormous amount of documents and historical information available to use when teaching the Cold War. In spite of this, how does a teacher create and use these materials in a useful and educational way that will allow students to form their own opinions and add to the discussion on who started the Cold War.

**Framework:**

The origins of the Cold War are extremely complex and cannot be truly understood with a minimal investigation into this topic. The following curriculum was developed to be used with an International Baccalaureate class called History of the Americas. Lessons and materials were created to enable the students to develop an in-depth understanding of the origins of the Cold War encompassing the years 1943-1949. Furthermore, educators need to enlighten the students on differing viewpoints of historians and their interpretations on the origins of the Cold War.

History of the Americas takes place over two-years and the second year of the course concentrates on 20th century topics. Quite naturally the Cold War dominates the class because of the involvement of the United States and the Soviet Union in world affairs from 1945 to 1991. The course is rigorous and students are expected to work at the collegiate level to develop a deep comprehension of the material and conflicting viewpoints of the era being researched. As an educator and
student of history the History of the Americas allows for a proper investigation of the past, which benefits the students and is a chance for the educator to teach a college level course to high school students.

I. Alignment to the International Baccalaureate Curriculum

II. Where to Begin?
   - Alexis de Tocqueville and Adolf Hitler
   - The Big Three
   - New York Times Articles

III. Working with Primary Sources: Three Major Conferences
   - The Tehran Conference (1943)
   - The Yalta Conference (1945)
   - The Berlin/Potsdam Conference (1945)

IV. Compare and Contrast: Looking at Differing Perspectives
   - Joseph Stalin's Election Speech (1946)
   - Winston Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech (1946)

V. Frayer Model: Understanding Terms and Events

VI. Final Assessments: Using Technology and the Written Word
   - Windows Movie Maker: Understanding the Origins of the Cold War
   - RAFT: (Role, Audience, Format, Topic)

VII. Conclusion

VIII. Resource List and Works Cited
Sources used in gathering information and creating lessons on the Cold War

IX. Worksheets

I. Alignment to the International Baccalaureate Curriculum

The work presented within this course portfolio is directed towards meeting the curriculum and standards of the International Baccalaureate class; History of the Americas. Students are required to retain a plethora of information on a variety of 20th century topics including the origins of the Cold War. Furthermore, International Baccalaureate students should also have the knowledge of how historical events have been viewed and interpreted by a variety of historical perspectives for. The origins of the Cold War is a notable topic for the reason that many historians have debated this topic. Students must also be able to develop their own particular viewpoint on historical events and be able to express themselves through the written word on their major examinations at the end of the year.

Portions of these lessons would be applicable to both Global Studies 10 and the United States History curriculum. The following information would enable the teacher to add information, which may not be required by the social studies curriculum, to present a well balanced view on the beginnings of the Cold War. Each of the lessons and material presented were also created in accordance with the New York State Social Studies Standards; Standard 1-History of the United States and New York, Standard 2-World History, Standard 4- Economic, and Standard 5-Civics, Citizenship, and Government.

II. Where to Begin?:

54
I like to begin the course by having students reflect on how and where the United States is currently involved in the world today. Students usually think of the obvious answers such as Iraq and Afghanistan and give a limited response on why we are there and why we are fighting. I also ask students if they feel the United States is a world leader and if they are truly acting in the best intentions of the people of the world or if we are self driven seeking out our own national interests. Furthermore, I also inquire if they know when the United States became one of two global powers seeking to influence the world and if we should still be acting in this manner.

Upon completion of our class conversation based around where the United States is involved today and how we arrived at the point of a major global power I have students look at two fascinating quotes; one by Alexis de Tocqueville in 1835 and the other by Adolf Hitler in 1945.

"There are now two great nations in the world, which starting from different points, seem to be advancing toward the same goal: the Russians and the Anglo-Americans...[E]ach seems called by some secret design of providence one day to hold in its hands the destinies of half the world."

-Alexis de Tocqueville, 1835

"With the defeat of the Reich and pending the emergence of the Asiatic, the African, and perhaps the South American nationalisms, there will remain in the world only two Great Powers capable of confronting each other-the United States and Soviet Russia. The laws of both history and geography will compel these two Powers to a trial of strength, either military or in the fields of economics and ideology."

-Adolf Hitler, 1945

Both of the quotes allude to the point that the Soviet Union (Russia in the case of Alexis de Tocqueville) and the United States would become the preeminent powers of the world. Both individuals were correct. Upon completion of a brief discussion of the quotes I have the students take a gallery tour and look over pictures of the Big Three at the major conferences and reflect on how the leaders of the United States (Franklin Delano Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman), Great Britain (Winston Churchill,
Clement Atlee) and the Soviet Union (Joseph Stalin) were portrayed to the public. News articles and propaganda of the era are also used to display how the public persona of the times portrayed the three nations as tremendous allies on their destination to destroy fascism around the globe. (Appendix A)

To help students understand how they will interpret historian’s viewpoints on who was responsible for starting the Cold War, I use a segment from Opposing Viewpoints in World History: The Cold War. The book does a wonderful job giving viewpoints to a number of topics throughout the Cold War. Very early on in the book it describes the schools of thought that surround the origins of the Cold War. “From the earliest days of the Russian Revolution until the end of the Cold War, Moscow viewed the United States as unalterably hostile.”103 Thus is the viewpoint of Glenn Chafetz describing how the Soviets feared the advancement of the Americans, which would occur after the defeat of the Nazi’s in Germany. Historian Mary Hampton posits that the Soviet’s and the American’s was self-interest at the heart of what they wanted to accomplish during the Cold War.

“Arguments that seek to explain the Cold War competition in terms of ideology...should anticipate that the United States would have supported democratic reform movements and uprising throughout Eastern Europe in this period...In fact, the Soviet Union resolved these crises without the intervention from the United States or its Western Allies.”104

III. Working with Primary Sources:


104 Ibid. 15.
By 1943 the United States and the Soviet Union both began to envision a post-
war world that would include each of the powers in global affairs. America would
not isolate itself as it had done following World War I and President Roosevelt would
push for the creation of a world body organization; the United Nations. Joseph Stalin
also viewed the Soviet Union in the post World War II era as a nation that would
ensure its own security. Marshal Joseph Stalin also envisioned the Soviet Union
forcing its will on nations it controlled "...whoever occupies a territory also imposes
his own social system...It cannot be otherwise."\textsuperscript{105}

During the years 1943-1945 the leaders of the United States, Great Britain,
and the Soviet Union met at three significant conferences that would shape the post
war world but would also sow the seeds of a hostile relationship between the socialist
and capitalistic nations of the world. Portions of each of the objectives and results of
the Tehran Conference (1943), Yalta Conference (1945), and the Berlin Conference
(1945) are distributed to each of the students. I have students record the decisions
and major goals of the conference and try to speculate on what motivated each of the
leaders present at the conference. (Appendix B) Upon completion of the in-depth
look into the three major conferences I have students share with each other and
investigate if they have left out a major goal out or if they can help out their fellow
classmate grasp the meetings of the Big Three. As a closing activity I have students
prepare a radio address that each of the leaders would present to their people after one
of the three conferences.

IV. Compare and Contrast: Looking at Differing Perspectives

\textsuperscript{105} Gaddis. 14.
On February 9th of 1946 Joseph Stalin gave his “election” speech at the Bolshoi Theater in Moscow. In his speech to the Communist Party, Stalin reasserted his beliefs on the continuation of the spread of Marxist-Leninist thought. He also blamed the imperialistic West for World War II and the Soviet Union had survived through the bloodiest war in history. Stalin stated, “[t]he war has shown that the Soviet multi-national state system has successfully stood the test, has grown still stronger during the war and has proved a completely vital state system.” A declaration of war or conflict? The students will pose their own thoughts on Stalin and if he was simply defending his nation or instigating a conflict between the East and West. The language used by Stalin had not been heard since 1941 and the leaders of the Western nations saw the speech as an aggressive approach towards their way of life and considered it as a declaration of the Cold War.

Winston Churchill, the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, visited the United States and revealed his true concerns of Stalin and the threat that the Soviet Union was formulating against the West. President Truman and Winston Churchill both believed it was time to persuade the American public perception against the totalitarian regime of Marshal Stalin. On March 5, 1946 Churchill delivered his infamous “Iron Curtain” speech in Fulton, Missouri. “From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent.”

The majority of students who are taking History of the Americas are familiar with the “Iron Curtain” speech in the sense that it was a warning to the West of the evil intentions of the Soviet Union. However, I have yet to come across a student

106 Judge. 13.
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who has heard of the “Bolshoi Theater” speech given by Stalin, which led to Churchill’s retaliatory address. History should never be taught from one perspective. Students must be given a variety of viewpoints and encouraged to use their own critical thinking skills to come up with their own opinion. In comparing and contrasting the two speeches of 1946 individual students can look at the concerns, fears, and threats from each side and contemplate who, or if both sides, had their hand in starting the Cold War.

Students should be encouraged to develop their own analysis on particular aspects of history. However, it is very important to provide questions for the students to answer prior to coming to a sound opinion. The following questions would be appropriate to help the student:

For investigating Stalin’s Election Speech:

1. How did Stalin explain the outbreak of WWII?

2. Why did Stalin emphasize so strongly that the Soviet social and state systems had triumphed, in addition to the obvious victory of the Red Army?

3. Why was this speech viewed with alarm in Washington and London?

4. How can you tell that Stalin’s explanation is based on Marxist principles?

For investigating Churchill’s “Iron Curtain” Speech:

1. What evidence did Churchill give of Soviet Expansionism?

2. If Churchill recognized “the Russian need to be so secure on her western frontiers,” why did he object so strongly to what the Russians were doing in Eastern Europe?”
3. Why did Churchill assert that “the old doctrine of the balance of power is unsound”?

4. Since Churchill was no longer prime minister, why did his speech have such a powerful impact? (Appendix C)

V. Frayer Model: Understanding Terms and Events

Social studies is rich with historical figures, places, events, and vocabulary. Students can become overwhelmed with glossary terms and long lists of items to know and understand for examinations. Therefore, when a student simply writes down a definition for a plethora of words in can become mundane and very tedious. Processing of information does not take place when a student uses a monotonous way of recording definitions.

The Frayer Model (Appendix D) is a strategy that is designed to analyze and assess the attainment of concepts. The strategy is a graphic organizer that breaks the definition down into concepts. The Frayer model works well with all levels of students and it can be accomplished alone or with a partner. Retaining information is more successful because the student defines the word in his/her own words, gives specific characteristics of the term or event, examples are given along with an image to help students also see a visual reminder of the term. The Frayer Model can be used with readings and videos to help students target in on terms that will help them use specifics when writing or discussing a particular time period.

VI. Final Assessment: Using Technology and the Written Word

As the students learn about the Origins of the Cold War, they are required to read a great deal of material surrounding the era. Much of the mandatory reading are
primary sources based around the early part of this conflict between the Soviet Union and United States. Seeing that the students have a great amount of background information I like to see if the students can create a movie on the Origins of the Cold War using Microsoft Moviemaker. (Appendix E)

Each student is required to research and design a 15-20 frame clip for Windows Moviemaker informing their audience about the evolution of the Cold War. Each person utilizes the sources and knowledge they have obtained over the previous classes to put together a historically accurate video segment. Specific events the students must include come from the book *Major Problems in American Foreign Relations*, which is edited by Dennis Merrill and Thomas G. Paterson. The documents selected help the student gain a first hand perspective into the break up of the Alliance that held together the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union during World War II.

There are ten documents that outline the differences between the major superpowers after World War II. In document 1, Harry Hopkins, who was a representative of the United States was sent to talk to Joseph Stalin about the ending of the Lend-Lease aid to the Soviet Union and the influence of the Soviet Union in Polish politics. Both of these issues caused a major rift between the Americans and Soviets as each were beginning to see the other as more and more of a legitimate threat. These primary sources do a tremendous justice towards individuals being able to form their own opinion on whose fault it was for starting the Cold War. A specific way in which the student can see the viewpoint of the Soviet government is when Marshal Stalin replied to the questioning of Mr. Hopkins by stating “...it may seem

108 Merril and Paterson. 205.
strange although it appeared to be recognized in United States circles and Churchill in his speeches also recognized it, that the Soviet government should wish for a friendly Poland. In the course of twenty-five years the Germans had twice invaded Russia via Poland."\(^{109}\) Stalin presents a very real problem to the United States for the reasoning of the great influence on Polish politics by the Soviet Union. However, the agreement at Yalta was that nations would choose freely on what type of government would represent the people.

The architect of containment, George F. Kennan and his "Long Telegram," of 1946 are also included within the segment of primary sources. This telegram would outline the policy of the United States for the next fifty years. Communism must stay where it exists and not spread any further. George F. Kennan inspired the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, which is also, included amongst the students readings.

With these types of sources the student can develop an appealing final project in which he or she must use creativity along with their understanding of the Origins of the Cold War. Technology is usually embraced by the students and they enjoy being able to create something on their own but with the ability to access an abundance of pictures and images relating to the beginning of the Cold War.

Upon completion of the Windows Moviemaker project, I have the students determine who they feel is at fault for causing the Cold War. By the end of the unit they have read over many primary sources and have also taken a look a variety of historian’s viewpoints on the Origins of the Cold War. I require them to write an R.A.F.T. essay (Appendix F) (Role, Audience, Format, Topic) to allow them to

\(^{109}\) Ibid. 206.
express themselves in a written format, but with a different method. They have the option of taking on the role of an historian with a new book entitled: *I Know Who Started the Cold War*. The audience is a group of fellow scholars, both Soviet and American. Format of the written work is a lecture on your findings and how you have come to this decision. The topic of course is who started the Cold War.

It is necessary for students to be able to express themselves in the written word. The RAFT format also allows themselves to become a bit imaginative and they do not have to hear the word “essay.” Yet they must still be able to provide an ample amount of information backing their particular viewpoint on who caused the Cold War.

VII. Conclusion

The United States continues its role as a world superpower in the 21st century. With the influence our nation encompasses and the role citizens have as voters it is crucial that there is a deep understanding of our past. A course such as the History of the Americas allows for students to gain insight to our history but also permits the individual to use their insight to form their own opinions.

Much of our involvement in global affairs today stems back to the Cold War. This is precisely why the subject of history and the topic of the origins of the Cold War are very important for students to learn about and comprehend. As our nation became more entangled with the Soviet Union our influence spread at a faster and farther rate. Our nation once again is increasing its global influence and it is very
important that our leaders of today and leaders of tomorrow can reflect back on history to come up with solutions that will bring success and long-term security to our nation and the world.
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IX. Worksheets (Appendices)

The ensuing worksheets may be used for the activities described in this teaching portfolio.
Appendices: Student Worksheets
Task: Please read the two quotes below and respond with your reaction to each particular quote. Upon a brief discussion around the quotes and your thoughts we will take a gallery tour around the room. We will be observing pictures of the “Big Three,” propaganda, and news articles surrounding the three major conferences of World War II.

Part I: Foreseeing the World

“There are now two great nations in the world, which starting from different points, seem to be advancing toward the same goal: the Russians and the Anglo-Americans...[E]ach seems called by some secret design of providence one day to hold in its hands the destinies of half the world.”

-Alexis de Tocqueville, 1835

“With the defeat of the Reich and pending the emergence of the Asiatic, the African, and perhaps the South American nationalisms, there will remain in the world only two Great Powers capable of confronting each other-the United States and Soviet Russia. The laws of both history and geography will compel these two Powers to a trial of strength, either military or in the fields of economics and ideology.”

-Adolf Hitler, 1945

1. How could de Tocqueville and Hitler foresee the rise of the Soviet Union (Russia) and the United States? (Hint: Look at the years and consider what was happening in our history.)

Part II: Gallery Tour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Picture A: The Big Three at Yalta</th>
<th>Picture B: The Big Three at Potsdam (Berlin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who made up the original Big Three?</td>
<td>1. Who made up the “new” Big Three?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do they appear to be getting along?</td>
<td>2. How do they appear to be getting along?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propaganda A: Pro Allies</td>
<td>Propaganda B: Pro Allies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What symbols do you see?</td>
<td>1. What symbols do you see?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the point being expressed?</td>
<td>2. What is the point being expressed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Who are the individuals?</td>
<td>3. Who are the individuals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Give the propaganda piece your own title?</td>
<td>4. Give the propaganda piece your own title?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New York Times: “Abroad; Stalin’s Record Breaking Trip to Teheran,” Dec. 6, 1943


| 1. What perception is being reported to the public? |
| 2. What are the main points of the conference? |
| 2. What are the main points of the conference? |
Introduction: During World War II the Big Three met at key conferences to determine what the world would look like upon the ending of World War II. It seemed as if the world would be a safer and more peaceful planet upon the ending of World War II. But would it be?

Task: You and a partner will look over assigned portions of the agreements made at the three major conferences between the Big Three during World War II. Upon the completion you will share with the class your findings from your research. Finally you will prepare a radio address for one of the leaders that made up the Big Three. (Directions below)

The Tehran Conference (1943): Read only section (a) and answer the questions.
1. What were the goals of the conference and what motivated each of the leaders present at the conference?

2. List three things you feel are important?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

3. Write a question which you feel is left unanswered by the document:

The Yalta Conference (1945): Read only section II and answer the questions.
1. What were the goals of the conference and what motivated each of the leaders present at the conference?

2. List three things you feel are important?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

3. Write a question which you feel is left unanswered by the document:
The Potsdam (Berlin) Conference (1945): Read only section (a) and answer the questions.

1. What were the goals of the conference and what motivated each of the leaders present at the conference?

2. List three things you feel are important?
   a. 
   b. 
   c. 

3. Write a question which you feel is left unanswered by the document:

Closure Activity: Choose one of the leaders we have been studying about and prepare a radio address. How would your particular head of state address their public? Be sure to include their nation's goals and how they will achieve them with the help of their fellow allies. (Please utilize the back for your address)
Task: Please read the two historical speeches; Stalin’s election speech (Bolshoi Theater Speech) which was given on February 9th, 1946. And Winston Churchill’s “Iron Curtain” speech, which was delivered on March 5, 1946. After the completion of each speech please respond to the questions below.

Stalin’s Election Speech:

1. How did Stalin explain the outbreak of WWII?

2. Why did Stalin emphasize so strongly that the Soviet social and state systems had triumphed, in addition to the obvious victory of the Red Army?

3. Why was this speech viewed with alarm in Washington and London?

4. How can you tell that Stalin’s explanation is based on Marxist principles?

Churchill’s “Iron Curtain” Speech:

1. What evidence did Churchill give of Soviet Expansionism?

2. If Churchill recognized “the Russian need to be so secure on her western frontiers,” why did he object so strongly to what the Russians were doing in Eastern Europe?”

3. Why did Churchill assert that “the old doctrine of the balance of power is unsound”?

4. Since Churchill was no longer prime minister, why did his speech have such a powerful impact?

* Based on your prior knowledge from the in-class assignments, previous homework readings, and the two speeches, who do you feel is more responsible for starting the Cold War? Please elaborate on the back.
Name
Date
IB: History of the Americas
Key Vocabulary

**Task:** Please complete the Frayer Model diagrams below to help you comprehend the key vocabulary terms on the Origins of the Cold War.

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition (in own words):</th>
<th>Characteristics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where the state or central power has total control over everything</td>
<td>Single Ruling Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usually Dictators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples:**

- Hitler
- Stalin
- Mussolini

**Image:**

![Totalitarian Image]

---

**Definition (in own words):**

Characteristics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kennan's &quot;Long Telegram&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Examples:**

- Image:
Task: To research, design and create a 15-20 frame clip for Windows Movie Maker informing your audience about the Origins of the Cold War (Be Creative!) Your research must utilize all prior resources from class so that you are able to bring your “movie” to life with the parameters of this assignment.

• You need pictures and pieces of text (no more than 15 words per slide)
• Picture size has to be greater than 400 x 600 resolution
• Total length of your clip cannot exceed 3 minutes
• You can use any transitions that you want
• Sound should be added as the last step

Use websites listed to aid you in your research.

http://www.coldwar.org/
http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/cold.war/
http://www.learningcurve.gov.uk/cold_war/G2/default.htm
http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/coldwar.htm
http://www.trumanlibrary.org/hst/g.htm
http://www.wilsoncenter.org/
http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/decade/decade17.htm

Work must be cited in the closing credits, so keep track of where your information comes from.

Directions for using XP Movie Maker
Start Menu> All Programs> Accessories> Windows Movie Maker

Use your movie task menu to guide you in your filmmaking. You should only need to use menus 1 and 2 (Capture Video and Edit Movie Menu).

To get pictures or video go to the Menu 1 Capture Video and click on Import Video or Import Pictures.

To get those pictures of video in the timeline just click and drag.

To add text, effects or transitions go to the Edit Movie Menu and select the desired edit.
Task: Please complete the R.A.F.T. letter. Each segment is explained below and your response should be well detailed and full of specifics for making your points. This letter should be at least two-pages (typed).

I Know Who Started The Cold War!!!!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R. Role</th>
<th>An American or Soviet historian who just finished a new book called <em>I Know Who Started The Cold War</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Audience</td>
<td>Group of fellow scholars, both Soviet and American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Format</td>
<td>A lecture on your findings and how you have come to this decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Topic</td>
<td>Who started the Cold War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>