

Who was responsible for the Cold War?			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
USA	<p>US aggressive, imperialistic and provocative foreign policy. Truman Doctrine (1947) and Marshall Plan were threatening to European sovereignty, granting \$13 billion in US aid to the reconstruction of Western-style democracy and supposedly a barrier to Communism, justified suspicions and defensive actions by USSR.</p>	<p>Dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945, widely claimed to have been directed at the USSR. Soviet perspective: 'It was clear already then that the US Government intended to use the atomic weapon for the purpose of achieving its Imperialist goals from a position of strength in the Cold War' (Zhukov, 1971).</p> <p>Greece, Turkey Clear goals of containment by the US NATO and WEU</p>	<p>Japan already on verge of surrender, had offered armistice three times in the week prior. Thus, can be concluded that the bombs designed to purposefully be a provocative action against the USSR, and a demonstration of US might to offset the balance of power. Enabled US to have a legitimate claim of influence over Japan - increased anxieties within the USSR, seen as imperialism. As a result, USSR struggled to increase research on own atomic bomb, which they had developed by 1953. Accusations of US 'dollar imperialism' were later substantiated with the 1947 Marshall Plan. Again, USSR responded with formation of Cominform - offered aid to Eastern nations. Equivalent retaliation Struggle to maintain parity characterised the Cold War - doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction meant neither side was willing to strike first, and as such the Cold War was ideological rather than physical/on the ground. Thus, the Cold War both started and was perpetrated by the hostile, provocative and imperialistic actions of the US, to which the USSR was forced to respond with equal measures and equal suspicion, in order to defend itself.</p>
USSR	<p>Aggressively expansionist USSR post-war. Exploited the power vacuum after the fall of nazism to gain power</p> <p>What the Hungarian Communist Rakosi described as Salami Tactics - Albania 1945, Poland, Hungary and Romania 1947, Czechoslovakia 1948, East Germany 1949.</p>	<p>eg. Overran Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Hungary, GDR with Communism.</p> <p>'The Cold War was caused by the military expansionism of Stalin and his successors. The American response... was basically a defensive reaction' (Hart, 1986)</p>	<p>Aggressively expansionist nature was manifested in the USSR's unwillingness to cede democracy, lest it lose its influence over such nations. Confirmed at Potsdam Conference - the free elections which were promised at Yalta were not delivered. Led to heightened tensions between superpowers at the conference.</p> <p>Communism was aggressive and hostile - Stalin hung on to the idea of World Revolution, final goal of destroying capitalism. Seen in the Berlin Blockade - attempts to expand sphere of influence and shut out capitalist influence on the flimsy basis of an introduction of a new currency. Actions of the US were purely defensive eg. Berlin Blockade, had to prevent West Berliners from starving, Marshall Plan had aim of preserving democracy (a condition of aid) to prevent other nations falling under Communist totalitarianism.</p> <p>Evidence that after the Collapse of the USSR in 1991, the Cold War came to an end.</p>

Who was responsible for the Cold War?			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Conflict of ideologies, mutual misunderstanding of intentions	Blame cannot be clearly attributed, as was caused by a mutual misunderstanding of intentions and motives	<p>Post-revisionist historians such as Gaddis claim that ‘The Cold War was caused by the conflicting interests of the United States and the U.S.S.R., compounded by miscommunication and poor diplomacy’</p> <p>Berlin Blockade</p> <p>Mutual sustainment of arms - Stalin kept arms buildups for fear of weakness of war with the West, West saw this as provocative</p> <p>No tolerance for appeasement in West because of WWII - meant were less conciliatory</p>	<p>US quick to see Soviet defensive actions as aggressive expansionism. Soviets intended to establish a buffer zone of friendly states around themselves, as they had been invaded thrice from the west in the preceding century. Soviet claims to Poland, and to other ‘buffer zone’ nations, was misinterpreted as Soviet expansionism by the US. Meant that neither side was to blame - both had reacted to misinterpreted actions and intentions by the other side.</p> <p>Furthermore, cultural differences perpetuated this misunderstanding and divide. Americans saw themselves internationally as morally righteous, the defenders of democracy abroad. Truman Doctrine legitimised Marshall Plan expansion across Europe to defend democracy from Communist influence - Soviets saw this as an offensive, rather than defensive measure, as ‘dollar imperialism’. As such, Cold War tensions were brought on by a mutual misunderstanding of intentions.</p>

Analyse the effects of one idea during the period of study: Mutually Assured Destruction

For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Mutually Assured Destruction was a force for political continuity	<p>Desire to maintain Mutually Assured Destruction meant that neither side (US or USSR) was willing to make concessions to end the Cold War.</p> <p>Debilitating effects on attempts at peaceful unity and diplomacy, limiting a change in levels of tension between the superpowers throughout the period.</p>	<p>Evident in 1980s when, in response to the Soviets' deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe in 1976, the US installed missiles in Europe November 1983. Crucial reaching of parity demonstrates not only the practice of equivalent retaliation to maintain Mutually Assured Destruction which characterised and perpetuated Cold War conflict, but the stagnating effect on international relations which saw both sides immediately abandon any attempt at peaceful negotiation, resulting in the continuity of hostility and Cold War tensions.</p>	<p>This elucidates the degree to which the belief that each ideology was inherently hostile to the other (the US saw the USSR as aggressively expansionist, while the USSR saw that the US was purposefully spreading imperial influence across Europe to undermine Communism) fuelled mutual fear and suspicion of the other's ability to essentially destroy their regime, beginning at the advent of the nuclear age in 1945. This mutual fear intensified a continuous mission to maintain military and nuclear parity throughout the period, meaning that the Cold War conflicts were perpetuated by ever-increasing suspicion. As such, the balance of terror, and the struggle to maintain nuclear and military parity throughout the period, was a significant force for continuity in the Cold War period of 1945-1991.</p>
Bankrupt of the Soviet Union - CHANGE: from economic sustenance to bankruptcy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 33% of Soviet GDP was directed towards the Military-Industrial Complex by 1990. 18% of GDP spending for the Soviets in the 1978-85 period almost twice that of the USA (Harrison, 2003) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> USSR was unable to sustain such levels of expenditure at the cost of rising social unrest as a result of diminishing living standards. In 1984, the USSR was forced to end its supply of cheap fuel and raw materials to the Eastern European states. Unintendedly forced Eastern Europe to have closer economic ties to the West. Combined with the fact that 'the demonstration effect of Western economic success gave them additional appeal' for struggling Eastern European states, according to Joseph Nye (2011), meant that economic failure was significant in reducing the hegemony and dominance of the USSR in the Eastern Bloc. Consequently, greater market economic measures flowed eastwards across Europe in a wave of revolutions of independence in 1989. By 1990, Soviet influence had effectively diminished, the conflict of ideologies across Europe had ended, and thus the Cold War had been brought to completion.

Analyse the effects of one idea during the period of study: Mutually Assured Destruction			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
CHANGE: from Brinkmanship to detente	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The balance of terror was a significant force for change in that it caused a shift in international relations, from active brinkmanship to detente, when it was realised that Mutually Assured Destruction had been reached. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is evident in the Cuban Missile Crisis - both sides recognised that the fragile brinkmanship of the missile crisis had threatened international security, and neither could afford to begin nuclear war with the other. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The crisis led to an agreement that both should seek to avoid war with each other, which ushered in a new period of detente. According to the Soviets, detente was a result of Soviet military capacity finally matching that of the US in the Missile Crisis, thereby necessitating peace - as Brezhnev said in 1975, ‘now the leaders of the bourgeois world can no longer seriously count on resolving the historic conflict between capitalism and socialism by force of arms’. As a result of the arms race and the balance of terror, nuclear parity had been met. This means that the threat of Mutually Assured Destruction acted as a deterrent to nuclear war in the detente period. As such, it can be considered that the arms race was a significant force for change throughout the period, as it led to a shift in international policy from brinkmanship to detente.

Forces for change: leadership, economics, arms race			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Leadership: Gorbachev	Gorbachev came to power 1985. Policies of ‘glasnost’ and ‘perestroika’ opened floodgates for greater political and economic liberalisation, bringing an end to Cold War ideological conflict.	‘Gorbachev wanted to reform communism, not replace it. However, his reform snowballed into a revolution driven from below rather than controlled from above’ - (Nye, 2011)	<p>1986-90 - censorship was relaxed, democratic elections allowed - damaging in revealing corruption of the Communist Party leadership, reducing public trust in the party.</p> <p>Glasnost and perestroika had the unintended effect of exposing the dominance and corruption of the Communist Party and opening it up for challenge - meant that support and power of the CPSU was reduced, bringing an end to Communist rule in the USSR.</p> <p>Leadership was instrumental in enabling the end of Communism and the Cold War - while it had not been his intent, his tolerance of independence and alternative ideas led to the collapse of Communism across the USSR.</p>

Forces for change: leadership, economics, arms race			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Leadership: Reagan	Reagan took a tougher stance against the USSR. Change from peaceful coexistence and detente, to active resistance against the USSR, enabled the US to force the economically-failing Soviets to concede the end of the Cold War	Reagan came into power 1981, immediately increased anti-Soviet rhetoric and action. Increased military-industrial complex - While Carter's final military budget had been \$17.4 billion, by 1989, Reagan had increased his to \$300 billion.	<p>1983, announced Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) or 'Star Wars' which was an anti-ballistic missile shield to protect itself from Soviet attack. Defended at Geneva Summit of 1985, Reykjavik 1986, finally accepted by the USSR at Washington Summit 1987.</p> <p>Reagan's insistence on the implementation of the SDI, despite hostility from the USSR, eventually led Gorbachev to recognise that the SDI was Reagan's plan to end the arms race peacefully.</p> <p>Disrupted parity - meant that US had edged ahead in arms race, and Soviet attack would be weakened.</p> <p>Undermined the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction - deterrence based on MAD had fuelled the Cold War with a struggle to maintain parity in the arms race.</p> <p>Western orthodox historiography regards that the US' aggressive foreign policy and insistence on the SDI, led it to a position where the USSR could not afford to maintain parity, forcing the end of the Cold War.</p>
Leadership: Brandt, de Gaulle, European regionalists	As detente developed in the 1960s-70s, European leaders began to change the international landscape in Europe. Led to a change from Cold War ideological polarisation of Europe, to greater European regionalism in response to divisive partition of Berlin by Berlin Wall (eg development of the WEU by the Brussels Treaty in 1954). Undermined the consolidation and influence of both superpowers in Europe, the theatre of Cold War.	As de Gaulle was said to have stated, 'The idea of a western or eastern bloc... means nothing in our eyes... There should be only one bloc in Europe, one made up of people interested in not being attacked by Germany' .	<p>Ostpolitik, the policy introduced by Willy Brandt, West German Chancellor from 1969, saw the increased cooperation and interconnection between the two Germanies, with the hope of future reunification.</p> <p>Ostpolitik represented a genuine desire for unity and a push towards European regionalism, which was echoed across Europe - such as in Gaullist France, reflected in Hungary and Czechoslovakia seeking their own 'roads to socialism'. Demonstrated a rejection of superpower influence in Europe, fundamentally and practically undermining the continuation of the Cold War.</p> <p>1970: Moscow treaty opened relations between USSR and FRG, enabling peaceful diplomatic relations between East and West, decreasing the threat of potential nuclear attack.</p> <p>Superpowers lost the means by which to continue conflict with each other - Europe opposed to being used as a theatre of war e.g. 1989, Hungarian leaders decided to allow East German 'holiday-makers' to escape to the West through the Hungarian border - 200,000 left. Culminated with the forced destruction of the Berlin Wall in 1989, symbolising the end of Cold War superpower conflict in Europe. Deteriorating spheres of influence in both the East and West ended the driving force of Cold War conflict - mutual suspicion of expansionism.</p>

Forces for change: leadership, economics, arms race			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Economic: Soviet Economic Decline	Economic decline was a force for change in that it weakened the Soviet Union's hold on Eastern Europe	Global overreach, costly war in Afghanistan, maintenance of arms race had led to severe economic decline. By the late 1980s, only 8% of Soviet industry was competitive at world standards (Aldred)	<p>The effect of this was that Communist economic systems could not adapt to supplying goods at competitive prices like in the Capitalist West.</p> <p>As a result, Soviet hold on Eastern Europe was weakened - July 1984, economically suffering USSR forced to end its supply of cheap fuel and raw materials to Eastern Europe.</p> <p>Unintendedly forced Eastern Europe to have closer economic ties to the West. Combined with the fact that ‘the demonstration effect of Western economic success gave them additional appeal’ for struggling Eastern European states, according to Joseph Nye (2011), meant that economic failure was significant in reducing the hegemony and dominance of the USSR in the Eastern Bloc.</p> <p>Consequently, greater market economic measures flowed eastwards across Europe in a wave of revolutions of independence in 1989. By 1990, Soviet influence had effectively diminished, the conflict of ideologies across Europe had ended, and thus the Cold War had been brought to completion.</p>
Social/Cultural: Tolerance for Liberal Democracy	Wasn't Gorbachev's leadership which ended the Soviet Union - rather, it was that his reforms marked a new tolerance for long-desired freedom, independence, and liberalisation.	‘Underestimation of the potency of the appeal of nationalism, split the Communist party and wrecked the Soviet Union.’ (Judge et al, 2017)	<p>Weakened internally and externally - seen in tolerance of the anti-Communist Polish Solidarity movement which, in 1989, saw the election of first non-Communist Eastern European leader, PM Mazowiecki, since the 1940s.</p> <p>Marked disintegration of polarising Cold War spheres of influence, increased integration.</p> <p>Relaxation of Communism, manifested in Poland, and the subsequent non-intervention by Gorbachev, marked the end of the Brezhnev Doctrine which justified Soviet claims to intervene in their own sphere of influence.</p> <p>Demonstrated change - an acceptance of independence which had not been present in Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia 1968</p> <p>Many regard the end of the Brezhnev Doctrine, and of Soviet claims to Eastern Europe, as the key event in the end of the Cold War, as fears of Soviet expansionism had been what had driven the Cold War - Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and containment.</p> <p>While Gorbachev's reforms themselves were significant in allowing the liberalisation of the Soviet Union, pressure for democratisation had been present for many years - such as in Hungary in 1956. Thus, the liberalisation of the USSR was of secondary significance to the Soviet tolerance to such a change, which eventually enabled a wave of revolution which brought down the Iron Curtain and ended the Cold War.</p>

Forces for change: leadership, economics, arms race			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Balance of Terror	The balance of terror was a significant force for change from parity to disparity in the Cold War period as it created a nuclear and military imbalance between the US and USSR. It was this imbalance which contributed to the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War in 1991. The US' aggressive foreign policy and insistence on the SDI, led it to a position where the USSR could not afford to maintain parity, forcing the end of the Cold War.	The SDI (announced in 1983) was the pinnacle of the arms race, a policy which proposed to establish a massive anti-ballistic missile shield which would render the deterrent of Mutually Assured Destruction inoperable, as it would mean that the effects of a Soviet strike on the US would be greatly reduced.	The proposal of the SDI meant the US had gained nuclear superiority in the arms race - in the USSR, this loss of parity greatly reduced their diplomatic power in negotiating with the US. This failure of diplomatic power was seen in the failure of the USSR to negotiate the rejection of the SDI at the Geneva and Reykjavik summits of 1985-86 (Aldred). As a result, the USSR was led to a position where it was economically and militarily unable to sustain the tensions of the Cold War, leading to its collapse in 1991. The Cold War ended as a direct result of the USSR realising they were militarily and economically unable to maintain nuclear parity. Therefore, it can be argued that the balance of terror was a force for change from military parity to disparity, causing the end of the Cold War.
Balance of Terror	The balance of terror was a significant force for change in that it caused a shift in international relations, from active brinkmanship to detente.	This is evident in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 - both sides recognised that the fragile brinkmanship of the missile crisis had threatened international security, and neither could afford to begin nuclear war with the other.	The crisis led to an agreement that both should seek to avoid war with each other, which ushered in a new period of detente. According to the Soviets, detente was a result of Soviet military capacity finally matching that of the US in the Missile Crisis, thereby necessitating peace - as Brezhnev said in 1975, 'now the leaders of the bourgeois world can no longer seriously count on resolving the historic conflict between capitalism and socialism by force of arms' . As a result of the arms race and the balance of terror, nuclear parity had been met. This means that the threat of Mutually Assured Destruction acted as a deterrent to nuclear war in the detente period. As such, it can be considered that the arms race was a significant force for change throughout the period, as it led to a shift in international policy from brinkmanship to detente.

Causes of detente			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Vietnam	Vietnam War (1955) had brought about a new era of warfare - the 'war at home' which people saw on their own televisions revealed the horror of war and increased opposition to American military activities, and American participation in the Cold War.	<p>US public polling in 1978 reveal nearly 72% of Americans believing the war was "fundamentally wrong and immoral" (Hagopian, 2011).</p> <p>Reagan coined the term "Vietnam Syndrome" to describe the reluctance of the American public and politicians to support further military interventions abroad after Vietnam.</p>	<p>Military expenditure had undermined programmes for social reform - Kennedy's 'New frontier' and Johnson's 'New Society' had both faced this problem. Urban riots in 1968 indicated increasing pressure internally to focus on the development of internal social policy. Detente would enable the military-industrial complex to reduce, enabling social reforms at home.</p> <p>Significance of the media - for the first time, young humanitarian generation empathised with the destruction of living standards and suffering of Vietnamese - bolstered domestic peace movement in America. Strong pressure on the government transferred to opposition to Cold War involvement, as citizens for the first time began to question the actions of their own government.</p> <p>Furthermore, detente enabled the US to take a more conciliatory approach to international relations, particularly in the Cold War, enabling them to appease the American public and avoid further military intervention which would increase vehement opposition by the American public.</p>
Mutually Assured Destruction	Detente was brought on by the doctrine of Mutually Assured Destruction, whereby both sides recognised they had the capacity to destroy each other, which acted as a deterrent to tension, ushering in a period of relative peace.	Evidence - that buildup of arms continued throughout detente period. Eg. between 1972-80, number of US warheads almost doubled, and number of Soviet warheads tripled.	<p>The key event which saw the recognition, by both sides, that they had the capacity to destroy each other, was the Cuban Missile Crisis 1962. The crisis led to an agreement that both should seek to avoid war with each other, which ushered in a new period of detente. According to the Soviets, detente was a result of Soviet military capacity finally matching that of the US in the Missile Crisis, thereby necessitating peace - as Brezhnev said in 1975, 'now the leaders of the bourgeois world can no longer seriously count on resolving the historic conflict between capitalism and socialism by force of arms'. As a result of the arms race and the balance of terror, nuclear parity had been met. This means that the threat of Mutually Assured Destruction acted as a deterrent to nuclear war in the detente period. As such, it can be considered that the arms race was a significant force for change throughout the period, as it led to a shift in international policy from brinkmanship to detente.</p>

Causes of detente			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Pressure from Europe	Greater East-West cooperation for European Unity encouraged peaceful coexistence	Events of 1968 demonstrated the growing instability and discontent with the Cold War division of Europe - student riots in France threatened de Gaulle's reign, and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia was met with rage	Result of this was a push for greater European cooperation across the Iron Curtain, embodied in West German Chancellor, Willy Brandt's, Ostpolitik 'Eastern Policy' of cooperation and recognition of East Germany in 1969. Enabled greater movement of people and goods between East and West Germany. Acted as an impetus for greater superpower cooperation - Europe had been the battleground for the ideological battles of the Cold War, and with the easing of tensions across the Iron Curtain, came a reduction in superpower influence in the region, not only enabling but necessitating greater cooperation. No longer were Americans and Soviets able to compete in their ideological battles by means of arms buildups, economic and social divisions, and fortified spheres of influence in Europe, as Ostpolitik and similar policies began to dismantle the Cold War spheres of influence. Ostpolitik effectively encouraged other nations to make similar efforts to bridge the Iron Curtain divide, leading to a period of increasingly peaceful relations (regardless of mutual arms build-ups at the same time) between East and West - for instance, in France's extension of friendly relations to Romania.

Development of European Unity			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Yes - increased unity	The expansion of unifying organs of the European nations indicates increased unity.	While the origins of the EU composed of the Six: Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Italy, France and West Germany, by 2004, the Inner Six had increased to 25, including 8 former satellite states of the USSR (Sedelmeier, 2014)	This concept of a united Europe was born out of a collective desire to prevent future war, by tying the devastated nations of Europe to each other, economically, politically and socially. This motive initially manifested as an economic partnership in the European Coal and Steel Community, founded on May 9 1950 with the Schuman Declaration, and the Treaty of Rome establishing a customs union for the Western bloc , but was expanded to facilitate cooperation and unity in other areas by the expansion of the European Parliament (established in 1952 , but extended in influence in the 1970s, including the first democratic popular elections to the Parliament in 1979), and the Maastricht Treaty in 1992 . Maastricht created the modern EU, reflecting the expansion of the Union's cooperation to social, political and legal spheres. While unity was initially focussed on the liberal democratic, capitalist Western bloc, total European unity was enhanced post-1991 with the breakdown of the USSR, which resulted in the rejection of Communism by Eastern bloc states, who sought to integrate into the European whole. At the turn of the century, Europe was more united than ever - people, goods, services, and even currency (the Euro, introduced 1999) could flow freely across borders. This growth in membership and expansion of the cooperative economic, political and social roles and powers of the EU over time, indicate that European Unity increased btw 1945 and 2001.
Yes - increased political unity	The fall of the USSR indicated a turning point for European unity in that it saw the fall of the Iron Curtain, and the democratisation and liberalisation of Eastern Europe which created greater political unity across Europe.	In 1950, Eastern bloc states had an average democracy score of -7.9. By 2001, this average score had increased to 6.4 (Rosling, 2019) , indicating the pivotal point, during and after the fall of the USSR, which saw former Soviet satellite states integrate into the more liberal democratic Western system of political governance.	After the CPSU was defeated in the USSR's first open democratic elections in 1988 , the Brezhnev Doctrine, which legitimised Soviet influence and intervention in satellite states, was abolished. This symbolic action by Moscow was seen internationally as a tolerance for demands for national independence, fuelling democratisation and liberalisation movements in Eastern Europe. Gorbachev's policy of glasnost (openness) saw free political participation and speech tolerated for the first time, evident in Poland with the legal recognition of the anti-Soviet Solidarity movement in 1989. As a result, Eastern States rejected Communism in the Autumn of Nations between 1989 and 1991. Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, the Caucasus and Baltic states all implemented democratic governance and market economic mechanisms, shifting away from Communism and towards greater uniformity with the Western liberal democratic model. As such, it can be argued that greater political unity was developed across the European landscape throughout the period of 1950-2001, with the splintering of the divisive bloc mentality, and subsequent adoption of Western democratic governance in former communist European nations.

Development of European Unity			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
No increased economic unity	European nations were, by 2001, more economically integrated than ever; however this integration did not reduce economic disparities between East & West, and thus did not lead to greater economic unity.	For instance, Ukraine's GDP/capita was around 49.5% of France's in 1950, prior to Ukraine's independence from the USSR in July 1990. However, this had decreased further by 2001, by when the GDP per capita of Poland was only 15% of France's (Maddison, 2016). This lingering disunity is described by historian Dariusz Rosati when he wrote that 'the collapse of Communism could not, by itself, reduce the economic disparities... nearly 15 years after the transition began, Europe is [by 2001] still economically diversified, with average per capita incomes in the East being several times lower than the West' .	This disparity indicates that, while the European institutions such as the Common Market were successful in creating one large customs union in Europe, there were no significant long-term unifying economic effect of European Integration. The East/West disparity was largely caused by the failing Soviet economy just prior to its collapse in 1991, as a result of excessive military spending to maintain parity with the US, which left independent states economically crippled upon their secession. Historian Darius Rosati further argues that diverse political traditions (socialism in the East) and deep-rooted nationalism, as seen in the Hungarian liberation movement of 1956, the Polish solidarity movement in the 1980s, and post-1991 in the Yugoslav Wars, stifled the development of true European economic unity. Thus, despite integration, indicators such as GDP, demonstrate sustained economic disunity across Europe between 1950-2001.
No: unity was never achieved nor truly desired, as integration was only for pragmatic, strategic means.	In 1945, a clear ideological and geopolitical divide had been established across Europe (manifested in the partition of Germany) at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, indicating a mutual desire for peaceful coexistence between Eastern and Western powers in Europe.	Throughout the centre of the period (1960s-90s), the West asserted its economic, military and diplomatic hegemony (US development of the H-bomb, the provision of economic aid in the European Regional Development Fund).	Meant that the East recognised it was falling far behind, politically, economically and militarily, and was vulnerable. To preserve the integrity of socialism, the East had to concede that there must be 'different roads to socialism' as Khrushchev famously said in his Secret Speech in 1956. The 'rollback' of hard-line Communist policy in Eastern Europe (eg. in the Prague Spring 1968, and the independence movements of the 1989 Autumn of Nations) was motivated to prevent nuclear war, which could not be afforded by the Eastern bloc, militarily or economically. However, arguably this represents great disunity, given that unity was desired only to the extent to which it was strategically advantageous - eg. Invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Integration, according to Maher, 2009, 'sprang from overlapping national interests rather than a collective desire for unity' , and therefore an increase in unity only occurred to the extent to which it was necessary to national defence and the preservation of national ideology. Thus, while European integration saw Europe increasingly connected between 1950-2001, Europe was still disunited ideologically, socially and politically at the end of the period.

Development of European Unity			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
			<p>An era of intra-European competition for scarce resources among desperate nations... many possible forms of cooperation, economic ones in particular, had nothing idealistic about them and carries no implications of future unity' (Judt, 2009)</p> <p>'Europe today is not so much a place as an idea, a peaceful prosperous international community of shared interests and collaborating parts; A 'Europe of the mind', of human rights, of the free movement of goods, ideas, and persons, of ever-greater cooperation and unity.' (Judt, 2009)</p> <p>'The European Union faces a dismal future because it sprang from overlapping national interests rather than a collective desire for unity.' (Maher, 2009)</p> <p>'There is no European foreign policy and therefore there is no united European position.' (Judt, 2009)</p> <p>'There should be only one bloc in Europe, one made up of people interested in not being attacked by Germany.' De Gaulle, 1944</p>

To what extent was detente achieved?			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Attempts at negotiation	SALT, Helsinki, international visits, media such as the handshake in space etc. all presented careful cooperation	Detente was, in the words of Nixon 'a means of controlling the conflict with the Soviet Union' rather than a genuine attempt at peace and cooperation.	<p>Meant that treaties were more to create a public and diplomatic patina of cooperation, weakening their impact and significance as neither party was truly committed to a mutual, permanent reduction of tensions.</p> <p>Contradictorily to its explicit purpose, SALT I fed nuclear arms race, incentivising the greater construction of multiple-warhead missiles, tactical weapons, bombers etc, which were not covered by the agreement. Meant had little real impact on reducing tensions</p>
Tension never really relaxed - arms buildup		Western powers spent \$39.5 million on nuclear weaponry research and development throughout the detente period, was a 39% increase over the previous 8 years (Aldred, 2010)	Constant growth in nuclear development elucidates the superficial nature of peace in the detente period. Demonstrates that detente was, instead, a tactic employed by the superpowers in the aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis scare, in order to buy time for increased armament on the arms race, while avoiding conflict to focus attention on domestic issues (such as riots and demands for social reform in the USA, and conflict with China in the USSR)

--

To what extent was detente achieved?

For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Ostpolitik	Represented a push for detente in the lowering of tensions across the iron curtain	Began with Willy Brandt's election in 1969.	Initiated with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty between the FRG and USSR, followed by treaty the year after in 1970 which enabled the opening of diplomatic relations between the FRG and Soviet Union in the Treaty of Moscow. Marked the end of the Hallstein Doctrine which prevented the recognition of any nation under Soviet influence by the FRG, demonstrating an acceptance of genuine spheres of influence and an attempt at mutual cooperation. In a move unapproved by the USA, Ostpolitik encouraged greater cooperation in the spirit of detente across the border. Followed by other nations in greater cooperation between East and West - Romania and East Germany (Basic Treaty, 1972) which opened relations between East Germany and. Represented principles of detente - easing of tensions and a genuine pursuit of cooperation across the iron curtain.

To what extent was peaceful coexistence achieved?

Peaceful coexistence was almost purely leadership-driven. It represented very little political or social change from the containment era, however, the diplomacy and patina of liberalisation promoted by Khrushchev gave the illusion to a shift of mutual acceptance of peaceful coexistence. In reality, both superpowers were equally as hostile towards each-other, representing continuity from the Stalinist era of containment.

Bolstered by the increase in their military, industrial and technological abilities (eg. Space race Yuri Gagarin, development of atomic weaponry), the USSR *theoretically* wanted to take their conflict with the US onto a purely ideological level to avoid confrontation. However, this came into conflict with their newfound military and nuclear might as a global superpower - and thus, they continued an approach of aggressive and defensive brinkmanship to defend their sphere of influence. US tolerance of this demonstrated a commitment to containment and peaceful coexistence while avoiding confrontation.

For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
CMC	Manifestation of brinkmanship which represented continuity from previous era of containment	Cubans were offered generous credit of \$100 million by the USSR	Confirmed American fears that containment policy had failed Khrushchev saw Cuba as a chance to even the arms race by placing nuclear missiles in Cuba, countering the presence of US missiles in Turkey. Ignored established spheres of influence, demonstrating disrespect for peaceful coexistence. Furthermore, epitome of brinkmanship - extremely close to all-out nuclear war. Demonstrates aggressive, provocative policy and violation of established spheres of influence, contradictory to aims of peaceful coexistence. Hostility of brinkmanship demonstrates aggressive, expansionist nature which contradicted peaceful coexistence. Also validates the purpose of Peaceful Coexistence - to reduce threat of nuclear war, rather than to pursue actual peace. Wanted to avoid confrontation, but were not prepared to cede dominance in arms race
Non-intervention in Hungary 1956	Yes → US non-intervention in the crushing of Hungarian uprising by the Soviets demonstrates adherence to principles of peaceful coexistence	Communist Imre Nagy embarked on period of liberalising reforms, relaxing censorship and applying to withdraw from Warsaw Pact in attempt to follow socialism in a more deviant style to that of the Soviets. Brutally crushed by 30,000 Soviet troops which killed over 20,000 people in 10 days of fighting.	While USA spread anti-Communist content via broadcasts on Radio-Free Europe, they failed to present in defence of the Hungarian rebels. They thereby informally acknowledged the Brezhnev Doctrine enabling the USSR to intervene in the sovereign affairs of Warsaw Pact states. Demonstrated the USSR's continued approach of aggressive and defensive brinkmanship to defend their sphere of influence after attempted independence of Hungary. US tolerance of this demonstrated a commitment to containment and peaceful coexistence while avoiding confrontation. US had ceded their role as defenders of democracy in Europe, were willing to cede dominance in favour of peaceful coexistence.

To what extent was peaceful coexistence achieved?

Peaceful coexistence was almost purely leadership-driven. It represented very little political or social change from the containment era, however, the diplomacy and patina of liberalisation promoted by Khrushchev gave the illusion to a shift of mutual acceptance of peaceful coexistence. In reality, both superpowers were equally as hostile towards each-other, representing continuity from the Stalinist era of containment.

Bolstered by the increase in their military, industrial and technological abilities (eg. Space race Yuri Gagarin, development of atomic weaponry), the USSR *theoretically* wanted to take their conflict with the US onto a purely ideological level to avoid confrontation. However, this came into conflict with their newfound military and nuclear might as a global superpower - and thus, they continued an approach of aggressive and defensive brinkmanship to defend their sphere of influence. US tolerance of this demonstrated a commitment to containment and peaceful coexistence while avoiding confrontation.

For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Berlin Crisis	Non-tolerance for spheres of influence	Result of instability in East Germany as a result of brain drain, and the ‘demonstration effect of Western economic success’ as Rosati put it, for East Germans, Khrushchev placed ultimatum on Allies - withdraw from Berlin and cede it as a free state.	<p>Khrushchev aimed to limit the Western sphere of influence over Germany, crack down on US imperialism in Eastern Europe. Ultimatum for Allied withdrawal from West Berlin demonstrated disrespect for Western sphere of influence in Berlin as agreed upon at Yalta Conference in 1945, and represented an attempt to rollback the Western influence over Eastern Europe in order to consolidate own sphere of influence. Brinkmanship was contradictory to the aims and principles of peaceful coexistence.</p> <p>However, can be argued that this represented adherence to peaceful coexistence - did not act upon the expiration of the ultimatum, and in response the Allies came to the negotiation table in order to discuss a treaty on Germany. Illustrates that for both powers, negotiation was a more viable an desirable option than confrontation, manifesting principles of peaceful coexistence.</p>

European leaders			
For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Willy Brandt - Ostpolitik	Ostpolitik, the policy introduced by Willy Brandt, West German Chancellor from 1969, saw the increased cooperation and interconnection between the two Germanies, with the hope of future reunification.		<p>Ostpolitik represented a genuine desire for unity and a push towards European regionalism, which was echoed across Europe - such as in Gaullist France, reflected in Hungary and Czechoslovakia seeking their own 'roads to socialism'. Demonstrated a rejection of superpower influence in Europe, fundamentally and practically undermining the continuation of the Cold War. Superpowers lost the means by which to continue conflict with each other - Europe opposed to being used as a theatre of war e.g. 1989, Hungarian leaders decided to allow East German 'holiday-makers' to escape to the West through the Hungarian border - 200,000 left. Culminated with the forced destruction of the Berlin Wall in 1989, symbolising the end of Cold War superpower conflict in Europe. Deteriorating spheres of influence in both the East and West ended the driving force of Cold War conflict - mutual suspicion of expansionism.</p> <p>Brandt also signed non-aggression treaties with the Soviet Union and Poland, which helped to ease decades of European tensions.</p> <p>Cohesive or divisive? Both:</p> <p>In West Germany, Brandt's Neue Ostpolitik was extremely controversial, dividing the populace into two camps. One camp embraced all of the conservative parties, and most notably those West German residents and their families who had been driven west by Stalinist ethnic cleansing from Historical Eastern Germany, especially the part that was given to Poland as a consequence of the end of the war; western Czechoslovakia (the Sudetenland); and the rest of Eastern Europe, such as in Romania. These groups of displaced Germans and their descendants loudly voiced their opposition to Brandt's policy, calling it "illegal" and "high treason".</p> <p>A different camp supported and encouraged Brandt's Neue Ostpolitik as aiming at "Wandel durch Annäherung" ("change through rapprochement"), encouraging change through a policy of engagement with the (communist) Eastern Bloc, rather than trying to isolate those countries diplomatically and commercially. Brandt's supporters claim that the policy did help to break down the Eastern Bloc's "siege mentality", and also helped to increase its awareness of the contradictions in its brand of Socialism/Communism, which together with other events eventually led to the downfall of Eastern European Communism.</p>

European leaders

For/Against	Explain	Example	Effect
Konrad Adenauer	Made Chancellor 1949-1963Conservative and staunchly anti-communist, Adenauer strengthened West Germany's political, military and economic alliance with the West, particularly with France. He also oversaw the rearmament of West Germany and its admission as a member of NATO, which was granted in 1955.		Brash refusal to accept or acknowledge the Oder-Neisse Line (between Germany and Poland), nor to re-negotiate the reunification of Germany on neutral terms, as he knew that the Soviets would never be willing to cede the Oder-Neisse line