



NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

COURSE CODE: PCR 419

**COURSE TITLE: INTERNATIONAL POLITICS OF THE COLD WAR
(1945 - 1991)**

PCR 419

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS OF THE COLD WAR (1945 - 1991)

Course Developer/Writer: Mathias Jarikre

Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution

School of Arts and Social Sciences

National Open University of Nigeria

Course Editor

Course Coordinator Mathias Jarikre

Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution

School of Arts and Social Sciences

National Open University of Nigeria

TABLE OF CONTENT

Module 1	International Politics of the Cold War
Unit 1	International Politics
Unit 2	Polarity
Unit 3	History of Cold War
Unit 4	Chronicles of Cold War
Unit 5	Causes and Consequences of the Cold War
Module 2	Cold War as Social Conflict
Unit 1	Approaches to Cold War
Unit 2	Cold War as Social Conflict
Unit 3	Iron Curtains
Unit 4	Berlin Blockade and Airlift
Unit 5	Berlin Wall
Module 3	Cold War Strategies
Unit 1	Marshall Plan
Unit 2	Molotov Plan
Unit 3	Containment
Unit 4	Deterrence
Unit 5	Detente
Module 4	Military Alliances and Nuclear Weapons
Unit 1	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
Unit 2	Warsaw Pact
Unit 3	The Role of Nuclear Weapons
Unit 4	Arms Race and Control

Unit 5

Cold War Treaties and Agreements

MODULE 1

Unit 1 INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Unit 2 POLARITY

Unit 3 HISTORY OF COLD WAR

Unit 4 CHRONICLES OF COLD WAR

Unit 5 CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF THE COLD WAR

UNIT 1 INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 Definition of International Politics
 - 3.2 Basic Forms of International Politics: Imperial, Feudal and Anarchic Systems
 - 3.3 The Nexus between Domestic and International Politics
 - 3.4 Views of International Politics (Anarchic)
 - 3.4.1 The Realist
 - 3.4.2 The Liberalist
 - 3.4.3 The Constructivist
 - 3.5 Basic Concepts of International Politics: Actors, Goals and Instruments
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Today, there are nearly 200 countries in the international system, each can be self absorbed and continue to jealously guard their claim as independent and sovereign states. There are about 300 international governmental organizations, some are global (United Nations - UN), other are regional (European Union -EU, Africa Union – AU, etc) and more numerous are the international nongovernmental organizations (NGO) such as the Human Rights Watch, to the villainous (Al Qaeda) and Multinational corporation (MNCs). Some people are also important key players in their roles as

decision makers, protester, voters and other political participant in a state or international organization.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, students will

- Develop a basic understanding of international politics
- Become familiar with the forms of international politics and understand why nations behave the way they do in relations to another.
- Examine the power politics and the balance of power and the various views about international politics
- Improve their ability to synthesize information and think critically as they reflect on the decision making challenges and the choice of policies in relations to domestic or international politics.
- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 DEFINITION OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

International politics in anarchical world is predicated upon countries pursuing their self interest as far their power would allow them. This has remained the main thrust of international politics. Like individual citizen in domestic systems, States acts and recognize rules that orchestrate and govern its responsibility to the common good within a considerable freedom, to approach politic with a sense of collective responsibility and the fundamental objectives and directive principles of state policy.

International politics and international relations are often used interchangeably. Though, there is a distinction in usage as international politics is used primarily to describe official political relations between governments acting on behalf of their state” (Hannessian Jr., 1966). While Interactional Relations, according to Hoffman (1960), “is concerned with the factors and activities which affect the external policy and the power of the basic units into which the world is divided”. The distinction between international politics and international relations is imperative because some inter – state relations is not only political and restricted to state actors only.

International politics means different thing to different scholars and authors, therefore, let us consider some definitions of international politics. According to Palmer and Perkins, the study of international politics is essentially concerned with the state

system. For Hans J. Morgenthau (1966), focuses his analysis of international politics on political relation and on the problem of peace, he went further to state that international politics is struggle for, and use of power among nations. Padelford and Lincoln defined International Politics as “the interaction of individual nation state in their pursuit of their perceived national interest and goals”. While Strausz-Hupe and Posner conceived International Politics to “include actions of citizens and the decision of political significant groups.” Prakash Chandra while adopting a working definition for his book *International Politics* defined International Politics “as a process in which nations try to serve their national interest, which may be in conflict with those of other nations by means of their policies and actions.

It will suffice that International Politics in its quintessential is heavily laced with the characteristics of classical world politics to the exclusion of war which has lost its primordial use for resolving international conflicts. Among other things the decisive principles of classical world politics include the acquisition, maintenance and use of power for war as a determinant and evidence of strength. But like salt when it has lost its taste and efficacy is cast away, war has lost its primacy and today, it is being questioned as an instrument of national policy. This is not to suggest the least that there is an end to war because we have not found an alternative to war, also like the use of salt to mankind. Besides, nation states have continued to increase the defense budgetary provision.

Essentially, the power politics and the balance of power in world politics is all about Europe because it was all inclusive of the entire world space. Apparently, as the dominant power politics, there was no equals elsewhere in terms of power politics that can be compared to what was obtained in Europe in the 19th century. The frontiers of European power extended to and dominated the East and the Pacific, South Asia, the East Indies, Indochina, Burma, India, Persia and the Middle East. Similarly, it was not limited to these areas only, but also from Cape Town to Cairo. America was not spared from Europe’s domination as both south and north were part of European colonial extension and possession. In view of the above backdrop, European power projected throughout the entire world, therefore, the balance of power in Europe means balance of world power. Under this prevailing scenario, whatever political maneuvers and diplomacy employed in the balance of power in Europe involved the rest of the world. By the end of the 19th century, there was a dramatic shift of events, with the emergence of United States of America and Japan as world power outside the Europe and became an anachronism to speak of balance of power in Europe because of it could no longer self contained.

3.2 BASIC FORMS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: IMPERIAL, FEUDAL AND ANARCHIC SYSTEMS

There are three basic forms of world politics namely the imperial, feudal and anarchic system of states:

IMPERIAL SYSTEM

The imperial system is characterized as one dominant government over the environment/states with which it has contact. The 13th century Roman Empire is a notable example in the western world. Similarly, Spain and France attempted to gain sovereign supremacy in west in the 16th and late 17th century respectively. Also, the British Empire spread the globe in the 19th century even though it had to scramble for partition with other strong states.

FEUDAL SYSTEM

The feudal system is the second basic form of world politics and involves the local micro-level of authority whereby territorial boundaries is a determinant of human loyalty and political obligation. The feudal system was prevalent after the collapse of the Roman Empire in the medieval period. An individual is obliged in loyalty to local authority and lord as well as duty bound in service to another. For instance, the belief system in Christendom permits an individual loyalty to be extended to some Bishop/Lord or Pope in Canterbury and Rome. Political obligations were determined to a large extent by what happened to one's superior. The political authority in the very nature of the feudal system meant that sovereignty did not exist legally, but in fact, did exist. This is because commoners had little or no author as they were considered as subject. However, by the 13th century, with the military technology and economic expansion the feudal system had began to wane with the emergence of a new political order with a dramatic transformation of the intentional system, based on territorially defined states whose sovereignty made them equals legally. (John J. Rouke, 2006).

ANARCHIC SYSTEM

The third basic from of international politics is anarchic system of state. It is made up of relatively cohesive states with no superintendent government over them. The city – states of ancient Greece and the 15th contrary Machiavellian Italy were notable examples. These are other examples of anarchies state system such as the dynastic territorial states controlled by a ruling family in the 5th century China and India. In 1648, the Peace of Westphalia ended the thirty years of war, it marked the birth of the modern nation state and of the world political system based on sovereign state, as the primary political actors. For instance, consequent upon the Treaty of Peace of

Westphalia, national states continued to garner authority and power to consolidate and expand their kingdoms into empires. Monarchs such as Louis XIV of France (r. 1643 – 1715), Peter the Great of Russia (r. 1682 – 1725) and Frederick II of Prussia (r. 1740 – 1786) are notable examples, who expanded the frontiers of their kingdoms into empires.

The emergence of the state as the prominent mode of government had unprecedented implication for the international system. International system is an abstract concept that encompasses global actors, the interactions (especially patterns of interaction) among those actors and the factors that cause those interactions. The international system is the largest of a vast number of overlapping political systems that extend downwards in size to micro political systems at the local level. In contemporary studies of international systems, international politics is defined as politics in the absence of a common sovereign, politics among entities with no ruler above them. (Nye, 2003) It is otherwise known as anarchic and self help system. Anarchic, according to 17th century English philosopher Thomas Hobbes, “is a “state of nature” characterized by a nasty, brutish and short state of war of all against all.

An anarchical system is one in which there is no central authority to make rules, to enforce rules or to resolve conflicts among the actors in the political system (Rourke, 2006). There is a consensus that a society or system without a central authority is prone to chaos and permits the strong to oppress the weak. However, the position of anarchist philosophy contends that artificial political economic or social institutions have abused the power of society to engender cooperation. Therefore, they contend that the collapse of these institutions will lead to a cooperative society, in contrast to the Marxist contention that once capitalism is extinct and labour force achieve proletarian harmony, the state system will collapse.

Soon after the World War II certain pervasive developments swept through the world politics such as: the decline of colonialism and emergence of new sovereign states; pressure of public opinions (public opinion of Americans on Vietnam); change in the personnel of international politics (from professional diplomats and military men to amateurs, professional revolutionaries, businessmen, etc); change in goals; technological development - atomic and nuclear weapons; defenseless against the new weapons; military superiority; multi-polarity and Bipolarity, etc. All of these factors in their peculiarity have systematically and substantially changed the character of international politics.

3.3 THE NEXUS BETWEEN DOMESTIC AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

International politics is viewed as a subject radically different from domestic politics. It is also true that there is an interface between domestic and international politics and has many things in common. But before we continue, let us identify one essential difference between them. In domestic politics, the leaders are preoccupied by the interest of the people who will determine their acceptance and need not worry that their actions will not prompt a foreign intervention to jeopardize their hold on power. According to Mesquita (2003), “domestic politics involves the selection by leaders of policies and actions designed to keep them in office.” In contrast, in international politics, leaders must worry that their foreign policies not only mobilize domestic opposition capable of overthrowing them but may also irritate a foreign rival, sparking attack and possible defect.” Thus, at home a policy may be good and popular at one time but may prove to be a great source of generating international tension. This is also the case when foreign policy may be intended to satisfy the demands of a foreign enemy or friend at the opportunity cost of the domestic stakeholder and therefore lose the domestic support for that government.

The primary aim of politics whether it concerns domestic or international politics, is making choices about the acquisition and allocation of scarce resources as is true of economics. However, it is necessary, that we make haste to state that market economies revolves on the pivot of demand and supply of scarcity of good and competition. Politics as authoritative allocation of resources goes beyond this, as it is rather based on Collective decision making rather than individual choices. Through the process, it can be determined who gets what and when. For examples, the legislature holds such an authoritative allocation of valuable resources through legislative budgetary decision on defense to affect international affairs and even tariffs to influence international trade.

Politics is preponderant on group and individual competition for advancement in wealth and control of power. Such political competition precipitate intrigues and involves risk of sanctions as well in opportunity for rewards. In international politics, the actions and policies of leaders are continually exposes to the risk of sanction by foreign adversaries or domestic foes and regulated by treaties and few institutions comparable to domestic police force and courts to enforce the rule of behavior.

3.4 VIEWS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS (ANARCHIC)

There are two different schools of thought of political philosophy within international politics in the context of anarchic whereby there is no higher government. The different schools of thought are ascribed and given prominence by the philosophical

works of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke. Thomas Hobbes writing within the context of his time characterized by civil war stressed on insecurity, force and survival, hence, the Hobbesian philosophy of existence summarized as a state of chaos or war. John Locke also writing within the context of stable political environment which he then lived, argued that the state of nature does not have a common sovereignty, however, argued that anarchic is not absolute threat to man's existence as it present opportunities for the development of social interaction and contract. Contemporary views of international political are built on these philosophy delineated as realist and liberal approaches which are further classified as pessimistic and optimistic.

3.4.1 THE REALIST

One dominant traditional thought pattern in international politics is realism and the proponents are called the Realist. According to the realist, the basic essence of international politics is the interaction between one state and another and its central problem is the use of force and war. That is, leaders strive to maximize the power of their state while minimizing the ability of other states that could jeopardize its security. The above assumption presupposes that international politics is all about force and war and states in constant war. But the realists hold tenaciously to the views of Thomas Hobbes to justify their claim that "just as stormy weather does not mean perpetual rain, so a state of war does not mean constant war. Thus, in anarchic system, the inevitability of war propels states to make huge budgetary provisions for armies and military technology even in times of peace.

There are four basic assumptions about international politics according to the realist. They include:

- (i) The state is the most important actor in international politics, what this means is that national government are the principal actors in the theatre of international politics. Thus, interest groups or individual have no effect on how nations interact or relate to one another.
- (ii) The state is a unitary and rational actor, that is the state speak in one voice, this does not in any way presupposes there are no different views or the best option to national issues but only one approach will be enacted. Also, the state being rational presupposes that it has capacity to identify goals and preferences and determine their relative importance. Furthermore, the concept of 'black box assumption' finds explanation in this concept because domestic actors (like the Congress) have no effect on how a nation conducts its international affairs. Thus leaders have the leverage to act out their script which they have script for what they believe to be their national interest.

(iii) International politics are essentially conflictual because of anarchy, in our introductory discourse, we mentioned that anarchic does not mean chaos rather it defines the absence of a higher authority to prevent aggression or arbitrate disputes. Anarchy as a political system avails states the dire need to be armed in order to ensure its security status. The acquisition of arms and construction of military arsenals and technology are preemptive and provocative gestures for neighbouring state apprehension which may lead them to build up their own security defensive mechanism. For instance, the World War II was as a result of many States involved in this kind of behaviour because it was clearly a period when states were seemingly sitting on a keg of gun powder which can easily erupt into violence. Also, the two Cold War superpowers and their ideological differences launched an arms race, which resulted in a tense but more stable situation though hostile to each other. Both sides feared the capacity of the other.

(iv) Several security and strategic issues which were classified as high profiles dominated the international agenda. For instances, the primary goal of the state within the international community is to maximize their power especially military powers. North Korea is a notable example of a nation that operated within the ambit of this maxim in 1990 soon after the collapse of the Soviet Union. North Korea without a communist allies believed that the only means to survive was the development of nuclear weapons in total disregard of existing non-proliferation treaties and turn out United Nations (UN) weapon inspectors and observers.

3.4.2 THE LIBERALIST

The other dominant traditional thought pattern of international politics is liberalism. The proponents of western political philosophy such as France's Baron de Montesquieu and Germany's Immanuel Kant are notable examples of classical liberals. The political philosophy of this group is located on their conviction that a global society functions at the same time with the state and becomes a major phenomenon for the state activities. According to them, trans-border activities which include trade, contacts and international institutions such as the United Nations (UN) and its multifaceted agencies create contest for the state in its quest for the balance of power. The underlying

3.4.3 THE CONSTRUCTIVIST

Between the realist and the liberalist emerged a more recent diverse group of theorists called the constructivists. This group emerged because they identified some inadequacy with the earlier schools of thought and are opposed to their major theories which to them were far from being the true scenario of world politics. The thrust of the constructivist was primarily to give explanation to the weaknesses of the realist

and liberalist philosophies and proffer ways to the lacuna created by a changing world politics. According to Nye (2003), “constructivists emphasize the importance of idea and culture in shaping both the reality and the discourse of international politics ... and stress the ultimate subjectivity of interests and their links to changing identities”

For the constructivist, the earlier groups did not take into cognizance the changing goals and interests of nations in a world of constant change to make salient predictions. Thus, constructivists are convinced and are apt to point out that the issues and concepts concerning states and sovereignty are not permanent but in constant flux, therefore, they are constantly seeking answers to the question of identities, norms culture, national interest, and international governance.

It will suffice to state that constructivism provide a useful to the major theories of realism and liberalism and as an approach rather than a theory helps us to understand how preferences are formed and to generate knowledge prior to the issues through predictive power. However, the theories of realism and liberalism serve as road map that allows us to make sense in an unfamiliar terrain.

3.5 BASIC CONCEPTS OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS: ACTORS, GOALS AND INSTRUMENTS

There are three fundament concepts which serve as road map that allows us to grasp useful insight and to theorize about international politics, these are actors, goals and instruments.

ACTORS:

Contrary to the traditional realist recognition of the states in general as the only actors and the big ones in particular as the significant actors international politics there is a new order after World War II and since the beginning and end of the Cold War. As we mentioned in our introductory statement there are nearly 200 countries in the international system. Besides, more importantly are the non-state actors who are on the increase as major stakeholder in international economies. Examples of non-states include the multinational corporations in the oil and gas (Shell, Chevron/Texaco), information technology (IBM), communications (MTN) and automobile industries (General Motors). Though this group of non-state actors lack some form of military force but their economic value cuts across several international borders and placed them as a formidable force to be preferred in terms of choice of a nation. Others include intergovernmental institutions like the United Nations (UN), Economic Community of West Africa States (ECOWAS), Organization of Petroleum Export Countries (OPEC) and nongovernmental organization such as the Red Cross, and

Amnesty International. Other groups that have further enlarged the stage of international politics are the terrorist group like Al Qaeda, drug cartels and mafia organizations.

GOALS

In an anarchic system the dominant goals of states is the security and the preservation of its territories by the military. However, there is a paradigm shift with the increasing concern for economic wealth, socio threat issues like drug traffic, the spread of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and ecological changes and global warming. When the security threat alters the strategic purpose of security changes which underscore the fact that military security is not the only goal pursued by states neither do any other issue replaced military security rather the scope of international politics for a state have more complex with a variety of goals.

INSTRUMENTS

Military force is the traditional view of instrument of international politics because in earlier times it was used to defined a great power as they prevail in war, but all of that is being eroded with recent development as they soon discovered that it is more costly to use military force to achieve their goals. According Hoffman (1981), the link between military strength and positive achievement has been loosened. A number of issues tends to invalidate the use of military force as instrument of international politics: One of such issues is the internal constraint where there is a growing awareness in most democratic states in the form of antimilitarism. This has constrain leaders in making the decision to use force in a large or protracted scale rather they have opted for the lesser risk in the use of economic interdependence, communication, internationals, and transnational actors as instruments in international politics to upstage the critical role of military force. Another salient issue is that nuclear weapon – the ultimate means of military force and even conventional force is very expensive to use in all practical purposes in the event of war and peacetime.

Self Assessment Exercise

Explain the choice of acquisition and allocation of scarce resources as the aim of domestic and international politics.

4.0 CONCLUSION

International politics is a high politics of statecraft, strategy and diplomacy in the socio-economic, cultural, institutional and military dimension in relations to other states. It highlights the impact of international processes, the role of international actors – state and non-state in sustaining global capitalist dominance, the source of violent conflict and war, and the nature and evolution of state sovereignty. Today, international politics is about the territorial state system without a common sovereign who rules above them. It is a self help system also known as anarchic.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed international politics and attempted some definitions and explanations of key issues in international politics. The unit specifically discussed the basic forms of international politics such as imperial, feudal and anarchic systems, the links between domestic and international politics, the theories of the realism and liberalism as well as the constructivist approach to international politics. Also, the three basic concepts of international politics such as actors, goals and instruments were also discussed in the unit.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

- 1 what is realism? How does it differ from the liberal view of international politics
- 2 Discuss the basic forms of international politics

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Hannessian, John J. (1966), “The study and Teaching of International Relations: Some Comments on the Current Crisis” *SAIS REVIEW* X.

Hoffmann, Stanley (ed.) 1960), *Contemporary Theory in International Relations*. Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey; Prentice Hall.

MacPherson, C.B. (1981), ed. *Leviathan* by Thomas Hobbes. London: Penguin

Mesquita, ,Bueno de, Bruce, J., and Morrow, James D. (1999), “Sorting through the wealth or nations” *International Security*, 24/2

Mesquita, Bruce Bueno de (2003), *Principles of International Politics: People’s Power, Preferences and Perceptions*. New York: New York University Press.

Morgenthau, Hans J. (1954), *Politics Among Nations: The struggle for Power and Peace*. New York.

Padelford, Norman J. and Lincoln, George A. (1976), *The Dynamics of International Politics*. London: Macmillan

Palmer, Norman D. and Perkins, Howard C. (1953), *International Relation: The world Community in Transition*. New York.

Prakash, Chandra (1979), *International Politics*. Delhi: Sanjay.

Rouke, John T. (2006), *International Politics on the World Stage*. New York: McGraw – Hill

Struazz Hupe, Rober and Possnory, Stefan (1954), *International Relations in the Age of Conflict Between Democracy and Dictatorship*. New York.

UNIT 2

POLARITY

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 Polarity in International Politics
 - 3.2 Types of Polarity
 - 3.2.1 Unipolarity
 - 3.2.2 Multipolarity
 - 3.2.3 Bipolarity
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The various ways which power is distributed among nations in international system is known as polarity. Polarity describes the nature and dynamics of power distribution at a given time in the international system. The distinction is absolutely dependent on power distribution and influence of state at the regional and international level. In contrast, Non-polarity, is a system in international circle where power is found in many hands and many places, that is, numerous centers of power but none dominating. The division of power in this system can be found to exist in a nation state, corporations, non-governmental organization, terrorist groups, and such as Al Qaeda.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Define polarity in international politics
- Highlight the various form of polarity
- Discuss bipolar system as another description of Cold War, and
- Identify the salient features inherent in bipolar system
- Identify the conflict generating properties of polarity

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 POLARITY IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Prior to the emergence of the concept of bipolarity in international politics, there existed a world political system in which power is primarily held by four or more international actors, it was popularly referred to as multipolar system. The multipolar system cover the period from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 to the World War II (with the final defeat of Napoleon in 1815) and the first World War featured major state actors like Great Britain, France, Prussia/Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia and adjunct actors like Italy and Turkey. “The basic essence of multipolarity according to John Rourke is marked by shifting alliances designed to preserve the balance of power by preventing any single power or alliance from dominating Europe and by extension, the world” However, the system lost its ability to maintain a balance of power when the major actors and powers began to collapse to form two strong alliance that gave birth to the bipolar system in international politics. The shift in alliance did not come about as a thunder bolt but rather there was a momentous and rapid global change. The changes include the gradual extinction of monarch for elected officials to headship of countries, the emergence and prominence of international organization such as the United Nation (UN), world population explosion from 1.6 billion to about 6 billion people, technological/medical advancement and scientific innovation in computer, television, nuclear energy, missiles, space travels, etc.

Similarly, tremendous changes occurred by 1900, when several states began to pursue their sovereignty to gain independence, for instance, China overthrew its emperor and rid itself of domination; there was division and reduction in European domination as the United States and Japan began to assume significant status and to play prominent roles. Also, Africa, Asia and Latin American countries became active with a voice of self actualization as they struggle to attain independence and to cast away the shackles of colonialism and European domination.

The tragedy of the World War II (1939-45) signaled the total collapse of the European based multipolar system which gave birth to a bipolar structure represented by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) and the United States of America. Although, the War had a devastating effect on Europe as a whole, the Soviet Union was able among the very many European nations to emerge as the superpower leader of the East pole. While the United States with its military and economic superpower became the leader of the West pole. Bipolar system has been described as “a type of international system with two roughly equal actors or coalition of actors that divide the international system into two poles”. The system also involved a great deal of world politics centered on the confrontation between the two superpowers in terms of

ideological linings. The intensity of the uneasy alliance, rivalry and hostility between the two, partitioned the entire world into two antagonistic divide in what became known as the Cold War.

3.2 TYPES OF POLARITY

Polarity as a global system has been categorized into four different sub-systems namely: unipolarity, bipolarity, tripolarity and multipolarity.

3.2.1 UNIPOLARITY

Unipolarity is a system in international politics whereby one state holds most of the cultural, economic and military control. Unipolarity is different from hegemony because hegemony may not have the total control of some key sectors such as the seaports or common.” Some early empires represent some form of unipolarity, notable among them were, the Egyptian Empire that existed between C3150 - C.1285 BCE, Akkadian Empire from 2279 - 2193BCE, Assyrian Empire 675 BCE to 626 BE (from the Egyptian invasion to the Babylonian revolt), the Persian Empire and Alexander’s Empire. Today, after the end of the Cold War in 1991, and the collapse of the Soviet Union, there emerged another unipolar world dominated only by the United States.

3.2.2 MULTIPOLARTY

The distribution of power whereby more than three nation-states have somewhat equal capacity in military, cultural and economic influence of their sphere at regional and international level is known as multipolarity. According to Bruce Bueno de Mesquita (2003), “multipolar is” an international system based on three or more centers of power (pole) that may include states or International Governmental Organization (IGO), such as the European Union, 19th century international system may be described as multipolar.” Notable examples of multipolar political world were the third century B.C Hellenistic kingdoms of the Eastern Mediterranean that came out of Alexander the Great’s Empire. For instance, Macedonia, Syria and Egypt contend with one another for domination of the region. This made establishing hegemony impossible as there was a combined formidable opposition against the strongest states until the Roman domination in mid second century B.C.

There are different views on the stability of multipolarity which have been generally classified into two distinct theorists, namely the classical realist and neorealist theorist.

According to the classical realist, multipolar system is more stable than bipolar system. This is because great power can acquire more power through alliances and petty wars that do not challenge other powers, but in bipolar system this is not possible. For the neorealist, the primary preoccupation of nation states in multipolar system is on its security and to invert the formula. Nation states in multipolar system focus more on their fear of any member of other powers and may overt or covertly compromise their security as a result of misjudging the intention of other states. On the other hand, nation states in a bipolar system are preoccupied with the fear of each other, that is, at extreme cases, the power can miscalculate the force required to counter threats and may incur more cost of financing such operation. It can be argued that multipolar system is more stable than bipolar system because of the complexity of mutually assured destruction in relation to nuclear weapons. Multipolar system have many shifting alliances until one or two things happen - strike a balance of power or one nation state attack another because of a probable fear of new alliance. One salient implication of multipolarity and others that may involve two or more poles in international politics is the strength of international strategic decisions to maintain a balance of power rather than out of ideological reasons.

It has been argued that bipolar system (during the Cold War) are safer because the two superpower countries- the United States and Soviet Union in that case know that the risk of going to war are high and therefore will avoid doing so. Before the World Wars, the great powers of Europe assembled regularly to discuss internal and international issues.

Also, before the World Wars, from Napoleonic Wars to the Crimean War, great powers of Europe met regularly to discuss both internal and international issues as a manifestation peacetime multipolarity. The period of war time multipolarity is represented by World War 1 and II, the thirty years world warring states period, three kingdoms period and the tripartite division between Song Dynasty/Liao Dynasty/Jin Dynasty/Yuan Dynasty.

3.2.3 BIPOLARITY

The Soviet Union never equaled the United States in terms of economic and military technological advancement with the use of nuclear energy but had a huge conventional armed force, an overwhelming ideological posturing and in 1949 developed her atomic weapon, thus beginning the East – West axis conflict and the balance of terror. This, of course was a replacement for the vacuum created by the collapse of the old balance of power structure to erect the bipolar system. Bipolarity is a system of power distribution in the international politics whereby two states have

the majority of economic, military and cultural influence. One better way to describe the world in shorthand during the cold war whereby two blocs depict the other in the worst possible light is a bipolar world. The Cold War world was a creation of the United States and Soviet Union that also governed and enforced the bipolar system in other words the international system during the Cold War (1949 -1991) was governed by bipolarity.

According to John Rourke (2000) bipolar system is “a type of international system with two roughly equal actors or coalition of actors that divide the international system into two poles. Bruce Bueno de mesquite (2003) defined bipolar system as “a structuring of international system in which international politics is dominated by two powerful states, with all other states associated with one or another of these two poles. Often than not, to achieve this, axis and allies would be developed in their spheres of influence. For instances, during the Cold War, the United States organized most western and democratic states into a bloc as the Western Bloc. While the Soviet Union, on its own organized most communist states under its influence into the Eastern bloc. Soon after, the two power blocs began to maneuver for the support and consolidation of the claimed and unclaimed areas. The building of alliances in a bipolar system is a manifestation of the conflict trajectories as was the case of the Cold War and conflict interest with a commonality that may further lead to bonding as in NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Kenneth Waltz a neorealist defined “bipolarity as situations when two large states have nearly all the power.” He went further to argue that bipolarity is a stable type of system because it signifies communication and calculation

At the regional level, there were some examples of the existence of bipolarity before the Cold War era. For example, Sparta and Athens in pre-Alexandrian Greece, Carthage and Roman Republic before the Punic Wars, Roman Empire and the Sassanid during the Roman – Persian Wars that lasted till the invasion of Persia, Russia and Japan up to the Russia-Japan War of 1905 causing bipolarity in their sphere of influence in several parts of China, Korea and Mongolia. Also, Israel and Egypt could be considered as regional powers in the Middle East during the Arab – Israeli conflict from 1948 to 1978.

The bipolar system within the purview of the Cold War has been classified two periods of a tight bipolar balance and loose bipolar balance.

A tight bipolar balance as during the late 1940s and early 1950s in the United States led NATO and the Soviet Union led Warsaw Pact face-off

A loose bipolar balance, began in the mid- 1950s, as China moved away from the Soviet Union (Sino-Soviet split) and France from NATO, and the third World countries began to organize in the neutral and nonaligned movement.

According to John Burke and Mark A. Boyer, following the Second World War, the world was divided into two armed camps led by the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and its allies, the Warsaw Pact countries, feared a United States led take-over of the eastern European state that became satellites after the World War II and replacing a socialist political and economic system with a liberal one. The United States and its allies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries were equally apprehensive that the Soviet Union would overrun Western Europe. Both sides sought to defend themselves by building up massive military arsenals. However, it must be observed that the nuclear balance of terror and bipolarity existed at the same time. Nuclear weapons brought about a peculiar form of the balance of power often called balance of terror. Balance of terror is preponderant upon the fear that nuclear weapons produced to maintain world peace as enshrined in the principles of mutually assured destruction (MAD). Thus, the duo of bipolarity and nuclear weapons produced a long period of world peace in modern state system.

There are divergent views on polarity, there are those claiming that the world is multipolar fall into two main camps, there are those that feel that phenomenon of superpower is archaic. Though, agreed that the United States and the Soviet Union were Cold War superpowers, but contend that the complex economic interdependencies within the international circle, and creation of a global village through technology “the concept of one or more states gaining enough power to claim superpower status is antiquated” William Thompson (1980). The opposing view is that during the Cold War, the United States and Soviet Union were not superpowers because they rely on the smaller states in their spheres of influence. Some other contending views of polarity include the lack of flexibility and that it reinforces the importance of marginal conflicts like the Vietnam War. Also contentious was the conventional assumption that bipolarity either erodes or explodes.

The economic strength of the United States, no doubt, influence the socio-economic and political systems of many nations, the United States depended on foreign investment and trade with other nation states, thereby creating a neutral economic dependency between developed and developing economics. Thus, for those who argue that the world is multipolar, the interdependency concept presupposes that the United States is not self sufficient as it depends on the existence of a global community to sustain its people’s quality of life. Therefore, the United States cannot be classified as superpower. The interdependence concept in international system also involves complex state of world affairs and military strength of developing nations. The idea of

supporting foreign policies of other nations cannot be overemphasized. The diplomatic and economic variables that bind the world together are so strong and dynamic that it is impossible for one state to act in total disregard to the interest of other nations. Nevertheless, new alliances underscore most activities in the international system and the United States has used it to its fullest and largely considered to be a sole superpower due to its unchallenged strength and influence to create a unipolar world through alliances.

Self Assessment Exercise

Critically examine the polarity as an international system

4.0 CONCLUSION

Today, with the fall of the Soviet Union with its ideological and nuclear capability, it is no longer a force to reckon with, while the United States continues to have a wide political sphere of influence and the best economic relations in most sphere of the global divide including former stronghold of the Soviet Union. Consequently, the United States is assuming unquestionable hegemonic status. The bipolarity in the Cold War proves advantageous to the United States because it has gained strategic control of its interests and possesses a strong alliance both in the East and West where it has a strong presence.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed polarity as a system in international politics and attempted some definitions and explanations of the various forms of polarity such as unipolar, tripolar, multipolar, nonpolar and bipolar systems. The unit specifically discussed the basic characteristics of bipolar system as a shorthand description of the Cold War and attempted a comparative study of bipolarity and the other forms of polarity.. Also, we discussed in this unit, the different types of bipolar system and the nexus between bipolarity and nuclear weapons that resulted in balance of terror.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

- 1 what is bipolarity? How does it differ from the other forms of polarity
- 2 Discuss the nexus between bipolarity and nuclear weapons

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn Glenn (1989), *The West and the World Since 1945* (2nd ed) New York: st. Martins

Haass, Richard (2008) “The Age of Nonpolarity” Council on Foreign Relations
[http://www. foreignaffairs.org](http://www.foreignaffairs.org)

Mansfield, Edward D. (1993) “Concentration, Polarity and the Distribution of Power” *International Studies Quarterly* 37 (1). Blackwell Publishing.

Mesquita, ,Bueno de, Bruce, J., and Morrow, James D. (1999), “Sorting through the wealth or nations” *International Security*, 24/2

Mesquita, Bruce Bueno de (2003), *Principles of International Politics: People’s Power, Preferences and Perceptions*. New York: New York University Press.

Nye, Joseph S. (2003), *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History* (4th ed) New York: Longman

Rourke, John and Boyer, Mark (2002), *World Politics: International Politics on the World Stage*. New York: McGraw Hill

Thompson, William R. (1988) *On Global War: Historical-Structural Approaches to World War Politics* Colombia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Waltz, Kenneth (1959) *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.

UNIT 3 HISTORY OF THE COLD WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 Beginning of the Cold War
 - 3.2 The Second Cold War (1979–85)
 - 3.3 End of the Cold War (1985–91)
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The situation in Europe before 1945 was that of crisis in the balance of power and the Cold War was fourth in the series of such crisis since the end of the eighteenth century. First, France under the leadership of Napoleon Bonaparte had attempted to temporarily upset the balance of power by overrunning Europe. However, a coalition of states engaged themselves to desperate resistant battle to contain him. According to Joseph Nye “Napoleon spread the revolution idea of popular sovereignty throughout Europe, and the Napoleonic Wars posed an enormous challenge to both the rules of the game and to the balance of power”. Second, at the beginning of the twentieth century, German’s Kaiser William II challenged the European balance of power and for four years the coalition of state forces fought desperately to unsettle the attempt. Third, toward the tail piece of the 1930s, Germany’s Adolf Hitler attempted to reenact France’s Napoleon’s dream to overthrow the balance of power in Europe. Just as ever, the ensuing war was fought by a formidable coalition forces to defeat Hitler and restored the power equilibrium. Rather, the defeat of Germany’s Hitler created a power vacuum which left Russia possessing and controlling half of East Europe and created a vacuum in the west which lay prostrate before Russia. This was precarious for the western allies having defeated Hitler, to face a situation that demand courage and sacrifice, therefore, it became unavoidable for the western allies to come together to maintain the balance of power. This new challenge and the struggle thereof led to the fourth war which was the Cold War.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the origin of the Cold war
- Highlight the balance of power in Europe before the Cold war
- Discuss the development of world politics throughout the Cold war
- Identify the various Cold War conflict progression

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 BEGINNING OF THE COLD WAR

Soon after the end of World War II in 1945, world politics witnessed the emergence of two powers blocs in Europe, the capitalist democracy dominated by the United States and socialist communism dominated by the Soviet Union. Consequently, there was a power struggle for supremacy and the ensuing conflict was the cold war fought on the platform of economic, military and ideological rivalry. The origin of the Cold War actually began with the unsuccessful interference of Western powers in the Civil Wars of the Russia revolution of 1917. As a result, Soviet Russia embraced an economic and ideological posture in strong opposition to the capitalist and democratic West in the formation of Comintern. Comintern was formed in 1919 as a formal organization of Communist parties through which to direct, coordinate, and control Communist policy in Europe. It has an international outlook as international organization of Communist parties and Soviet leader Kremlin used it to direct the Communist conspiracy all over the world in general and to promote Communist revolution in other countries in from 1919 to 1943. In contrary, the United States adopted and pursued an isolationist policy between 1918 and 1935, which reflected total dislike rather than conflict. Soviet Russia, in swift reaction as a manifestation of being afraid of fascism and Nazi Germany tried without success to form alliance with the democratic western power against Germany. However, Soviet Russia continued to sought for alliance and finally signed the Nazi Soviet pact in 1939 between the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin and Germany's Adolf Hitler. This pact did not prevent war between the two powers as it only delayed it as Germany invaded Soviet Union and at the same time increase the anti-Soviet hostility in the West.

The invasion of Soviet Russia and France by Germany united the Soviet and the West (Western Europe and later America) against a common foe, Adolf Hitler the leader of Nazi Germany. The result was World War II and the transformation of world power with the Soviet Union and United States of America emerging as global superpowers. The United States is basically a nation of European stock with its language and culture

of exclusively European descent makes a European nation. The economic situation changed in favour of the United States and Japan outside the European continent in the nineteenth century. The situation of the Cold War was different from that of the Napoleonic War because the states in Europe could contain them but in the World Wars and the Cold War to upset the balance of power and maintain the status quo had to seek the assistance of the United States for succor against the Soviet Union. This is reminiscent of the United States intervention in World War II to avert the defeat of Russia, United Kingdom, France by Germany and Hitler would made himself supreme over Europe and the Mediterranean. Soon after the war in 1945, the weight of the United States was again required to secure the balance of power in Europe against Soviet Union. Soviet Russia in its expansionist tendencies liberated and dominated a vast area of the weakening Eastern Europe and introduced its political system and turned them into satellite states to ward off the capitalist West. There is consensus among scholars that fear in terms of its security rather than ambition propelled the Soviet Russia into expansion of the Russian society without natural frontier to serve for its defense. Similarly, the United States and its allies liberated the other part of Western Europe to establish capitalist economies and democratic nations.

The Second World War ended in 1945 with Europe divided into two opposing blocs and occupied and dominated by the armies of each power. The United States and its allies with a capitalist and democratic posturing occupied Western Europe while the Soviet Union with the socialist communism occupied and dominated the eastern European. Joseph Stalin, the Soviet leader had expected the early collapse of the capitalism in Europe but was dismayed by the consolidation and expansion. In addition to the different prevailing circumstances, there was the constant fear of soviet invasion, development of atomic, fear of economic collapse on one side and domination on the other. And ultimately, within the Soviet front, were of rearmed Germany hostility to the Soviet Union. Thus, Soviet Union inadvertently developed what Winston Churchill in 1946 described as an iron curtain has fallen over Europe. Sir Winston Churchill, former Britain Prime Minister delivered his famous Fulton speech titled “The Sinews of Peace” also commonly referred to as “iron curtain speech” on March 5, 1946, at Westminster College, Missouri. In his speech he called for an Anglo-American alliance against the Soviets who he accused of establishing an iron curtain from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic (Harriman,1988).

The United States, one of the superpowers in response to the spreading of Soviet point and communism introduced and adopted the policy of containment in 1947, it was aimed at checking and stopping further Soviet expansion and its communist ideals. The decision to act became more apparent and expedient as states in Eastern Europe have began to accept communism as a state system. Fox example, Hungary was taken

over by the communist party, also through a coup, Czech became communist when a new communist government took over. The expansionist activities of the Soviet Union in Europe became an awesome bewilderment to the United States especially when Britain declared her inability to finance and continue to give military support to the Greek Government against the imminent overthrow by the communist guerrillas. Elsewhere, at about that time also, Turkey was under intense threat by communist guerrillas. No doubt, the success of the communist guerrilla warfare presented a new impetus and enormous benefit to communist expansion and domination. This fit was possible because they were supported with military aid from Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. The United States response to this precarious situation was enunciated and outline by the Truman Doctrine – United States anti communist doctrine. The basic thrust of the doctrine was that “it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minority or by outside pressure.” By the token of this doctrine as it were the United States is poised to declare war on communist Soviet Union as it embarked upon a massive military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey. Consequently, United States troops defeated the Communist guerrillas in 1948 in Greece and Turkey.

In accordance with the Truman Doctrine of March 12, 1947, the United States with the benefit of economic hindsight considered it as necessary option that a prosperous Europe would be a major determinant to restrain and contain Soviet communist incursion and threat of expansion in Europe. On June 4, of the same year the United States adopted the Marshall plan following the speech of George Marshall the U.S Secretary of States. According to him, “it is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace”. Accordingly, the United States invited European countries to design economic reconstruction plan of Europe which she promised to provided the financial assistance. The Communist Soviet Union considered it as America’s imperialist antics and therefore refused to avail itself of the financial assistance in spite of their economic distress.

Two reasons were responsible for Soviet Union refusal to accept the Marshall Plan. First, was that as a condition for the financial assistance, states which accept the Marshall Plan aid must as a matter of obligation declare its economic records to the United States. Second, there was the fear that it will inadvertently expose and weaken the Soviet totalitarian system of government to western influences. It should be noted that the traditional Soviet Union was a closed and secret so were their societies and activities were shroud in secrecy. The Soviet Union stymie her satellite states in Eastern Europe from accepting the United States financial aid instead introduced the Molotov Plan. Nevertheless, it is worthy of note that the United states foreign policy as exemplified in the twin policies of the Truman doctrine and marshal Plan had

placed her in an unequal pedestal as pacesetters and leader of the western allies to resist the communist Soviet Union's expansionist programme in Europe signified the beginning of the Cold War. The divergence of interest and goals which were central condition of the Cold war were based on ideological struggle and mutual opposition of two powers, one led by the socialist communism Soviet Union and the other by the capitalist and democratic United States had been established.

The city of Berlin was the heart of Cold War tension. The city was divided into four for the post World War superpowers of Britain, France, United States and Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union, United States, Britain and France divided Berlin and established zones of occupation and a loose framework for four-power control of occupied Germany. Initially, the United States and Britain merged their zone of Western German occupation into "Bizonia" and later the France's zone was incorporated to become "Trizonia". This Western German occupied zone was constituted into a federal governmental system as part of the reconstruction plan of Germany as agreed by the representatives of a number of Western European governments and the United States. Soviet refused to participate in a German rebuilding effort set forth by western European countries in 1948. This gave way to the Marshall Plan to re-industrialize and rebuild the German economy, including the introduction of a new Deutsche Mark currency to replace the old Reichsmark currency. In response, Stalin instituted the Berlin Blockade, one of the first major crises of the Cold War, preventing food, materials and supplies from arriving in West Berlin. The United States, Britain, France, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and several other countries began the massive "Berlin airlift", supplying West Berlin with food and other provisions. In May 1949, Stalin realized the success of the airlift and lifted the blockade.

In April 1949, Britain, France, the United States, Canada and eight other western European countries signed the North Atlantic Treaty that established the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In august, Soviet Union detonated its first Soviet atomic device. In October, the Soviet Union proclaimed its zone of occupation in Germany the German democratic Republic.

Broadly speaking, the hallmark of the 1950s was the beginning of European integration as a fundamental by-product of the Cold War which Truman and Eisenhower promoted politically, economically, and militarily.

In the early 1950s, the United States started to worked for the rearmament of West Germany and, in 1955, secured reintegration Germany into NATO in spite of Soviet strong opposition to prevent it. Among other effects, the Korean War galvanized NATO to develop a military structure.

As a result of the defeat of the United States back Chiang's Kuomintang (KMT) Nationalist Government in China by Mao's Liberation Army in 1949 and Soviet alliance with the People's Republic of China the Truman administration expanded the containment policy to Asia, Africa and Latin America to stop further or counter revolutionary nationalist movements, often led by Communist parties financed by the USSR.

After the death of Joseph Stalin, Nikita Khrushchev became the Soviet leader following the deposition and execution of Lavrentiy Beria. He embarked on a new approach to the Soviet execution Cold War policies by cataloguing and denouncing Stalin's crimes in a campaign of de-Stalinization.

Between 1953 and 1962 witnessed some crisis and escalation of tension such as the Korean War, Hungarian revolution (1956) and the Warsaw Pact. From 1957 through 1961, Khrushchev openly and repeatedly threatened the West with nuclear annihilation. He claimed that Soviet missile capabilities were far superior to those of the United States, capable of wiping out any American or European city. In contrast, the United States was preoccupied in its foreign policies to increase the strength and the success of liberal capitalism. The Cold War conflict trajectories changed from the 1960 battle of the men's mind to basically clashing geopolitical objectives.

Khrushchev, the Soviet leader attempted to transfer control of Western access to East Germans failed when he issued an ultimatum to withdraw their troops from the sectors they still occupied in West Berlin to turn all of Berlin into an independent, demilitarized "free city". NATO formally rejected the ultimatum in mid-December and Khrushchev withdrew it in return for a Geneva conference on the German question.

The Berlin Crisis of 1961 represent the climax of the cold war tension and it was as a result of the fleeing East Berliners to seek for greener pasture and robust way of life in West Berlin to avoid the austere and regimental life in East Berlin. Between 1947 and 1961, more than 2.5 million East Germans including professional migrated to West Germany to denounce communism causing serious brain drain for the economy. The Soviet control East Germany government introduced restriction of emigration movement in East Germany and the rest of the Eastern Bloc with the erection of the Berlin walls. The walls separated the eastern and western parts of the city of Berlin with 24 hour surveillance instructed to shoot at sight anyone who attempt to flee by climbing over the wall. The Soviet alliance in the Eastern Bloc experienced a major hiccup in the manner of strong opposition from allies beginning with the Sino-Soviet split and Mao disrespect for the new Soviet leader after the death of Joseph Stalin.

On the nuclear weapons front, the US and the USSR pursued nuclear rearmament and developed long-range weapons with which they could strike the territory of the other. In August 1957, the Soviets successfully launched the world's first intercontinental ballistic missile Race.

The Revolutionary Cuban leader Fidel Castro formed an alliance with the Soviet Union in 1959 to repudiate the United States. Shortly afterward the United States intelligence discovered Soviet missile installations in Cuba and the United States responded immediately with a naval blockade. The Cuban missile crisis heightened Cold War tension with much apprehension of a nuclear war. But the efficacious concept of mutual assured destruction played out its restrictive capacity. The aftermath of the crisis led to the first efforts in the nuclear arms race at nuclear disarmament and improving relations, although the Cold War's first arms control agreement, the Antarctic Treaty, had come into force in 1961

At the beginnings of the 1960 there was a dramatic change with the rapid recovery of Western Europe and the emergence of Japan in international politics depicting a complicated world no longer divided into two clearly opposed blocs with economic stagnation of the Eastern Bloc. The period between 1962 and 1979 brought some measure of relaxation of tension through confrontation. For instance, in 1966, France withdrew from NATO's military structures and expelled NATO troops from French soil. In 1968, a period of political liberalization in Czechoslovakia called the Prague took place that included "Action Programme" of liberalizations, which described increasing freedom of the press, freedom of speech and freedom of movement, along with an economic emphasis on consumer goods, the possibility of a multiparty government, limiting the power of the secret police and potentially withdrawing from the Warsaw Pact.

3.2 THE SECOND COLD WAR (1979–85)

The term second Cold War refers to the period of intensive reawakening of Cold War tensions and conflicts in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Tensions greatly increased between the major powers with both sides becoming more militaristic through proxy and direct military interventions in the internal affairs in support or defense of allies.

Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan in December 1979 in support of Nur Muhammad Taraki formed Marxist government. Prime Minister Taraki was assassinated by his party rivals. According to the United States, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was "the most serious threat to the peace since the Second World War" Immediately, the United States President Jimmy Carter imposed sanctions on Soviet Union by placing embargo on grain and technology shipment, increased military budget and spending as

well as withdrew from the senate a bill for the domestication of the Strategy Arms limitations Talk treaty. In addition, the United States announced plans to boycott 1980 Summer Olympics games in Moscow, Soviet Union.

The Polish solidarity movement that stimulated a religious and nationalist resurgence Ronald Reagan imposed economic sanctions on Poland to protest the suppression of Solidarity in 1979. The Soviet leadership was advised not to intervene should Poland fall due to Solidarity pressure so that they may not suffer another economic sanctions which could be more disastrous than the earlier one. The Soviet at this time was facing a tense decade of economic stagnation and pressure from spending on the arms race and other Cold War commitments. It should be observed that Soviet Armed Forces was the largest and the defense expenditure lack military necessity. According to Manfred R. Hamm (1983), "by the early 1980s, the USSR had built up a military arsenal and army surpassing that of the United States. Previously, the US had relied on the qualitative superiority of its weapons, but the gap had been narrowed"

Margaret Thatcher and Reagan, both new British Prime Minister and United States President respectively denounced the Soviet Union and its ideology describing it as "evil empire" that would soon be "ash heap of history". The Reagan administration revived the B-1 Lancer program abandoned by his predecessor Jimmy Carter to pursue a new military buildup, installed cruise missiles in Europe and announced the Strategic Defense Initiative popularly called star wars by the media. Reagan's efforts at military buildup especially to shoot down missiles in mid-flight was the largest peacetime defense buildup in the annals of United States military

The Soviet Union for the first time did not respond with a further arms buildup because of the enormous military expenses and the heavy burden it may further place on a depressed economy in the face of decreased oil prices in 1980s. However, this did not deter the Soviet Union on 1 September, 1983, from shooting down a Boeing 747, with 269 passengers including a United States Congressman, belonging to Korean Air Lines when it violated Soviet airspace. The Reagan administration condemned the act as a massacre and immediately moved to support an increased military deployment. Furthermore, the administration adopted a more proactive counter insurgency tactics to intervene in foreign conflict as it intervened in the Lebanese Civil War, bombed Libya and backed the Central American Contras, anti-communist paramilitaries seeking to overthrow the Soviet-aligned Sandinista government in Nicaragua.

3.3 END OF THE COLD WAR (1985–91)

Mikhail Gorbachev former General Secretary became the youngest Soviet leader and a time of economic stagnation and dearth of foreign currency earnings as a result of downward slide in oil prices. The economic depression prompted Gorbachev to introduce new measures and structural changes to revive the ailing Soviet economy. The structural economic reform was called perestroika designed to relax production quota system, encourage privatization and gave incentives for foreign investment. According Gaddis (2005) “these measures were intended to redirect the country's resources from costly Cold War military commitments to more profitable areas in the civilian sector.” Mikhail Gorbachev though continued with the arms race but was more open to discuss bilateral issues and held four meetings with President Ronald Reagan. He withdrew Soviet forces from Afghanistan. And he signed an agreement with the United States to destroy all intermediate range nuclear force [INF] missiles and short-range [SRINF] missiles.

Also, Gorbachev simultaneously introduced glasnost, or openness, which increased freedom of the press and the transparency of state institutions. *Glasnost* was intended to reduce the corruption at the top of the Communist Party and moderate the abuse of power in the Central Committee. Glasnost also enabled increased contact between Soviet citizens and the western world, particularly with the United States, contributing to the accelerating detente between the two nations. The relationship between the East and West improved through the mid-to-late 1980s. For instance, in 1989 there was widespread unrest in Eastern Europe, Gorbachev did not intervene as these countries cut their ties with the Soviet Union, withdrew her forces from Afghanistan and agreed to the unification of Germany in 1990.

Without Soviet military support the communist leadership of Warsaw Pact states became ineffective and sooner than later the component states of the Soviet Union began to declare their independence with the complete withdrawal of the Baltic states from the Union. Consequently, the dissolution of the Soviet Union became inevitable and the communist party lost its 73 year monopoly of state power.

The dreadful Berlin wall which had been a symbol of German division and cold War conflict interest fell on November 9, 1989, for it will be remembered as one of the great moments of cold War and German history. Barely twenty three days from the collapse of the Berlin Wall precisely on December 3, 1989 at the Malta Summit, the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and the United States President George H.W. Bush declared the Cold War over. Finally, on December 25, 1991, the USSR was declared officially dissolved as a result of the internal wrangling and threat to succession from the Union culminating in the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States, created on December 21, 1991.

Self Assessment Exercise

Critically examine the role of the foreign policy in the development of the Cold War

4.0 CONCLUSION

Cold War from the original usage to the post-war tension, it was made popular by the tensions between of tension the United States and the Soviet Union with armed conflict. And there are different account and numerous volumes on the origin of and what and who caused the Cold War by historians, political scientists and conflict scholars. Also, it has provoke different thoughts and orientation as to ask whether the conflict between the United States and its allies and the Soviet Union and her allies. What is however true of the different accounts is that no single one is exhaustive of the entire conflict progression and development. The Cold War is preponderant on the creation and development of nuclear weapons and nuclear confrontation which had immense effect in the areas outside Europe through nuclear threat.

The conflict is one of the final episodes of post-war peace settlement which never came and the Cold War deeply permeated life in East and West, affecting culture and society as well as politics and the military. The Cold War is about the contest between capitalist democracy and socialist communism, while in reality the situation was more complicated, with the 'democratic' side, led by the United States and the western allies and the Soviet Union with its austere authoritarian regimes led the eastern Bloc as countries under the Soviet sphere of influence.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the synopsis of the Cold War with retrospection on the earlier wars to achieve the balance of power in Europe. The journey so far took us through the various events of the Cold war especially the confrontations, military formations, policy, arms race and nuclear weapons. The unit specifically discussed the actions and reactions of the superpowers especially to the confrontations and issues in the Berlin blockade and air lift, Berlin Walls and the division of the City of Berlin and indeed Germany. Also, in this unit, we discussed some fundamental conflict situations and how they were resolved.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

- 1 Attempt a discourse on the history of the Cold War
- 2 Discuss the roles Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev in the end of the Cold War

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn, Glenn (1989) *The West and the World Since 1945* 2nd edition New York: St. Martins Press

Gaddis, John Lewis (2005). *The Cold War: A New History*. Penguin Press. Halle Louis J. (1967), *The Cold War As History*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers

Hamm, Manfred R. (1983), "New Evidence of Moscow's Military Threat". The Heritage Foundation. <http://www.heritage.org/research/russiaandeurasia/EM27>

Nye, Joseph S. (2003), *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*. New York: Longman

UNIT 4: CHRONICLES OF THE COLD WAR 1945 – 91

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 Important Events Up to 1978
 - 3.2 Important Events in the Second Cold War (From 1979–85)
 - 3.3 Important Events at the End of the Cold War (1985–91)
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

For students of peace studies and conflict resolution to fully grasp the conflict trajectories and dynamics of a great international conflict like the Cold War with the benefits considered hindsight, it is necessary to step beyond the battlefield to enable us interpret and understand the value it portend for peace scholars as we look at the prevailing ambience in terms of the chronicles of events, actors, issues, interests and the overriding political philosophy/movement that shaped terrible human predicament in international conflict like the Cold War. It is against this backdrop that Miall (1998) become more apt when he opined that “events in history are linked not simply by predictable, linear effects, by physical laws, given a first event, a sequence of knock-on effects. Rather, history is intrinsically made up of events that are connected by meaning, by the purposes and thoughts of those who act in history, what Pitrim Sorokin called the ‘logico-meaningful’ dynamics of history.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Provide conceptual tools for shaping their skills for conflict analysis.
- When combined with the other units can provide the central thread connecting the entire Cold War.
- Understand the basic complexity and progression of the Cold War through the very many events.

- Put the Cold War events in perspective and the correlating move in response

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 IMPORTANT EVENTS UP TO 1978

From 4th to 11th of February, 1945, the Soviet communist leader and Premier Joseph Stalin, American President Franklin Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill met in the Crimea Conference at Yalta. The Crimea conference ought to spell the end of the system of unilateral action, the exclusive alliances, the sphere of influence, the balance of power, and all the other expedients that have been tried for centuries but have always failed. Also at the conference Stalin confronted Roosevelt with certain political conditions for Russia's entry into the war against Japan. On the 8 May, 1945 the Second World War ended in Europe. On 26 June, 1945, the United Nations Charter was signed in San Francisco and centered on the obligation of preemptive war theory to the United States and others who signed. From 17 July to 2 August, 1945, Stalin, Harry S. Truman who replaced Roosevelt as the President of the United States and Churchill/Attlee met at Potsdam, at the conference serious differences emerged over the future of Europe in general and Germany in particular after she surrendered. However, a declaration commonly known as the Potsdam Declaration was made as alternative to unconditional surrender of Japan. Between August 6 and 9, 1945, the United States Forces used the first atomic bombs on Japan two cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki respectively and on 14 August, Japan surrendered.

Former Britain's Prime Minister Winston Churchill delivered his high powered diplomatic speech titled the Sinew of Peace commonly referred to as Iron Curtain speech at Westminster College at Fulton on 15 March, 1946. The Paris Peace Treaties were signed on 10 February, 1947. President Truman of the United States announced the Truman Doctrine and inaugurated the Marshall Plan aid package on 12 March and 5 June, 1947 respectively. In strong opposition to the Marshall Plan, on 5 October, 1947 the Eastern Bloc under the leadership and sponsorship of the Soviet Union announced the setting up of cominform (communist information Bureau) the purpose of defeating the Marshall Plan. The organization for Europe Economic Cooperation (OEEE) was set up on 5th October 1948 to coordinate Marshall Plan. Hostility between the Soviet Union and United States build up with the German currency reformation and the Soviet Union responded by placing embargo on the immigration and movement between East and West Berlin. As a counter reaction to the blockade

the West commenced the Berlin Airlift in June, 1948 on the traffic/ mediation between East and West Berlin as a counter reaction started the Berlin airlift.

In 1949, the communist countries under the leadership of the Soviet Union set up the Comecon. Also, the western military alliance was formed culminating in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). On 4 April, the treaty was signed by 11 countries including the United States, Britain and France. The Soviet Union ended the blockade of Berlin and the airlift was stopped, accordingly. The Union Soviet Socialist Republic developed and exploded its first atomic bomb. Thus, the Cold War conflict progression with both sides possessing atomic bomb the tension assumed a new dimension.

The 1950s opened with the forces of North Korean invading South Korea when the satellite army of the communist half of Korea in a surprised sudden bolt invaded the non – communist half on 25 June, in the manner that divided Germany into two. Through, the Berlin Blockage had been lifted but the walls and borders of East – West Germany were fortified. On 3 October 1950, Britain, joined the league of nations that possess atomic bomb as she tested her first A. bomb. Barely 23 and 30 day after, The United States exploded her first H bomb and Eisenhower became the President respectively. In March 3, 1953, Joseph Stalin died and was succeeded by Khrushchev as CPSU leader in September. In June 1953, East Germans (workers) were engaged in a massive uprising against communist rule beginning in East Berlin. And the three year old Korean War was declared ended on 27 July.

In 1955, West Germany joined NATO and four days after, on 14 May, the Warsaw Pact was established as an alliance between Moscow and the Communist regimes of East Europe. February 14, 1956, at the 20th Congress of CPSU, Khrushchev denounced his predecessor Stalin signifying a paradigm shift of policy and strategy which ultimately led to the dissolution of Cominform on April 17. The Hungarian uprising was a of de-Stalinization motivation to protest Soviet domination of their own country and against repressive domestic policies. Between 31 October and 7 November, the British – French air attack in Suez and Soviet forces launched an offensive against Budapest on 4 November. While in the United States, Eisenhower was being re-elected as President. On 4 October 1957, the Soviet Union launched and announced her earth satellite codenamed SPUTNIK -1. The decade ended with Fidel Castro assuming control of the Island called Cuba to propagate the communist ideals and policies and the visit of CPSU leader Khrushchev to the United States.

France, joined to swell the number of countries that possess atomic bomb, as she exploded her first atomic bomb on 13 February, 1960. Barely 15 days to the four power summit in Paris on 16 May, an American spy-plane U.2 was shot down over Soviet Union and the summit failed. On 1 May, 1960, President J. F. Kennedy

succeeded Eisenhower as United States President. In 1961, precisely 12 May, space travel and technology advanced as Yuri Gagarin, a Russian astronaut became the first man on space. In August, the border between East and West Berlin was sealed and commenced the construction of Berlin Wall. The Cold War's first arms control agreement known as Antarctic Treaty came into force in 1961. In 1962, the Cuban missile crisis occurred, it confirmed and depicted Castro and associates as revolutionist against the United States from the moment they seized power. 1963 witnessed increase in bilateral relationship between the United States and Soviet Union as both set up hotline and signed nuclear test-ban treaty in June 20, and 25 July respectively. Also in June, President Kennedy visited Berlin and met Khrushchev in Vienna. He was assassinated and Johnson became the United States President. In October 1964, Brezhnev assumed leadership of CPSU and Johnson won the United States Presidential elections in November. Also, in Asia, China exploded her first atomic bomb on October. The United States - Viet Cong conflict escalated into Vietnam War in 1965. In 1966, France withdrew its forces from NATO military command demanding a thorough reorganization of NATO as she claimed to be subordinated to the integrationist system dominated by les Anglo - Saxons. On January 27, 1967, representatives of sixty countries including the trio of United States, Soviet Union and Britain signed a treaty banning nuclear weapons from outer space. Similarly, the trio signed a Treaty of Nonproliferation of nuclear weapons in 1968. Czechoslovakia denounced the Warsaw Pact but Warsaw Pact troops intervened to maintain physical control of its wayward ally and prevented the Czechs from developing military capabilities. The year ended with Nixon becoming the United States President- Elect in November.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I) began in November 1969 and a treaty was signed in 1972 by the United States and Soviet Union. Early in 1971, China was admitted into the United Nations while Taiwan was expelled as a member. The Germany basic Treaty was signed by the East and West in 1972. Early in 1973, the Vietnam Peace Treaty was signed in Paris and in March, the United States withdrew its troops from Vietnam, the war ended in April, 1975. In far away Middle East, the Arab-Israeli War (Yom Kippur War) broke out and oil prices were doubled by producers.

Gerald Ford succeeded Nixon who resigned as the United States President. Brezhnev agreed to chart a new strategic aim control pact in 1974. In 1975 the two superpowers behind the Cold War- the United States and Soviet Union embarked on the Appollo-Soyuz space flight and the Helsinki Declaration was signed. In Africa, the Angolan Civil War started in November, 1975. Jimmy Carter won the United States Presidential Elections in 1976. He facilitated and organized the Camp David meeting between the Arab – Israeli leaders that broker peace in the Middle East. The Camp

David meeting is significant because it provided a platform for dialogue and opened up personal communication between the leaders. In 1977 the Soviet Union deployed SS – 20 missiles.

3.2 IMPORTANT EVENTS IN THE SECOND COLD WAR (1979–85)

The beginning of the end of the 1970s saw several diplomatic manoeuvre as the United States established diplomatic relations with China. Carter and Brezhnev signed the strategic Arms Limitation Talks II. However, other events elsewhere like the Iranian and Nicaraguan Revolution which ousted United States regimes and the invasion of Afghanistan on Christmas day undermined the efforts of President Jimmy Carter to place another limit on the arms race. It is strongly believed that the Soviet Union's intervention in Afghanistan was the greatest threat after the Second World War to world peace.

In January, 1980 the United States stopped sale of grains to the Soviet Union and in July boycotted Moscow Olympics games. Ronald Reagan won the United States Presidential election vowed to increase military spending and confrontation with the Soviet Union and with the support of the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher denounced the Soviet ideology and tagged it as an “evil empire”. By this time Soviet military budget account for as much as 25% of its gross national product because its military arsenals and forces surpassed any in the world. According to William Odom (2000) “the Soviet Armed Forces became the largest in the world in terms of the number and types of weapons they possessed, in the number of troops in their ranks and in the sheer size of their military – industrial base. In the early 1980s Reagan made good his vow and began massive military buildup acclaimed by Fenny Mark (2006) as “the largest peacetime defense buildup in the history of the United States.”

In Poland, the visit of Pope John Paul II to his home land became the tonic the people needed for a moral focus against communism, the organized labour in Solidarity Movement stirred up nationalist resurgence to galvanized opposition of labour in Solidarity Movement stirred up national resurgence to galvanized opposition. The communist Soviet in reaction to the crisis of 1980/81 introduced martial law as a measure to justify the suppression of Solidarity Movement by the Polish regime. In 1982, the United States Government went beyond the sale restriction to impose economic sanctions against Soviet Union. The Reagan administration perceiving that oil was the mainstay of Soviet export revenue persuaded Saudi Arabia and other non member states of Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) to increase production and supply. Consequently, there was an oil glut in the 1979. According to

Yegor Gaidar (2007) “oil prices decreased and large military expenditures gradually brought the Soviet economy to stagnation.

Brezhnev, the Soviet leader in March barely seven months before his death in November 10, 1982, and succeeded by Andropov froze the deployment intermediate – range ballistic missile (IRBMs) SS-20 missiles aimed at West Urals targets. The United States President Reagan announced in 1983, the commencement of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) also known as Star Wars especially by the media. SDI was defense programme to shoot down missile in mid flight (Garhoff, 1994) and against nuclear attacks. On 1 September, a Korean Airlines flight 007, a Boeing 747 carrying 269 passengers including a Congressman was shot down by the Soviet Union alleging violation of its airspace. Reagan condemned the act of massacre and increased support for military deployment. At this time there were strong indications that the Soviet economy is becoming enfeebled to respond. This led to the end of the mutual assured defense (MAD) which was created in 1952 whereby neither of the superpowers would dare hot war with the other because the resulting conflict would destroy much of the world. In retaliation of the United States boycott of 1980 Olympics Games in Moscow, the Soviet Union and its satellite states boycotted the July Olympics Games in Los Angeles. Earlier in January, NATO and Warsaw Pact held a conference on disarmament. In February, Chernenko became CPSU leader at the death of Andropov.

3.3 IMPORTANT EVENTS AT THE END OF THE COLD WAR (1985-91)

The Cold War conflict progression and curve of tension began to slide toward a logical beginning of the end of the Cold War, Reagan administration called for a tripled spending in strategic defense Initiative (SDI) and the ailing Chernenko died and is succeeded by the comparatively youthful Mikhail Gorbachev then Secretary General as CPSU leader. At this time, the oil glut has had a drastic effect on the Soviet economy prompted Gorbachev to announce his reform agenda to revive the ailing Soviet economy called perestroika or restructuring which allow private ownership of business and foreign investment. In addition, he introduced glasnost or openness with the objective of enthroning press freedom and transparency of state policies and business to ward off internal opposition and anti reform groups. Prior to Gorbachev's policies, Communist Russian was all intrusive regime that was shrouded in total secrecy. Also, new diplomatic Foreign Minister was appointed in the person of Edward Shevardnadze and the first summit between United States Reagan and Soviet Union Gorbachev held in Geneva, on 22 November 1985. These series of events marked the turning point toward the conclusion of cold war era.

In 1986, the second summit was held in Iceland, the negotiations failed as Reagan declined Gorbachev desired in elimination of United States proposed Strategy Defense Initiative. However, success was recorded in November, 1987 when the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) was signed. The Treaty eliminated all nuclear – armed, ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers (300 to 3,400 miles) and their infrastructure”. As part of its reform agenda, Warsaw Pact called for substantial reduction of forces in 1988. The eight year old Iran-Iraq War which started in 22 September, 1970, ended on 20 August, 1988. George Bush became President of the United States. In 1988, several international events around the world signal the denouement of the Cold War. For instance, Cuban and Soviet forces withdrew their troops from Angola and Afghanistan respectively. The Polish Solidarity Movement won the parliamentary elections in Hungary and the Socialist Workers Party voted for its own dissolution to allow East Germans cross the border into Austria.

The pro-democracy demonstration started in East Germany and subsequently opened its border with West Germany. In Czechoslovakia, non-communist government took power and Ceausescu’s government overthrown in Romania. Lefebvre, Fitzmaurice and Vierdag (1991) writing in their book *The Changing Political Structure of Europe* observed that “the 1989 revolutionary wave that sweep across central and eastern Europe overthrew the Soviet-style Communist states, such as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria”. While in Romania, they violently overthrew the Communist regime and executed the Head of State. These revolutions were indications that the Soviet alliances were drifting to the precipices as the Warsaw Pact states were losing power without the usual military assistance and the fabric which once held the Soviet alliance were already disintegrating.

Gorbachev’s reforms and permissive attitude, which established glasnost (freedom of the press) and the opportunity to question national policies considered to be repressive accelerated the quest by the Union component republic to declare their autonomy from Moscow, with the Baltic States withdrawing from the union entirely” (Gaddis, 2005). The formidable walls of Berlin which was a significant phenomenon in the Cold War collapse in 1989.

As earlier as February 1990, the dissolution of the Union Soviet had become apparent when the 73 year old monopoly of state power held by the Communist Party was surrendered. Subsequently, free elections held in East Germany and ultimately Germany was reunited in October. Iraq invaded and annexed Kuwait in August 1990 as a direct consequence of adverse economic effect of 1980 Iran/Iraq War and the financial implication of fighting the war. Between 19 and 21 November, 1990, NATO and the Warsaw Pact signed a reduction treaty at Paris CSCE Summit to a

substantial reduction of forces. Consequently, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia demanded the removal of Soviet troops and refused to participate in future military exercises. The trade and other economic link between the Soviet Union and its satellites states in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon) founded in 1949 was dissolved on 29 June, 1991 and two days later, the Soviet Union alliances and military support to other communist state was stopped when the Warsaw Pact was disbanded on 1 July. President Bush of the United States and Mikhail Gorbachev of Soviet Union signed the START II agreement. The Commonwealth of Independent State was establishment on December 21, bringing to an end the Union Soviet Socialist Republic. According to Soviet leaders the purpose of the Commonwealth was to “allow a civilized divorce” between the Soviet Republic and is comparable to a loose confederation. Four days later, to be precise 25 December 1991, Mikhail Gorbachev formally resigned as President of the USSR announcing its formal disbandment.

Self Assessment Exercise

Critically examine the chronology of the Cold War

4.0 CONCLUSION

The chronicles of the Cold War is something more than a meaningless succession of events. There is a movement, a progression and a development. The events fall into patterns that are logical. Here, we see individual struggling with the enveloping problems of the day and how they put themselves to grips with it. Suffice it that, in trying to understand a great conflict like the Cold War, one should as a matter of necessity rise above the dust of the battlefield to take a compassionate view of the excruciating human beings on both sides – the capitalist democratic society and the socialist communism.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the events of the Cold War with special emphasis on the actors, movements, development and conflict progression. The chronicle attempts to provide a connection as a central tread to other units in this course. The unit attempt to extend the history of the Cold War to explain the fact that neither history nor theory alone is sufficient. The unit specifically discussed the important event up to 1978, the second Cold War and the end through a certain cycle that goes with a beginning, a middle and an end. Also, in this unit, we provided some intrinsic conflict situations and the various responses.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1 Discuss the events up to 1978 and the second Cold War?

2 What parallel can you draw between the origin of the Cold War and the chronicle of events?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Feaney, Mark (2006).” Caspar W. Weinberger, 88: Architect of Massive Pentagon Build Up.” *The Boston Globe* (Encyclopedia.com) <http://www.enlyclopedia.com/doc/1p2-7946374>.

GADDIS, John Lewis (2005). *The Cold War: A New History*. Penguin Press

Gaidar, Yegor (2007), (in Russian) *Collapse of an Empire: Lessons for Modern Russia* Brooking Institution Press.

Garthoff, Raymond (1994) *Détente and confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan*. Brooking Institution Press.

Lafeber, Walter (2002). *America, Russia, and the Cold War. 1945 – 2002*. Boston: McGraw – Hill.

Lefeber, R; Filzmanrice, M and Vierdag, E.N. (1991). *The Changing Political Structure of Europe*. Martinus Nijhoft Publisher.

Odom, William E. (2000). *The Collapse of the Soviet Military*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Palmer, D. Norman and Perkins C. Howard (2010), *International Relations*. Delhi: A.I.T.B.S Publishers

Partos, Gabriel (1993), *The World that came in from the Cold War*. Great Britain: Royal Institute of International Affairs.

Rourke John T. (2007), *International Politics on the World Stage*. Boston. McGraw Hill

UNIT 5 CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF COLD WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 Traditionalist
 - 3.2 Revisionist
 - 3.2.1 Soft Revisionist
 - 3.2.2 Hard Revisionist
 - 3.3 Post Revisionist
 - 3.4 The Orthodox – Revisionist Debate on the Origin of the Cold War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the Cold War, several questions such as who and what caused the conflict has been a major discourse among scholars and policy formulator which have given prominence to three schools of thought identified as traditionalist, revisionist and post revisionist.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, students will

- Develop a basic understanding of the causal - effect of Cold War
- Become familiar with the varieties of what caused the Cold War.
- Be able to examine the socio –economic and geopolitical consequences the Cold War as a determinant of post Cold War conflict trajectories.
- Identify the course and causes of conflict in the Cold War conflict.
- Improve their ability to synthesize information and think critically as they reflect on the decision making challenges and the choice of policies in relations to domestic or international politics as a major cause of the Cold War
- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 CAUSES OF THE COLD WAR

The Cold War was a manifestation of tension as a result of several overwhelming factors which can be classified as ideological, economic and political difference between two super powers the United States and Soviet Union before the Second World War and immediately after escalated into mutual distrust and suspicion. According to Miall (1998), “wars often arise from the juxtaposition and combination of previously unrelated chains of events. Indeed, it is this juxtaposition that is one of the factors which give the occurrence of war its surprising and dramatic quality”. He went further to state that “at the same time, what matters most is not the juxtaposition in time of different chains of events, but the meaning these events have for those who are responsible for taking decisions”. Miall opined that “we cannot properly explain their occurrence unless we understand not only the chain of events which led to them, but also the mental world of the participants and the connections they made. It is this which makes wars particularly difficult to predict” (Miall, 1998).

Ideological Incompatibility

Generally speaking, the United States and the Soviet Union have different ideological leanings. The United States political system favoured capitalism and democratic culture while the Soviet Union represents communism and a political culture they emphasize absolutism. For instance, in the United States, people are free to form political associations, parties and have their own opinion which culminates in the election of the government of their choice through the process of free ballot. In the Soviet Union, political activities are totalitarian and revolve around only the Communist Party that denies the people right to form their own political party with a traditionalist Imperialist tendencies that also deny the people the right of assembly, speech and of the press. No doubt, when these societies with different systems of government that seem to juxtapose themselves come in contact, there is bound to be little compromise between United States and Soviet Union. Each side had a different view on how to establish and maintain post war security. According to Gaddis (1990) the western allies desired a security system in which democratic government as possible. The animosity between the United States and Soviet Union were stimulated by the 1917 Bolshevik revolution which enthroned a Marxist government that was opposed to capitalistic imperialism. According to Morgenthau (1983) the United States fears of Marxism stimulated the emergence of anticommunism as an opposing ideology. Ideology has been defined by Kegley and Wittkopf (2001) as “a set of core philosophical principles that leaders and the citizens collectively hold about politics. The interest of political actors, and the ways people ought to ethically behave”

Economic

One of the economic values of capitalism is free market operation which encourages free trade. This is the kind of position that the United States represented and desired to extend throughout the world. In contrast, the Soviet Union and its economic activities abhor and would not want to risk the Soviet Union being opened to perceived negative influence from the west on its people and consequently erode the strength of the communist totalitarian regime. Thus, their various foreign policies exhibit these interests which were perceived in different light that generated ill feeling between the two powers.

Power Rivalry

The power vacuum created at the end of the Second World War from multipolar system in Europe and the general economic decline and depression in Europe gave unprecedented advantage to Soviet Union to dominate the affair of east Europe. The United States with its economic advantage and nuclear superiority after the World War became the undisputed leader of the West and focal point with its foreign policy for economic assistance to countries in Europe at that time became the only state capable of filling the power vacuum. The vacuum of military and economic power was complemented by a political vacuum and such a vacuum can hardly persist because nature abhors vacuum. Only Russia, which did not demobilize after the war and did not dismantle its war time military establishment would be in a position to fill the vacuum. Furthermore, the Soviet's expansionist aggression had brought all Eastern Europe including important parts of Germany under it. Thus, the axis power was still so immediate and Atlantic allies must as of necessity rally opinion against axis power without expressing hostile suspicion. By this the Cold War is inevitable.

Extension of Soviet Influence in Europe

Prior to the end of Second World War, the Soviet Union had extended the frontiers of its political and military influence in Europe, especially in the east through the military expeditions of the Red Army. By 1945, the Soviet Union had acquired the curzen line as new boundary with Poland. Thus, the big three, Winston Churchill of Britain, Franklin Roosevelt of United States and Joseph Stalin of Soviet Union, at the Yalta Conference, could not agree on what shape and size Europe should look and how borders could be drawn, following the war" (Gaddis, 2005). One reason responsible for this, according to John Lewis Gaddis is that "Russian historical experiences with frequent invasions, sought to increase security by controlling the internal affairs of countries that border it". However, both America and Britain opposed among others the Soviet position on these very many issues. Consequently, there was no firm consensus on the framework for post war settlement in Europe.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union in its desire to consolidate its control in eastern Europe circumvented the post-war election process by intimidating voters, change the voting list, and ultimately influencing the result in favour of the Communist Party through the Red Army. Similarly, by the late 1946, the Communist Party was becoming a formidable party in Western Europe, where it encouraged Communists to actively participate in the post-war election in France and Italy.

The Reaction of the United States

The United States did not immediately consider the implication of the geo-political expansion and influence of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism in eastern and central Europe, therefore, did not advocate strong resistance before May, 1945, but afterwards the government favoured a policy of strong resistance against Soviet Union. After the Yalta Conference, the United States under President Roosevelt had no doubt about Stalin's promised democratization process in eastern Europe under the influence of Soviet Union by setting up freely-elected parliamentary governments in the area. Therefore, President Roosevelt did not consider resistance against the Soviet Union. President Harry Truman succeeded Roosevelt after his death on April 12, 1945, Truman, unlike Roosevelt never believed the communist Stalin to set up democratic government, this conviction prompted his paradigm shift of strategy of containment and the twin policies of the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine to contain and resist the Soviet expansion and the spread of communism. Truman could not concede the fear and concern of the United States government for the continued threat of Soviet expansion into Western Europe having established her control in Eastern Europe.

The military nuclear technological advancement of the United States especially with the development and successful explosions of her first atomic bomb prior to the Potsdam Conference placed the United States in a better stead which gave Truman an overwhelming confidence to consider the option of adopting a stiffer attitude to check the expansion of Soviet Union in Europe. In addition, the overbearing posture of Stalin and the Soviet Union after the Second World War left much to be desired. For instance, Moscow determined quest to extract heavy reparation from Germany, accusing Britain of upholding a reactionary monarch in Greece, supporting an Italian fascist regime in Trieste and Stalin's undiplomatic truncation of Truman's proposal on the internationalization of all principal waterways. These were some reasons that scholars and government have advanced over the years that may have spurred the reaction of the United States in strong and stiffer resistance to the expansion agenda of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism in Europe.

Poor Relations Between the United States and the Soviet Union

The deteriorating relations between the west and east after the Second World War was brought to the front burner after the “Sinew of Peace” speech commonly referred to as Iron Curtain by former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill. Prior to the speech, the western allies were immensely grateful for the proactive role played by the Soviet Union in defeating Hitler’s Germany but were also weary of Moscow that have hitherto concentrated its energy is on post-war economics. According to Winston Churchill “From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent” the above descriptive phrase revealed the secret agenda of the Soviet Union which more any other became a catalyst that change the way the democratic West viewed the communist East. The speech increased the distrust and suspicion of the Soviet Union by the United States that have become weary of Soviet aggressive geopolitical expansion and spread of communism in Europe.

It is worthy of note that earlier two major but insignificant issues had occurred but were capable of deteriorating diplomatic relations. Firstly, during the World War II the United States supplied and provided material support for the allied nations through a lend and lease programme. Soon after the war, the United States abruptly terminated the programme while the ravaged Soviet Union was still in need of post war economic reconstruction assistance. Secondly, the United States ignored Soviet request for economic assistance her post-war reconstruction programme.

As we have mentioned earlier, the causes of the Cold War are deeply engrained in the ideological, economic and political differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, the causes are located within the ambit of several issues explained above but include overwhelming fear and distrust by both countries plan of possible attack from each other. Though, President Harry Truman had a personal dislike of the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, who he described as secretive, the activities of the Soviet Union in their occupied territory in Germany provoke the United States and the apprehension of that the Soviet Union that might use western Europe (Cuban missile site) as a military base to attack it.

3.2 CONSEQUENCES OF THE COLD WAR

The consequences of World War II manifested in the victory of the Soviet Union over Nazi Germany and the attempted to spread Soviet philosophy of communism which spurred its rejection through a global containment as was elevated into a doctrine by President Truman. Consequently, communism collapsed worldwide.

By the Cold War, the United States motivated and challenged the Soviet Union from World War II exhaustion to great-power status. In spite of the Soviet large armies, the

Soviet Union was spurred into the atomic bomb, nuclear technology and space achievement. Similarly, the United States policies and strategies against communism in China had much the same effect there.

The Berlin Wall was demolished and the two German nations were unified.

The Cold War has also frozen the world into its immediate postwar postures and prevented peace settlements in East and West. It led to destructive conflicts like the Vietnam War and the Korean War

Since 1945 the United States has spent enough resources on the Cold War to make many ailing societies healthy through the Marshall Plan and the economic recovery programme in Europe. Though, this may have had some adverse effect on the United States by dangerously weakening of its economy but became a successful capitalist imperialist.

The aftermath of the Cold War competition affected employment levels and research, development and production opportunities in defense related industries

The Cold War has sufficiently led to world militarism far beyond the two world wars and have gone ahead to create a United States dominated by the military. Both the United States of America and the Soviet Union built up huge arsenals of atomic weapons and ballistic missiles. The military alliances and blocs like the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and The Warsaw Pact (now disintegrated) were formed

The Cold War have depleted the resources for peacetime living with huge defense budget while neglecting the domestic needs, health and education of the citizens to provide human security by alleviating the poverty and suffering. However, emergent competitors like China have forged ahead with such technologies to become world power. For instance, in spite of its rapid and relatively bloodless end, the Cold War was fought at a tremendous cost globally over the course of more than four decades. It cost the U.S. up to \$8 trillion in military expenditures, and the lives of nearly 100,000 Americans in Korea and Vietnam. It cost the Soviets an even higher share of their gross national product. In Southeast Asia, local civil wars were intensified by superpower rivalry, leaving millions dead. The Soviet Union collapsed due to economic weaknesses

The developing countries in the late 1980s “lost to the arms race in a single year the equivalent of 187 million human years of income” (Sivard 1991)

Some of the economic and social tensions that underpinned Cold War competition in parts of the Third World remain acute. The breakdown of state control in a number of areas formerly ruled by Communist governments has produced new civil and ethnic conflicts, particularly in the former Yugoslavia. The Baltic States and some former

Soviet republics achieved independence. In some countries, the breakdown of state control was accompanied by state failure, such as in Afghanistan. But in other areas, particularly much of Eastern Europe, the end of the Cold War was accompanied by a large growth in the number of liberal democracies. In areas where the two superpowers had been waging proxy wars, and subsidizing local conflicts, many conflicts ended with the Cold War; and the occurrence of interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, or refugee and displaced persons crises declined sharply.

The end of the Cold War gave Russia the chance to cut military spending dramatically, but the adjustment was wrenching. The military-industrial sector employed at least one of every five Soviet adults. Its dismantling left millions throughout the former Soviet Union unemployed. Russian living standards have worsened overall in the post-Cold War years, although the economy has resumed growth in recent years. In the 1990s, Russia suffered an economic downturn more severe than the U.S. or Germany had undergone six decades earlier in the Great Depression after it had embarked on capitalist economic reforms. Therefore, the end of the Cold War liberated both the United States the Soviet Union from a rivalry that had exacted enormous toll and reduced strength relative to other ascending great powers China, Japan and Europe Union (EU). The legacy of the Cold War continues to structure world affairs. The Cold War institutionalized the role of the United States in the postwar global economic and political system. By 1989, the United States was responsible for military alliances with 50 countries and 1.5 million US troops were posted in 117 countries. The Cold War also institutionalized the commitment to a huge, permanent wartime military-industrial complex.

The term Third World is synonymous with the Cold War describing the economically less developed states of Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Latin America.

The nonalignment movement began in 1955 during the Cold War era among Asian and African countries in Bandung, Indonesia to devise a strategy to combat colonialism because they sought to avoid entrapment in the Cold War. They tried through the nonalignment to maximize their own interests while minimizing their costs. The strategy energized both the United States and Soviet Union to renew their efforts to woo the uncommitted neutrals to their own network of allies. The Movement as a strategy died with the Cold War as its foundation of moral neutrality was undermined by the superpowers.

According to Don Oberdorfer (1991) the end of the East –West conflict set forth unfamiliar circumstances when he stated that “a clear and present danger to delineate the purpose of power, and the basic shift invalidated the framework for much of the

thought and action about international affairs in the East and West since World War II”.

Self Assessment Exercise

Examine the causal-effect of the Cold War

4.0 CONCLUSION

The peaceful end of the Cold War depicts that great power rivalry may not ultimately result to armed conflict as both powers attempted to resolve the competitive difference without warfare. The end has brought a transformed global hierarchy where the United States has become world hegemonic leader without a major challenger. This has ultimately altered the face of world politics which according to Former President George Bush “the collapse of communism has thrown open a Pandora’s box of ancient ethnic hatreds, resentment, even revenge”. Bush underscored the imminent fear of uncertainty which the post Cold War years may offer in terms of security dilemma, renewed economic competition, conflict and even warfare among the emerging world powers. Furthermore, the very many causes of the Cold War are still prevalent in the post Cold War era of anarchic international politics. The Cold War indeed took a heavy economic toll on the world. Let's hope that nations learn to live in peace in the 21st century, as there are no winners in

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the various causes and consequences of the Cold War. The unit specifically discussed the ideological incompatibility, economic interest, power rivalry, extension of Soviet influence in East –central Europe, the reactions of the United States and the poor relations between the United States and Soviet Union. Also, the unit discussed the consequences of the Cold War from the victory of the Soviet Union over Nazi Germany in 1945, the spread of communism in East central Europe, the emergence of two superpowers, world militarism, economic woes, nonalignment movement, the Third World and to the emergence of new ethnic fragmentations

.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1 What might be some lessons of the Cold War that might help preventive diplomacy

2 What were the causes of the Cold War? Were they inevitable, if so, when and why

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn, Glenn (1989) *The West and the World Since 1945* (2nd Edition). New York: St. Martins

Gaddis, John Lewis (1997) *We Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. London: Oxford University Press.

Kegley, Charles W and Wittkopf , Eugene R. (2001) *World Politics: Trend and Transformation* (8th Edition). New York: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Nye, Joseph S. (2003), *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History* (4th edition). New York: Longman.

Oberdorfer, Don. (1991). *The Turn: From the Cold War to a New Era*. New York: Poseidon.

Williams, William A. (1959). *A Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. Cleveland: World

Rouke, John T. (2006), *International Politics on the World Stage*. New York: McGraw – Hill

MODULE 2

- Unit 1 APPROACHES TO COLD WAR**
- Unit 2 COLD WAR AS SOCIAL CONFLICT**
- Unit 3 IRON CURTAINS**
- Unit 4 BERLIN BLOCKADE AND AIRLIFT**
- Unit 5 BERLIN WALL**

UNIT 1 APPROACHES TO THE COLD WAR

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 Traditionalist
 - 3.2 Revisionist
 - 3.2.1 Soft Revisionist
 - 3.2.2 Hard Revisionist
 - 3.3 Post Revisionist
 - 3.4 The Orthodox – Revisionist Debate on the Origin of the Cold War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Since the beginning of the Cold War, several questions such as who and what caused the conflict has been a major discourse among scholars and policy formulator which have given prominence to three schools of thought identified as traditionalist, revisionist and post revisionist.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, students will

- Develop a basic understanding of the approaches to the origin of Cold War
- Become familiar with the varieties of schools of thought on the origin and who caused the Cold War.
- Be able to examine the socio –economic and geopolitical context of the superpowers during the Cold War so as to determine if it was inevitable
- Give explanation to the actions and reactions of the superpowers during the Cold War.
- Identify the incompatible goals and interests of the Cold War dramatis personae.
- Improve their ability to synthesize information and think critically as they reflect on the decision making challenges and the choice of policies in relations to domestic or international politics as a major cause of the Cold War
- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 TRADITIONALIST

The traditionalist were the early writer and commentator in the mid 1945 and 1950, otherwise known also as the orthodox approach strongly hold the opinion that, Joseph Stalin the leader of, and Soviet Union caused the Cold War. They argued that between the First World War and the evil of the Second World War and even after, the Soviet Union had exhibited an aggressive and expansive tendency which poses to be a great threat to the international community. According to them, the United States had a foreign policy and diplomacy that was defensive. For instance, soon after the war, the United States proposed “a universal world order and collective security through the United Nations (UN)”. The main thrust of a collective security within the United Nations is enshrined in the resolve of states to ensure world peace through a system in which states in the Union accept that the security of one is the collective responsibility of all, such that, it will join forces to suppress any form of aggression but which also is distinct from collective defense or alliance system. It is against this backdrop and modest understanding that the United States made her proposal. No doubt, the inherent, physical location and historical experiences of frequent invasion and the wanton destruction and loss of lives of its citizens in the Second World War propelled the Soviet Union to pursue its expansion and increase security by occupying and controlling the internal affairs of countries that bordered it such as the Polish government. Thus, the Soviet Union did not accept the proposal for the establishment

of the United Nations. Similarly, after the war, while America was disposed to demolishing its troops, the Soviet Union never did rather it left large armies in Eastern Europe. Furthermore, the threat from Soviet guided interest even when America was ready to accommodate Soviet interest as manifested in the Yalta Conference, it become approach that Stalin the Soviet leader was not ready to abide by the terms of the Yalta Agreement when he strongly and conspicuously interfered with the elections in Poland. The character of Soviet expansion is explained by its enthronement of communist government in Czechoslovakia in 1948, Berlin blockage from 1948 to 1949 as an attempt to squeeze the West out of West Berlin and communist North Korea invasion of South Korea. These precarious situations at different points and time gradually awaken the fear and suspicion of the Soviet Union in west. Consequently, the traditionalist posited that these events precipitated the launch of the Cold War.

3.2 REVISIONIST

The Revisionist school of thought featured prominently in 1960s and early 1970s, they had a strong conviction that the Cold War was caused by the United States and not the Soviet expansion as the Traditionalists contend. According this school of thought, bipolarity was not a consequence of the Second World War, because it never existed. They posited that, placing the United States and the Soviet Union on a scale of balance then, after the war, shows an imbalance in favour of the United States which was already strengthened by the war and had developed her nuclear weapons. In fact, according to their opinion, the Soviet Union was much weaker, than the United States therefore, there was no basis for the assumption of the existence of bipolarity. Evidently, they argued that the Soviet Union suffered great loss in the war with an estimated death toll of about 30 million people combined with a depressed economy of low industrial production in 1939 which could not be compared or compete with the economy of the United States. The United States was capable of offering financial assistance to other countries after the war. Given the prevailing economic situation, the Soviet Union had strongly felt that it should look inward to build up her economy and repair the domestic damage. Thus, the behaviour of the Soviet Union was quite moderate in its foreign policies as they tried to restrain Chinese Communist Mao Zedong and Greek communist from taking power. Also, in Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Finland, Stalin the Soviet leader allowed non communist government to reign.

Though, the disposition and opinions of the revisionist were strictly pro – Soviet and anti West, they were also classified into two camps of “soft and hard revisionist.

3.2.1 SOFT REVISIONIST

The soft revisionist pitched the discourse on the individual as the sole dramatic personae in the origin of the conflict. This group contended that the death of Franklin Roosevelt in April, 1945, and his successor, President Harry Truman was a critical factor in the diplomatic relations between United States and Soviet Union. According to them, President Roosevelt was an optimistic man who, though was aware that eastern Europe had fallen under the influence of Soviet Union did not advocate strong resistance against Russian expansion. But for his successor, President Truman, communism was unacceptable and was determined to pursue a policy of strong resistance against Soviet expansion because if not checked could extend from Eastern Europe into Western Europe. Truman never believed the communist. In 1945, the United States during his presidency “cut off the lend–lease program of wartime aid that some ships bound for Soviet ports had to turn around in mid ocean” (Joseph S. Nye. 2003). Other instances cited by the soft revisionist to buttress their position, include, Truman’s attempt to intimidate Stalin at the Potsdam Conference of July 1945, when he announced the United States success in exploding her first atomic bomb. It was also alleged that he fired his Secretary of Agriculture, Henry Wallace, for urging an improved relations with the Soviet Union and appointed a profound anti communist as Secretary of Defense, helped to give credence to why the United States was anti Soviet.

3.2.2 THE HARD REVISIONIST

It is all about a paradigm shift from dramatic personae to policy thrust such as liberal capitalist democracy. prominent among them were Gabriel and Joyce Kolko and William A. Williams, who argued that “the America economy required expansionism and that the United States planned to make the world safe, not for democracy, but for capitalism” According the hard revisionist, the American economic hegemony was strongly built on intolerance of any organized and closed economy without free market occasioned by fear of repeat occurrence of another economic depression caused by the unprecedented absence of external trade. This group posited that the Marshal Plan – United States aid to Europe was designed to propagate the economic influence of the United States over the world, and that it was most appropriate for the Soviet Union to reject it as a possible threat to their sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. According a major proponent of this school of thought, William A. Williams in his book *The Tragedy Of America Diplomacy* “America always favored an open door policy in the international economy because thy expected to walk through it” (sic).

3.3 POST REVISIONIST

The post revisionist school of thought was a marked departure from the traditionalist and revisionist points of view. The post revisionist era spanned from the beginning of the late 1970s to 1980s up to the end of the Cold War, and exemplified by John Lewis Gaddis. This school of thought unlike the earlier ones- the traditionalist and revisionist could not blame anybody rather they considered it as an inevitable phenomenon. According to them, prior to the Second World War there was a multi-polar system with at least seven major powers but after the havoc and wreck by the war, only two superpowers survived -the United States and the Soviet Union. The emergence of only two superpowers (bipolar system) and the weakness of the European states created a power vacuum which stirred at the United States and Soviet Union. Thus, there are bound to manifest some sort of competition, and conflict is inevitable, therefore according to Gaddis and his group, it is of no effect to seek for whom to blame.

Evidently, the post revisionist explored the inherent differences between the United States and Soviet Union in relation to individual state goals and interest, which brought incompatibility to the fore. For instance, the Soviet Union and United States had different goals at the end of the Second World War which were classified as tangible goals - possessions and territory and intangible or milieu goals – general context of world politics respectively. The Soviet tangible goals clashed with United States' intangible goals, when the latter advanced the course of the global United Nations system while the former pursued consolidation of its influence over its controlled and satellite states in eastern Europe. Beyond the different goals lies the issues of different styles and designs to actualize the incompatible goals under one international body like the United Nations even though each had its own sphere of influence – Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and the United States in Western Europe.

Another point put forward by the post revisionist to debunk the revisionist economic determinism as a reason for expansion by both powers was that there is the inherent and age-long dilemma of state security in an anarchic system. This of course, became imperative that no state, neither the United States nor Soviet Union could allow the other to dictate and control the whole of Europe. For the post- revisionist, the war was not as in the past, whoever occupied a territory also imposes on it his own social system. Stalin in a private conversation in 1945 said that “everyone imposes his own system as far as his army can reach”. and Roosevelt's declared that “in the global war there is literally no question, political or military, in which the United States is interested were pointers that reinforce the conflict trajectories in a bipolar structure. In other words, hostility is bound to set in, whereby one hard line begets another and an enemy line is drawn as perception becomes rigid.

3.4 THE ORTHODOX – REVISIONIST DEBATE ON THE ORIGIN OF THE COLD WAR

The debate on the origin of the Cold War is predominantly situated in the emergence of Europe in 1945 as dictated by the territorial division of loots which caused a crack and disintegration of alliances formed in the Second World War that turned into five decades of hostility between the United States and Soviet Union. The thrust of the Orthodox argument in locating the causes of the Cold War is that the United States policy was largely reactive to Soviet acts of aggression and sovietisation of east-central Europe after 1945. Europe was divided by Soviet expansion through military coercion, political intimidation and subversion which necessitated United States hostility and policy of containment to stymie Soviet power and communism which was greatly feared. Thus, the orthodox concluded that the Soviet Union had before hand perfected the plan to dominate east central Europe through its expansion but the United States did not conceived such plan on any part of Europe. Rather, the United States expected the Soviet Union to join forces with the West as against anti- fascist regimes to pursue and nurture the idea of collective security as expounded by the then nascent United Nations to manage international affairs for world peace.

The orthodox account provided a political and intellectual context of the origin of the Cold War throughout 1950s to give a conservative account. A more radicalized social and political context emerged in 1960s to provide a more critical account of United States actions. This group of Revisionist turned the spotlight of critical attention and blame away from Moscow and toward Washington. The Revisionist argument criticized the significance of the economic power and how the United States attempted to use its economic superiority to try to undermine Soviet influence in east central Europe through the Marshall Plan, Truman Doctrine and the economic recovery programme and instruments. The orthodox contend that the inherent Soviet expansionist tendencies combined with its communist ideology were the main reason for the Cold War. According to the Revisionist, the tension and contradictions in the United States capitalist system were germane to dismantling any perceived political obstacle on the part of its open international exchange, trade and investments. In addition, the Revisionist scholars argued to a vary degrees that the United States open door policy and imperial anti colonialism were based on securing access to new market and raw material to grow the United States economy and to avoid and turn around the world economy after the depression crisis of the inter war period. According to them, the key obstacle to the United States achieving its goal was anti capitalist revolutionary movements, this was closely followed by the British Empire and the Soviet Union. For the Revisionist, they emphasized the autonomous nature of revolutionary movements as more significant factor than the role of inter –capitalist

conflict between the United States and Britain while playing down the substance of communism and the Soviet Union.

Beyond the Orthodox and Revisionist arguments, it is important that we consider the significance of the character of the Soviet Union and the kind of international relations that it can pursue as a way of expanding its influence and power. This factor becomes salient on the backdrop of contrasting positions to the United States which could deploy private and State economic sources of influence in Western Europe, as a model strategy of galvanizing international and domestic political economy of post war Western Europe to consolidate its influence and power in the region. Consequently, it becomes only natural for the Soviet Union within its geopolitical context to deploy explicitly political and military sources of power to secure its hegemony in east-central Europe. No doubt, the Soviet style of international expansion was directly political and coercive using its political and coercive institutions to transform the nature of state power in the areas of occupation. But this was not the case with the United States experience in the West as it preserve the character of state power or refashioned it in accordance with the principles of capitalist liberal democracy.

The issue of the character of the Soviet state expansion into east-central Europe in the Cold War is a reflection of its form of international relations mixed with its security objectives. Though, the United States had its security objectives, however, there was to a large extent a distinctive gap between them because the United States that emerged from World War II had a different wartime experience with enormous strategic military and economic strength compared to the Soviet Union. The security objectives of both powers were different as well as their political ideologies. The United States is constituted domestically as a capitalist state whereby the security rested upon the maintenance and spread of the United States like political and economic system in the external security context to preserve its domestic political and economic character.

The significance of this for our understanding of the approaches to Cold War developments between the United States and Soviet Union is to explain the different geopolitical and socio-economic atmosphere under which the superpowers operated and made decisions. For instance, the establishment of liberal capitalism in Western Europe does not require the United States or its agent as local – national state political – military presence to direct the societies. In contrast, the communist security system necessitated the political – military presence of the Soviet Union over and within society. Both the United States and Soviet Union expanded their political frontiers into the two halves of Europe either through alliance or coercion to impose on its area of influence its own social system. The character of Soviet expansion were strictly centralized, authoritarian, coercive, militarized and based on communist party

monopoly of socio-economic political power. The expansion of the United States assumed its character in terms of the bourgeois separation of state and economy but permitting political influence and power through international capitalist economic relations.

Another significance is to explain that any encroachment either from the liberal capitalist form of state and politics into east central Europe is a major threat to Soviet security. Likewise, the intrusion of communist influence into Western Europe as in the cases of Italy in 1945 and France in 1947 were threat to security of the United States. Suffice it that, the submissions and accounts of both the orthodox and revisionist are germane and partly correct on the basis of their contention for a robust discourse of the origin of the Cold War which was inevitable.

Self Assessment Exercise

Was the Cold War inevitable? If so, why and when? If not, when and how could it have been avoided?

4.0 CONCLUSION:

Since the collapse of Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, documents and relevant information have emerged from the Soviet archives and made accessible to scholars of international relations. These documents have provoked intense discourse and debate on which side, and who started the confrontation. One fact which cannot be over-emphasized in the emergent discourse and debate is the notion that the Cold War was highly probable and inevitable in a bipolar structure. The bipolar structure staged two superpowers to be entangled into a power vacuums struggle in Europe and of course, it was not unlikely that they will find it easy to disengage. Similarly, systemic and structural explanation alone cannot be sufficient for the understanding an international hostility that spanned over four decades. Beyond the systemic and structural explanation lies the underpinning factors of individual and domestic politics of Roosevelt and Truman of the United States and Stalin and Khrushchev of the Soviet Union. This may account for the revisionist focus on domestic politics for a clearer understanding of the Cold War.

Both schools of thought did not consider the significance of both superpowers social interest in pursuing their different security objectives. The United States security preserved the capitalist class in Western Europe while the Soviet security system requires the elimination of the capitalist class and the social properties upon which its class rule rested. Though, ignored the social aspect of the rivalry in terms of security objective were as important as the ideological and economic interest because they

attempt to preserve and expand on their ideological and economic interest, they are either overtly and covertly imparting on the social interest which benefit from it.

The robust account of the orthodox, revisionist and post revisionist of the Cold War suggest that the conflict between the United States and Soviet Union after World war in 1945 was inevitable. It also reinvigorated the conflict in terms of relation between the Soviet Union and the Western allied prior to World War II which the United States was invited to intervene and rescued the West. Finally, the different character in state ideology, interest and geopolitical circumstances were in themselves antagonistic and germane to incompatibility therefore the Cold War was inevitable.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the various approaches and claims by different schools of thought on the theme of causes and origin of the Cold War. The unit specifically discussed the basic thrust of their argument as issues and actors based such as the orthodox on issues of provocations, revisionist on dramatis personae and the post revisionist trying to absolve both of any wrong by contending that the War was inevitable. Also, the unit discussed the robust debate between the orthodox and revisionist on the origin of the Cold War in relations to the socio-economic and geopolitical situation after the Second World War.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1. When did the Cold War begin? When did it end? Why? What do traditionalist, revisionist and post revisionist approaches contribute to your answers?
2. Do a comparative analysis of the traditionalist and revisionist view of the origin of the Cold War

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Gaddis, John Lewis (1997) *We Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. London: Oxford University Press.

Nye, Joseph S. (2003), *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History* (4th edition) New York: Longman.

Williams, William A. (1959) *A Tragedy of American Diplomacy*. Cleveland:World

Rourke, John T. (2006), *International Politics on the World Stage*. New York: McGraw – Hill

UNIT 2 COLD WAR AS A SOCIAL CONFLICT

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 What Is Cold War
 - 3.2 The Cold War as a Social Conflict
 - 3.3 Characteristics of Cold War
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The origin of the term Cold War can be ascribed to George Orwell in one of his article in the British Newspaper *Tribune* essay titled “You and the Atomic Bomb” published on 19th October, 1945. The essay explored a world living amidst a precarious threat of nuclear war following the 6 and 9 of August, 1945 when the United States of America bomber tagged “Town Gay” bombed two Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Consequently, he went further to warn of “a peace that is no peace” which he called a permanent” Cold War”. According to Orwell, the war is the “ideological confrontation between the Soviet Union and the Western powers”. And in one of his subsequent articles in *The Observer* of 10 March, 1946, asserts that “after the Moscow Conference last December, Russia began to make a Cold War in Britain and the British Empire”

Bernard Baruch, an American Financier and Presidential adviser, delivered a speech in South Carolina on 16 April, 1947, saying “let us not be deceived we are today in the midst of a Cold War”. This speech is attributed to have been the first description of the global tensions after the Second World War between the Soviet Union including its satellites states and the United State including its Western European allies. The Book, *Cold War* in 1947 by a Newspaper Reporter and Columnist. Walter Lippmann gave the term a wider prominence.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, you should be able to:

- Provide the theoretical framework for Cold War as a social conflict.
- Understand the various definitions of Cold War.
- Understand the basic typology of Cold War as a social conflict.
- Describe the nature and character of the Cold War

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 WHAT IS COLD WAR

The term Cold War has been defined by different scholars, international policy formulator, etc, to mean the existence of some form of tension without direct physical confrontation among nations. However, there are accounts of indirect confrontation by proxy to secure their interest. In his work, Louis Halle writing within the preview of ideology stated that “the Cold War presented itself as a world-wide contest between liberal democracy and communism. Each side looked forward to the eventual supremacy of its system all over the earth. The official communist goal was the liberation of mankind from capitalist oppression. Ideologically minded Westerners interpreted this as signifying that Moscow was trying to impose its own authoritarian system on a world that it meant to rule”. The United States, on their part, had traditionally looked forward to the liberation of mankind from the oppression of autocracy, and to the consequent establishment of their own liberal system throughout the world. To the ideologist in Moscow this meant that “the imperialist ruling circles in American were trying to enslave all mankind under the yoke of Wall street”. The ideological perspective to the conflict makes the difference and the primary justification to the distrust by the two superpowers and their allies that created a reality to the ordinary man in the society beyond the operative objectives. The ensuing conflict and rivalry was called Cold War because, in its characteristic manifestation, there was no direct physical confrontation or fighting between the superpowers often referred to as hot war on its broad sense. The ideological preferences to the explanation of the Cold War does not give adequate attention to other issues such as the socio-economic properties and domestic undertones and how they contribute to the geopolitical conflict trajectory.

Another salient perspective to the understanding of the Cold War is the socio-economic dimension which manifested as a global social – systemic conflict and how the socio-economical constitution of the superpowers and their allies also propelled their role of coercion and militarized social relations and how this became a *prima facie* of military competition and geopolitical conflict associated with the Cold War.

Similarly, at the level of international politics involving the Cold War, there were socio-economic challenges that dictated a shift and unavoidable revolutionary socio-economic change after the Second World War and states began to align themselves to economic realities propelled by social force and political movement. The Cold War has also been described as the struggle between states alone and the superpowers - the United States and Soviet Union in particular, but rather a struggle between social forces within the states and also outside of the state in the form of guerrilla armies, revolutionary movements and organized, politically conscious social classes.

Within the diplomatic circle, the Cold War has been defined also as the nuclear standoff and arms race between the superpowers. According to the *Collins English Dictionary* (complete and unabridged), “Cold War as a state of political hostility and military tension between two countries or power bloc, involving propaganda, subversion, threat, economic sanctions and other measures short of open warfare especially between the American and Soviet Blocs after World War II”. Also, the *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms* defined the Cold War as “a state of international tension wherein political, economic, technology, sociological, psychological, paramilitary and military measures short of overt armed conflict involving regular military forces are employed to achieve national objective”.

The Cold War began immediately after the Second World War and span over a period of five decade from 1945-91. It was an open yet restricted conflict between two groups of nations that have evolved and recognized as practitioner of a political system and its ideology. The groups of nations often classified as the Eastern and Western blocs. The Soviet Union and its satellite states are known as the Eastern Bloc and the United States and its allies are referred to as Western Bloc. Thus, the foreign policies of these group of nations especially the Soviet Union and the United States were dominant issues and conflict trajectories of the Cold War from its latent stage in 1945 until the end and collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

3.2 THE COLD WAR AS A SOCIAL CONFLICT

Four basic themes of social conflict theory have been identified by Randall Collins to include:

1. social stratification to explain inequality among groups and their domination over one another;
2. causes of what happen in society are sought in the interests of groups and individuals and their interest in maintaining their positions of domination;

3. who wins what in these struggles depend on the resources controlled by the different factions, including material resources for violence for economic exchange, and also for social organization and shaping emotions and ideas; and
4. social change driven especially by conflict; hence, long periods of relatively stable domination are punctuated by intense and dramatic episodes of group mobilization. (Collins, 1985)

These four basic themes of social conflict theory as elucidated by Collins (1985) will serve as a theoretical framework that guides our discussion of the Cold War as a global social systemic conflict located in the typology of conflict of interest which subsume economic interest, ideological incompatibility, and misperception

The Cold War is a competition between the United States and Soviet Union for hegemonic leadership. An evaluation of the Cold War using Kenneth Boulding's predictive outlook of conflict when he stated that "situation of competition in which each party wishes to occupy a position that is incompatible with the wishes of the other" (Boulding, 1962). And several other events and causes can aid our understanding of the conflict properties of the Cold War – power rivalries that ended without great power violence.

Cold War as Conflict of Interest

The power vacuum created at the end of the World War II and the power transition which lay at the feet of the United States and Soviet Union to top international hierarchy created an atmosphere of suspicion therefore conflict became inevitable. Prior to the Cold War neither the United States nor Soviet Union did sought unilateral advantage rather both expressed the hope of cooperation to reach agreement. This underscored an informal agreement that each power should enjoy dominant influence in its sphere of influence as advocated by President Franklin Roosevelt. Also, this was in consonance with the United Nations (UN) expectation that the great powers would cooperate to preserve world peace. For instance, the United States as a measure of resolving future international conflicts proposed a worldwide international community, democratically organized under a sort of parliament of nations like the UN, the Soviet Union found it hard to subscribe to that kind of organization. The plan for the economic reconstruction and integration of West Germany and indeed the Marshall Plan initiated by the United States and supported by the western allies were issues of interest which the Soviet Union opposed, alleging that a reconstructed West Germany and integrated into the West would be a threat to its future. And the economic assistance to Europe was another imperialist goal of the United States designed as anti communist campaign against the Soviet Union.

Ideological Incompatibility

George Kennan and John Foster Dulles, United States policy makers acknowledged that the Cold War was in its essence a war of idea (Paddington, 2003). There was a general consensus both in Washington and Moscow in relation to the observation of James F. Byrnes, United States Secretary of State, when he observed that “there is too much difference in the ideologies of the U.S and Russia to work out long-term programme of cooperation. Byrnes comment reinforces the fact that such scenario is a precursor to conflict. Within the context of the Cold War rhetoric the United States and the Soviet Union couched their ideology to depict the incompatibility as imperialistic, capitalist system and the atheistic communistic system respectively. It is not this set of core philosophical principles held by leaders and citizens alike are not ideal but commitment to an ideology are prone to perceive other ideologies as competitive or as challenges to their belief system which may at times cause hatred and hostility. Ideology according to Kegley and Wittkopf (2001) is “a of core philosophical principles that leaders and citizens collectively hold about politics, the interest of political actors, and the way people ought to ethically behave.” Undoubtedly, such assumptions were prevalent in Washington and Moscow as was witnessed in the West and East Blocs “when ideological differences made the Cold War a conflict not only between the two powerful states but also between two different social system” (Jervis, 1991)

Misperception

Pruitt and Rubin (1986) defined conflict “as a perceived divergence of interest” also International Alert (1996) holds that conflict is a perceived incompatibility of interest, values, needs, aim which may or may not be expressed in behaviour’. This a fundamental psychological factor which was preponderant in the Cold War. The superpowers had an ingrained misperception of each other’s motive that fertilized mistrust. When conflict parties imbibed mistrust they are prone to vilify the actions of the other party while they see theirs as virtue. Naturally, when this happens it is a precursor to conflict and hostility is inevitable. On the other hand, when the evil intentions of an adversary is assumed as truth, self fulfilling prophecy will be given birth to which may affect the future by the very way it is anticipated. This is the pivot on which the wheel of the Cold War arms race revolved. Kegley and Wittkopf (2001) were apt to describe it as “mistakenly fearing that a rival is preparing for an offensive war, a potential victim then arms in defense, thereby provoking the fearful rival to fulfill the prophecy by defensively building more weapons”. This attitude featured prominently during the Cold War when both superpowers imposed their perception of reality on events and were ultimately enslaved by their own vision.

At the latent stage of the Cold War, especially with the Soviet expansionist activities as a manifest national sense of insecurity, the West led by the United States and even Winston Churchill in his popular Iron Curtain speech titled Sinews of Peace allude to the Soviet Union as pursuing a world dominance agenda. Likewise, the Soviet Union saw the United States response to the very many crises as a ploy to ward off the Soviet Union and plans to encircle and destroy their socialist system. This misperception is a product of mistrust like Ronald Reagan, a cold War President of the United States observed “we don’t mistrust each other because we are armed, we are armed because we distrust each other’ which in turn bred conflict.

3.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF COLD WAR

The nature of the cold war featured certain overwhelming conflict properties that sustained war for five decade. The relations between lead nations of each of the Blocs (East and West) the Soviet Union and United States were characterized by suspicious, mutual distrust and misunderstanding and was extended to their allies. The absence of trust and compromise were so intense, and heightened the fear of outbreak of a Third World War as a direct consequent of the production of nuclear weapons and arms race. For instance, the United States have never ceased to express her fear and concern over the possible threat posed by the Soviet Union geopolitical expansionist tendencies and attempt at the introduction of communism throughout the world. Similarly, the Soviet Union was weary of the United States imperialist movement with capitalism and the attempt of stopping revolutionary activities in other countries.

There was no direct war in the execution of the Cold War. However, there were incidences of armed conflict where the superpowers were indirectly involved in terms of espionage, armed conflict through surrogates and against surrogates, through spies, traitors and undercover agents. The Korean War, Vietnam War and Soviet invasion of Afghanistan were among other wars that brought to the fore the tension between the two superpowers in an armed struggle by giving substantial support to their allies in terms of funding and supply of weapons. Furthermore, in the course of each bloc strategizing their conflict arsenal both the Soviet Union and the United States involved much of its peace time resource in developing strategic military technology as a form of deterrence and secret conflict through espionage. No doubt, the Soviet Union and the United State were preoccupied with the development and production of nuclear weapons and a lot of intelligence service agents lost their lives.

The prevailing circumstances became a puzzle and a thought provoking ironies for scholars of international relations, politics, history, and conflict Resolution demanding immediate explanation. The answer then as now, is that the mass production and

existence of weapons of mass destruction presupposes that wars could not be entered into arbitrarily and could only be deterred by the awareness of the capability of such destructive weapons. Deterrence through Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) was a salient feature of the Cold War in that the development and possession of nuclear weapon such as Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBN) deterred both powers from attacking each other. This is because, the Soviet Union and the United States were aware of the delicate balance that existed with each developing and possessing weapons of mass destruction that in a split seconds could make the planet earth inhabitable and reduce each other to nothing. Therefore, none of the leaders of the superpowers countries were insensitive enough to allow its army to embark on a suicide mission.

The period of military relaxation of tension often referred to as detente during in the late 1960s and early 1970s were characterized by several events which encouraged the superpowers to try to control the nuclear arms race and resolve some of the conflicts. Consequently, a new form of alliances emerged which altered the pattern international relations beyond the two clearly opposed blocs when less powerful sates began to assert their independence.

The Cold War manifested to an unprecedented arms races, with the, invention and development of an endless list of weapons both conventional and nuclear weapons which include but not limited to jet fighters, bombers, nuclear weapons, chemical and biological weapons, surface-to-air missiles, antiaircraft artillery, regular artillery, surface to surface missiles (including SRBMs and cruise missiles), intercontinental ballistic missiles (including IRBMs) anti ballistic missiles, armoured vehicles, riffles, rocket propelled grenades, anti tank weapons, submarines and anti submarines warfare, submarine launched ballistic missiles, electronic and signal intelligence, reconnaissance aircraft, spy satellites, etc.

The advancement in military technology was capital intensive in terms of manufacturing investments supported by the superpower. The Western Bloc was more favourably disposed to such investments and fielded weapons in many of these areas with superior effectiveness. This is because prior to the Cold War the United State enjoyed a robust economy and was ahead of all others in digital computers and technology

The Secret Services and Intelligences Agencies such as CIA (United States), KGB (Soviet Union) M16 (United Kingdom) BND (West Germany) and Stasi (East Germany) were solely responsible as the armies of these countries rarely had much participation in the Cold War. This is because the major world powers never entered into armed conflict overtly against each other. The Cold War strategies and mandates were often carried out by the secret service personnel in espionage who were either

civilian or military recruited on location or conscripted into the service. These personnel stand a great risk and were most vulnerable to extrajudicial killings or used as near prisoners of war when detected. Also, spy airplane and surveillance aircraft used for these kinds of assignment were shot down when suspected or detected.

The symbol of the Cold War struggle and hotspot of conflict was the city of Berlin in Germany. The Berlin wall represented the object of struggle, as it partitioned each of the power blocs. Berlin had a special status and was divided into four sectors occupied by the United States, Soviet Union, Britain, and France. Though, the city of Berlin was located within the heart of Soviet zone of occupation, the United States, Britain and France decided to merge their sector for economic development and convenience. Suffice it that, this merger and alliance may have contributed to the Soviet Union resolve to begin the Berlin Blockade.

One prominent feature of the Cold War strategy was the use of propaganda as a form of free information which gave a background to a buildup of tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States.

The Cold War periods was a movement of intense conflict to relative cooperation; reciprocity – when friendly initiative to one is reciprocated in kind, and action to reaction

As it were, both rivals were willing to shift their ideological positions whenever their national interests necessitate such inconsistency. Thus, the conflict progression between the United States and Soviet Union during the Cold displays a series of shifts between periods of conflict and cooperation. Each superpower's posture toward the other tended to be reciprocal, and, for most periods between 1945 and 1982, confrontation prevailed over cooperation (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2003).

Self Assessment Exercise

Critically examine the Cold War as a social conflict

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Cold War was not only a conflict of interest, ideology, and misperception, it was also a geopolitical conflict which was a product of international consequences of the socio – economic constitution of the Soviet power and the way it related to the world and expanded. The source of the geopolitical conflict is located in ideological preferences of each superpower like the economic conflict located in the Cold War conflict of interest. Furthermore, there was also the internal socio-economic conflict within each superpower bloc though in varying degrees which also dictated the tempo

of the external Cold War conflict. This point becomes more salient when considered in relation to the collapse of the Soviet Union as a result of domestic economic pressure it faced that brought about the decisive end of the Cold War.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the origin of the term Cold War with reference to some definitions and how it evolved and locate it within the purview of social conflict. The unit discussed the character of the Cold War in its variation. The character becomes more visible when we inspect the superpower relations and motives. The unit specifically discussed and defined the various typologies of Cold War conflicts as social conflict. Also, in this unit, we provided some intrinsic sociological, geopolitical and economic account of the Cold War conflict situations and the various responses.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

- 1 Discuss the Cold War in terms of its character?
- 2 Conflict is inevitable, was the cold war inevitable? If so, why and how, Discuss

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn, Glenn (1989) *The West and the World Since 1945* 2nd edition New York: St. Martins Press

Collins English Dictionary – Complete and unabridged (2003) Harper Collins Publishers.

Collins, Randall (1991) “Conflict Theory and the Advance of Macro-Historical Sociology” in G. Ritzer (ed) *Frontiers of Social Theory, The new Synthesis*. New York: Free Press

Coser, Lewis (1956). *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press

Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, (2005). United States Department of Defence

Gaddis, John Lewis (2005). *The Cold War: A New History*. Penguin Press. Halle Louis J. (1967), *The Cold War As History*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Kegley, W Charles and Wittkopf Eugene R. (2001) *World Politics: Trend and Transformation* 8th edition New York: Bedford/St. Martin's

Nye, Joseph S. (2003), *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*. New York: Longman.

Paddington, Arch, (2003), *Broadcasting Freedom: The Cold War Triumph of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*. Kentucky: University Press of Kentucky.

UNIT 3

IRON CURTAIN

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 What is Iron Curtain
 - 3.2 Iron Curtain: Origin and Nature
 - 3.3 Cold War Iron Curtain
 - 3.4 "The Sinews of Peace" by Winston Churchill
 - 3.5 Fall of Iron Curtain
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Cold War put the world on a dangerous course and the spending of billions of dollars in the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. That was really a sad time in the history of man. Many people, mostly young people lost their life in the attempt to escape to the West. There was no freedom in the Iron Curtain countries. The term Iron curtain became synonymous with the Cold War divisions in Europe. This unit attempts to highlight the origin and nature of the iron curtain and use in literature, theatre and by Winston Churchill's "Sinews of Peace".

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, students will

- Develop a basic understanding of the term Iron curtain
- Become familiar with the origin and various natures with their usage.
- Be able to examine the significance of the iron curtain as a symbol pf Cold War division
- Identify the content and context of Winston Churchill's Sinew's of Peace also known as iron curtain speech
- Improve their ability to synthesize information and think critically as they reflect on the actions and reactions in relations to the Iron curtain speech as the beginning of the Cold War
- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 WHAT IS IRON CURTAIN

According to Robert Wilde, the term iron curtain is the “description of the physical, ideological and military division of Europe between the western and southern capitalist states and the eastern, Soviet dominated communist nations during the Cold War, 1945 – 1991”. The term "iron curtain" described the antagonism between the Soviet Union and the West. The phrase received wider circulation after the March 5th 1946 speech by Winston Churchill to reveal the harsh and 'impenetrable' nature of the divide, when he stated:

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of central and eastern Europe Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in the Soviet sphere and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a high and increasing measure of control from Moscow. (Winston Churchill, 1946)

The above quotation were part of a speech by British war time Prime Minister Winston Churchill delivered in Missouri in March, 1946 calling United States and British people to help preserve the peace that the allies won. The word iron curtain were prominent in that speech to describe the emerging precarious era that would defined international relation and politics after World War II. The United States and its western allies began a struggle that lasted for about five decades to contain Soviet expansion and spread of communism fostered by the Soviet Union. Prior to the defeat of Germany in the World War II, the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union were allies against a common enemy Adolf Hitler of Germany and had met to chart a new course of post war Europe. They were able to partition Europe, which boundaries were later adjusted by the position of each country's troops on the ground when the war in Europe ended in May, 1945.

Iron Curtain is a term used to describe the boundary that separated the Warsaw Pact countries from the NATO countries from about 1945 until the end of the Cold War in 1991. The Iron Curtain was both a physical and an ideological division that represented the way Europe was viewed after World War II. To the east of the Iron Curtain were the countries that were connected to or influenced by the former Soviet Union. This included part of Germany (East Germany), Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania (until 1960 when it aligned with China). While Yugoslavia was Communist politically it was not considered to be a part of the Eastern Bloc or behind the Iron Curtain. Josip Broz Tito, the president of Yugoslavia at the time, was able to maintain access with the west while leading a communist

country. The other countries to the west of the Iron Curtain had democratic governments.

3.2 IRON CURTAIN: ORIGIN AND NATURE

Iron curtain as a term was used earlier in literature and politics before the famous Winston Churchill's "Sinews of Peace" speech. In pre Cold War usage, the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sofa 38b as a reputed reference to an iron barrier or divide connoting that "even an iron barrier cannot separate Israel from their heavenly father. Extant literature suggests that Queen Elisabeth of the Belgians was the first to coin the term to describe the political scenario between Belgium and Germany in 1914, after World War I. The first account of the term in literature, was derived from the safety curtains used in theatres and Ethel Snowlen, first applied it to Communist Russia border as an impenetrable barrier in her book *Through Bolshevik Russia* 1920. Also... the western sky was a blaze of yellow flame. The iron curtain was down" were used in 1933 satirical novel to narrate the way an artillery barrage protected the infantry from an enemy assault. Sebastian Haffner, used it as a metaphor in his introductory discussion of the Rise to Power by the Nazi Germany in 1933. In German theatres *eisirner vorhang* or iron curtain was obligatory precaution to prevent the possibility of fire from spreading from the stage to the rest of the theatre. Incidents of fire were prevalent because the decor were highly inflammable, thus, a mental wall is erected to separate the stage from the theatre.

"Behind the Iron Curtain" is the title of 1943 article published in signal a Nazi propaganda periodical, its focus was' the iron curtain that more than ever before separates the world from Soviet Union. Joseph Goebbels, the German Minister of propaganda, predicted in a weekly newspaper *Das Reich* that " an iron curtain would fall over this enormous territory controlled by the Soviet Union, behind which nations would be slaughtered" as an outcome of the Yalta Agreement between Stalin, Roosevelt and Winston Churchill. In the Soviet context, the first oral mention of the term iron curtain was credited to a broadcast made by Schwerin Von Krosigk on 2 May, 1945 to the German people stating that "in the east the iron curtain behind which, unseen by the eyes of the world, the work of destruction goes on, is moving steadily forward'.

Prior to his popular speech at Missouri, Churchill had repeatedly used the term iron curtain in his telegram to President Truman in 1945. The theme of message was in the manner of pretest against United States retreat to what was earlier designated and the possible outcome of military withdrawal warning that Soviet power into the heart of western Europe and the descent of an iron curtain between United States and

everything to the eastward” Also, at the Potsdam Conference, he complained of an iron fence coming down upon the British mission in Budapest to Stalin. At the British House of Common, in an address to members on 16 August, 1945, he stated that “it is not impossible that tragedy in a prodigious scale is unfolding itself behind the iron curtain, which at the moment divide Europe in twain” (Hansard - House of Common, 1945).

In the United States, the term had a relative usage except its reference in the *New York Times* in relation to its usage by Vladimir Macek, a Yugoslav opposition leader who fled his home country, in narration to Sulzberger while interned by the Germans in Croatia.

During the Cold War era, the term iron curtain received prominence when it underscored the theme buried deep is a public speech by Winston Churchill, a war time British Prime Minister. Churchill’s usage does not assume its earlier connotation to refer to the actual mental barrier that split the continent into two as it later usage depicts the ideological barriers. The term best describe the boundary that separate the Warsaw Pact countries from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) countries from the beginning to the end of the Cold War (1945-1991). The term connotes both a physical and ideological leaning that permeates Europe and how it was viewed after World War II unto imperialist and capitalist regime on the hand, al the communist and progressive world on the other. While the iron curtain became physical the moment the Berlin wall was created to separate the East and the West.

3.3 COLD WAR IRON CURTAIN

The Cold War iron curtain was actually both physical and ideological. While there was the idea of ideology separating the world. The iron curtain become physical the moment the Berlin Wall was created, thus separating East and West.

To put ourselves back in these times, we must recall that soviet army had overran Poland and advanced into Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Eastern Germany including East Berlin. The Soviet Union introduced communism as it sought to increase security by controlling the internal affairs of countries that bordered it. The activities of the Soviet Union poses dangerous threat to the United States and the western allies that desired a security system in which democratic government were established as widely as possible.

According to Churchill, the Soviets were intent on pursuing their historical dreams of empire by installing autocratic communist regime answerable to Moscow wherever they could. “This is certainly not the liberated Europe we fought to build up... Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace”, he warned.

Much of the countries in Eastern and part of central Europe except West Germany, Switzerland and Austria were under the Soviet Union hegemony. The Soviet Union annexed Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Eastern Poland, part of Eastern Finland, Northern Romania as Soviet Socialist Republics within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Soviet Union converted German Democratic Republic, Peoples Republic of Bulgaria, Peoples Republic of Poland, Peoples Republic of Hungary, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the Peoples Republic of Romania and the Republic of Albania into satellite states where communist Soviet installed government rule. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was the only Eastern bloc countries that retained its full independence. The country states of the Eastern Bloc of the iron curtain developed their own international economic and military alliances such as Comecon and the Warsaw Pact.

The countries in the western, northern and southern Europe, including West Germany, Austria and Lichenstein that operated open market economics and domestics government. Most countries to the west of the iron curtain exuding neutral Switzerland, Austria, Sweden, Finland and Ireland, allied themselves with the United States and Canada to form the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alongside the Europe Free Trade Association. In addition, most of the nominally neutral countries had economic affiliation with the United States than they were to the Warsaw Pact.

Some events such as the Marshall Plan, Berlin blockade and air lift and the coup de tat in Czechoslovakia depicts further Cold War division inside the iron curtain. The Soviet leader, Joseph Stalin’s strong opposition to the post war comprehensive recovery programme designed by the United States to offer economic assistance to willing European nation including the Soviet Union and those of eastern Europe depicts a remarkable reinforcement of its protective belt over Soviet controlled nations and what the iron curtain stands for in the Cold War. Though, borne out of Stalin’s apprehension over the United States interest in terms of political, cultural and economic penetration, forbade Soviet eastern bloc countries from accepting Marshall Plan in the guise of the newly formed cominform. The Soviet Union went further to cut of surface road access to Berlin, popularly known as the Berlin blockade, to cut off all supplies in term of food, water and other sundry goods for the citizen of non-Soviet sector of Berlin. Berlin, a German city was a Soviet occupied territory and the only option to subvert the blockade was through limited air corridor. The United States,

Britain, France and other countries launched a campaign for massive aerial supply to the non Soviet sectors of Berlin. The Soviet Union lifted the Berlin blockade in 1949 as a result of the success of the aerial supply.

One fundamental and contentious issue in the Cold War was immigration restriction from East to West symbolic of the iron curtain. The implementation of emigration restrictions during the Cold War stopped most migration between East –West which were predominantly from Soviet occupied eastern Europe countries to the West. However, between 1950 and 1990 those granted permission to migrate did so under the bilateral agreement for ethnic migration. For instances, most Soviets allowed to leave during this period were ethnic Jews permitted to emigrate to Israel after a series of embarrassing defections in 1970 made the Soviet Union to open limited ethnic emigration (Krasnov, 1985)

Perhaps, one of the main characteristics of the iron curtain countries is that the people in those countries were completely shut off from the west.

The physical shape of the iron curtain was in the form of border defenses between the countries of Western and Eastern Europe. The border area were restricted with heavy military presence notable among the border defense was the inner German border commonly known as *die Grenze* in German – between East and West Germany. The inner German border were designed in different design to cater for their peculiar need, for example, in the rural areas, there were double fence made of steel mesh with sharp edges, while near urban areas a higher concrete barrier similar to the Berlin walls. the barriers were erected in at least a short distance inside East German territory to avoid encroachment into the western territory. The area had several guard post and signs with numerous watch towers set behind the barrier, the access to the area were strictly at personal risk because of the constant surveillance by border guards. The civilian and armed guard death toll at the border ran into several hundred as a result of common shooting incident.

Apart from these, elsewhere along the border between West and East the defense arrangements were like the intra-German border. During the period, the barrier in the Hungarian axis began at least 15kilometer before the border, movement was highly restricted as only citizens with valid passport for travelling out and resident of that area require special permission to enter the area with 5kilometres of the border. The defense wall were heavily fortified with a double barb wire fence, space laden with land mines which were later replaced with a electric signal fence, guard towers and a sand strip to track border violations.

The term, iron curtain was peculiar to the fortified borders in central Europe, because it was not used to describe similar border between Communist and Capitalist states of

Asia. Though, the border line between North and South Korea could be compared with the former inner German border, especially, in terms of the militarisation, but it has never been conventionally considered as part of iron curtain. Rather, when China fell to Mao Tse-tung Communist in 1949, the metaphor change to bamboo curtain.

3.4 "THE SINEWS OF PEACE" BY WINSTON CHURCHILL

I am glad to come to Westminster College this afternoon, and am complimented that you should give me a degree. The name "Westminster" is somehow familiar to me. I seem to have heard of it before. Indeed, it was at Westminster that I received a very large part of my education in politics, dialectic, rhetoric, and one or two other things. In fact we have both been educated at the same, or similar, or, at any rate, kindred establishments.

It is also an honour, perhaps almost unique, for a private visitor to be introduced to an academic audience by the President of the United States. Amid his heavy burdens, duties, and responsibilities - unsought but not recoiled from - the President has travelled a thousand miles to dignify and magnify our meeting here to-day and to give me an opportunity of addressing this kindred nation, as well as my own countrymen across the ocean, and perhaps some other countries too. The President has told you that it is his wish, as I am sure it is yours, that I should have full liberty to give my true and faithful counsel in these anxious and baffling times. I shall certainly avail myself of this freedom, and feel the more right to do so because any private ambitions I may have cherished in my younger days have been satisfied beyond my wildest dreams. Let me, however, make it clear that I have no official mission or status of any kind, and that I speak only for myself. There is nothing here but what you see.

I can therefore allow my mind, with the experience of a lifetime, to play over the problems which beset us on the morrow of our absolute victory in arms, and to try to make sure with what strength I have that what has been gained with so much sacrifice and suffering shall be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.

The United States stands at this time at the pinnacle of world power. It is a solemn moment for the American Democracy. For with primacy in power is also joined an awe-inspiring accountability to the future. If you look around you, you must feel not only the sense of duty done but also you must feel anxiety lest you fall below the level of achievement. Opportunity is here now, clear and shining for both our countries. To reject it or ignore it or fritter it away will bring upon us all the long reproaches of the after-time. It is necessary that constancy of mind, persistency of purpose, and the grand simplicity of decision shall guide and rule the conduct of the English-speaking

peoples in peace as they did in war. We must, and I believe we shall, prove ourselves equal to this severe requirement.

When American military men approach some serious situation they are wont to write at the head of their directive the words "over-all strategic concept." There is wisdom in this, as it leads to clarity of thought. What then is the over-all strategic concept which we should inscribe today? It is nothing less than the safety and welfare, the freedom and progress, of all the homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands. And here I speak particularly of the myriad cottage or apartment homes where the wage-earner strives amid the accidents and difficulties of life to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord, or upon ethical conceptions which often play their potent part.

To give security to these countless homes, they must be shielded from the two giant marauders, war and tyranny. We all know the frightful disturbances in which the ordinary family is plunged when the curse of war swoops down upon the breadwinner and those for whom he works and contrives. The awful ruin of Europe, with all its vanished glories, and of large parts of Asia glares us in the eyes. When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty States dissolve over large areas the frame of civilised society, humble folk are confronted with difficulties with which they cannot cope. For them all is distorted, all is broken, even ground to pulp.

When I stand here this quiet afternoon I shudder to visualise what is actually happening to millions now and what is going to happen in this period when famine stalks the earth. None can compute what has been called "the unestimated sum of human pain." Our supreme task and duty is to guard the homes of the common people from the horrors and miseries of another war. We are all agreed on that.

Our American military colleagues, after having proclaimed their "over-all strategic concept" and computed available resources, always proceed to the next step - namely, the method. Here again there is widespread agreement. A world organisation has already been erected for the prime purpose of preventing war, UNO, the successor of the League of Nations, with the decisive addition of the United States and all that that means, is already at work. We must make sure that its work is fruitful, that it is a reality and not a sham, that it is a force for action, and not merely a frothing of words, that it is a true temple of peace in which the shields of many nations can some day be hung up, and not merely a cockpit in a Tower of Babel. Before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation we must be certain that our temple is built, not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock. Anyone can see with his eyes open that our path will be difficult and also long, but if we persevere together as we did in the two world wars - though not, alas, in the interval between them - I cannot doubt that we shall achieve our common purpose in the end.

I have, however, a definite and practical proposal to make for action. Courts and magistrates may be set up but they cannot function without sheriffs and constables. The United Nations Organization must immediately begin to be equipped with an international armed force. In such a matter we can only go step by step, but we must begin now. I propose that each of the Powers and States should be invited to delegate a certain number of air squadrons to the service of the world organization. These squadrons would be trained and prepared in their own countries, but would move around in rotation from one country to another. They would wear the uniform of their own countries but with different badges. They would not be required to act against their own nation, but in other respects they would be directed by the world organization. This might be started on a modest scale and would grow as confidence grew. I wished to see this done after the First World War, and I devoutly trust it may be done forthwith.

It would nevertheless be wrong and imprudent to entrust the secret knowledge or experience of the atomic bomb, which the United States, Great Britain, and Canada now share, to the world organisation, while it is still in its infancy. It would be criminal madness to cast it adrift in this still agitated and un-united world. No one in any country has slept less well in their beds because this knowledge and the method and the raw materials to apply it, are at present largely retained in American hands. I do not believe we should all have slept so soundly had the positions been reversed and if some Communist or neo-Fascist State monopolised for the time being these dread agencies. The fear of them alone might easily have been used to enforce totalitarian systems upon the free democratic world, with consequences appalling to human imagination. God has willed that this shall not be and we have at least a breathing space to set our house in order before this peril has to be encountered: and even then, if no effort is spared, we should still possess so formidable a superiority as to impose effective deterrents upon its employment, or threat of employment, by others. Ultimately, when the essential brotherhood of man is truly embodied and expressed in a world organisation with all the necessary practical safeguards to make it effective, these powers would naturally be confided to that world organisation.

Now I come to the second danger of these two marauders which threatens the cottage, the home, and the ordinary people - namely, tyranny. We cannot be blind to the fact that the liberties enjoyed by individual citizens throughout the British Empire are not valid in a considerable number of countries, some of which are very powerful. In these States control is enforced upon the common people by various kinds of all-embracing police governments. The power of the State is exercised without restraint, either by dictators or by compact oligarchies operating through a privileged party and a political police. It is not our duty at this time when difficulties are so numerous to interfere forcibly in the internal affairs of countries which we have not conquered in war. But

we must never cease to proclaim in fearless tones the great principles of freedom and the rights of man which are the joint inheritance of the English-speaking world and which through Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus, trial by jury, and the English common law find their most famous expression in the American Declaration of Independence.

All this means that the people of any country have the right, and should have the power by constitutional action, by free unfettered elections, with secret ballot, to choose or change the character or form of government under which they dwell; that freedom of speech and thought should reign; that courts of justice, independent of the executive, unbiased by any party, should administer laws which have received the broad assent of large majorities or are consecrated by time and custom. Here are the title deeds of freedom which should lie in every cottage home. Here is the message of the British and American peoples to mankind. Let us preach what we practise - let us practise what we preach.

I have now stated the two great dangers which menace the homes of the people: War and Tyranny. I have not yet spoken of poverty and privation which are in many cases the prevailing anxiety. But if the dangers of war and tyranny are removed, there is no doubt that science and co-operation can bring in the next few years to the world, certainly in the next few decades newly taught in the sharpening school of war, an expansion of material well-being beyond anything that has yet occurred in human experience. Now, at this sad and breathless moment, we are plunged in the hunger and distress which are the aftermath of our stupendous struggle; but this will pass and may pass quickly, and there is no reason except human folly of sub-human crime which should deny to all the nations the inauguration and enjoyment of an age of plenty. I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago from a great Irish-American orator, a friend of mine, Mr. Bourke Cockran. "There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace." So far I feel that we are in full agreement.

Now, while still pursuing the method of realising our overall strategic concept, I come to the crux of what I have travelled here to say. Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organisation will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English-speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire and the United States. This is no time for generalities, and I will venture to be precise. Fraternal association requires not only the growing friendship and mutual understanding between our two vast but kindred systems of society, but the continuance of the intimate relationship between our military advisers, leading to common study of potential dangers, the

similarity of weapons and manuals of instructions, and to the interchange of officers and cadets at technical colleges. It should carry with it the continuance of the present facilities for mutual security by the joint use of all Naval and Air Force bases in the possession of either country all over the world. This would perhaps double the mobility of the American Navy and Air Force. It would greatly expand that of the British Empire Forces and it might well lead, if and as the world calms down, to important financial savings. Already we use together a large number of islands; more may well be entrusted to our joint care in the near future.

The United States has already a Permanent Defence Agreement with the Dominion of Canada, which is so devotedly attached to the British Commonwealth and Empire. This Agreement is more effective than many of those which have often been made under formal alliances. This principle should be extended to all British Commonwealths with full reciprocity. Thus, whatever happens, and thus only, shall we be secure ourselves and able to work together for the high and simple causes that are dear to us and bode no ill to any. Eventually there may come - I feel eventually there will come - the principle of common citizenship, but that we may be content to leave to destiny, whose outstretched arm many of us can already clearly see.

There is however an important question we must ask ourselves. Would a special relationship between the United States and the British Commonwealth be inconsistent with our over-riding loyalties to the World Organisation? I reply that, on the contrary, it is probably the only means by which that organisation will achieve its full stature and strength. There are already the special United States relations with Canada which I have just mentioned, and there are the special relations between the United States and the South American Republics. We British have our twenty years Treaty of Collaboration and Mutual Assistance with Soviet Russia. I agree with Mr. Bevin, the Foreign Secretary of Great Britain, that it might well be a fifty years Treaty so far as we are concerned. We aim at nothing but mutual assistance and collaboration. The British have an alliance with Portugal unbroken since 1384, and which produced fruitful results at critical moments in the late war. None of these clash with the general interest of a world agreement, or a world organisation; on the contrary they help it. "In my father's house are many mansions." Special associations between members of the United Nations which have no aggressive point against any other country, which harbour no design incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations, far from being harmful, are beneficial and, as I believe, indispensable.

I spoke earlier of the Temple of Peace. Workmen from all countries must build that temple. If two of the workmen know each other particularly well and are old friends, if their families are inter-mingled, and if they have "faith in each other's purpose, hope in each other's future and charity towards each other's shortcomings" - to quote some

good words I read here the other day - why cannot they work together at the common task as friends and partners? Why cannot they share their tools and thus increase each other's working powers? Indeed they must do so or else the temple may not be built, or, being built, it may collapse, and we shall all be proved again unteachable and have to go and try to learn again for a third time in a school of war, incomparably more rigorous than that from which we have just been released. The dark ages may return, the Stone Age may return on the gleaming wings of science, and what might now shower immeasurable material blessings upon mankind, may even bring about its total destruction. Beware, I say; time may be short. Do not let us take the course of allowing events to drift along until it is too late. If there is to be a fraternal association of the kind I have described, with all the extra strength and security which both our countries can derive from it, let us make sure that that great fact is known to the world, and that it plays its part in steadying and stabilising the foundations of peace. There is the path of wisdom. Prevention is better than cure.

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organisation intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytising tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and goodwill in Britain - and I doubt not here also - towards the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs in establishing lasting friendships. We understand the Russian need to be secure on her western frontiers by the removal of all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We welcome her flag upon the seas. Above all, we welcome constant, frequent and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty however, for I am sure you would wish me to state the facts as I see them to you, to place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in many cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow. Athens alone - Greece with its immortal glories - is free to decide its future at an election under British, American and French observation. The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed-of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which

were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

Turkey and Persia are both profoundly alarmed and disturbed at the claims which are being made upon them and at the pressure being exerted by the Moscow Government. An attempt is being made by the Russians in Berlin to build up a quasi-Communist party in their zone of Occupied Germany by showing special favours to groups of left-wing German leaders. At the end of the fighting last June, the American and British Armies withdrew westwards, in accordance with an earlier agreement, to a depth at some points of 150 miles upon a front of nearly four hundred miles, in order to allow our Russian allies to occupy this vast expanse of territory which the Western Democracies had conquered.

If now the Soviet Government tries, by separate action, to build up a pro-Communist Germany in their areas, this will cause new serious difficulties in the British and American zones, and will give the defeated Germans the power of putting themselves up to auction between the Soviets and the Western Democracies. Whatever conclusions may be drawn from these facts - and facts they are - this is certainly not the Liberated Europe we fought to build up. Nor is it one which contains the essentials of permanent peace.

The safety of the world requires a new unity in Europe, from which no nation should be permanently outcast. It is from the quarrels of the strong parent races in Europe that the world wars we have witnessed, or which occurred in former times, have sprung. Twice in our own lifetime we have seen the United States, against their wishes and their traditions, against arguments, the force of which it is impossible not to comprehend, drawn by irresistible forces, into these wars in time to secure the victory of the good cause, but only after frightful slaughter and devastation had occurred. Twice the United States has had to send several millions of its young men across the Atlantic to find the war; but now war can find any nation, wherever it may dwell between dusk and dawn. Surely we should work with conscious purpose for a grand pacification of Europe, within the structure of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. That I feel is an open cause of policy of very great importance.

In front of the iron curtain which lies across Europe are other causes for anxiety. In Italy the Communist Party is seriously hampered by having to support the Communist-trained Marshal Tito's claims to former Italian territory at the head of the Adriatic. Nevertheless the future of Italy hangs in the balance. Again one cannot imagine a regenerated Europe without a strong France. All my public life I have worked for a strong France and I never lost faith in her destiny, even in the darkest

hours. I will not lose faith now. However, in a great number of countries, far from the Russian frontiers and throughout the world, Communist fifth columns are established and work in complete unity and absolute obedience to the directions they receive from the Communist centre. Except in the British Commonwealth and in the United States where Communism is in its infancy, the Communist parties or fifth columns constitute a growing challenge and peril to Christian civilisation. These are sombre facts for anyone to have to recite on the morrow of a victory gained by so much splendid comradeship in arms and in the cause of freedom and democracy; but we should be most unwise not to face them squarely while time remains.

The outlook is also anxious in the Far East and especially in Manchuria. The Agreement which was made at Yalta, to which I was a party, was extremely favourable to Soviet Russia, but it was made at a time when no one could say that the German war might not extend all through the summer and autumn of 1945 and when the Japanese war was expected to last for a further 18 months from the end of the German war. In this country you are all so well-informed about the Far East, and such devoted friends of China, that I do not need to expatiate on the situation there.

I have felt bound to portray the shadow which, alike in the west and in the east, falls upon the world. I was a high minister at the time of the Versailles Treaty and a close friend of Mr. Lloyd-George, who was the head of the British delegation at Versailles. I did not myself agree with many things that were done, but I have a very strong impression in my mind of that situation, and I find it painful to contrast it with that which prevails now. In those days there were high hopes and unbounded confidence that the wars were over, and that the League of Nations would become all-powerful. I do not see or feel that same confidence or even the same hopes in the haggard world at the present time.

On the other hand I repulse the idea that a new war is inevitable; still more that it is imminent. It is because I am sure that our fortunes are still in our own hands and that we hold the power to save the future, that I feel the duty to speak out now that I have the occasion and the opportunity to do so. I do not believe that Soviet Russia desires war. What they desire is the fruits of war and the indefinite expansion of their power and doctrines. But what we have to consider here to-day while time remains, is the permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries. Our difficulties and dangers will not be removed by closing our eyes to them. They will not be removed by mere waiting to see what happens; nor will they be removed by a policy of appeasement. What is needed is a settlement, and the longer this is delayed, the more difficult it will be and the greater our dangers will become.

From what I have seen of our Russian friends and Allies during the war, I am convinced that there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness. For that reason the old doctrine of a balance of power is unsound. We cannot afford, if we can help it, to work on narrow margins, offering temptations to a trial of strength. If the Western Democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter, their influence for furthering those principles will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. If however, they become divided or falter in their duty and if these all-important years are allowed to slip away then indeed catastrophe may overwhelm us all. Last time I saw it all coming and cried aloud to my own fellow-countrymen and to the world, but no one paid any attention. Up till the year 1933 or even 1935, Germany might have been saved from the awful fate which has overtaken her and we might all have been spared the miseries Hitler let loose upon mankind. There never was a war in all history easier to prevent by timely action than the one which has just desolated such great areas of the globe. It could have been prevented in my belief without the firing of a single shot, and Germany might be powerful, prosperous and honoured to-day; but no one would listen and one by one we were all sucked into the awful whirlpool. We surely must not let that happen again. This can only be achieved by reaching now, in 1946, a good understanding on all points with Russia under the general authority of the United Nations Organisation and by the maintenance of that good understanding through many peaceful years, by the world instrument, supported by the whole strength of the English-speaking world and all its connections. There is the solution which I respectfully offer to you in this Address to which I have given the title "The Sinews of Peace."

Let no man underrate the abiding power of the British Empire and Commonwealth. Because you see the 46 millions in our island harassed about their food supply, of which they only grow one half, even in war-time, or because we have difficulty in restarting our industries and export trade after six years of passionate war effort, do not suppose that we shall not come through these dark years of privation as we have come through the glorious years of agony, or that half a century from now, you will not see 70 or 80 millions of Britons spread about the world and united in defence of our traditions, our way of life, and of the world causes which you and we espouse. If the population of the English-speaking Commonwealths be added to that of the United States with all that such co-operation implies in the air, on the sea, all over the globe and in science and in industry, and in moral force, there will be no quivering, precarious balance of power to offer its temptation to ambition or adventure. On the contrary, there will be an overwhelming assurance of security. If we adhere faithfully to the Charter of the United Nations and walk forward in sedate and sober strength seeking no one's land or treasure, seeking to lay no arbitrary control upon the thoughts of men; if all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your

own in fraternal association, the high-roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time, but for a century to come.

The text of Sir Winston Churchill's "The Sinews of Peace" speech is quoted in its entirety from Robert Rhodes James (ed.), *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches 1897-1963* Volume VII: 1943-1949 (New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1974).

Our copious reproduction and citation of Winston Churchill's "famous Sinews of Peace speech" is not at all gratuitous rather it reinforces the surprised revelation of an iron curtain which became a clarion call for the United States and the West that was hitherto extremely grateful for the proactive role of the Soviet Union in ending the World War II. And, the significant twist that changed the way the democratic West viewed the Communist East that precipitated the beginning of the Cold War.

.

3.5 FALL OF IRON CURTAIN

Several events revealed that the free world is winning the Cold War and the dangers of a Third World War has decreased, and the spread of communism has been arrested, signs of strain and defiance are evident and cracks are opening in the iron curtain notably in the Soviet sphere of the Cold War geography. For instance, the Soviet Union jettisoned its intervention in Eastern Bloc politics because of the prevailing economic depression and political stagnation. This new posture is in defiance to the Brezhnev Doctrine which held that if a socialist state were threatened in any state then other socialist governments had an obligation to intervene to preserve it, in favor of the Sinatra Doctrine (Crampton, 1997). In Poland and Hungary, anti-communist candidates won a striking victory, the victory preceded a series of peaceful anti-communist revolutions in central and eastern Europe, that led to the complete collapse of communism. In Hungary, the border guard were unable to intervene in a mass exodus of people across the iron curtain as they fled into Austria. Also, in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania experienced mass protest against the communist regime, the government relaxed border restrictions and new regulations which saw tens of thousands of East Berliners flood checkpoints during the iron curtains. November 9, 1989, remains the best date for the end of the Cold War when the iron curtain was ripped open in Berlin. Eastern European nations were pecking from behind the iron curtains and people were literally dancing.

Exactly forty six years after Churchill announced to the world from the same Westminster College that an iron curtain had descended over Europe, on May 6, 1992, he announced the end of iron curtain.

Self Assessment Exercise

Examine the iron curtain antagonism as the beginning of the Cold War

4.0 CONCLUSION

Starting with the original use of iron curtain to describe an anti – fire device fitted into theatres, this engaging volume tells the story of how the term developed into a powerful metaphor that shaped the world for decade before the onset of Cold War. The term captures a particular way of thought about the world that long pre-date the Cold War and did not disappear with the fall of the Berlin wall or the collapse of the Soviet Union. The iron curtain depicts a long conflict history of the Cold War’s most evocative metaphor. The unit traces the history of the term long before Churchill famous Fulton speech of 1946. The iron curtain somewhat protected the more isolated eastern bloc from invaders. Perhaps, one of the main characteristics of the iron curtain countries is that the people in these countries were completely shut off from the West. Many people, mostly young people lost their life in the attempt to escape to the west. There was no freedom in the iron curtain countries for their people lived under varying degrees of repression.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed what is iron curtain? origin and nature of iron curtain as anti fire devise in theatre and as a symbol of division of Europe after the World War II. The unit specifically discussed Winston Churchill’s popular iron curtain speech titled “Sinews of Peace” as a wake-up call to the United States and Britain to contain the spread of communism and the extension of Soviet influence in East –central Europe. Also, the unit discussed the fall of the iron contain as the end of the Cold Wall and collapse of Communism and the Soviet Union.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

- 1 What is the relation of Winston Churchill’s Sinews of Peace to iron curtain
- 2 The iron curtain was a symbol of division in the Cold War Europe, discuss?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Cohen, J.M and M. J Cohen (1996) *New Penguin Dictionary of Quotations*
Penguin Books

Crampton, R.J (1997), *Eastern Europe in the Twentieth Century and After*. New
York: Routledge

Goebbels, Joseph (1945) “Das Jahr 2000” *Das Reich*

Hansard House of Common (1945), Vol. 413

Krasnov, Vladislav (1985), *Soviet Defectors: the KGB Wanted List*. Hoover Press

Robert, Rhodes James (1974) (ed.), *Winston S. Churchill: His Complete Speeches
1897-1963* Volume VII: 1943-1949 (New York: Chelsea House Publishers.

Wilde, Robert () “Iron Curtain

\

\

UNIT 4 BERLIN BLOCKADE AND AIRLIFT

CONTENT

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Causes of the Berlin Blockade
 - 3.2 The Berlin Airlift
 - 3.2.1 Black Friday
 - 3.2.2 Operation Little Vittles
 - 3.2.3 The Easter Parade
 - 3.3 Soviet Responses
 - 3.4 The Blockade Ends
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Berlin Blockade was a clear manifestation of distrust and open hostility in diplomatic relation between the United States led western powers and the Soviet Union led eastern bloc since the end of and indeed during the Second World War. No doubt, the Cold War was already a firm feature of the political landscape- ideology, diplomacy and military alliance, the Berlin Blockade represents the first open conflict. The Soviet decided to close all rail traffic from West to East Berlin on 24 June, 1948, to prevent supplies to the three western sectors of Berlin, with a civilian population of about 2,500,000 people. The western sector of Berlin became dependent on reserve stocks and airlifted supplies. The blockade and airlift has been acclaimed as one of the most ruthless strategy in contemporary civilization to use mass starvation for political coercion. Berlin was located 100 miles inside the Soviet occupation zone. The Soviet zone produced much of Germany's food supply, while the territory of the British and American zones had to rely on food imports even before the war. Prior to the airlift when the Soviet introduced new measures on 25 March 1948 to restrict Western military and passenger traffic between the American, British and French occupation zones and Berlin. The British General Clay started the first airlift of supplies to the military garrison known as Little Lift on 2 April 1948 and stopped all military train. Though, the Berlin blockade was intended to force negotiations over the division and future of Germany it rather provoked fear of armed conflict. This led to the formation of military alliance as it accelerated the creation of the North Atlantic Treaty

Organization, an American-Western European military alliance. However, the United States led West response to the blockade proved that the Soviet blockade was totally ineffective.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After reading this unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the Berlin Blockade;
- The causes of the Berlin blockade;
- The significance of the airlift operation, and
- Understand the conflict behavior and decaying diplomatic relation in the Cold War

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 CAUSES OF THE BERLIN BLOCKADE

The city of Berlin like the rest of Germany was divided among the post war four superpowers, the Soviet Union on the one side and the trizone made up of the United States, Britain and France. The Berlin blockade was a fundamental phenomenon in the Cold War and re-emphasized the different objectives of the superpowers for Germany. The main cause of the Berlin Blockade was the Cold War, which was just getting started.

All superpower occupiers were apprehensive about the future of a reborn and rearmed unified Germany which could once again alter world peace especially in Europe. Besides, one important factor then was how communist Russia perceived a unified and capitalist West Germany as an allied of the United States, which could be a major threat to Soviet interest, control and ultimately destabilize the communist east. For the western allies, a unified West Germany fully integrated into pan-European economic and defense organizations was capable of supporting itself and to keep it under control to guarantee world peace.

At the 1945 post war conference at Potsdam near Berlin, the emergent super powers namely the Soviet Union, United States, Britain and France could not reach an agreement on the future of Germany on several issues on post war configuration of Europe but most importantly was re-industrialize post – war Germany. The Soviet Union wanted to de-industrialize Germany by insisting on stripping East Germany of its wealth and machinery (factories, equipment, technicians, managers and skilled personnel were removed to the Soviet Union) as reparation payment from Germany

for its war spending. The Soviet through the Morgenthau Plan had strategically proposed to partition and de-industrialize post-war Germany. Contrary to the Soviet goal for Germany, the United States and Britain wanted to re-industrialize Germany to become a wealthy trading partner and a robust market for America's produce and sundry goods to avoid the mistake of Versailles. In spite of all the well-meaning plans for cooperation, the super-powers found it increasingly difficult to work together because of their different goals in and for Germany. Thus, the policies of the United State and the Soviet Union towards Germany were so different that conflict was imminent. This was a major underlying cause of the Berlin Blockade.

The 1948 economic recovery programme for Europe otherwise known as the United States' Marshall Plan was the most important prelude to Cold War strategy and manifestation of conflict as the Soviet Union believed it was America's deliberate attempt to undermine Russian influence in Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union considered the economic integration with west as another imperialist ploy by the United States and capable of eroding Soviet control of Eastern bloc toward realigning Europe. The Soviet Union immediately moved to discourage and prevent nations of the Eastern Bloc from participating and receiving the Marshall Plan aid. Rather than improve the relationship in terms of cooperation among the super powers, the atmosphere turned competitive. The Russians started stopping and searching at all roads and rail traffic into Berlin. On the other side, the USA had just adopted the Truman Doctrine to 'contain' the USSR. The Berlin Blockade was just another event in this 'Cold War' between the superpowers. It also bought the threat of US nuclear power to Europe because the United States was the only nation that possessed nuclear weapon.

As part of the economic recovery plan for Germany and Europe in general, America and Britain introduced a new currency into their zone of Germany on 23 June. The Soviet Union claimed that the new currency was an attempt to wreck Soviet controlled East Germany economy. The Soviet in a spontaneous reaction went beyond the initial mere stop and search operation to total blockade of all road and rail traffic into Berlin. This Soviet decision was to prevent people in Eastern Europe who had started to change all their money into the new western currency, which they perceived to worth more. For the Americans, this was a direct attempt by the Soviet Union to force them out of Berlin.

Another factor contributing to the Blockade was that there were no alternate route to Berlin for the western allies and there was no formal agreement guaranteeing rail and road access to Berlin through the Soviet zone. Berlin, the former German capital, had a special status. Although it was located within the Soviet zone of occupation, Berlin was divided into four sectors among the Soviet Union, United States, Britain and

France. Thus, the western allies had to rely on Soviet goodwill to provide them with a tacit right to such access. (Miller, 2000) The Soviet Union that was intended to frustrate Britain and the United States out of Berlin refused to grant any cargo access other than one rail line, limited to ten trains per day, three air corridors for access from Hamburg, Buckeburg and Frankfurt but did not grant request for expansion to the various additional routes that were later proposed. Meanwhile, the Soviet Union stopped delivering agricultural goods from their zone in eastern Germany in 1946. Immediately the United States responded by stopping shipments of dismantled industries from western Germany to the Soviet Union.

In response, the Soviet Union mounted formidable campaign against America policy and started to obstruct the administrative work of all four zones of occupation. Consequently, the Soviet Union and its military advisers outlined a plan to force the policy of the western allies into line with the wishes of the Soviet government by "regulating" access to Berlin (Miller, 2000).

3.2 **THE BERLIN AIRLIFT**

In response to the Soviet Union blockade (24 June 1948 – 12 May 1949) of all access to West Berlin, the sectors of Berlin under Allied control, after failed attempts at negotiation and even mediation by the United Nations (UN), the Western Allies organized the Berlin Airlift to carry supplies to the people in West Berlin. Unlike the ground routes that were never negotiated, the four occupying powers of Berlin had agreed that there would be three twenty-mile-wide air corridors providing free access to Berlin. Convinced that airlift using cargo aircraft does not constitute military threat and the Soviet Union could not risk military confrontation by shooting down an unarmed aircraft, the western allies moved to use airlift of goods and supplies to West Berlin fast enough to prevent starvation. Given the feasibility assessment made by the British, an airlift appeared the best course of action. There thus began a massive airlift of food, coal and other supplies between the Western German zones and Berlin. The airlift was at first highly improvised and by the end of July that year United States and United Kingdom planes were bringing in 2000 tons a day. Walker (1994), in his book *The Cold War* described the efficiency of the airlift when he observed that the airlift was "an astonishing display of the West's industrial weight and political determination." (Walker, *The Cold War*, Vintage, 1994)

The task of the airlift was enormous considering the volume of supplies needed a day to feed a population well over 2.5 million in West Berlin. A total of about 200,000 flights recorded in the first year, a task carried out by the Royal The United Kingdom's Royal Air Force and United States Air Force, including the Royal Australian Air Force, Royal Canadian Air Force, Royal New Zealand Air Force and South African Air Force that were directed by British and United States aircrew personnel. It is

important to note that the Britain's Royal Air Force (RAF) was already running an airlift in support of British troops in Berlin and was used to the challenges of airlifting. The British and Americans forces agreed to start a joint airlift operation code named "Operation Plainfare" and "Operation Vittles" respectively. In September 1948, Operation Pelican the code name for the Australian contribution started. On 26 June 1948 Operation Vittles was launched with thirty-two c-47s aircraft flew to Berlin carrying 80 tons of cargo containing milk, flour, and medicine. While two day after, on 28 June, 1948, the first British aircraft flew. With the increase in the airlifting operation there was the challenge of accommodating the large number of flights to Berlin, the need to maintain a schedule and fixed cargo loading times became paramount, thus a complex timetable for flights called the "block system" was developed.

3.2.1 **BLACK FRIDAY**

A central operation known as Combined Air Lift Task Force (CALTF) controlling both USAF and RAF operations under the command of Maj. Gen. William Turner began in October, 1948. The deployment of Turner, a former deputy commander of Military Air Transport Services (MATS) was not unconnected to the fact that in spite of the enormous success of the airlift, the operation was far below its capability because USAFE was a tactical organization without any airlift expertise. This is because aircraft maintenance was inadequate, under engagement of crew, idle, abused and disused transport, necessary record-keeping was scant, and ad hoc flight crews of publicity-seeking desk personnel were disrupting a business-like atmosphere and no motivation of personnel. Barely two weeks after assumption of duties and on a working visit to Berlin specifically to confer an award of hard work on Lt. Paul O. Lykins, an airlift pilot who had made the most flights into Berlin up to that time, as symbolic of the entire effort to date. On that fateful day because of poor visibility due to cloud cover and heavy rain showers, in quick succession three AC-54 were involved in mishap – the first aircrafts crashed and burned on the runway, the second landing behind it burst its tires while trying to avoid it and the third ground looped on the auxiliary runway. Though, no loss of life but because the control tower has loss control of the situation and the airlift commander was circling overhead, stacked with a dozen other transports, immediately, General Tunner ordered that all stacked aircraft to return home. This day was popularly known as 'Black Friday' which also, became a turning point of the Berlin Airlift operations. Consequently, to reduce accident rate and delays several new operation control measures were introduced such as instrument flight schedule, mobile snack bars for refreshment and altered the "ladder" to three minutes and 500 feet of separation, stacked from 4,000 to 6,000 feet. Instead

of the earlier schedule of Aircraft to take off every four minutes, flying 1000 feet higher than the flight in front and three eight-hour shifts of a C-54 section to Berlin followed by a C-47 section.

As his top priority was to further maximize the utilization of aircraft and personnel Tunner also shortened block times from three eight to four six hours to squeeze in another shift, to record a daily goal of 1440 (the number of minutes in a day) landings in Berlin. Ultimately, the underpinning philosophy of Tunner's goal as commander of the Berlin Airlift was to create a "conveyor belt" approach of controlling the airlift operations which would enable him determine the pace either by fast tracking or slowed down operations as situations might dictate. The operation also created employment for the local people and mitigated the challenge of lack of manpower as they replaced unloading crews and airfield repairs to improve airlift operations and save time. Notwithstanding, the most outstanding operational innovations of Tunner which surmounted the several oppositions to his command was dexterity in organizing the airlift operation of a central coordinating point through the Combined Air Lift Task Force (CALTF) for controlling all air movements into Berlin, rather than separate and independent operation by each air force unit. As a result of Tunner's efficiency barely one month as commander of Berlin Airlift operations huge success was recorded as daily flight operations increased to more than 1500 and delivered more than 4500 tons of cargo.

3.2.2 OPERATION LITTLE VITTLES

Operation Little Vittles is a story of the relationship that developed between a United States Air Force pilot called Gail Halvorsen and a crowd of children who had gathered at the end of the runway to watch the aircraft. Captain Halvorsen, one of the many Airlift pilots started the idea of dropping candy bars and bubble gum with handmade miniature parachutes, which later became known as "Operation Little Vittles". On one of his routine time off visited Berlin, he decided to take photographs of exciting scenario where he met a crowd of children at the end of runway. He introduced himself and answered several questions from the curious children about aircraft and their flight. To show his affection for the children gave out two sticks of doublemint gum with a promise to drop off more on his return if only they can share it without fighting. One of the children asked, how would they know and identify his flight, he promised to wiggle the wings of his aircraft.

As promised, on approach to Berlin the next day, Captain Halvorsen wiggled the wings and dropped off some bars of chocolate to the waiting children. This continued

with each passing day and the number of children waiting for “Uncle Wiggly Wings”, “Chocolate Uncle” and “Chocolate Flier” increased. Though the numerous mails by the children as a mark of appreciation addressed to the chocolate flier and the publicity by the media upset the commanding officer, but Tunner gave Halvorsen’s gesture an official nod, supported and immediately expanded it by allowing other pilots participate in the programme popularly known as “Operation Little Vittles”. Operation Little Vittles received wide spread support and acceptance by manufacturers even children all over the United States sent in their own candy to help out while the German children rechristened the candy dropping aircraft as “raisin bomber”. The operation was a major Cold War propaganda success.

In spite of the success of the Berlin Airlift, the operations encountered myriad of problems and challenges especially during the winter period when the food supplies may be adequate but the need for additional coal to heat the city dramatically increased the total amount of cargo to be transported by an additional 6,000 tons a day. This was a major challenge because maintaining the fleet was a major task and the current airlift operation would have to be expanded for bigger aircraft and ground crews. Another problem was the lack of runways in Berlin to land on by C-54s aircraft. The airlift operation also demonstrated that the Soviet blockade could not keep anything out of Berlin.

3.2.3 THE EASTER PARADE

The mother of the Berlin Airlift operations was christened the Easter parade planned and efficiently executed by General Tunner in April 1949. Tunner inspired an unprecedented airlift operation on Easter Sunday to break the monotony and give everyone a morale boost. The plan was simply to demonstrate maximum efficiency by simplifying cargo handling - the only cargo would be coal, and stockpiles were built up for the effort. The entire airlift crew worked and maintenance schedule altered from noon on 15 April to noon on 16 April 1949. The effort of General Tunner and his men on the Easter parade operation showed that 12,941 tons of coal had been delivered in 1,383 flights, without a single accident. The significance of the Easter parade was that operations in general were boosted, the tonnage of supplies flown into the city exceeded that previously brought even by rail because tonnage increased from 6,729 tons to 8,893 tons per day thereafter. In total, the airlift delivered 234,476 tons in April. The Berlin Airlift had finally succeeded, and appeared able to operate indefinitely.

At the end of the Berlin Airlift operation, about US\$224 million equivalent to present day \$2.06 billion was spent as operational cost of the airlift. A total of 2,333,478 tons

were delivered and distributed as follow: the United States 1,783,573 tons; the United Kingdom's Royal Air Force (RAF) 541,937 tons; the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) 7,968 tons of freight and 6,964 passengers during 2,062 sorties. Also, the C-47s and C-54s aircrafts in the airlift process flew 92 million miles with one plane landing every thirty seconds.

Apart from the Gatow air disaster when a Soviet Air Force fighter jet collided with a British European Airways killing all aboard on both aircraft, seventeen American and eight British aircraft crashed during the operation. The airlift operation recorded a total of 101 casualties, including 40 Briton and 31 Americans as a result of crashes

3.3 **SOVIET RESPONSES**

The relationship between the Soviet led Eastern Bloc and the United States led Western bloc throughout the Cold War was far from cooperation but was manifest competition over ideological dominance which bothered on socialist communism and capitalist democracy. The unprecedented success of the Berlin Airlift was a rude shocker and a source of immense apprehension to the Soviet authority. In response, the Soviet Union began on 1 August, 1948 to offered free food to anyone who crossed into East Berlin and registered their ration cards there, but West Berliners overwhelmingly rejected Soviet offers of food. (Tunner, 1987).

The reaction of Soviet and German communists to the airlift were evident of manifest Cold War conflict because for the period of the airlift they employed several conflict behavior which include: Subjecting the hard-pressed West Berliners to sustained psychological warfare; relentlessly proclaimed that all Berlin came under Soviet authority and predicted the imminent abandonment of the city by the Western occupying powers; harassed members of the democratically elected city-wide administration, which had to conduct its business in the city hall located in the Soviet sector; buzzing by Soviet planes; obstructive parachute jumps within the corridors; shining searchlights to dazzle pilots at night; flak; air-to-air fire; rocketing; bombing and explosions. One major threat to flight operations was a Soviet-controlled radio tower located in around Tegel airfield, its proximity caused problems to the airfield. All diplomatic pressure and pleas to relocate the station were rebuffed by Soviet German authority, but the Western allies through its French field commander blew it up on 16 December, 1948, which only provoke Soviet complaints.

Apart from soviet opposition which the Airlift operation had to contend with, there was also the natural weather condition in November and December which militated against the airlift operation. In November and December, 1948 the entire continent of Europe experienced the longest-lasting fogs ever to blanket it for weeks.

Consequently, all too often, aircraft would make the entire flight and then be unable to land in Berlin. On 20 November, 42 aircraft departed for Berlin, but only one landed there. At one point, the city had only a week's supply of coal left. It will suffice that no efforts could fix the weather.

3.4 THE BLOCKADE ENDS

Following the success of the Airlift operations and the "Easter Parade" of 1949 which particularly humiliated the Soviets, it does appear that the Soviet East Germany military administration was ready to renegotiate the diplomatic issues of the Cold War and end the Berlin blockade. Soon afterwards, leaders of the post war powers of Soviet Union, United States, Britain and France began serious negotiations, and a settlement was reached, on Western terms. On 4 May 1949 the Allies announced an agreement to end the blockade and eight days later on 12 May 1949, the Soviet blockade of Berlin was lifted at one minute after midnight.

The lift of the blockade by the Soviet military authority did not translate to immediate stop of the airlift by the western allies rather only night and weekend flights were stopped but flights continued for some time, in order to build up a comfortable surplus large enough to last for three months. By 24 July 1949 three months' worth of supplies had been airlifted, this was strategic because it will allow enough time to re-open airlift operation when it becomes expedient. Thus, after fifteen months of airlift operations, the Berlin Airlift officially ended on 30 September 1949. As mentioned earlier the Berlin Blockade, airlift and various conflict behaviors provoked sanguinary fear just after World War II, the blockade turned out to be totally ineffective rather it ended up backfiring on the Soviets in other ways

Self Assessment Exercise

Critically examine the causes of the Berlin Blockade?

.

4.0 CONCLUSION

Several reasons which include the future of a reborn and rearmed Germany, economic recovery programme of Europe in general and Germany in particular through the United States' Marshall Plan, among others has been identified for the Soviet blockade of the United States, United Kingdom and French zones of Berlin. Considering the strategic nature and position of the Soviet zone of Berlin to the survival of the trizone, the Soviet Union had anticipated that a blockade would force the other occupiers of Berlin into negotiation over the division and future of Germany.

Instead the Western allies responded with a totally unprecedented airlift of huge amounts of supplies such that there was no need to negotiate. On the whole, both the Soviet Union and United States exercised great caution not to provoke armed conflict in spite of the fact that the blockade in the first instance was a manifestation of open conflict. The blockade and success of the airlift accelerated the creation of a democratic German state and the military alliance and the Western allies – North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Also, the Soviet Union was placed on economic pressure when the allies shut all exports from Germany into Soviet zone. This resulted in an unconditional lifting of the blockade on 12 May, 1949.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have discussed Berlin blockade as the first manifestation of open conflict between the superpowers in the Cold War. We have also examined the causes of the blockade and the various airlift operations.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAS)

1. Discuss the Berlin blockade
2. Outline the various airlift operation and discuss them

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn, Glenn (1989), *The West and the World Since 1945*. New York: St. Martins Press

Harrison, Hope Millard (2003). *Driving the Soviets Up the Wall: Soviet-East German Relations, 1953-1961*. Princeton University Press.

Miller, Roger Gene (2000), *To Save a City: The Berlin Airlift, 1948–1949*, Texas A&M University Press.

Nye, Joseph S. Jr (2003). *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*. New York:Longman

Tunner, Henry Ashby (1987), *The Two Germanies Since 1945: East and West*, Yale University Press.

UNIT 5 BERLIN WALL

CONTENT

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 What is Berlin Wall
 - 3.2 Construction of Berlin Wall
 - 3.3.1 Causes of the Berlin Wall
 - 3.3.2 Immediate Effects
 - 3.4 The Fall of the Berlin Wall
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

As the relationship between the Soviet Union and the other three Allied powers quickly disintegrated, the cooperative atmosphere of the occupation of Germany turned competitive and aggressive. Although an eventual reunification of Germany had been intended, the new relationship between the Allied powers turned Germany into West versus East, democracy versus Communism. The Berlin Wall soon became a truly physical symbol of both the Cold War and the Iron Curtain, the divisions made manifest. It was also hugely embarrassing for the cause of communism, the ideology which was supposed to be so attractive to workers now having to pen them in to stop defections to the capitalist West. By 1961, tens of thousands of East Germans had fled to the west. East Germany's communist government decided to stop them. It built a wall separating the eastern and western parts of the city of Berlin. Guards shot at anyone who tried to flee by climbing over.

In this unit, we shall examine the Berlin War as major source of Cold War tension. This include its symbol and the various components and significance of the city of Berlin. Further, we will examine the reason for the construction an, effects and ultimately the fall of the Berlin Wall

2.0 OBJECTIVES

On completion of studying this unit, students should be able to:

- Define Berlin Wall as a symbol of Cold War tension;

- Explain the nature of Cold War conflict in relation to the creation of the Berlin Wall, history, detente and challenges of emigration;
- Discuss the causes and immediate effects of the Berlin Wall.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 WHAT IS BERLIN WALL

The Berlin Wall known in German language as Berliner Mauer was a physical wall of separation constructed by the German Democratic Republic (GDR, East Germany) on 13 August, 1961, to barricade and completely cut off East Berlin from West Berlin and other West Germany territory. Within the officialdom of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) authorities, the Berlin Wall was referred to as Anti Fascist (Antifaschistischer Schutzwall) protection rampart to describe the non de-Nazification of West Germany. On the contrary, the West Berlin government using the words of Mayor Willy Brandt, referred to it as a Wall of Shame. The outcome of the 1945 Potsdam conference gave Soviet Union possession of East Berlin, East Germany and domination of the Eastern Bloc while Britain, France and the United States had possession of West Berlin, West Germany and indeed, the Western Bloc. Jennifer Rosenberg (2009) described the Berlin Wall as “the physical division between West Berlin and East Germany. However, it was also the symbolic boundary between democracy and Communism during the Cold War.” Between 1949 and 1961, not less than 2.5 million East Germans had migrated from East to West Germany, the emigrants include an increasing numbers of skilled workers, professionals, and intellectuals. The brain drain poses a serious threat and set back to the economic viability of the East German state. In response, East Germany constructed a barrier through the city of Berlin called the Berlin Wall, German Berliner Mauer, to prevent East Germans’ and circumvent their access to West Berlin and indeed West Germany. The Berlin Wall and its borders symbolized the “Iron Curtain” between Western Europe and the Eastern Bloc. The Soviet socialist regime was in control of East Berlin government, and “officially claimed that the wall was erected to protect its population from fascist elements conspiring to prevent the "will of the people" in building a socialist state in East Germany”. Beyond the official claim lies the underpinning issue of massive emigration and defection as a result of discontentment and harsh realities faced by East Berliners during the Cold War under a repressive Communist regime. For the East German government, the only and expedient means of preventing escape to the West via Berlin was to close the border between East and West Berlin on August 13, 1961. No doubt, as a result of the economic recovery programme through the Marshall Plan, the life in West Berlin – West Germany was much better than in the East after World War II.

The Berlin Wall was a large concrete wall with a complex system of walls, fences, watchtowers and barrier which began in East Berlin consisted of the following features – starting from the border area, backland Wall, signal fence, different kind of barriers, watch towers, lighting system, column track, control track, anti-vehicle trenches, last wall, known as the "Wall" border area- West Berlin. Other features of the wall in terms of size and length of wall structure include: total border length around West Berlin: 96 miles / 155 km; border between East and West Berlin: 27 miles / 43.1 km; border between West Berlin and East Germany: 69 miles / 111.9 km; border through residential areas in Berlin: 23 miles / 37 km; concrete segment wall: 3.6m (11.81 ft.) high, 66 miles / 106 km; wire mesh fencing: 41 miles / 66.5 km; anti-vehicle trenches: 65 miles / 105.5 km; contact or signal fence: 79 miles / 127.5 km; column track: 6-7 m (7.33 yd) wide, 77 miles / 124.3 km; number of watch towers: 302; number of bunkers: 20; persons killed on the Berlin Wall: 192; Persons injured by shooting: ca. 200. Prior to the erection of the wall in 1961, it was estimated that between 2.6 million and 3.5 million people from East Germany migrated to West Germany. But between 1961 and 1989 the wall restricted the exodus of East Germans and all efforts to escape resulted in vary death toll estimate between 100 and 200. The Berlin Wall was the last Wall also known as the so called Death Strip dangerously situated just after the East and West Berlin border. The Death Strip was covered with raked sand or gravel, rendering footprints easy to notice, easing the detection of trespassers and also enabling officers to see which guards had neglected their task, it offered no cover; and most importantly, it offered clear fields of fire for the wall guards (Hagen Koch,2009). From 1961 when the Berlin Wall was first erected to the collapse in 1989, the Berlin Wall evolved through four generations: Wire fence (1961); improved wire fence (1962–1965); concrete wall (1965–1975) and *Grenzmauer 75* (Border Wall 75) (1975–1989).

3.2 CONSTRUCTION OF THE BERLIN WALL

Immediately after Walter Ulbricht signed the order to close the border and erect a wall at a government guesthouse in Dollnsee, North of East Berlin, on Saturday, 12 August 1961, within a short time frame (of less than 12 hours) the Berlin Wall was erected in the dead of night by the police and army units who closed the border with West Berlin. This action is contrary to an earlier statement made at a press conference by the same Walter Ulbricht (First Secretary of the Socialist Unity Party and GDR State Council Chairman) on 15 June, 1961 when he declared that “no one has the intention of erecting a wall.” However, GDR plan to erect a wall received impetus when the United States President John F. Kennedy gave a tacit indication of non United States objection if only the Wall is restricted to the Soviet zone of Berlin. Thus, in

compliance to the United States desires, the barrier was built slightly inside East Berlin or East German territory to ensure that it did not encroach on West Berlin at any point. Later, it was built up into the Wall proper, the first concrete elements and large blocks being put in place on 17 August, 1961. The construction works were carried out under the strict security coverage and protection of the GDR National People's Army (NVA) and Combat Groups of the Working Class (KdA) soldiers operating within the ambit of the orders to shoot at any defection suspect. The construction works include the installation of chain fences, walls, minefields and sundry obstacles along the western border line between East and West Germany. In addition to these barrier structures, was a barren space of land left to provide clear visibility against fleeing refugees to be hunted by security guards.

The wall itself went through four major transformations during its 28-year history. The Berlin Wall started out as a barbed-wire fence with concrete posts, but just a few days after the first fence was placed, it was quickly replaced with a sturdier, more permanent structure made out of concrete blocks, topped with barbed wire. The first two versions of the wall (barbed wire and concrete blocks) were replaced by the third version of the Berlin Wall in 1965. This version consisted of a concrete wall, supported by steel girders.

The third generation of Berlin Wall was replaced by the fourth generation, officially named Stutzwandelement UL 12 11 in 1975 and was the last and most complex version of this kind of Berlin Wall also known as "Grenzmauer 75" (Border Wall 75). Stutzwandelement consist of 4500 pieces of concrete segment of about 360cm/11.81ft height, 120cm/3.9ft width and weight 2750kg. The construction work of the concrete segment was not a difficult task but was highly resistant to breakthrough and environmental pollution.

Between East and West Berlin there were nine crossing points used by specific nationality such as the West Berliners, West Germans, Western foreigners and Allied personnel into East Berlin including GDR citizens and other socialist countries into West Berlin with valid permits. Of prominence was Checkpoint Charlie located between Friedrichstraße and Zimmerstraße for vehicular and pedestrian movements. Also, between West Berlin and other East Germany surroundings, there were several other transit border crossing between West Germany and West Berlin, West Berlin to East Germany, from East Germany to Poland, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and for East Germans into West Berlin carrying a permit. More access were created and opened after the 1972 agreements including four autobahns, four railway routes and by boat for commercial shipping through canals and rivers.

3.3 CAUSES OF THE BERLIN WALL

Consequent upon the Potsdam agreement whereby Germany and indeed Berlin the capital seat of the Allied Control Council was divided into four parts. It should be noted here that the city of Berlin was located on the Soviet territory. This encouraged political division among the occupying powers of the Soviet Union on the one side and Britain, France and the United States on the other. Similarly, prior to economic recovery programme of Europe by America popularly known as the Marshall Plan, the Soviet Union neither supported post war reconstruction plan of Germany nor an audit of industrial plants, goods and infrastructure already removed by the Soviets. As a result of the ensuing conflict, the Soviet Union instituted the Berlin Blockade in 1948, to prevent food, materials and sundry supplies to West Berlin, mounted public campaign against the policies of the West, and attempt at disrupting the 1948 elections which the communist party lost. However, the Soviet compelled itself to lift the blockade in 1949 after the United State led successful and massive Berlin airlift as well as the consistent demonstrations by Berliners for the continuation of the airlift.

The city of Berlin symbolizes the soul of the Cold War tension between the East and the West Bloc. The Soviet Foreign Affairs Ministry through a secret treaty had unlimited power to direct the administrative, military and secret police structures of the GDR. According to Wettig (2008), *Stalin and the Cold War in Europe* “the major task of the ruling communist party in the Soviet zone was to channel Soviet orders down to both the administrative apparatus and the other bloc parties, while pretending that these were initiatives of its own.” Wettig went further to state that “if statements or decisions deviated from the prescribed line, reprimands and, for persons outside public attention, punishment would ensue, such as imprisonment, torture and even death”. The FRG otherwise known as West Germany developed into a capitalist market economy and a democratic parliamentary State with a steady economic growth guaranteeing an improved standard of living from the early 1950s became the envy of East Germans who defer all odds to move to West Germany.

By the early 1950s, the rest of Eastern Bloc including states which were more economically advanced and open than the Soviet Union, where no prior border existed between East and West and hitherto had no formal approach of restricting emigration and controlling national movement adopted the Soviet model. After this point, up to March 1952, there still existed some open lines for unrestricted movements between the East Germany and Western occupied territories. A more thorough measure to stop movement between East and West was introduced after the April, 1952 meeting of East German leaders with the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin. According to Hope Millard Harrison (2003), "the demarcation line between East and West Germany should be considered a border—and not just any border, but a dangerous one ... The Germans

will guard the line of defence with their lives." In spite of the various restriction policies, the border in Berlin was easily accessible then because it was administered by all four occupying powers. Besides, East Germany still granted visits to allow its residents access to West Germany, but with the increase in the cases of defection recorded between 1955 and 1956, the East Germans restricted all movement to the West. Harrison (2003) quoting the observation of Soviet East German ambassador, Mikhail Pervukhin, stated that "the presence in Berlin of an open and essentially uncontrolled border between the socialist and capitalist worlds unwittingly prompts the population to make a comparison between both parts of the city, which unfortunately, does not always turn out in favor of the Democratic [East] Berlin." Accordingly, in its quest to reduce the defection and refugee flow from the East Germany state, it introduced a new passport law in 1957 and heavy penalties for offenders. The new passport law and penalties like previous efforts to finding a lasting solution to emigration and defection problems of East Germany rather than reduce the number it geometrically increased the percentage of those wanting out. One reason for the fleeting illusion being pursued by East Germany is essentially caused by the porous nature of the border in Berlin controlled by four powers with no physical barrier and available access to West Berlin through subway train. Between 1958 and 1960, the population distribution of refugees defecting to West Germany revealed that a greater percentage were young and well educated leaving for economic reasons resulting to a devastating brain drain. The loss was disproportionately heavy among professionals: engineers, technicians, physicians, teachers, lawyers and skilled workers. (Dowty, 1989) According to Harrison (2003) "the flight of the intelligentsia has reached a particularly critical phase." For instance, on capital flight, East Germany lost over 22.5 billion marks to the drain in terms of educational investment. According to Raymond Pearson (1998), "the brain drain of professionals had become so damaging to the political credibility and economic viability of East Germany that the re-securing of the German communist frontier was imperative."

3.3.1 IMMEDIATE EFFECTS

As a result of closing of the East-West sector boundary in Berlin, the vast majority of East Germans could no longer travel or migrate to West Germany. Many families were split, while East Berliners employed in the West were cut off from their jobs. West Berlin became an isolated enclave in a hostile land. All crossing points were closed to them between 26 August 1961 and 17 December 1963.

Though, there were protest by West Berliners as to why the US did not attempt to defend West Berlin but President Kennedy had to acknowledge that the United States could only hope to defend West Berliners and West Germans; to attempt to stand up for East Germans would result only in an embarrassing downfall. In spite of the fact

that the Wall violated postwar Potsdam Agreements, which gave the United Kingdom, France and the United States a say over the administration of the whole of Berlin, the U.S. government informed the Soviet government that it accepted the Wall as "a fact of international life" and would not challenge it by force.

The Berlin Wall presupposes that the possibility of a Soviet military conflict over Berlin was not necessary and brought about some measure of détente. For the East German State, the Wall was an "anti-fascist protective rampart" (German: *"antifaschistischer Schutzwall"*) intended to prevent and discourage external offensive from the West.

Considering the political ambience of post war Germany and the Cold War rivalry, the Berlin Wall was mainly a means of preventing the citizens of East Germany from entering or fleeing to West Berlin. On the contrary, considering the economic realities, the construction of the Wall had caused untold hardship to families divided by it. For instance, Berlin's complex public transit networks, the S-Bahn and U-Bahn were divided with it. Some lines were cut in half and many stations were shut down consequently creating unemployment.

The Wall gave rise to a widespread sense of desperation and oppression in East Berlin. The psychological trauma and disillusionment of most East Berliner could best be imagined within the backdrop of the expressed personal thoughts of one resident, recorded in her diary "Our lives have lost their spirit...we can do nothing to stop them" (Frederick Kempe, 2011)

In spite of discontent with the wall, the diplomatic importance for the creation of the Berlin Wall for both East and West Germany cannot be overemphasized. For once, it successfully stemmed the exodus of people from East Germany and the Soviet Union through the directed authority of East German government was able to reassert its control over the country: resolved to an extent the issues dual currency militating against economic activities thereby eliminating the increasing black market operations; and grew the GDR economy- initially their loss threatened to destroy the economic viability of the East German state. On the contrary, the Wall became a strong Cold War arsenal used by the West to bring to the front burner communist tyranny especially in reporting the indiscriminate killing of suspected defectors. Though, after the reunification of Germany such fatalities were later treated as acts of murder..

3.4 The Fall of Berlin Wall

According to Jennifer Rosenberg "the fall of the Berlin was nearly as instantaneous as its creation, was celebrated around the world." Early indications of the collapse of the Berlin Wall first manifested when Hungary in the summer of 1989 effectively

disabled its physical border defense with Austria and more than 13000 East German tourists escaped to Austria through Hungary. This marked the beginning of several similar events in neighboring Czechoslovakia and mass demonstrations within East Germany by those who want to leave to the West. This was the start of what East Germans generally call the “Peaceful Revolution” of late 1989. Considering the increasing wave of protest the new Krenz government decided on 9 November to allow refugees to exit directly through crossing points between East Germany and West Germany, including West Berlin. In a related event arising from the uncoordinated press conference to announce the ministerial modification of the new regulation on private travel by Gunter Schabowski declared that "As far as I know effective immediately, without delay". Soon after the broadcast of the declaration East German besieged the border crossing, in face of the growing crowd, the guards finally yielded, opening the checkpoints and allowing people through with little or no identity checking. Ecstatic East Berliners were soon greeted by West Berliners on the other side in a celebratory atmosphere.

For twenty eight years the Berlin Walls prevented East Berliners and Germans from fleeing to the West. On 9 November, 1989 was the date officially acknowledged for the fall of Berlin Wall but it must be clarified that the entire wall was not demolished at that point. The official dismantling of the Wall by the East German military began in Bernauer Straße, on 13 June 1990. It was reported then that a crane moved in to destroy a section of the Wall near Brandenburg Gate on 21 December 1989. However, the following day, it turned out to be merely the construction of new crossings because the East German authority had earlier announced the opening of ten new border crossings and it continued through the middle of 1990, including the Brandenburg Gate on 22 December 1989. In addition to the official effort to open new border crossing there were several unauthorized border crossing through the holes by East Germans popularly nicknamed "Mauerspechte" - “wall woodpeckers”. The final collapse of the Berlin wall was on 1 July, 1990, when East Germany adopted the West German currency and all *de jure* border controls ceased. Technically, the Wall remained guarded for some time after 9 November, 1989, by East Germany military units who also demolished it. For remembrance, a few short sections and watchtowers were left standing. The fall of the Wall was the first step toward German reunification, which was formally concluded on 3 October 1990. Nye (2003) succinctly puts it that “the end of the Cold War might be dated by when the division ended, that is 1989, when the Soviet Union did not use force to support the communist government in East Germany and the Berlin Wall was pierced by jubilant crowds in November 1989, the Cold War could be said to be over.”

Self Assessment Exercise

The Berlin Wall was a symbol of Cold War conflict. **Discuss**

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

Soon after World War II, the city of Berlin became a major source of conflict which the Potsdam conference attempted to resolve, though on the Soviet zone it was divided among the super powers. Periodically, the Soviets pressured the other occupying powers with the aim of bluffing the Allies into renegotiating the division of Germany and to leave the city for its sole occupation rather than declaring war over the cut of zone. The fundament factor for Soviet pressure then was the fact that thousands of East Germans were simply walking from East Berlin to West Berlin to seek better new home and employment in West Germany. Accordingly, this caused the Soviet Union and East Germany authority a serious economic consequence of brain drain and political embarrassment as they were alleged to flee the harsh communist regime. To stop and prevent the exodus and further emigration the communist regime constructed the Berlin Wall in 1961, a concrete barrier separating West from East Berlin. The result was that many families were divided living in different parts of the city through border restriction. The Berlin War meant different things to different people because for the Berliners, the wall was a source conflict, death, oppression and hardship. But for international politics and the Cold War conflict, it was a useful tool for peace enforcement and détente because the prospect of confrontation between the East and West Bloc was eliminated. In addition, it was no longer a major diplomatic issue from the period of it erection in 1961, as the Soviet Union no longer felt threatened by the emigration problem and collapse of communism. For twenty eight years the Berlin Walls prevented East Berliners and Germans from fleeing to the West

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we examined Berlin Wall as a symbol of Cold War conflict, explored its history, meaning, creation, causes, effects and the fall of Cold War iron curtain.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAS)

1. What is Berlin Wall?
2. What are the causes and effects of the Berlin Wall?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn, Glenn (1989), *The West and the World Since 1945*. New York: St. Martins Press

Dowty, Alan (1989). *Closed Borders: The Contemporary Assault on Freedom of Movement*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Harrison, Hope Millard (2003). *Driving the Soviets Up the Wall: Soviet-East German Relations, 1953-1961*. Princeton University Press.

Kempe, Frederick (2011). *Berlin 1961*. USA: Penguin Group.

Nye, Joseph S. Jr (2003). *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*. New York:Longman

Pearson, Raymond (1998). *The Rise and Fall of the Soviet Empire*. Macmillan.

Wettig, Gerhard (2008). *Stalin and the Cold War in Europe*. London:Rowman & Littlefield.

Rosenberg, Jennifer (2006) "The Rise and Fall of the Berlin Wall"www.about.com guide; 20th Century History Guide

MODULE 3

Unit 1 MARSHALL PLAN

Unit 2 MOLOTOV PLAN

Unit 3 CONTAINMENT

Unit 4 DETERRENCE

Unit 5 DETENTE

UNIT 1 MARSHALL PLAN

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
- 3.1 Marshall Plan
- 3.2 The Goals of Marshall Plan
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The Marshall Plan was a massive pawn in a Cold War chess game played out in the character of ideology and geopolitics, pitching the Soviet Union Marxist – Leninist ideals against the free market capitalist ideology of the United States. This unit exposes the students to the various frameworks to explain why the United States should prevent the perceived Communist aggression of the Soviet Union through a containment strategy based primarily on economic policies. The Marshall Plan, otherwise known as European Recovery Programme, was the most important aspect of the strategy of containment that Kennan had outlined. The students will understand the frameworks of United States policy of containment and evaluate the plan through these three frameworks. The unit intends to discuss the goals and strategies to enhance our better understanding.

1.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

- Describe the United States Marshall Plan
- Understand the United States strategies of Europe Economic Recovery Programme
- Explain the goals the Marshall Plan.

2.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 MARSHALL PLAN

During World War Two (1939 – 1945), American was not directly attacked therefore was not a victim of the barrage of bombing campaigns and ground battles that had ensued throughout Europe. This privileged situation placed the capitalist economy of the United States at a comparative advantage as it flourished through the huge exportation of its produce to its Allies in Europe. However, at the end of the War, the market demand situation change, its capitalist economy needed foreign markets to supply its surplus produce. “American exports in 1947 were only five per cent of gross national product, compared to ten per cent in the pre-1929 period” (McCormick, 1995). It must be noted here that Europe was indeed a huge market but lack the finance to back up its demand that the United States had to supply because its industries had been destroyed by the war and the lack of dollars in the possession of European governments. It became necessary for America to reopen and build up the market in Europe to stimulate the United States economy. Thus, the European Recovery Programme (ERP) was to ensure that participating European countries would have the means to purchase American goods and in doing so they would be reopening their markets to American trade. President Harry Truman announced the Truman Doctrine to the American Congress on March 12, 1947. He proposed that the United States must adopt a policy to support free peoples who were resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. According to him "We must take immediate and resolute action." The Truman Doctrine was a proposal to send military and economic aid to Greece and Turkey, which the American Congress authorized in May 1947. The Marshall Plan was an extension of the principle underlying the Truman Doctrine. The Secretary of State Marshall initiated the European Recovery Programme, through his famous speech at Harvard on June 5, 1947.

The United States did not hide the fear that poverty, unemployment and dislocation power in Europe were germane to Soviet influence and popularity of communist parties to voters in Western Europe. In order to create stable conditions for the sustenance of democratic principles, George C. Marshall on 5th June, 1947 in a speech

delivered at Harvard University proposed European self help recovery program to be funded and coordinated by the United States. Based on the recommendation of a unified plan for the economic reconstruction of Western Europe by a Committee representing 16 (sixteen) countries, the United States Congress approved and signed into law in 1948 the establishment of the European Recovery Programme (ERP). The aid plan was offered to all European countries including the Soviet Union and its satellites states under military occupation. The participating and receiving countries were: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and West Germany.

The Soviet Union considered the economic integration with west as another imperialist ploy by the United States and capable of eroding Soviet control of Eastern bloc toward realigning Europe. The Soviet Union immediately moved to discourage and prevent Eastern bloc nations from participating and receiving the Marshall Plan aid. In June 1947, delegates from France, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union met in Paris to discuss Marshall's proposal. After several days, Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav M. Molotov walked out, stating that the Soviet government "rejects this plan as totally unsatisfactory." Viewed by Western leaders as one more refusal to support postwar stabilization efforts, Molotov's action contributed to the growth of Cold War tensions. In its stead, the Soviet Union introduced its own economic assistance plan known as Molotov Plan and later as Comecon to provide subsidies and promote trade within eastern bloc. Some nations of Western Europe were excluded from the Marshall Plan, one of such nations was Spain, which did not openly take part in the World War II. Spain was an aggressive anti – Communist embraced as allies by the United States, but pursued a policy of self – sufficiency, currency control and quotas. Other nations were Finland, Romania, Hungary and East Germany that were forced to pay for reparation supplies to the Soviet Union.

A Committee known as the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) under Paul G. Hoffman was constituted to administer the aid plan for the four years (1948 – 1952). Within this period, an estimated sum of \$13 billion worth of economic and military aid were disbursed to assist industrial and agricultural production, create financial stability and expand trade. The United Kingdom and France organized the 16 participating countries to establish a master financial-aid-coordinating agency, the Committee of European Economic Cooperation which was later became Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) including West Germany, which was headed by Robert Marjolin of France.

The Marshall Plan of economic and technical assistance brought about an increase in gross domestic product of several western European nations of about 15 and 25 with a

rapid growth of the chemical engineering and steel industry. The years of the Marshall Plan was a period of economic revival and prosperity for Europe with an increase of about 35% in industrial production. The United States Cold War time President Harry S. Truman applauded the success of the concept and under the 1949 Point Four Programme extended it beyond Western Europe, even to less developed nations throughout the world. In 1951, the Marshall Plan was replaced by Mutual Security Plan as a futuristic plan for the United States search for market for its produce and survival. The plan was originally schedule to end in 1953, but ended in 1951, because of the enormous cost of the Korean War and rearmament and other political factors such as the increase of congressional opposition.

IMPLEMENTATION

The United States response to Britain's announcement that it could no longer support Greece in the battle against communist expansion in Greece and Turkey and the request for United States intervention, to continue in aid under the Truman Doctrine was the beginning of a four year aid plan. The monies for the Marshall Plan to benefiting countries were transferred to the governments of the European nations to be jointly managed by Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) and the home government. The ECA had an envoy at each participating nation's capital, usually a prominent American businessman whose responsibilities include but not limited to the following, to: (1) give a boost to the European economy; (2) promote European production, (3) bolster European currency, (4) facilitate international trade, especially with the United States; and (5) contain the growing Soviet influence in Europe, a silent unofficial goal of ECA (and of the Marshall Plan) in relation to the spreading and growing strength of communist parties in Czechoslovakia, France, and Italy. There was a joint allocation meeting by panels of government, business, and labor leaders to examine and conduct the needs assessment.

The funds allocated for the economy recovery of Europe in accordance with the provisions of the Marshall Plan aid were used to procure goods from the United States. Prior to the aid, Europe was experiencing significant dearth of foreign reserve as a result of funding the war, the only available means of securing importation of foreign good was through the Marshall Plan aid. At inception, the importation were restricted to daily needs of food and fuel, but later included the reconstruction needs as was originally conceived. Subsequently, when the Korean War broke out and the pressure from the United States Congress there was a shift in expenditure with a huge amount of the aid spent on rebuilding the militaries of Western Europe. A breakdown of disbursement of allocation of \$13 billion as at mid 1951 was as follows: importation of raw materials and semi-manufactured products \$3.4 billion; food, feed,

and fertilizer \$3.2 billion; machines, vehicles, and equipment \$1.9 billion on; and fuel \$1.6 billion (Hogan, 1987)

Other sources of funding were counterpart funding introduced to provide funds in the local currency. The aim was to serve as loan revolving scheme for industry according to the 60% ECA rules. For instance, in Germany where it was most noticeable government-administered funds provided the opportunity for private enterprises to secure easy loan for rebuilding programmes. These funds were pivotal for the reindustrialization of Germany because about 40% of investment in coal industry (energy sector) was provided from these funds (Crafts and Toniolo, 1996). This loan revolving system made it possible for the government to provide financial assistance to others as the companies comply with the provision of the loans. And it became the cornerstone of the state owned KFW bank and over time the fund had grown over 300% of the initial capital. The counterpart fund was also absorbed into government budget as revenue and used as measure to reduce budget deficit as was in the case of France and other countries.

The Economic Cooperative Administration initiated and funded the Technical Assistance Program to facilitate training of European industrialist and engineers through a study tour of United States mines, factories and smelters. Also, American technical experts were involved as technical advisors in the industrialization programme in Europe.

EXPENDITURE

The distribution of Marshall Plan aid was divided on a roughly per capita basis amongst the participating nations. There was an assumed consensus to give preference to the major industrial powers because their resuscitation was essential for general European revival irrespective ideological leaning. The table below shows Marshall Plan aid by country and year (in millions of dollars) from Schain Martin, ed (2004) *The Marshall Plan Fifty Years Later*. There is no clear consensus on exact amounts, as different scholars differ on exactly what elements of American aid during this period were parts of the Marshall Plan.

Country	1948/49(\$mil)	1949/50(\$mil)	1950/51(\$mil)	Cumulative (\$ millions)
Austria	232	166	70	468
Belgium/luxembourg	195	222	360	777
Denmark	103	87	195	385
France	1085	691	520	2296
Germany	510	438	500	1448
Greece	175	156	45	376
Iceland	6	22	15	43

Ireland	88	45	0	133
Italy/Trieste	594	405	205	1204
Netherland	471	302	355	1128
Norway	82	90	200	372
Portugal	0	0	70	70
Sweden	39	48	260	347
Switzerland	0	0	250	250
Turkey	28	59	50	132
United kingdom	1,316	921	1,060	3,297
Total	4,924	3,652	4,155	12,731

3.2 GOAL OF MARSHALL PLAN

(i) Economic Recovery

The Marshall Plan had three important frameworks that are all related and interlinked to achieve various goals. This section will discuss the plan through these three frameworks. The conceptualization and development of the Marshall Plan as a coordinated economic recovery programme was at a critical economic period when the United States was confronted with serious economic challenges to export its produce to Europe because of the dearth in supply of American dollars. As a result of the shortfall in demand leading to lower productivity and employment in Europe, the first action plan to achieve the goals was for the United States to restart trade with Europe to ensure economic stability through its continued expansion to sell its huge produce to avoid an economic slump. The Marshall Plan became a conveyor belt for the expansion of the United States economy by creating a market in Europe. Europe was the epicenter for the spread of the American free market under the platform of economic aid which scholars had argued to be an imperialist action, though participating countries were saddle with the planning and distribution of the aid packages.

(ii) Containment of Communism

The second goal of the Marshall Plan, as outlined by George Kennan Cold War strategy, it was a war to be fought by political rather than military warfare, thus, US should contain the perceived aggressive advances of the Soviet Union through a containment strategy based primarily on economic policies. After the World War II,

poverty, hunger and unemployment were prevalent in Europe. According to George Marshall *every* country in Europe was so poor that it was in danger of turning Communist, Europe was a breeding ground of hate. It was obvious that most population that suffered devastating destruction in Europe tend to favour communism, as it promises better lifestyle under the Marxist – Leninist ideals.

For Washington, beside the aim of rebuilding the economy and expanding the European market, there was the immediate need to rebuild democratic system to counter perceived threats to Europe balance of powers. For instances, the Communist Parties were beginning to gain much popularity in Italy and France prior to the 1948 elections. It does appear that any Communist government in these countries would be dominated by Moscow and could translate to Soviet dominance in Europe. This situation became more precarious when the Soviet Union refused to withdraw from its satellite states in the East. To contain Communist influence on the Plan in Europe, the United States preferred industrial programme which were more of economic advantage to social programme. The double barrel policies as enunciated in the Truman doctrine and the Marshall Plan galvanized the economic and military assistance in billions of dollars to Western Europe, Greece and Turkey, and the Italian Christian Democrats in the 1948 Italian election. With the aid of the United States, the Greek military won its civil war, and the Italian Christian democrats defeated the powerful alliance of Communist and Socialist in the 1948 elections. In the years after the Marshall Plan, the influence of communism in Western Europe was greatly reduced, and the popularity of communist parties waned throughout the region.

Though, the Marshall Plan was a pledge of economic assistance to Europe it was heavily laced with the political interest of the United States. The Plan helped to relax economic hardship and discontentment that were germane to political stability.

(iii) Integration of Europe

The most lasting significant goal of the Marshall Plan however was the role of European integration into a single economic bloc. The Leaders of the United States and many other European countries were convinced that European integration was necessary to secure the peace and prosperity of Europe, and thus used Marshall Plan guidelines to foster integration. This goal in itself had multiple aims: (1) it ensured the integration of Germany into a wider European market and reduced the possibility of waging war in the future as it created a leverage for the United States to trade with Europe as single entity without undue characterization of the different regulations for different countries; (2) Germany was essentially pivot for the United States economic investment in Europe with its enormous available of technical skill and proficient for industry, indeed German capacity and the United States involvement stimulated further fear in France; (3) Germany Integration into a united Europe would serve to

prevent its significant growth and not to be stronger than France or any other European country while preserving the countries mutual dependence on one another, there would be a balance of power and war would never again be an option. (4) With the reduction of aggression and through trade cooperation among themselves as states, a Europe united could also be developed into a third force under the United States hegemony which would act as a buffer towards the Soviet threat in this sphere.

In some ways this effort of the third force through the Marshall Plan guidelines to foster integration, led to the development of regional bodies such as NATO under American guidance and the OEEC for the structures and bureaucrats that would later be used by the European Economic Community (EEC) and European Union. It indeed seemed true then that the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine were two halves of the same walnut (LaFeber, 1997). While the Marshall Plan would provide markets for US industries it would also ensure that Europe remain in the orbit of Washington rather than Moscow. “The Marshall Plan was one of the first elements of European integration as it erased trade barriers and set up institutions to coordinate the economy on a continental level, that is, it stimulated the total political reconstruction of Western Europe” (Milward, 1984).

Self Assessment Exercise

Explain the strategies of the Marshall Plan in relation to the United States foreign policy of containment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has presented us the description of the Marshall Plan, the background information of the economic recovery of Europe after the World War II, as United States economic strategy for containing Soviet Union and the spread of Communism. The unit also exposed the various strategies as well as the goals of the Marshall Plan for the United States. But students should know that the Soviet alternative to the Plan was not a riposte, and students will have opportunities to explore subsequent units.

5.0 SUMMARY

The economic recovery of Germany was necessary for the prosperity of Europe. It was not completely based on the destruction of World War II rather it was futuristic for the United States and her economic search for market for its produce and survival. The unit discussed the twin policies of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The unit also gave attention to the goals and strategies of the policies both official and

unofficial in relation to the containment of Communism through economic integration of Europe.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1. Work out an argument that the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan caused the Cold War
2. Discuss the Marshall Plan

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

LaFeber, W. (1997). *America, Russia and the Cold War*. New York.

Milward, Alan S (2006). *The Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1945–51*. Berkeley: University of California Press

Schain, Martin, ed. (2001). *The Marshall Plan: Fifty Years After*. New York: Palgrave.

Hogan, J. Michael (1987). *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain, and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947–1952*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crafts, Nicholas, and Gianni Toniolo, (1996). *Economic Growth in Europe Since 1945*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

UNIT 2 MOLOTOV PLAN

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 What is Molotov Plan
 - 3.2 The Conception and Strategy of Molotov Plan
 - 3.3 Comecon
 - 3.4 Goals and Implication
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further Readings

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The Soviet leader Joseph Stalin strong conviction that Europe economic integration as conceived by American twin policies of the Truman's Doctrine and the Marshall Plan was capable of eroding Soviet control of the Eastern Bloc countries and tactical arrangement by the United States to consolidate a pro-United States realignment of Europe. In a bipolar Cold War conflict trajectory to establish a nation's power dominance and supremacy, the Soviet Union must as a matter of obligation move to protect its own. One way which the Soviet Union must prevent this, was to ensure that Eastern Bloc nations do not participate in America's economic recovery programme by introducing an alternative to the Marshall Plan. The Soviet's alternative popularly called the Molotov Plan but institutionalized as the Comecon was designed to provide subsidies and encourage trade among countries of eastern Europe. This unit exposes the students to the various strategies of the Soviet Union to stop the United States economic imperialism of Europe especially in the Eastern Bloc. The students will understand how nation act in order to achieve balance of power in a bipolar world as we discuss the policy goals and strategies to enhance a better understanding.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

- Describe the United States Molotov Plan
- Understand Soviet strategies of Eastern European Economic Integration
- Explain the concept of Comecon.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 WHAT IS MOLOTOV PLAN?

The Molotov Plan was the system created by the Soviet Union in 1947 in order to provide aid to rebuild the countries in Eastern Europe that were politically and economically aligned to the Soviet Union (Source: [Wikipedia.org/wiki/Molotov_plan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Molotov_plan))

3.2 THE CONCEPTION AND STRATEGY OF MOLOTOV PLAN

Soviet Union leader Joseph Stalin's (1879-1953) opposition to the United States' Marshall Plan is referred to as Molotov Plan. In spite of post war economic depression, Stalin considered America's plan's vision of an integrated European market with considerable freedom of movement, goods, services, information, and, inevitably, people, as an affront with probable threat to his economic, political, and foreign-policy goals. In addition to declining to participate in the Marshall Plan itself, the Soviet Union prevented the Eastern European countries under its control from taking part. Subsequent Soviet propaganda portrayed the plan as an American plot to subjugate Western Europe. Soviet opposition to Europe Economic recovery program was considered by leaders of Europe Western Bloc as one more refusal to support postwar stabilization effort and capable of escalating Cold War tensions.

Students would recall that in the preceding units, the United States Marshall Plan was discussed. However, on 4th June, 1947, George C. Marshall, America's Secretary of States, gave a speech to announce the economic assistance to war torn nations of Europe, which became popularly known as the Marshall Plan. The Plan provided billions of dollars to European nations to help starve off economic disaster in many of them.

The Soviet Union saw the Marshall Plan as means to create an anti-Soviet bloc. Stalin vacillated on the need to accept or reject the offer because he strongly felt that the Soviets should take the offer and directed that Molotov attend the negotiations regarding conditions of aid to be held in Paris. There was a dramatic twist of Stalin disposition to accepting economic cooperation and that Germany would also be extended aid, which he thought would hamper the Soviets' ability to exercise influence in western Germany, (Wettig, 2008). Though failed, Soviet initial plan was to abort or

at least hinder the program through destructive participation in the Paris talks. More worrisome to Soviet Union was Czechoslovak and Polish enthusiastic posture to accept the Marshall Plan. Stalin perceived that these two of its allies were likely not going to abide by the Soviet directives not to accept the aid, which could result to its possible loss of control in the Eastern Bloc. More importantly also was the condition that every country willing to participate in the Marshall Plan are obligated to have its economic situation independently assessed and scrutiny by the United States to which the Soviets opposed because possible loss of sovereignty. Soviet control over eastern Europe was totalitarian and never in doubt, because Czechoslovakian overt interest in the Marshall plan were noticed early enough and Stalin invited Jan Masaryk, the foreign minister to Moscow where he cautioned for thinking of joining the Marshall Plan. On the contrary, Stalin rewarded Polish Prime minister Josef Cyrankiewicz for the rejection of the Plan with a lucrative five-year trade agreement, the equivalent of 450 million 1948 dollars in credit, 200,000 tons of grain, heavy machinery, and factories. As a result, the other Eastern European states immediately rejected the offer, notably was Finland that had to declined in order to avoid antagonizing the Soviets

According to Gerhard Wettig in his book *Stalin and the Cold War in Europe*, after Vyacheslav Molotov, Soviet Foreign Minister left Paris, opposed and rejected the plan “statements were made suggesting a future confrontation with the West, calling the United States both a “fascizing” power and the “center of worldwide reaction and anti-Soviet activity,” with all U.S.-aligned countries branded as enemies” Furthermore, the communist losses in elections in Belgium, France and Italy were the United States ground plan to destroy Communism and Soviet control of Eastern Europe. Wettig also opined that Soviet “claimed that “marshallization” must be resisted and prevented by any means, and that French and Italian communist parties were to take maximum efforts to sabotage the implementation of the Plan. In addition, Western embassies in Moscow were isolated, with their personnel being denied contact with Soviet officials.

Andrei Vyshinsky, Soviet deputy foreign minister In a 1947 speech to the United Nations General Assembly, said that the Marshall Plan violated the principles of the United Nations. He accused the United States of attempting to impose its will on other independent states, while at the same time using economic resources distributed as relief to needy nations as an instrument of political pressure, (“Vyshinsky Speech to U.N. General Assembly”). Beyond Stalin immediately plan to build economic cohesive Communist Blocs and to take stronger control over the Eastern Bloc countries, was the strong desire to destroy any appearance of democratic institutions. For instance, in the Hungarian elections of 1947 when it does appear that the Communist party would be losing over 40% of votes, an all-out repression was instituted to suppress independent political forces on the basis of continuing instructions by Soviet cadres (Wettig, 2008).

Soviet Union summoned all nine European Communist parties to a meeting in southwest Poland in late September, 1947, to denounce the domination of a clique of America imperialist in international politics. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) is anti West, Parties were to struggle against the U.S. presence in Europe by any means necessary, including sabotage. The Marshall Plan was described as "the American plan for the enslavement of Europe". It described the world as bipolar and typified by —the imperialist and anti-democratic camp on the one hand, and the anti-imperialist and democratic camp on the other. (Wettig, 2008). From on set, all eastern Bloc nations rejected the Marshall Plan except Czechoslovakia, though some countries permitted minor influence of non-communism, in such circumstances, the Soviet Communist Information Bureau (Cominform) took charge in redirecting the mission to destroy capitalist manifestation in the area and to oppose the Marshall Plan under the slogan of national independence.

3.3 COMECON

The Molotov Plan was the Soviet's version of the Marshall Plan, created in order to provide aid to rebuild the countries in Eastern Europe that were politically and economically aligned to the Soviet sphere of influence. In 1947, the Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov in a delegate parley of Foreign ministers of Soviet Union, United Kingdom, France and United States in Paris to discuss the Marshall proposal declared Soviet opposition to the plan and "rejects this plan as totally unsatisfactory.". In its stead, the Soviet Union decided to create an economic union of Eastern European nations as proposed by the Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov. This plan called the Molotov Plan was designed to rebuild their post war economies according to a plan set forth by the Communist parties of each participating nation. The Eastern Bloc nations under Soviet sphere of influence were involved in the Molotov Plan, they include: Poland, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania. The plan was a system of bilateral trade agreements which also established Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) to create an economic alliance of socialist countries. This aid allowed European nations under Soviet sphere of influence and control to stop depending on American aid, rather allowed Molotov Plan states to reorganize their trade to the Soviet Union.

Despite the prevailing political and economic upheavals after World War II, the Soviet Communist leader, Joseph Stalin still considered it necessary to enforce Soviet domination of the small states of Eastern Europe by making the economic recovery aid to Europe less attractive to some states that had expressed interest in the Marshall Plan. This was the cornerstone of Soviet Union formation of Comecon "to exchange

economic experiences, extend technical aid to one another, and to render mutual assistance with respect to raw materials, foodstuffs, machines, equipment, etc."

A January 1949 communiqué agreed upon by the nations of the eastern bloc- Union, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania in Moscow established the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (also referred to as Comecon, CMEA, CEMA, or the Council) The communiqué declared the position of the eastern bloc nations in relation to the economic recovery programme of Western Europe as they decline to "subordinate themselves to the dictates of the Marshall Plan" and their intention to resist the trade boycott imposed by "the United States, Britain and certain other countries of Western Europe". These reasons among others led the Soviet Union to "organize a more broadly based economic cooperation among the countries of the people's democracy". Unlike the implementation process of the Marshall Plan, Comecon lacked clear organizational structure and operated on an ad hoc basis without a charter for more than ten years. However, the primary function of Comecon was redirecting commerce of member countries toward each other and introducing import replacement industries to encourage members to be more economic self sufficient without a central regional policy to solve economic problems. The operations of Comecon were design in line with Soviet pursuit of parallel industrialization strategies in Eastern Europe. The plan was to encourage East European governments to look inward and to pursue bilateral ties with the Soviet Union because of Stalin's aversion for multilateral operation. In the circumstances of Comecon's operation, there was scarcely scope for multilateral policies or institutions because each member state of the Eastern Bloc had to deal with the Soviets on a one-to-one basis by means of direct consultations with Moscow through local Soviet missions. Because the nations under Soviet influence were isolated from the rest of the world and the prevalence intrabloc transaction they have to evolve new dimension to foreign trade through their interactions on economic reforms. This development was not exclusive to the more industrialized and the more trade dependent of the East European countries but even smaller centrally planned economies, had the opportunity to develop a mechanism through which to coordinate investment and trade policies. Consequently, the process grew intrabloc relationship into a more formidable institutional framework such as the 1955 Warsaw Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance not for only economic interest but also political – military enterprise as a result of Western Europe economic integration and instability in Eastern Europe

The years following the treaty especially in 1959 when the Comecon Charter became effective, recorded accelerated economic activities. It undertook a number of bilateral and multilateral investment projects among eastern bloc nations and the establishment of Comecon subsidiary institutions. Some of such institutions were the Central

Dispatching Board to manage the unified system; International Bank for Economic Cooperation – a special bank to facilitate financial settlements among members; and the joint Institute for Nuclear Research. The Soviet Union was the epicenter of all these development efforts to galvanize the investment strategies of the eastern bloc nations toward regional specialization and increased productivity to compete with and even make less attractive the capitalist economies. A notable development was the introduction of the Basic Principles of the International Socialist Division of Labor as adopted by 15th Council Session, based on the principles of specialization embraced by the more industrial states than the less developed East European nations which industrialization growth ambition was greatly threatened by this principles. The Soviet party leader Nikita Khrushchev in articles and speeches proposed a central Comecon planning organ to implement the Basic Principles and foreseeing the evolution of a "socialist commonwealth" based on a unified regional economy. Romania and some other members strongly opposed the proposals on the grounds of sovereign equality of members to forestall supranational planning and reinforce the interested-party clause of the Charter. This marked the beginning of a lull as each country including the Soviet Union was engaged with internal matters and programs of economic reforms which ultimately weakened the regional cohesion.

Further Extension and Improvement of Cooperation and the Further Development of Socialist Economic Integration, which laid the guidelines for Comecon activity. One of such activity was the Comprehensive Program which incorporated elements of both the market and the plan approaches. Following the market approach, the Comprehensive Program sought to: strengthen the role of money, prices, and exchange rates in intra-Comecon relations; encourage direct contacts among lower level economic entities in the member countries; joint planning on a sectoral basis through interstate bodies that would coordinate members' activities in a given sector; new organs in the manner of international associations that would engage in actual operations in a designated sector on behalf of the participating countries; and the need for multilateral projects to develop new regional sources of fuels, energy, and raw materials. Such projects were to be jointly planned, financed, and executed. The aim of the comprehensive program was designed to achieve among others a new concept in relations among members: "socialist economic integration, to intensify and improve cooperation among members, "to develop socialist economic integration, a process of the international socialist division of labor. Comecon sought to attract the participation of developing countries in its activities. The language of the Comprehensive Program may thus also be regarded as an attempt to revitalize the image of Comecon in order to make association with it an attractive alternative to associated status with the EEC.

3.4 GOALS AND IMPLICATION

The Molotov Plan was a trading bloc of communist countries, also known as the Council for Mutual Economic (COMECON) aid which was the soviet's alternative arrangement to the American's Marshall Plan. The objectives include to: coordinate trade and industries of the Eastern Europe countries and promote economic development and cooperation among themselves. It must be noted that like the America's Marshall Plan beyond the official stated goals, comecon was suppose to promote economic growth for all in Eastern Europe, however, the Soviet Union benefitted from the comecon because Soviet Russia now had a market to sell it's goods. What this implies is that comecon was an avenue for the Soviet to expand their market in the guise to help out its countries, because the Soviet Union was only keen on challenging the United States perceived economic imperialism, rather than having the real intention of helping the countries out. Furthermore, because of the immense benefit accruing to The Soviet Union from the activities of Comecon is a strong pointer to the fact that it was more of self-profit for it's economy. It will suffice to state that on the one hand the Soviet Union gained a market to initiate cash flow and to increase its gross national product because of mass export and on the other hand, Eastern Europe countries were have a steady supply of raw materials from the Soviet Union.

Self Assessment Exercise

Explain the Soviet strategies of the Molotov Plan in relation to the United States foreign policy of containment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has presented us the Soviet alternative plan to the United States Marshall Plan in terms of the background information of Soviet plan for subsidies and trade with eastern Europe. The unit also exposed the various strategies as well as the goals of the Molotov Plan and Comecon for Eastern Europe. But students should know that the Soviet alternative to the Plan was not a riposte. After all, the implications of the formation of the Marshall Plan and Comecon, escalated Cold War tension because the relationship between Moscow and Washington did not improve rather grew worse. Both plans have different goals, whereas the United States through the Marshall Plan was strategically orchestrating the plan of containment, the Soviet Union was trying to resist and fight back. However, in the circumstance that the Soviet Union was trying to fight back showed the clear mistrust and distrust between Moscow and Washington

and no matter how noble the Marshall Plan was, it was one of the United States Cold War strategies to stop the spread of Communism..

5.0 SUMMARY

Though, the economic recovery of Germany was necessary for the prosperity of Europe. The Soviet Union was strongly convinced that a reconstructed German economy would be a major threat to its sovereignty and security. The unit discussed the Molotov Plan which was later institutionalized to become Comecon as Soviet strategies to prevent America's economic imperialism of Europe. The unit also gave attention to Soviet strategies aimed at reinforcing control of its satellite states and alliance of the Warsaw Pact nations.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1. Work out an argument that the Molotov Plan and Comecon escalated the Cold War tension?
2. Discuss the Soviet Comecon as Soviet Cold War strategy

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Wettig, Gerhard (2008), *Stalin and the Cold War in Europe*. Rowman and Littlefield.

“Vyshinsky Speech to U.N. General Assembly Temple University.
http://isc.temple.edu/hist249/course/Documents/vyshinsky_speech_to_un.htm.
Retrieved 2009-03-03.

UNIT 3 CONTAINMENT

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
- 3.1 Containment
- 3.2 Strategies of Containment
- 3.3 The Goals of Containment
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The conflict trajectory and protracted tension between the United States and the Soviet Union with inhibited restraint not to provoke full scale war, provided unique episodes of the Cold War international relations and the policy options available to states in its decisions on its security issues. This unit exposes the students on the variety of explanation of policy options a state can use to contain an enemy. The students will understand how the United States policy of containment was used in the Cold War. The unit intends to expose the goals and strategies of containment to enhance our better understanding.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

- Describe the policy of containment in the Cold War period
- Understand the different forms and strategies of containment
- Explain the goals the containment

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 CONTAINMENT

The policy of containment is interwoven with the concept of deterrence. Though, the policy did not originate with the Cold War, as the term did, it has been used as a

primary strategy in foreign affairs long before the Cold war. Early in the history of Europe, there were evidences of its use by the Catholic Church to contain the spread of the Reformation and the doctrine associated with Martin Luther. Also, the conservative monarch states of Europe used the policy to contain French Revolution which propagated the ideology of liberty and equality.

Containment is the blocking of another nation's attempt to spread its influence. The term was used after the Second World War to describe the foreign policy strategy of the United States. George Foster Kennan, a United States diplomat and State department Adviser on Soviet Affairs introduced it in a public debate where he suggested a long-term patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies. The notion of containment was predicated upon the domino theory, which held that if one country fell under communist influence or control its neighbouring countries would soon follow. As a reminder, the battles of the Cold War were fought worldwide and on nearly every continent and in nearly every country around the globe. At the heart of the conflict were two very different world-views held by the two nations and their allies. The Soviet Union viewed capitalism as a monster, which, if unchecked, would consume the entire world with hedonistic abandon. America viewed Communism as an inherently evil mechanism designed to destroy the rights and liberties of all mankind. Both sides believed that the other was seeking world domination (McConnick, 1998). Both states were acting to secure their own survival and security. To do so, they must create a system in which their own power was maximized, while that of their opponents must be reduced.

The United States drafted its strategy for meeting the post-war Soviet threat in 1947. George Kennan, an American diplomat serving in Moscow, proposed a strategy in an anonymous article in the July 1947 edition of *Foreign Affairs* magazine. In his article, Mr. Kennan proposed, "a long-term patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies" through "counter-force at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points." This soon became the impetus for the development of the containment policy by the Truman administration. President Truman identified two key components to the containment strategy: the formation of regional alliances and providing economic and military assistance to other nations to prevent communist expansion. As governments were being restructured in the former colonies, the communists sought to expand their influence to these newly independent nations. The governments of these nations, now in a position of insecurity and weakness, sought help in stabilizing their frail economies and political structures. Many aligned themselves with either the Soviets or the Americans as a means of securing economic and military assistance for their nations.

Kennan's "Source of Soviet Conduct" like Churchill's Fulton speech informed the American people of the challenge posed for their country by the power and behavior of the Soviet Union and provided a clear and sophisticated definition of it that, in itself supplied the grounds for a new formulation of American policy

The first significant strategic use of containment doctrine in the Cold War was in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean countries of Turkey, Greece, and Iran. Before the World War II Britain was influential in this regions, after the war at the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences of 1945 and 1946, Winston Churchill of Great Britain, Franklin D. Roosevelt of united States and Joseph Stalin of Soviet Union had agreed among other issues of post war settlement that the Soviet Union remove their troop from northern Iran on or before March 1946. The Soviet Union refused to remove its troops from Iran by the date agreed upon by the leaders. Rather, Stalin insisted on Soviet exploitation of the oil rich economic resources of Iran, as well as putting pressure on Turkey, its neighbor to the south while Greek communist seem to winning the civil war in Greece. Confronted with American and British pressure as they supported Iran in a debate within the United Nations, the Soviets eventually agreed to move their troops. One reason for the success of communism in Turkey and Greece civil war was the inability of Britain to continue its financial support to the anti-Communist governments of Turkey and Greece. In February 1947, the British government requested the assistance of the United States in the prevention of communist-led insurgence

The American government's response to this request was the adoption of containment, aimed at stopping the spread of communism. In March of 1947, President Truman made a speech to Congress called for the allocation of \$400 million as intervention fund to aid the governments of Greece and Turkey. In this speech, he enunciated the implication for the United States and outlined the elements of the Truman Doctrine. He urged that the United States must act to "help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national identity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes" and that these regimes "undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States" (McConnick, 1998). Furthermore, the United States must therefore "assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way." In accordance with the Truman Doctrine the administration in June 1947 enacted the Marshall Plan as a twin policy to put Kennan containment strategy into action.

3.2 STRATEGIES OF CONTAINMENT

Broadly speaking, the United States strategy of containing the spread of communism could be classified into military diplomacy and the twin policies of Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. The choice of the containment strategy option is predicated on

whether to contain Soviet power (balance of power) or to contain communism. However, the United States understanding that the best medium to spread democracy is to remove hunger, poverty and economic instability which are pertinent conditions for the expansion and growth of communism

1. Economic Assistance:

(a) Marshall Plan: America engaged in an extensive economic assistance when in 1947 enacted the Marshall Plan, a pledge of economic assistance to the nations of Europe willing to participate and the Soviet Union was not an exception. The aid programme was designed to recover the democratic and economic system in Europe. Another was the growth of international economic cooperation. This strengthened the economies and governments of nations in Western Europe, and as the economies of Western Europe improved, the popularity of communist parties declined.

(b) Berlin Airlift: soon after the division of Berlin, German capital into four among the world powers United States, United Kingdom, France and Union Soviet Socialist Russia after the Second World War. The trio of United States, United Kingdom and France merged the territory into Unified West Berlin, (West Germany). Stalin, the Soviet leader did not accept the developments rather opted to apply enough pressure on the Western governments to force a renegotiation. Consequently, this pressure was transform into the Berlin blockage, in which all rail and road links were cut off, as well as the electricity supply, the excuse given being a need to stop devalued older currency flooding in from the West. With the blockade hunger was imminent in West Berlin because of limited food supplies and Soviet Russia had anticipated that western allies would be frustrated out of West Germany. However, with restraint not to provoke full scale war but in an unprecedented twist the allies planned an airlift of food supplies through three air corridors over the Russian zone in Germany allocated to the allies after the World War II, to overcome the Russia's anticipated hunger and hardship in the West. Similarly, Soviet Union could not risk war by shooting a plane down and causing war. Thus, began a massive airlift of food, coal and sundry supplies of approximately two thousand tons per day between the Western German zones and Berlin until September 1949, although the blockade was officially lifted in May 1949. On their part, the allies shut all export from Germany into Soviet zone, placing economic pressure back on Soviet Russia.

2. Military:

(a) Military Intervention: The United States military option of containment was in the form of classical diplomacy which involved a fewer military means and was selective. The policy of Communist containment was different in its use as military aggression and espionage to control third world governments of the nations (South

Korea, Indochina, the Middle East, and Latin America) to achieve balance of power. It also provided military aid to totalitarian communist government. For example, as a means of weakening Soviet power, the United States aided the Yugoslav's Communist totalitarian government under Joseph Tito and support for Greek communists

(b) **Military Aid:** In March 1947, President Truman asked Congress for \$400 million in aid for Greece and Turkey. "It must be the policy of the United States," he argued in what became known as the Truman Doctrine, "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." The Truman Doctrine was a plan to give money and military aid to countries threatened by communism. The Truman Doctrine effectively stopped communists from taking control of Greece and Turkey.

(c) **Formation of Alliance:** The United States also led the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949. NATO was a joint military group. Its purpose was to defend against Soviet forces in Europe [or, as the saying went, "to keep Russia out, America in and Germany down"]. The first members of NATO were Belgium, Britain, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, and the United States. The Soviet Union and its east European allies formed their own joint military group -- the Warsaw Pact -- six years later.

3.3 GOALS OF CONTAINMENT

Containment was a political concept and strategy by the United States in the Cold War period to achieve among other the restoration of balance of power in Europe, containment of Soviet power expansion tendencies and the redefinition of international relations as conceived and practice by the Soviet Union. The United States of America, from the reign of Truman to George Bush pursued the strategy of containment in different forms.- The actions of the Soviet Union during the cold war and the United States response to those actions through the containment strategy as a political concept can be view in relation to the following goals.

1. Balance of Power

The ultimate goal of the United State foreign policy after the World War II was never to engendered bipolarity of Soviet and America sphere of influence. Rather, to act to prevent any one state from developing a preponderance of power. Prior to the cold war tension between the East and the West, America had favoured collective security predicated on sovereignty and international law to maintain world peace – whereby the preponderance of power would be on the good side – nonaggressive state. When this failed, the America foreign policy was designed to aid and encourage self

confidence in poor countries by establishing independent centres in Europe and Asia to aid nations threaten by Soviet expansionism. According to Kennan, who initiate and suggested the containment strategy and policy, the goal was to establish diverse concentration of power with a long – term economic assistance program. The economic aid program should be broad base in terms of geographical spread and benefiting nations should take responsibility of planning, while the United States, the donor country should coordinate with minimal interference in the internal affairs of willing nations.

2 Undermine Soviet Power Projection

Since the Soviet Union was obsessed with establishing a monolithic communist power directed from Moscow that is envisioned to dominate the entire world, it is imperative for the United States to explore the deep division that existed within communism. Thus, Kennan suggested that the United States can exploit the tension between Moscow and the international communist movement. Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and China presented a vulnerable instance, because independent mind Czechoslovakia and uncontrollable China, though communist became some sort of threat to Moscow. Therefore, according to Kennan should covertly support Titoism, (Yugoslav communist leader Josip Broz Tito repudiated Soviet leadership in 1948) without taking responsibility and even to cooperate with communist regimes elsewhere to undermine Moscow.

3 Redefinition of Soviet Concept of International Relations

The third goal of containment strategy of United States foreign policy was ambiguous. According to Kennan, it seeks to modify the concept of Soviet international relations wherein the Soviet Union remained prepared for a possible future war with the capitalist nations. And, “to undermine the general aid strategic potential of major western powers by a host of subversive measures to destroy individual government that might stand in the Soviet path, to do everything possible to set the major Western power against each other” (United States Foreign Policy). Thus, its obligation was to attempt to lead the Soviet Union from its universalistic notion of international affairs toward particularistic understanding of reality (Gaddis, 1982). For Kennan, the United States has it in its power to increase enormously the strains under which Soviet policy must operate, to force upon the Kremlin a far greater degree of moderation and circumspection than it has had to observe... (Kennan,1947).

Self Assessment Exercise

Explain the United States foreign policy of containment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has presented us the definition of containment, the background information of the Cold War United States foreign policy as a mechanism for containing Soviet Union and the spread of communism. The unit also exposed the various strategies as well as the United States objective. But students should know that there are some challenges of containment in the unit or courses, which you will have opportunities to explore subsequently in the course of your education career.

5.0 SUMMARY

The United States foreign policies of containment in the Cold War were discussed in this unit. The unit also gave attention to the goals and strategies of containment.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1. Briefly discuss the various strategies of containment in the Cold War

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Gaddis, John Lewis. *Strategies of Containment: a Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Glassner, Martin Ira, (1996). *Political Geography*, (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Gray, Colin S. (1988). *The Geopolitics of Superpower*, Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky.

James M. McCormick, (1998). *American Foreign Policy and Process*, 3rd ed. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers.

Stephen Hook and John Spanner, (2000). *American Foreign Policy Since World War II* (15th ed.) Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, Inc.

UNIT 4 DETERRENCE

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 What is Deterrence
 - 3.2 Deterrence Theory
 - 3.3 Deterrence Strategy
 - 3.4 Component of Deterrence
 - 3.5 Forms of Deterrence
 - 3.6 Nuclear Deterrence
 - 3.6.1 Problems of Nuclear Deterrence
 - 3.7 Conventional Deterrence
 - 3.8 Mutual Deterrence
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The conflict trajectory of the Cold War offers a unique perspective on international politics and relations because the protracted tension and hostility associated with the conflict between the two superpowers - the United States and the Soviet Union never ended in direct military warfare. However, what made the war exceptional was the dynamics of different foreign policy choices that generated the tension and apprehension within and between the two superpowers. One of such policy thrust was the choice to deter. This unit attempts to explain the doctrine of deterrence as a conflict management strategy in relation to the theory, strategies, goals, typology, components and the problems of nuclear deterrence.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, students will

- Develop a basic understanding of the term deterrence
- Understand how conflict management can be achieved by strategies of mutual deterrence.

- Become familiar with the Cold War conflict strategy to deter the enemy nation and negative conflict behavior
- Be able to explain the significance of the Cold War deterrence.
- Be able to explain how, why and when both superpowers had strong reasons to deter each other in terms of negative conflict behavior.
- Be able to explain deterrence theory, strategy components and typology.
- Identify and explain the nexus and variation between nuclear, conventional and mutual deterrence.
- Explain how personal restrictive behaviour and improved relations between the superpowers fostered deterrence to reduce the risk of war.
- Explain the desire of the superpowers to reduce the risk of a nuclear war through mutual assured destruction
- Improve their ability to evaluate the strategies and potential conflict behavior that can encourage deterrence
- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 WHAT IS DETERRENCE

According to Alex Schmid in his book *Thesaurus and Glossary of Early Warning and Conflict Prevention Terms*, define deterrence as “a threat-based, dissuasive method of conflict escalation prevention that acts on the political will of an opponent in an attempt to restrain him from engaging in aggression or continuing further aggression”. According to him, “deterrence is derived from the possession of credible power instruments that could inflict high or even unacceptable damage to an opponent, thereby restraining the latter from exploiting opportunities and pursuing expansionist intentions” He went further to stress that “deterrence creates a negative outcome in a cost-benefit calculation and is achieved by a combination of political determination, military capabilities and strategic skills”. Kegley and Wittkopf (2001) define deterrence as “a preventive strategy designed to dissuade an adversary (dissuasion by means of military threat) from doing what it would otherwise prefer to do”

The philosophy of deterrence is not peculiar to the Cold War because over time nations-state develop their armies, form alliance, and issue threats to deter other countries from attacking. Thus, the concept of deterrence is predicated on discouragement through fear and was a major component in generating the tension between the major actors of the Cold War. The development and possession of nuclear weapons reached it height during the Cold War period and the United States and Soviet Union- the major actors relied sufficiently on discouraging by threats but ironically aggravated the tension

The ultimate goal of the Cold War was the balance of power logic between the actors which was achieved by nuclear deterrence. Nuclear deterrence was a major source used by the actors in the Cold War to prevent any of the actors from gaining advantage thereby upsetting the balance of power. Then, the standard military strategy came to be the doctrine of deterrence, that is, the doctrine that fear of retaliation would prevent any nations from initiating a nuclear attack (Glenn Blackburn, 1989).

3.2 DETERRENCE THEORY

The theory of deterrence as a military strategy during the Cold War is in relation to the use of nuclear arsenals and featured prominently in the extant foreign policy regarding the development of nuclear technology. Generally speaking, deterrence refers to any party who in an attempt to discourage conflict or a potential aggressor, convey its readiness through any form or medium or broadcast to respond to any attack with equal or greater magnitude as counter attack. Appeasement is a direct opposite strategy of the philosophy of deterrence. The fundamental aspect of deterrence theory is the purpose on how to influence what an enemy thinks or does. Deterrence is a state of mind that prevents a deterree from acting in a way the deterred considers harmful.

David Krieger (2001) writing on nuclear deterrence, missile defense and global instability opined that:

In the world of nuclear deterrence theory, belief are everything what the leaders of a country perceive and believe is far more important than the reality. Nuclear deterrence is a simply proposition: Country A tells country B that if B does X, A will attack it with nuclear weapons. The theory is that country B will be deterred from doing X by fear of nuclear attack by country A. For deterrence to work, the leaders of country B must also believe that country A has nuclear weapons and will use them. Nuclear deterrence theory holds that even if country A might not have nuclear weapons, so long as the leaders of country B believed that it did they would be deterred.

Deterrence theory, according to Alex Schmid is based on a number of assumptions such as: one state does not misperceive the balance and the vulnerability of the stronger state is limited despite the existence of cheap weapons of mass destruction.

3.3 DETERRENCE STRATEGY

Conflict management can be achieved by strategies of mutual deterrence. Robert Doff and Joseph Cerami (2001), gave the following interpretation for explaining the common framework for developing deterrence strategy.

...Strategy is the relationship of ends (objectives), ways (concepts), and means (resources). How do we best use the available means to pursue our objectives? [Of late, we are]... confusing a strategic concept (deterrence) with the means (nuclear weapons). We deter an actor from undertaking a specific action in order to achieve a specific objective (non-use of nuclear weapons, preservation of peace, avoidance of war, etc.). Deterrence is not an objective ..., although it was spoken as such during the Cold War... Rather, deterrence is one way of achieving the objective. Strategic nuclear deterrence, especially MAD [mutually assured destruction], was a specific way of using a specific means (nuclear weapons) to achieve a larger strategic objective. Viewed in this way, it then even more apparent that there must be different means we can use in different ways (including in combination) against different actors to deter different actions.

Governments use deterrence as a strategy to threaten imminent and immense retaliation in the event of attack in order to discourage an enemy nation from the risk and damage of an aggressive action. Among the various deterrence strategies available and used as the Cold War deterrent were weapons of mass destruction (WMD), conventional weapons strength, economic sanctions, etc. A government may use one or a combination of deterrence strategies to deter a possible attack. One major strategy used by the superpowers that received great prominence during the Cold War was Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD), because it characterized the relation between the Soviet Union and United States. It does appear from the conflict trajectory of the Cold War that both nations were fully geared up for a large scale nuclear and conventional war, but were not prepared for the consequences of a nuclear war and were legitimately deterred by the risk. MAD lack credibility requiring the development of policies of flexible response which lowered the nuclear threshold, encouraged the belief that nuclear weapons could be used in deterrence. The strategy of denials is also used when Government develops and maintains defense and intelligence systems with the objective of neutralizing or mitigating attacks. The strategy provides that the aggressor must consider the opportunity cost and comparative advantage in relation to the likelihood of success of embarking on an offensive

The process and strategy of deterrence during the Cold War especially in the United States went through significant variations. For instance, at the latent stage the United States introduced the doctrine of containment. The policy of containment was abandoned and *détente* a new policy was adopted to reduce Cold War tension. Subsequently, the doctrine of mutual nuclear deterrence characterized the diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and United States. The concept of deterrence took a broader multinational dimension while the United States army was dealing with the break-up of the Soviet Union and the expansion of nuclear technology to other nations outside the United States and Russia.

The second strike capability, according to military strategist, is that the retaliatory force should be protected from destruction through a first strike. A second strike capability can be determined by a technical means and policy means. Deterrence works only if the intended deterree chooses to be deterred. The components of deterrence are both physical and psychological: Physical, because a series of military instruments are required to sufficiently threaten an opponent in a certain way. Psychological, because the deterree and deterrer must be convinced not to even think of attacking. Deterrence is successful only if the deterring nation has the political will to use its weapons and deterrence is credible only if the deterring nation is able to convey to the deterree that it is both capable and willing (Michael Carnes, 2001). Deterrence is assumed to be successful when adversaries are prevented from action and the heart of deterrence lay on the credibility of strategy and forces to responses in the event of a direct military assault.

According to David M. Kunsman and Douglas B. Lawson, the capacity to threaten with a credible response made deterrence effective and thereby making credibility a key component of deterrence. During the Cold War, the potential catastrophic destructive capabilities of nuclear arsenal created a peculiar security atmosphere which none of the leaders of any nation especially between the United States and the Soviet Union, dared the unimaginable consequences of using WMD. Therefore, nuclear weapons provided the credible response capability of the nation's army. Suffice it that, the purpose of nuclear arsenals is to deter the use of WMD – nuclear, chemical and biological weapons in crisis or conflict. The success of deterrence depends on two psychological components namely, communication and perception. However, these rules were not applied when the United States used its nuclear weapons on Japan. The unrestricted use of nuclear arsenals on the twin city of Japan by the United States, the United States never communicated its intention to warn if Japan did not do this they (United States) will attack you with nuclear weapon. In this case, deterrent did not play any role because these weapons were a closely guarded secret.

3.4 COMPONENT OF DETERRENCE

The nature of the doctrine of deterrence relies on four components preponderant on three key elements: capacity, credibility and communication.

First, the deterrent force must have the capacity to inflict unimaginable destruction or to exact a cost either by denial strategy, in terms of charges above normal price on the deterree. The deterrent nation must ensure the safety and reliable potential of its nuclear weapon whereby the opponent lack the capacity to eliminate the capability of the threatening nation.

Second, the threatening nation must demonstrate its planned readiness and deterrents to make good its issued threat by showing its capacity to engage in a war it is trying to prevent when the willingness to use retaliatory nuclear force is conveyed by the opponent that creates dilemmas.

Third, the threatening nation must convey to the opponents the price and implication for the desire to achieve an unacceptable objective thus, the opponent must believe in the doctrine of deterrence and its assurances.

Fourth, the issue of credibility is a major determinant in deterrence, thus, the deterrent message must convey the conviction and efficacy to buttress real probability that the threatening nation will perform the promised action if and when necessary.

Generally speaking, it is unlikely that these four requirements can be fulfilled or accomplished within a conventional armed conflict circle but during the Cold War this may not necessarily be the case as it was a conflict of interest and interest deemed vital enough to fight for that could in turn precipitate actual fighting..

3.5 FORMS OF DETERRENCE

There are two forms of deterrence: Core or passive deterrence and External or active deterrence:

Core or Passive deterrence is the threat with a nuclear strategic response in case of a nuclear attack on the home territory of the threatening nation for instance the Soviet Union.

External or active deterrence is the threat with a nuclear strategic response in case of a nuclear attack on the territory or troops of allies such as member nation of NATO. It is known as active because it involves a clear decision and the willful act on the part of the nation that owns the nuclear weapon. Also, because of its political tendencies, the

term active was used by United States European allies while policy maker in the United States deferred the term extended.

3.6 NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

Nuclear deterrence is a strategy and subunit of deterrence peculiar to the Cold War weapon development and how it galvanized the way superpowers approach to diplomatic relations and Cold War tension. “Nuclear deterrence is dissuading an adversary from attacking by threatening retaliation with nuclear weapons”, (Kegley and Wittkopf, (2001). Since the emergence of nuclear weapons, nuclear deterrence strategy has been a major military thrust throughout the Cold War. The strategy strived in a bipolar system dominated by the Soviet Union and United States with the increased number, type and improved methods of delivery. A nuclear deterrent is used to refer a country’s weapons, when considered in the context of deterrence theory and sometimes composed of a nuclear triad as in the case of the nuclear weapons owned by the United States, Russia and the Peoples Republic of China.

The essence of nuclear was succinctly captured by Bernard Brodley, a United States strategic analyst, when in 1946, observed that” thus far the chief purpose of our military establishment has been to war. From now on its chief purpose must be to avert them”. According to him “nuclear weapons in deterrence should the purpose to pervert their use”. Deterrence theory holds that nuclear weapons are intended to deter other states from attacking with their nuclear weapons through the promise of retaliation and possibly mutually assured destruction (MAD).

Furthermore, the theory of nuclear deterrence holds that its efficacy depends on nuclear armed state X being deterred from nuclear attack on nuclear state Y and even non-nuclear armed state Z that enjoys the protective canopy of nuclear armed state Y. The outcome will be a stand-off between nuclear armed state X and Y.

The trend of nuclear deterrence was precarious in the Cold War, both the Soviet Union and the United States had developed their various nuclear and warned against any first attack would compel a massive retaliation, this also include protection for the nations that are under their influence. The Cold War era recorded an extensive and massive development of nuclear weapons to completely destroy the other which precipitated the development of policies of mutual assured destruction..

Beyond the two Cold War superpowers, other nations developed their nuclear arsenals. For instances, Britain and France developed their nuclear arsenals and maintained a relatively small deterrent forces to avoid depending on the United States and to preserve their status as great powers. Also, because China felt threaten by the

Soviet Union, developed her nuclear arsenals. Israel, India, Pakistan and South Africa had a smaller cache of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear deterrence was a dangerous and potentially tragic one and also deeply selfish, irresponsible and lawless, risking all humanity and the planet (Krieger, 2001). During the Cold War, the deterrence forces occupied the top of the scale of preference of nuclear armed nations to prevent the calamity of first strike. Thus, nuclear armed nations were preoccupied with protecting their nuclear forces at the expense of its vulnerable ordinary citizens. However, nuclear deterrence limited a nuclear armed nation from becoming so powerful and not to assume that it can completely overwhelm another nation with a first strike. It is on this pivot that the nuclear arms race between the United States and Soviet Union revolved. First strike, do not mean that one nuclear armed nation actually have the force and capacity to overrun its opponent's nuclear forces. Nuclear deterrence is a concept that reveals a high degree of unprecedented uncertainty which escalates and rises, on the one side of the coin while on the other, the possibility of irrationality in time of crisis cannot be determined.

The philosophy, strategy, psychology and theory of nuclear deterrence has revealed that nuclear deterrence cannot be a stable system as a result of its predictable and unpredictable consequence in other countries. Thus, the security imperative of nuclear arms dictates an endless chain of development for instance, the history of development of nuclear arsenals indicates that the Soviet Union United Kingdom arsenals were developed as a result of the United States nuclear weapons. Subsequently, the Soviet Union and United Kingdom nuclear arsenals led to the development, of the French and Chinese forces. The development of India's nuclear force was as a Chinese nuclear force. The India's nuclear forces led to the development of Pakistani nuclear forces. In the Middle East Israel was the first to establish a nuclear weapon to give its hostile Middle East neighbours a deterrent force. As nuclear armed nations are on the increase there is a correlating increase of uncertainties in the system. Nuclear deterrence is not foolproof nuclear attack, rather, it undermines security, the most feasible proof against nuclear attack is predicated on the elimination of nuclear weapons as ordained in the non-proliferation treaty.

3.6.1 PROBLEMS OF NUCLEAR DETERRENCE

One problem of nuclear deterrence is to determine the efficacy. However, a counterfactual analysis can provide some measure of assessment. This is largely due to the fact that more often than not people in developed world are afraid of war because they recognize the horror of war while others contend that nuclear weapons

had a lot to do with avoiding World War III. Nevertheless, in the Cold War, certain conflict situations such as the Berlin blockade and airlift and the Cuban missile crisis would have escalated into nuclear armed conflict if not for the effects of nuclear weapons. Nonetheless, according to Joseph Nye (2003) “ there are still ambiguities about the missile crisis that make it difficult to attribute the whole outcome to the nuclear component”

Nuclear deterrent is dependent on capability to damage and credibility that weapons will be used which also involves the nature of conflict. For instance, between the United States and the Soviet Union in the Cold War, when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan, the United States have the capacity to attack the Soviet Union but the outcome may not warrant the attack because the stakes involved are low. This brings to the fore the challenges and problems militating against extended deterrence. Also, the problem of credibility leads to a distinction between deterring threats against own country and extending deterrence to cover an ally.

Another problem of nuclear deterrence was self restraint, for instance, between 1945 and 1949 before the Soviet Union developed her first nuclear weapon, only the United States possess nuclear weapons though in small quantity but did not use them. Several reasons such as the small size of the arsenals, they lack understanding of these new weapons and fear that the Soviet Union might use her large conventional forces to capture all of Europe have been identified why the United States did deploy its nuclear weapon.

Finally, nuclear deterrence raises a moral question - if nuclear war possibly fit the just war model or nuclear weapons could fit within just war theory?

3.7 CONVENTIONAL DETERRENCE

Conventional deterrence is the act of dissuading an adversary from attacking with conventional and nonnuclear weapons by threatening retaliation with nonnuclear weapons (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2003). Conventional and nuclear deterrence are often seen as the same but for a clearer understanding of conventional deterrence it is better to consider the distinction. Robert Haffa Jr. (1992) is more apt in determining the difference when he stated that:

Between strategic nuclear deterrence (the level at which the majority of the theorizing has occurred, at which the use of intercontinental thermonuclear weapons has been threatened, and at which deterrence is usually thought to have held) and conventional deterrence (the level that has received considerably less attention, at which, by definition, threats

to use unconventional weapons of mass destruction are excluded, and at which deterrence, arguably, has been prone to fail).... The range of likely cost benefit calculations shifts dramatically when the deterrent calculus of strategic nuclear warfare is compared with regional conventional conflict

3.8 MUTUAL DETERRENCE

The doctrine of mutual deterrence is based on the principle of assured destruction. Mutual assured destruction popularly known as MAD is a “subsystem of mutual deterrence in which both sides possesses the ability to survive a first strike and launch a devastating retaliatory attack” (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2001). The success of mutual deterrence is based on mutual vulnerability in relation to military potential for and psychological expectation of mass loss of lives and destruction as a result of nuclear armed conflict.

Self Assessment Exercise

Examine the iron curtain antagonism as the beginning of the Cold War

4.0 CONCLUSION

The entire concept of deterrence is preponderant on the assumption that the both sides had common rational peaceful goals. However, during the Cold War misperception and diplomatic miscalculations or opposing political ideologies led to escalating mutual perception of threat, and a subsequent arms race which heightened tension and increased the risk of actual war. Nevertheless, the doctrine of mutual deterrence characterized relations between the United States and the Soviet and United States from the 1960 until the 1980s. The Cuban missiles crisis was the closest the world has come to nuclear war. Thus, a failure of deterrence would have meant a full scale exchange of all nuclear weapons available to both countries – when deterrence fails conflict develops.

Deterrence by denial is the principle strategy of Cold War actors whereby the superpowers built up or maintained defense or intelligence systems with the objective of neutralizing or mitigating attacks. Deterrence and reassurance complement each other though deterrence especially nuclear deterrence took different shapes with different country and there is a form of positive feedback. The unit explored

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the doctrine of deterrence as a conflict management strategy and defined the term, the character and nature of deterrence in the Cold War. Deterrence is a threat-based, dissuasive method of conflict escalation prevention that acts on the political will of an opponent in an attempt to restrain him from engaging in aggression or continuing further aggression. The unit specifically discussed deterrence theory as a conflict management style designed to influence what an enemy thinks or does. As a strategic conflict management model three key elements- capability, credibility and communication. Also, the unit discussed the various typologies such as passive and external deterrence, nuclear deterrence and its challenges, conventional and mutual deterrence.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1. What actions and policies, by which parties, are most likely to deter the future risk of conflict escalation
2. Deterrence is a conflict management strategy. Discuss?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Carnes, Michael P.C. (2001). "Reopening the Deterrence Debate" in Max G. Mainwaring (ed.) *Deterrence in the 21st Century*. London: Frank Cass and Company Ltd.

Gaddis, John Lewis (1982) *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security*. Oxford University Press.

Haffa, Robert P. Jr. (1992) "The Future of Conventional Deterrence" in Gary L. Guertner, Robert Haffa, Jr. and George Quester (eds), *Conventional Forces and the Future of Deterrence*. Carlisle Barracks, Pa: U.S. Army War college

Kunsman, David M. and Lawson, Douglas B. (2001) *A Primer on US Strategic Nuclear Policy*, Sanda Report: Sanda National Laboration.

Krieger, David (2001) "Nuclear Deterrence, Missile Defenses and Global instability" *Nuclear Age Peace Foundation*. Media Temple.

Robert H. Dorff and Joseph R. Cerami, (2001) “Deterrence and Competition Strategies” in Max G. Mainwaring (ed.) *Deterrence in the 21st Century*. London: Frank Cass and Company Ltd.

Schmid, Alex P. (2000) *Thesaurus and Glossary of Early Warning and Conflict Prevention Terms* United Kingdom: Forum on Early Warning and Early Response

UNIT 5 DETENTE

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 What is Détente?
 - 3.2 Détente as Cold War Concept
 - 3.3 The End of Detente
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

There was a growing fear of a nuclear holocaust especially with the growth in those countries that had nuclear weapons. A cursory look at the tripartite relations that existed in the era of the Cold War between China, United States and the Soviet Union that possessed nuclear weapons explains why the superpower had to pursue détente. First, though with small volume of nuclear weapons, China was unable to continue in fear of world isolation and what the United States did in Vietnam and her worsening relations with the Soviet Union. For the United States, it became clearer that there better ways of containing communism other than confrontation, military budget and arms race but rather more advantageous to pursue cooperation and maintain peaceful relations with Soviet Union after the Vietnam experience. The Soviet Union had the largest armed forces and was spending a huge amount on the arms race at the cost of basic household with poor living conditions. Besides, the Soviet Union was aware of the imminent danger of her deteriorating relations with China while the United States was improving hers with China. This unit attempts to highlight the relaxation of tension, the reasons why and how the superpowers pursue détente and when the conflict situation and relations moved from confrontation to a period of cooperation and compromise.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, students will

- Develop a basic understanding of the term détente
- Become familiar with the Cold War conflict progression from a period and posture of confrontation to cooperation and compromise
- Be able to explain the significance of the détente and why the superpower abandoned confrontation to embrace cooperation
- Explain why both superpowers had strong reasons to seek relaxation in tensions
- Identify the various Cold War events such as the Berlin Walls, Sino-Soviet split, the Cuban missiles crisis, arms race and control, the Helsinki Conference, etc, brought about détente.
- Explain how improved relations between the superpowers could boost their domestic popularity, secure their power and increase wealth.
- Explain the desire of the superpowers to reduce the risk of a nuclear war, as they were aware that the nuclear arsenals on each side could lead to mutually assured destruction
- Improve their ability to evaluate potential conflict behavior that can encourage relaxation of tension and improve relations
- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 WHAT IS DÉTENTE?

Détente is a French word for relaxation. In the Russian lexicon the word is *razryadka* loosely meaning relaxation, discharge and in America parlance as alternative strategy to rollback. Détente in general, is a strategy of seeking to relax tensions between adversaries to reduce the possibility of war”, (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2003). Schmid (2000) defined détente as “period of reduced tension between military adversaries in which the risk of war is reduced (originally referring to the relaxed position of a crossbow”. It is a strategic relaxation of tension during the Cold War associated with the diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and United States and later China - a thawing at a period roughly in the middle of the Cold War. The United States pursued détente during the Nixon administration as a means to pursue the goals of containment. The Soviet Union also adopted détente as a term to describe their policies toward the United States. After a series of events constrained the superpower to desire some measure of control of their nuclear arsenals. Each of the superpowers had different reasons to pursue the course of détente. For instances, the United States, sooner than later discovered that there are more effective ways of containing communism than she did in the past. Besides, they soon realized the comparative advantage and cost effectiveness of maintaining a peaceful relationship with Soviet Union rather than the massive weapon production and maintaining a huge armed

forces. Similarly, the Soviet Union budgetary provision for defense was huge when compared to its ailing economy especially after the World War II dealt a huge blow to it. The huge spending in weapons development and maintenance presupposes that other areas of the economy such as basic household and living standard were neglected. Furthermore, the improved relationship between the United States and its archrival with China, a former ally now enemy poses serious threat to Soviet security, thus, the Soviet Union sought for a better relation with the United States. Suffice it that, this apprehension was extended to China an emerging world power that stock piled nuclear weapons though of smaller quantity than the superpowers.

3.2 DÉTENTE AS COLD WAR CONCEPT

When the United States and Soviet Union began strategic diplomatic shift from past confrontational posture by bargaining with its adversaries and to express its interest in a more cooperative relations, they tacitly began laying the foundation of détente. Using the words of Henry Kissinger, 1968 United States National Security Adviser to President Nixon “détente sought to create “ a vested interest in cooperation and restraint” “an environment in which competition can regulate and restrain their differences and ultimately move from competition to cooperation”.

Détente is the period when the relations between the United States and Soviet Union during the 1960s, that is, the tension of East and West blocs waned, reduce competition and increased cooperation with a marked departure from past confrontation as a result of compromises at the negotiation table. Of course, it was a period when the superpowers met several times to discuss approaches to relaxing tension between them and treaties that resulted from these meetings. The nuclear non-proliferation Treaty and Outer space treaty were two of the first building blocks of détente.

In June 1973, Leonid Brezhnev, Premier of the Soviet Union visited Washington as a high water mark in détente between the United States and Soviet Union. Also, the Appollo-Soyus project, a joint space experiment by three American astronauts and two Russian cosmonauts resulted into five years of political negotiations and technical co-operation including exchange of engineers to the two countries’ space centers.

Trade relations between the two blocs increased substantially during the era of détente. Most significant was the vast shipment of grain annually from the United States to Soviet Union to cushion the failure Soviet collectivized agriculture known as Kolkhoz.

Specifically, détente is seen to reflect mutual interest and understanding, cooperation and compromise as characteristics of superpowers relation rather than Marxist and Realist view that give greater impetus to material power, crisis and conflict. The key elements of détente reflect common interest about the need to avoid nuclear war, that is, mutual interest and cooperation overlooks the complex relationship between the superpowers.

The following Cold War events made détente possible: the Sino-Soviet split, the Berlin wall, Cuban missile crisis, Vietnam War, arms control and Helsinki conference

The Sino-Soviet Split

In 1979, the Chinese communists came into power and there was harmonious working together between the Soviet Union and the communist government in China. The Sino-Soviet split refers to the breakdown of the bilateral relationship and alliance that existed between the Soviet Union and China as two major communist nations. Prior to the collapse of alliance, the Soviet Union had sent technicians to assist China industrialize but by 1960, both nations have started to denounce each other in the public and the Soviet Union had to recall the technicians. Four reasons have been proffered for the causes of conflict and the deterioration of relationship between Soviet Union and China. First, the protracted dispute over the shared boarder territory of 4,500 miles. Second, the Chinese challenged the acclaimed leadership role of the Soviet Union of the World Communist Movement. Third, Chinese perception of, and accusation of Soviet Union hardness in the struggle against the capitalist movement by seeking improved relationship of the Soviet Union that sooner or later china world develop nuclear weapons. As a matter of fact, this fear became real when in 1964 China tested her first atomic bomb and hydrogen bomb in 1967 (Walter C. Langsam and Otis C. Mitchell 1991).

In the light of this, Soviet leadership began to see China, their border neighbour as the primary threat to their notional security more than the United States. Consequently, the Soviet Union opted to improve their relationship with the United States, for fear of facing two implacable adversaries simultaneously.

The Berlin Wall

The Berlin wall erected by the Soviet Union to curtail and check the exodus of people from East to West Berlin was a major source of conflict after the World War II. The Soviet Union pressured other occupying powers to leave Berlin and allow it to become part of East Germany. The fleeing Germans from communist regime in East Berlin saw West Berlin as a sort of save haven that portrayed the Berlin wall as a

source of oppression and hardship. Through, it became a major embarrassment for the Soviet Union but the wall prevented any further emigration of East Germans to the West and divided family. Within the ambit of the Cold War and international politics, Berlin was a significant diplomatic issues between the superpower, the Berlin wall encouraged détente because the Soviet Union were no longer threaten by mass exodus in Berlin.

The Cuban Missile Crisis

The Cuban revolutionary movement led by Fidel Castro toppled General Fulgencio Batista led corrupt dictatorship regime, proclaimed himself as communist and accepted Soviet military protection for Cuba. Cuba is only ninety miles from mainland of the United States, embracing communism and becoming an allied of America's archrival, the Soviet Union was a major security threat to the United States. Consequently, diplomat relations between the United States and Cuba were broken. With the assistance of America, some Cuban dissidents attempted to invade Cuba at the Bay of Pigs to precipitate an internal upheaval against the regime of Fidel Castro, but the outcome was disastrous for the dissidents who were captured by Castro's men. Thus, the United States and Cuban became sworn enemies.

Not too long in October 1962, intelligence report available to the government of the United States revealed the covert installation of a site from where nuclear warheads could be launched at a distance up to 1,400 miles in Cuba by the Soviet Union. Although, the warheads had not arrived in Cuba, but it does appear that the United States was apprehensive and the tension was welling up. President J.F Kennedy, the then head of United States government ordered a naval blockade to prevent the delivery of any Soviet missiles or war head to Cuba. The unfolding events were precarious, as it appears that violent confrontation was inevitable and might lead to direct armed conflict between the superpowers. Fortunately, the Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev and President J.F Kennedy were able to defuse the ensuing tension as the Soviet Union agreed to dismantle the missile sites, in return, the United States promised not to invade Cuba. Furthermore, both leaders explored the existing rapport and exchange of correspondence to improve diplomatic relations and to de-escalate the tension. No doubt, there was great apprehension on both sides, consequently, both leaders opted to establish a teletype-like hot line between Moscow and Washington, "on the assumption that better communion would resolve the possibility of accidental war" (Blackburn, 1989). In addition, both leaders were able to agree on a treaty which placed some measures of restraint in the arms competition, because in spite of the prohibition on testing of nuclear weapons both nations had not ceased to conduct underground nuclear test. According to Alva Myrdal (1976) "the treaty had little effect on nuclear weapons development, but it led to a reduction of radioactivity in the

atmosphere, and thus was important as a public work measure”. Leonid Brezhnev became the Soviet Premier after a power struggle with Nikita Khrushchev. He began to pursue improved diplomatic relations with the United States and detente was a major thrust of Soviet foreign policy. It became apparent that the Soviet leadership in spite of the Sino–Soviet split and its alleged role in the Cuban missile crisis and economic challenges was ready to tow the part of cooperation with the United States

The Vietnam War

The military involvement of the United States in the mid 1960 Vietnam War and the inextricable complication made détente irresistible to leaders of the United States. Vietnam was a nineteenth century French colony of Indochina, which was dominated by Japan during the World War II. France after the war attempted to regain control of Vietnam but met stiff opposition from the National Liberation Movement led by Communist Ho Chi Minh. In 1946, war broke out between France and her colony, the war last for about 8 years when France was finally defeated in 1954. In 1955, the first summit and conference since World War II was held in Geneva. The Geneva Conference among other things demonstrated that leaders of the superpowers nation can dialogue for peaceful resolution of international issues. The result of the conference was the partition of Indochina into four nations namely Laos, Cambodia, North Vietnam and South Vietnam. Communist Ho Chi Minh was in charge of North Vietnam and President Ngo Dinh Diem was the leader of South Vietnam sustained by America aid. The attempt to unify the North and South of Vietnam through election of a national government was resisted by President Diem who was pessimistic about the outcome of the election. Consequently, communist Ho Chi Minh, who was well favoured to win the elections, launched guerrilla warfare against South Vietnam for the national unification of North and South Vietnam by force.

Beyond the issues of national unification, the United States with the benefit of hindsight in relation to the theory of Domino, began to be involved for fear of the larger implication of Domino, began to be involved for fear or the larger implication of the Vietnam conflict - another opportunity for communist expansion. According to the dominion theory, if one small nation like South Vietnam fell to the communist, then nearby countries would inevitably follow, like dominos in a row – that is, the communist may threatening the shores of the United States.

In spite of the huge support by United States, the South was losing the struggle, even when America had committed more combat troops well half a million. The conflict escalation and the nature of warfare was a nightmare for the United States because of the difficult jungle like terrain where booby traps and ambush attacks. For the United States, the Vietnam War has been described as a war of attrition. Over time, frustration started welling up back home because of the protracted conflict as a result

of American's inability to over-run the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong guerrilla army in the South, this precipitated protest demonstrations in many college campuses. The Tet Offensive of 1968 complicated the end of the war, because the Viet Cong though defeated were satisfied with their strike at dozens of targets because it demonstrated their resilience and could not be overcome quickly. This fueled agitation of American in public opinion against the war, which constrained the government to seek negotiated end to the war. But Ho Chi Minh, convinced of his successes was not enthusiastic to cooperate, and the conflict escalated and it spread to Cambodia and Laos. Faced by this worrisome situation the United States had to seek the assistance of Soviet Union and China to prevail on North Vietnam to accept negotiation that resulted in a peace agreement. The Vietnam War provided another opportunity for the relaxation of tension that compelled the United States to seek better relation with communist power in the Cold War because the United States was neck deep involved and found it inextricably difficult to end the conflict and had to resort to its archenemy Soviet Union, in order to get out of the war.

Arms Control

The control of nuclear arms race was a salient goal pursued by the major dramatis personae of the Cold War through the nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty of 1968. The purpose of the treaty was to restrict weapon expansion by limiting possession of nuclear weapons to those countries like the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and China which already have them to keep them. Proliferation of nuclear weapons refers to the fact that more and more countries were acquiring the ability to construct nuclear weapons (Blackburn, 1989). To achieve the objective of nuclear nonproliferation treaty, the treaty stipulate that nations apart from the one mentioned above what wish to acquire nuclear energy were required to accept the terms of the treaty by subscribe to international inspection of their nuclear installation and pledge that such acquisition will not violate world peace but would rather be used for peaceful purposes. The restrictive terms of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty discouraged Argentina, Brazil, Egypt, Israel, Pakistan, South Africa and Spain from signing the treaty because of the disparities. However, this development did not restrain the arms competition. The Seabed Treaty was signed and enforced to prohibit placement of nuclear weapons on the sea bed and ocean floor. This treaty lacked military significance because no nation was involved.

Through the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT I & II), the major dramatis personae of the Cold War negotiated on Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM), Submarine-launched Ballistic Missiles (SBLMs), Anti Ballistic Missiles (ABM) and Multiple Independent Reentry Vehicle (MIRV). The series of SALT negotiations resulted in the agreement to freeze their nuclear arsenals and strategic weapons and

limitation on antiballistic missile systems. This sustained negotiation by the nuclear powers to control the arms race was fundamental to the relaxation, moderation and de-escalation of tension because they pledged to work for peaceful coexistence by signing an accord in 1972. By the terms of the 1972 accord, they were obliged to improved diplomatic relationship in terms of political, economic and cultural needs by consulting urgently on precarious international issues that may lead to nuclear war.

Helsinki Conference

Prior to the 1975 Helsinki conference on security and cooperation in Europe Willy Brandt, the West Germany chancellor introduced *ostpolitik* (East politics). Ostpolitik was a West Germany policy of nonaggression treaties with the Soviet Union, Poland and East Germany to resolve a number of unresolved territorial disputes from World War II. This policy apparently helped to de escalate and relax tension in central Europe. For instances, the stringent restriction of movement between East and West Berlin (Germany) was relaxed for free movement.

Beyond the ostpolitik, the Conference which held in Helsinki, Finland provided a pivot on which the two superpowers and thirty-five other nations agreed on three points for peaceful coexistence. They include: First, a declaration that no European frontiers should be violated. Second, encourage economic activities between Eastern and Western Europe. Third, nations were obligated to encourage free movement of persons and ideas within and among European nation. Among other things the conference was able to achieve a platform for better relationship between communist and non communist in terms of economies, freedom of movement and expression.

3.3 THE END OF DÉTENTE

By the late 1970s, the Cold War relaxation of tension was beginning to wane. Several reasons have been advance for the end of détente.

The Soviet Union had not ceased its military build-up in spite of the agreements and negotiations of the strategic arms limitation talks. For example, the Soviet Union deployed the new SS20 missiles in Europe. Similarly, the Soviet Union pursued its expansionist policies more vigorously by offering political and military support to emerging Marxist governments in Angola, in 1975, Ethiopia in 1977, Nicaragua in 1979 and Afghanistan in 1977-80

It was alleged that the United States undermined the arms control process when they failed to ratify SALT II and facilitated its allies in Europe, China and Japan to encircle the Soviet Union.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan shored up a struggle allied regime and the boycott of 1980 summer Olympics. The United States under the Carter doctrine increased and boosted defense budget and began financial assistance to Pakistan consequently subsidizing anti Soviet Mujahideen fighters in the region.

President Reagan opposed the concession of détente and abandoned Salt II negotiations

One fundamental factor that sustained the Cold War tension for over five decade was the mutual distrust and suspicion by and amongst the superpowers. The distrust and suspicion was also responsible for the end of détente, because by 1980, the feeling of distrust and suspicion has increased tremendously when both nations acquired new leadership with aggressive disposition. One of such leaders was President Ronald Reagan of the United States, who sought to increase the country's military arsenal was repented to have said "we don't mistrust each other because we are armed, we are menaced because we distrusts each other" this, neither of the supper or mere withered about the arm control negotiations.

Self Assessment Exercise

Critically examine the various events in the Cold War that necessitated detente

4.0 CONCLUSION

Détente is all about moving from confrontation to an era of increased cooperation through trade, shifting ground to accommodate the interest of the other party, and compromise. It was hoped that the new relationship would herald a permanent improvement in relations between the United States and Soviet Union, but differences in outlook led to an increasing number of conflicts. Détente seems to have just been the continuation of the Cold War by other means. Détente could probably not have taken place, and certainly wouldn't have assumed the form that it did, without the rift that developed between the world's two primary communist regimes. In spite of domestic opposition to détente, its success demonstrated that permanent conflict was not the only option, and that accommodation and compromise could lead to negotiation and agreement for peaceful co-existence.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the relaxation of tension during the Cold War by attempting to define what is detente. Also, the origin, nature and significance of detente as Cold

War strategic move from confrontation to cooperation with increased communication and negotiation. The unit specifically discussed the various Cold War events such as the Sino-Soviet split, Berlin Wall, Cuban missile crisis, the 1960 Vietnam War and its psychological effects for the United States, arms control – nuclear non-proliferation Treaties and the 1975 Helsinki Conference on security and cooperation. Also, the unit discussed the post détente period with renewed hostility and confrontations with particular reference to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, increased military budget and build up and advancement of distrust and mutual suspicion.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1. Do an argument why and how the cold War witnessed détente
2. How did the world's major powers attempt to ease world tension?

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn, Glenn (1989). *The West and the World Since 1945*. (2nd Edition) New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kegley, Charles W and Wittkopf, Eugene R. (2001) *World Politics: Trend and Transformation* (8th Edition). New York: Macmillan Press Ltd.

Langsam, Walter C. and Mitchell, Otis C. (1971) *The World Since 1919* (ed.) New York: Macmillan.

Myrdal, Alva (1976) *The Game of Disarmament*. New York: Parthenon

Schmid, Alex P. (2000) *Thesaurus and Glossary of Early Warning and Conflict Prevention Terms* United Kingdom: Forum on Early Warning and Early Response

MODULE 4

Unit 1	NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANISATION
Unit 2	WARSAW PACT
Unit 3	THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS
Unit 4	ARMS RACE AND CONTROL
Unit 5	COLD WAR TREATIES AND AGGREEMENTS

UNIT 1 NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION (NATO)

CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction
2.0 Objectives
3.0 Main Body
3.1 Collective Security, Creation and Organizational Structure of NATO
3.2 North Atlantic Treaty
3.3 NATO and the Cold War
4.0 Conclusion
5.0 Summary
6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
7.0 Reference/Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The military – geopolitical framework that was prevalent in Europe after World War II could be explained by alliances such as North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in 1949 and Warsaw Pact in 1955. The military defense of West Europe, like the Marshall Plan and economic cooperation, require a common front and collective responsibility for the international peace and security through common defense. The militarization of the western alliance was one means of intensification of Cold War tension and containment of communism on the one hand and on the other, to de-escalation. This unit exposes the students to the creation of NATO, the Treaty, structure and the western bloc alliance in the Cold War. The students will understand how the tense military standoff between NATO and Warsaw Pact nations developed

and how NATO was formed to secure West Europe from the spread of communism and Soviet expansion after World War II. The unit intends to expose the significance of NATO, in the area of collective security to achieve international Peace and to enhance our better understanding of the fluctuating tension throughout the post-war trans-atlantic alliance during the Cold War.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit students should be able to:

- Explain and describe the military alliance in the western bloc during the Cold War period
- Understand the significance of the North Atlantic Treaty to world peace.
- Explain the purpose, structure and tasks in the area of selected collective security.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 COLLECTIVE SECURITY, CREATION AND STRUCTURE OF NATO

The nations of Western Europe in search for a new order in terms of military alliance after World War II to ward off possible renewed aggression by Germany and the threat of Soviet expansionist tendencies with its spread of communism met in Brussels in 1948 to sign the Pact for a defense alliance called Western European Union. The Brussels military alliance was a precursor to NATO but was considered to be incomplete because it was between France, Britain, Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg but did not include the nations of North America of the United States and Canada. After the war the Soviet Union and United States became the two major super powers and the six member nations of the Brussels pact could not resist its expansionist and the spread of communist ideology without the support of the United States. As at this time there was growing presence of the Communist parties in France and Italy and potential aggression from Soviet armies, which became a serious concern for the United States. For the United States, it became imperative to form a formidable Atlantic alliance with the west to serve as a new defensive unit to counter the Eastern Bloc and the Berlin blockade that began in June 1948. The Cold War tension and strategy was predicated on the future of Germany the protagonist of World War II because Berlin the German capital was located within the Russian zone shared with the Western allies. At the defeat of Adolf Hitler and the Nazi regime, the country was

partitioned and divided into four zones among the Soviet Union on the Eastern Bloc and the United States, United Kingdom and France, allies on the Western Bloc. The expansionist ambitions of the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin were never in doubt because since the end of World War II, he was preoccupied with enthrone his rule on the whole of Europe, beyond the eastern portion that the Soviets had conquered in World War II. Apart from the United States military activities, no formal commitment through alliance of the sort was made to resist the Soviet, though, countries like Sweden and Ireland opposed such alliance, it became imperative to galvanized support and agreement in the manner of military alliance for collective security in Europe.

The founding member states of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1949 were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France (withdrew from military structure 1966), Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom and the United States. In 1952, Greece and Turkey joined but Greece withdrew from military command 1974 – 80), and in 1955, West Germany was integrated (With East Germany as reunified Germany from 1990) while Spain became a member in 1982. Currently, NATO comprises of 26 member nations, since the end of the Cold War in 1991 and the disbanding of Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO), the former Eastern Bloc nations and others such as Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic in 1999, and Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovenia, and the Slovak Republic in 2004 became members. In the Cold War tension, NATO was a military alliance between European countries and North America for their collective defense and security to contain the Communist Bloc led by the Soviet Union (later allied under the military Warsaw Pact 1955–91) and the perceived threat of the spread of communism. After the Cold War, NATO has assumed a new nomenclature with its increasing redefinition as an agent for international peace and security with the increasing international peace-keeping and enforcement.

The North Atlantic Treaty also called Washington Treaty was signed in Washington D.C on 5 April, 1949 by twelve signatories comprising of the nations of the Brussels Pact, Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, the United States and Canada formed the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and was ratified by the United States in August of the same year. The formation of the NATO in 1949 as a joint military group to defend against Soviet forces in Europe was led by the United States. The popular slogan then was "to keep Russia out, America in and Germany down". Six years later the Soviet Union and its east European allies formed their own joint military group called the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) or Warsaw Pact as we shall see in subsequent units.

Organizational Structure of NATO

The institutional structure of NATO comprises of international secretariat with two standing committees – the Council of foreign Ministers and the Committee of Chiefs of Staff. The Secretary General as the chief civilian of NATO is responsible for coordinating and directing the daily administrative activities as head of international secretariat in Brussels, Belgium. The Council of Foreign Ministers of NATO comprises Ambassadors of member nations who represented the foreign Minister as permanent members in session. The head of NATO's military operations is the Supreme Allied Commanders (Europe and Atlantic), usually Americans who act as Chair of a Military Committee consisting of the Chiefs of Staff. The military headquarters is known as Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers, Europe (SHAPE) in Chièvres, near Mons, Belgium. It should be noted here that the Military Commander have almost always been an American to avoid their troops from being under any foreign command. There is also an Allied Commander, Channel (a British admiral). In 1960 a permanent multinational Allied Mobile Force (AMF) was established with headquarters in Heidelberg, Germany, for quick and prompt response to any member nation under threat of attack. Also, just before the end of the Cold War and collapse of the Soviet Union, a meeting of NATO defense ministers approved in May 1991, the creation of 100,000-strong 'rapid-reaction corps' to be commanded by the United Kingdom. This new military structure would have a multinational outlook and operate as a mobile unit that could respond to the challenges of post-Cold War era within NATO territory unless otherwise agreed by all members of the alliance.

The staff at the Headquarters is composed of national delegations of member countries and includes civilian and military liaison offices and officers or diplomatic missions and diplomats of partner countries, as well as the International Staff and International Military Staff filled from serving members of the armed forces of member states.

The North Atlantic Treaty provided for the NATO Council like any alliance and outline how decisions are to be made. The Council is made up of its 28 member nations with each sending a representation (delegate or mission) to the headquarters, the senior member of the delegate is referred to as Permanent Representative usually experienced ambassador or civil servant. Each nation represented at the Council table or on any of its subordinate committees retains complete sovereignty and responsibility for its own decisions. Most member states domicile their mission to NATO through the embassy in Belgium. The North Atlantic Council (NAC) membership is made up of the Permanent Members and chaired by the Secretary General, the Council meets at least once a week with the vested governance authority and powers it takes decision in NATO and matters affecting. When decisions have to be made, action is agreed upon on the basis of unanimity and common accord. There

is no voting or decision by majority. Also, foreign ministers, defense ministers or heads of state or government (HOSG) as part of the Council meets at higher level meetings where decisions regarding NATO's policies are generally taken. It should be observed that in spite of whatever level the Council meets the authority and powers of decision - making, and its decisions have the same status and validity. NATO organized summits like the peoples' parliament is an important medium of reaching decisions on complex issues, such as enlargement.

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly is made up of legislators from the member countries of the North Atlantic Alliance as well as thirteen associate members. Officially, it is a different structure from NATO, meets at once at least twice every year, one at the annual session and one other. The Assembly sets broad strategic goals for NATO, and is the organ that directly interacts with the parliamentary structures of the national governments of the member states which appoint Permanent Members, or ambassadors to NATO (Maloney, 1991). The aim of the Assembly is to avail legislative members of NATO countries the opportunity to leverage on, and discuss security policies on the NATO Council. Also, the Assembly as a political integration body of NATO, through its five committees on Civil Dimension of Security, Defense and Security, Economics and Security, Science and Technology and Political Committee, generate political policy agenda setting for the NATO Council and provide impetus and direction as agreed upon by the national government of member states through their individual national political processes.

The Military Representative, usually a senior officer supported by international military personnel from each member nation's armed forces is the second important delegate to NATO. Each nation's Military Representative make up the membership of the Military Committee. The Committee is responsible for recommending measures considered necessary for the common defense of the NATO territory, provide direction and advice on military policy and strategy, provide guidance on military matters to the NATO Strategic Commanders, whose representatives attend its meetings, and the overall conduct of the military affairs of the Alliance under the authority of the Council. Like the Council, from time to time the Military Committee also meets at a higher level, namely at the level of Chiefs of Defense, the most senior military officer in each nation's armed forces. The operational work of the Committee is supported by the International Military Staff. The Supreme Allied Commanders (Europe and Atlantic) is the Chair of NATO Military Committee consisting of the Chief of Staff NATO member nation and direct military operations. The military operations is split into two Strategic Commands- the Allied Command Operations and the Allied Command Transformation, both are commanded by a senior US officer assisted by a staff drawn from across NATO. The former is responsible for the strategic, operational and tactical management of combat and combat support forces

of the NATO members while the later is responsible for the induction of the new member states' forces into NATO, and NATO forces' research and training capability (Espen Barth and Bozo, 2005). The Strategic Commanders are responsible to the Military Committee for the overall direction and conduct of all Alliance military matters within their areas of command.

3.2 NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments. They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law. They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area. They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty:

Article 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

Article 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

Article 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

Article 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

Article 5

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Article 6

(1) For the purpose of Article 5, an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack:

- on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian Departments of France (2), on the territory of or on the Islands under the jurisdiction of any of the Parties in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer;
- on the forces, vessels, or aircraft of any of the Parties, when in or over these territories or any other area in Europe in which occupation forces of any of the Parties were stationed on the date when the Treaty entered into force or the Mediterranean Sea or the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer.

Article 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third State is in conflict with the provisions of

this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

Article 9

The Parties hereby establish a Council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council shall be so organised as to be able to meet promptly at any time. The Council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

Article 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European State in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any State so invited may become a Party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

Article 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the States which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other States on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

Article 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

Article 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of other signatories.

Notes: The main object of the NATO alliance is stipulated in Article 5 to galvanize collective security so as to ensure international peace. However, the definition of the territories to which Article 5 applies was revised by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of Greece and Turkey signed on 22 October 1951. The Treaty came into force on 24 August 1949, after the deposition of the ratifications of all signatory states.

3.3 NATO AND THE COLD WAR

The Berlin blockade of June 1948 galvanized the formation of NATO at a time when the democratic and capitalist nations of the Europe and America were apprehensive and weary of communist Soviet Union invasion of Western Europe and spread of communism accordingly. The Soviet leaders had long feared encirclement by capitalist nations and interpreted all American actions as part of a long range plan to destroy communism. Likewise, the Americans believed that the Soviet Union was bent on world domination (Glenn Blackburn, 1989). The communist victory in the Chinese civil war of 1949 and the 1950 Korean War were two events that globalised the superpower conflict because it exacerbated the tension and does appear that world communism was becoming more dominant. Because of the existing distrust among the superpower and the struggle for survival, the United States believed, the Soviet Union harbour expansionist ambitions and to be intent on forcing his rule on to the whole of Europe, not just the eastern portion that the Soviets had conquered in World War II. The Soviet Union believed that capitalism is heavily embedded with labor exploitation and war-mongering imperialism. One source of overcoming this fear was to drum support and military alliance with other nations. In spite of the fact that military forces of member states and the nuclear weapons of the USA, the UK, and France were available none of it was engaged in a direct military confrontation between the superpowers. Rather, NATO became a deterrence strategy and brought about some standardization of allied military terminology, procedures, and technology. No doubt

member nations of NATO officially in their sovereign capacities identified two complementary aims of the Alliance which were to maintain security and pursue détente. This identification presupposes that each nation through the alliance or individual capability could provide defenses at whatever level rendered necessary by the Warsaw Pact's offensive capabilities without spurring a further arms race. There were about 1300 Standardization Agreements to cover NATO rifle, firearm, and aircraft marshalling signals including phonetic alphabet. STANAG was the code name for NATO standardization. NATO began military exercises for its military personnel and ships in 1952 to be battle ready and strategies in the areas of maritime, Mariner, combined air-naval-ground, simulated atomic air-ground and combined amphibious landing exercise.

Greece and Turkey became members of the alliance in 1952 resulting in controversial negotiations between the United States and Britain over the admittance of the two countries into NATO military command structure. As a result of Turkish invasion of Cyprus, Greece withdrew its forces from NATO military command structure. The Soviet Union in 1954 indicated its intent to join NATO in order to preserve peace in Europe but the proposal was rejected by the NATO countries because for them the aim of the Soviet Union was to weaken the alliance. Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty provide for the alliance's membership expansion among European nations, but one disturbing issue of admittance among NATO members was the question of admittance, re-armament and allowing West Germany to join NATO. Though, there was strong opposition and apathy among members as a result of German aggression which caused World War II, nevertheless, in May 1955 Germany was integrated into NATO. Halvard Lange, then Norwegian Foreign Minister described the situation as "a decisive turning point in the history of our continent". West Germany was pivotal to the alliance resistance of Soviet invasion and the economic recovery of programme of Europe. The Soviet response to the incorporation of Germany was the creation of Warsaw Treaty Organization and the signing of the Warsaw Pact on 14 May, 1955 which formally delineated the East – West Bloc of Europe.

The dominance of the United States in the military operations of NATO armed forces and special romance between the United States and the United Kingdom posed serious worries to France. France Cold War President Charles De Gaulle in 1958 and afterward registered his country dissatisfaction and argued for the creation of a tripartite NATO directorate that would avail France an equal opportunity with the United States and the United Kingdom. Especially, as France sought NATO's assistance to quell colonial insurgence in Algeria one of its colonies. President De Gaulle not satisfied with NATO's response to his request opted to build independent defense for France and withdrew from NATO military command structure in 1962. France also demanded that the United States withdraw its two hundred military

aircraft stationed in France, surrender the control of operational base and moved out all NATO troops in France accordingly. Ultimately, by 16 October 1967, NATO relocated the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) from Rocquencourt, France, to Casteau, north of Mons. Belgium. Nevertheless, France remained a member of the alliance, and committed to the defense of Europe from possible Communist attack with its own forces stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany throughout the Cold War.

Self Assessment Exercise

Explain the German rearmament as a major challenge to the formation of alliances in the Cold War.

4.0 CONCLUSION

This unit has discussed the collective security, creation and structure of NATO as a military alliance by nations of Western Europe against the spread of communism and Soviet Union. The main objective is to make students acquire the necessary skills to understand the role of alliances as a collective responsibility in achieving international peace and security. It is also to enhance scholarly Explanations for object of the Treaty and the tense military standoff between NATO (Western) and Warsaw Pact (Eastern Communist) nations in the Cold War period.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we discussed the collective security, creation and structure of NATO as a military alliance. Also, the object of North Atlantic Treaty and the German question to explain why its incorporation give birth for an opposing alliance, Warsaw Pact. The military diplomacy and militarization of the western alliance was one means of intensification of Cold War tension and containment of the Soviet Union and the spread of communism as well as to relax Cold War tension, détente.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

- 1 Discuss the NATO military alliance in the Cold War
- 2 The militarization of the western alliance was one means of intensification of Cold War tension, explain.

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Beer, Francis A. (1972) *The Political Economy of Alliances: Benefits, Costs, and Institutions in NATO*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

David C. Isby & Charles Kamps Jr, (1985) *Armies of NATO's Central Front*, Jane's Publishing Company Ltd.

John C. Milloy. (2006), *North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, 1948–1957: Community or Alliance?* focus on non-military issues

Smith, Joseph, (1990) ed. *The Origins of NATO*. Exeter: UK University of Exeter Press.

UNIT 2 WARSAW PACT

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 Early Formation
 - 3.2 Warsaw Pact
 - 3.3 Internal function and Goal of Warsaw Pact
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Without signing the Warsaw protocol for a formal alliance and extend the effective term of the 1955 Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance, the Soviet Union would have to grapple with the challenges of coordinating foreign policy and military integration with its East European allies through cumbersome bilateral arrangements. In addition, there would be no formal cohesive forum- political-military alliance in Eastern Bloc to articulate its interest in international negotiations like the CSCE and Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction talks, or for issuing its arms control pronouncements. In this unit as we attempt to discuss the general outlook of the Warsaw Pact, student will availed the opportunity of reflecting on the problem that affect alliances, participation in alliance decision making and how the Warsaw Pact provided for greater intra alliance debate, bargaining and conflict between members states.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

At the end of this unit, students should be able to:

- Develop a basic understanding of the Warsaw Pact as military strategy of the Soviet Union and as a system of collective security and defense
- Become familiar with East Bloc alliance and its significance in the Cold War tension
- Examine the formation of the bilateral and multilateral Treaties in contemporary international affairs
- Improve their ability to synthesize information and think critically as they reflect on the problems that affect alliance and decision making

- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 EARLY FORMATIONS

Prior to the formation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955, and as a result of Soviet occupation of central Europe at the end of World War II, they began to organize the armies of Eastern Europe into a coalition force with the Red Army to fight Wehrmacht. The experience of the Soviet military command over multinational forces was used to provide the impetus for the foundation on which the Warsaw Pact was built. The Soviet through the Red Army formed, trained and armed Polish and Czechoslovak unit to carry out its westward expansionist offensive into German occupied Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. Before this time Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania though with communist regimes were never allies of the Soviet Union rather they supported Nazi Germany in a bid to recover territories seized by the Soviet Union under the terms of the 1939 Nazi – Soviet non aggression Pact. However, through the defeat by the Red Army, Bulgaria and Romania forces were subjugated and transformed the remaining army into the side of the Soviet Union. The Soviet front commanders headed the allied control commission in each of these occupied countries. The important territories occupied by Soviet forces acquired the status of garrison with the creation in 1947 of Northern Group of Forces (NGF) and Group of Soviet Forces in Germany (GSFG) in 1949. Before this new formation, the Soviet had secured bilateral treaties of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance for twenty years with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Romania. The aim and implication of these treaties was that the East European nations that are signatory to the treaties were prohibited from entering into relations with Soviet enemy state, became Soviet official allies, and granted the continued maintenance of Soviet troops and military presence on their territory.

The circumstances of Soviet military presence and control facilitated the enthronement of communist governments and regimes in Eastern Europe through the combatant allies to the Red Army in the liberation war from Nazi occupation. The Soviet satellites regimes enjoyed Soviet military support and were obligated to Soviet political and security interest in Europe. The Soviet Union embarked on a systematic transformation of East European government through political control of their armed forces by instituting a system of local communist party after the Soviet model. The preponderance of Soviet activities in East Europe in the late 1940s and the 1950 was to cultivate and monitor political loyalty of its military allies and not to grow their military capabilities. Thus, the Red Army and its occupation authority purged or co –

opt rival communist and non communist resistance movement to suppress any form of opposition to restructuring according to the Soviet model.

Another Soviet strategy of systematic transformation of Eastern Europe was the Soviet style indoctrination aimed at consolidating and increasing communist party membership within the officer corps and to build a crop of military leaders that would be loyal to the national communist regime and the socialist ideals. One way to achieve this was the recognition and reward for unquestionable political loyalty at the expense of military professional and competence for advancement in the military industry. As a result, other unprecedented criteria of class origin became a necessary requirement to gain admission into the military school and commission into the officer cadre. On the contrary, because of the very many opportunities the military enterprise offered, many supported the continuance of communist party regime.

The Sovietization of East European national armies and the efforts to develop political and military instruments of control were strategies to erect political domination, however, the Soviet Union still experienced some resistance to its domination such as the 1953 Workers' uprising in East Berlin which its forces could not crush and became a major blow on Soviet control until the introduction of the use force which was relatively, a new option. Despite the Sovietization of East Europe and the political and military control, the Soviet had overtly avoided formalizing their alliance of Eastern Bloc until the 1955 integration and admission of West Germany into NATO forces.

3.2 THE WARSAW PACT

The Warsaw Pact was the formal name for the military alliance by nations of the Eastern Bloc in a treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance established on 14 May, 1955, under the auspices of the Soviet Union. Warsaw Pact, also known as Warsaw Treaty Organization was a mutual defense treaty subscribed to by eight communist states in Eastern Europe, namely: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Soviet Union. The Warsaw Pact had a multinational rather than a multilateral military defense outlook because it was more of a political-military alliance of European Communist states to counter the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and in response to the admission of West Germany into NATO. The name of the Pact was derived from Poland Communist Conclave, a Soviet initiative that was realized in a Conference by the Eastern Bloc held on 11 May 1955, in Warsaw, Poland. Some objectives of the Warsaw Pact and Treaty include; a pledged for mutual defense of any member state that is attacked; non-interference in the internal affairs of the member countries, respect for national sovereignty, and

political independence. Its terms included a unified military command and the stationing of Soviet troops in the other member states. For instance, Warsaw Pact troops were called into action to suppress the Polish, Hungarian and Czechoslovak uprisings in 1956 and 1968 respectively.

The supremacy of the Soviet Union in controlling and influencing the decisions and activities of the alliance is derived from the simple fact that Moscow provided: 80 percent of the manpower, more than 90 percent of the pact's defense expenditures for forces, which in the early 1980s reached 5.4 million troops, nuclear weapons and strategic forces, and was the sole custodian of all nuclear warheads. The high defense budgetary provisions and expenditure in the Cold War period led to a declining Soviet economy which necessitated the reformation of Soviet Cold War policies. Mikhail Gorbachev in his twin reformation policies of perestroika (restructuring) and glasnost (openness) changed the offensive defense of the pact's doctrine to non offensive defense with a substantial reduction of forces.

Ultimately for the Eastern Bloc the Pact was to maintain world peace through alliances. Thus, Article 1 of the Warsaw Treaty stressed the maintenance of international peace and security. Some other articles of the Warsaw Pact were pointers to this claim, for example: Article 2 proposed effective arms control measures; Article 3, obliged member states to consult each other on all aspects of international relations; Article 4, is a reaffirmation of Article 4, is a reaffirmation of Article 4, is a reaffirmation of Article 51 of the UN Charter which states that in the event of attack on any Warsaw Pact states they would have the right to individual or collective defense; and Article 7, banned other alliances prejudicial to the interests of the Warsaw Pact. Student should note that Article 5 and 6 of the 1955 treaty though not salient to the present discourse but provided for the establishment of the Joint Command of the armed forces and the Political Consultative Committee respectively.

The formalization of Soviet led Eastern Bloc alliance began when in May 1955, representative from Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania met in Warsaw to sign the multilateral Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance as a spontaneous reaction to NATO induction of West Germany as a member. Students would recall that the Soviet had secured bilateral treaties with each nation of east Europe on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance and the United States and its Western allies in the early 1950s, re-arm and integrate West Germany into NATO. The bilateral treaty avail the Soviet Union the leverage of efficient control of its East European allies before the formation of the multilateral Warsaw Pact. The Warsaw Pact was a legally defined multilateral alliance structure that was more than the bilateral arrangement, conceived and delivered by the Soviet Union to establish its control and influence as the world socialist leader,

prestige and legitimized its presence. No doubt, NATO's planned rearmament and integration of West Germany was a major threat to Soviet foreign policy objective, thus the Soviet Union was determined to prevent and oppose Germany's resurgence especially as a powerful ally of the Western powers. The Soviet plot to sabotage the admission of Germany into NATO was carefully orchestrated by Viacheslav Molotov in Berlin at the four super power nation foreign Ministers' Conference in 1954, where he made three proposals: first, the possibility of holding simultaneous elections of East and West Germany that may result in the Unification of Germany; second, general treaty on collective security in Europe and third, the dismantling of existing military alliances and blocs such as NATO. The Soviet proposal was rejected by the other three Foreign Ministers and on 5 May, 1955, West Germany was formally admitted into NATO. For the Soviet the integration of West Germany was a special threat to Soviet interests in Europe and the bilateral treaties have become inadequate its security framework therefore the East European socialist states come enter into a more formidable political and military alliance. Consequently, on 14 May, 1955, in a Soviet Union initiated conference in Warsaw, Poland, with its communist allies in East Europe formally created and signed the Warsaw Pact. It must be observed here that the Warsaw Pact was created six years after the establishment of NATO in 1949, thus it has been argued by scholars that the Soviet Union had tactically avoided alliances that could divide Europe into opposing blocks

The structural organization of the Warsaw Pact functioned as part of the Soviet Ministry of Defense and was divided into the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) and the Joint Command of Pact Armed Forces. The Political Consultative Committee (PCC) was the highest alliance organ and responsible for handling civil matters while the Joint Command was to organize the actual defense of the Warsaw Pact member states and controlled the assigned multi-national forces, with headquarters in Warsaw, Poland. Article 5 of the 1955 Pact established the Joint Command of the armed forces and Article 6 established the Political Consultative Committee, both headquartered were domiciled in Moscow. In practice, however, the Joint Command, as well as the Joint Staff were drawn from the general staff of the signatories and were part of the Soviet General Staff. Both the Pact's Commander in Chief and its Chief of Staff were Soviet officers. The command structure, logistics, directorate of operations and air defense network of the Joint Armed Forces were tied to the Soviet defense ministry. In 1976 the PCC established the permanent Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs (CMFA) to regularize the previously ad hoc meetings of Soviet and East European representatives to the Warsaw Pact. Given the official task of preparing recommendations for and executing the decisions of the PCC, the CMFA and its permanent Joint Secretariat have provided the Soviet Union an additional point of contact to establish a consensus among its allies on contentious issues. The Soviet Union was directly in charge and dominated the activities of the Pact because it

provided the two principal commanders -the First Deputy Soviet Minister of Defense and the First Deputy Head of General Staff of the Armed Forces acted as the Supreme Commander of the Warsaw Treaty forces and head of the Treaty Unified Staff respectively. The founding document formed the Joint Command to organize the actual defense of the Warsaw Pact member states, declared that the national deputy ministers of defense would act as the deputies of the Warsaw Pact commander in chief, and established the Joint Staff, which included the representatives of the general (main) staffs of all its member states. The treaty set the Warsaw Pact's duration at twenty years with an automatic ten- year extension, provided that none of the member states renounced it before its expiration. Although the Soviet Union directly commanded all allied units, the Supreme High Command included one representative from each of the East European forces. Lacking authority, these representatives simply relayed directives from the Supreme High Command and General Staff to the commanders of East European units. The Soviet General Staff in Moscow directed the activities of the alliance's Joint Command and Joint Staff and, through these organs, controlled the entire military apparatus of the Warsaw Pact as well as the allied armies. Although the highest ranking officers of the alliance were supposed to be selected through the mutual agreement of its member states, the Soviets unilaterally appointed a first deputy Soviet minister of defense and first deputy chief of the Soviet General Staff to serve as Warsaw Pact commander in chief and chief of staff, respectively. While these two Soviet officers ranked below the Soviet minister of defense, they still outranked the ministers of defense in the non-Soviet Warsaw Pact (NSWP) countries. The Soviet General Staff also posted senior colonel generals as resident representatives of the Warsaw Pact commander in chief in all East European capitals. Serving with the "agreement of their host countries," these successors to the wartime and postwar Soviet advisers for the allied armies equaled the East European ministers of defense in rank and provided a point of contact for the commander in chief, Joint Command, and Soviet General Staff inside the national military establishments. They directed and monitored the military training and political indoctrination programs of the national armies to synchronize their development with the Soviet Army. While all national units had so-called Soviet advisers, some Red Army officers openly discharged command and staff responsibilities in the East European armies. The general operations of Warsaw Pact's military was structured in different committees for various command for various tasks, it comprised of Committee of Defense ministers (KMO), the Combined Armed Forces (OVS) and the Combined Command (OK). In addition to the combined command, there was a military committee of the combined armed forces, a combined armed forces headquarters—in Moscow—and a Technical Committee (TK). Also, all equipment had common feature because all were Soviet designed, although some were later adapted and improved upon by the 'Non-Soviet Warsaw Pact' (NSWP) states. The

uniformity in training and organization would probably have given the Warsaw Pact the advantage on the battlefield. It must be noted here that for 36 years (1955 – 1991) the military alliances of the west (NATO) and east (Warsaw Pact) never did they engage in direct warfare against each other in Europe; but the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective allies implemented strategic policies aiming at the containment of each other in Europe, while working and fighting for influence within the wider [Cold War](#) (1945–91) on the international stage

Over the years precisely after the death of Soviet Leader Joseph Stalin, the structural organization of the Warsaw military command and technology was dismantled to reflect a new Soviet strategy as envisioned by his successor Khrushchev in his quest to achieve greater legitimacy for communism and the communist party through meeting the needs of the Soviet population. At inception the preoccupation of Stalin establish political control over the non-Soviet forces. Following Stalin's death, Khrushchev systematically renationalized the Warsaw Pact military hierarchy by replacing Soviet officers in high positions with indigenous personnel, and professional training and professionalism received new impetus. Although, the Soviet Union still maintained its control over the Warsaw Pact nations, the Ministry of Defense in Moscow recalled many Soviet Army officers and advisers from their positions within the East European armies. In 1969, a major structural reorganization of the occurred in the various Warsaw Pact management Committees - Committee of Defense Ministers, the Military Council, the Military Scientific Technical Council, and the Technical Committees. The CMD is the leading military body of the Warsaw Pact. In addition to the ministers of defense of the Warsaw Pact member states, the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff of the JAF are statutory members of the CMD. With the changes member nations were involved and participated actively in the genuine consultation and joint defense and foreign-policy decision making process of Warsaw Treaty Organisation operations in the areas of weapon research, development and production. In the circumstances, armies of the member nations had the opportunity to restore their distinctive national practices and re-emphasize professionalism in the military which hitherto was sacrificed in the altar of political loyalty. According to Fes'kov, Kalashnikov and Golikov (2004) military training supplanted political indoctrination as the primary task of the East European military establishments.

Khrushchev reforms of the Warsaw Pact popularly referred to as de-Stalinization encouraged internal sovereignty of member nations and the increased role of Non States of Warsaw Pact (NSWP), in the process, the East European armies began to reduce their loyalty to communist national cause. The Polish workers' riot of 1956, Hungarian revolution and public demonstration in support of Polish workers and Soviet invasion of Hungary, Albania severed relation with Soviet Union and Yugoslavia denunciation of Soviet Union and communist ideal with all defections and

near defection from Soviet alliance system in Eastern Europe marked a major crack and gradual disintegration of Soviet led Warsaw Pact. The events of 1956 in Poland and Hungary forced a Soviet re- evaluation of the reliability and roles of the NSWP countries in its alliance system. Soviet Union response to the cases opposition, near defection and defection led to a significant change in the role of the Warsaw Pact as an element of Soviet security the Soviets began to turn the Warsaw Pact into a tool for militarily preventing defections in the future. Moscow used the Pact to suppress dissent in Eastern Europe through military action. With the success of Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolution, it became imperative for Moscow to reduce the influence the multinational Political Consultative Council (PCC) the highest organ of the Pact to enhance its control. In the subsequent strains, nations like Albania and Romania supported strong opposition against Soviet Union (Sino –Soviet split), refused to participate in military exercises, stopped military cooperation and left the pact. In addition, with the increasing independence of the East European nations, the Warsaw Pact lost cohesion in the 1980s. Several events marked the beginning of the end of the Warsaw Pact began: The East European Revolutions in 1989; the reunification of East and West German in 1990 were symbolic act, which foretold the imminent dissolution of the Warsaw Pact's in July 1991; and in March 1991, the PCC officially dissolved the military structure of the pact. Barely four months after precise in July the political organization was terminated. The pact was dissolved with the founding members because it never grew beyond its original member except Albania that withdrew in 1968, prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union itself. In spite of the fact that the Soviets already had considerable success in establishing strong allies throughout the world, outside their formal military alliance and increased activities and relations with the Third World countries, the Warsaw Pact never added new member countries in the more than thirty years of its existence. This is irrespective of the activities and relations which were at its peak with Third World in the mid- to late 1970s, the Soviet Union did not offer Warsaw Pact membership to any of its important Third World allies. A notable instance was that the Soviet Union was reported to have strongly discouraged Libyan interest in Warsaw Pact membership, expressed through one or more NSWP countries - Hungary and Poland have confined their Third World involvement to commercial assistance, and limited its support of Libya to bilateral consultations. The Warsaw Pact impacted tremendously on the relaxation of Cold War tensions (détente) as it tend to reduce the level of threat perceived by the NSWP countries and their perceived need for Soviet protection, which ultimately eroded the cohesion of the Warsaw Pact alliance. This is because the United States and the nations of the West overtly recognized the territorial status quo in Europe which eliminated the apprehension of imperialist attempt to overturn East European communist regimes which does not justify the demand strict Warsaw Pact unity.

3.3 INTERNAL FUNCTION AND GOAL OF WARSAW PACT

The Warsaw Pact as a Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance was a Soviet military strategy to harness the potential of Eastern Europe and to consolidate Soviet control of Eastern Europe during the Cold War. The goal of Warsaw Pact military strategy in Europe is a rapid defeat of NATO in a conventional and nonnuclear war. The strategic goal of the Warsaw Pact as envisioned by the Soviet Union was to inflict a decisive defeat on NATO and cause the collapse of the Western alliance by frustrating its will to fight, knock some of its member states out of the war, before its political and military command structure could consult and decide how to respond to an attack. The following were some of the functions and goals of the Warsaw Pact:

- 1 **Diplomacy:** The Warsaw Pact functioned as a political-military alliance, however, until the 1960s, the Soviet Union used the Treaty more as a tool in East-West diplomacy. One salient objective of the Soviet Union was the grand desire to project a more flexible and less threatening image of communism abroad thus used the Political Consultative Committee (PCC) to aggregate its foreign policy initiatives and peace offensives, including frequent calls for the formation of an all-European collective security system to replace the continent's existing military alliances
- 2 **Non aggression Pact:** The Political Consultative Committee (PCC) also proposed a nonaggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Central Europe.
- 3 **Defense Strategy:** Practically, the activities of the Warsaw Pact were designed to build a multilateral military alliance. The Soviet Union stationed troops in the satellite states and concentrated primarily on making the Warsaw Pact a reliable instrument for controlling the East European allies. The commander of the Joint Armed Forces directed and monitored the military training and political indoctrination programs of the national armies to synchronize their development with the Soviet Army.
- 4 **Justification for Soviet invasion of Hungary:** the Soviet invasion of Hungary to repel the revolution of 1956 and the criticism that followed because it was clearly contrary to the provisions of the Warsaw Pact's rule of mutual noninterference in domestic affairs and conflicted with the alliance's declared purpose of collective self-defense against external aggression. Khrushchev, therefore invoked the terms of the Warsaw Pact as a justification for the Soviet invasion as a cooperative allied effort. Subsequently, the Soviet Union moved to turn the alliance's Joint Armed Forces (JAF) into a multinational invasion force that would put a multilateral cover over unilateral Soviet interventions as a measure to whip erring member states back under Soviet control.

5 Promote the Assimilation: The primary focus of Warsaw Pact joint military exercises between Soviet forces and the allied national armies was to ensure that the Soviet Union develop the overall training plan for joint Warsaw Pact exercises and for the national armies to promote the assimilation of Soviet equipment and tactics. And to prevent any NSWP member state from fully controlling its national army and to reduce the possibility that an East European regime could successfully resist Soviet domination and pursue independent policies.

Self Assessment Exercise

Explain the overall value of the Warsaw Pact to Soviet Union

4.0 CONCLUSION

The Warsaw Pact provided the Soviet Union an official mechanism to counter NATO in East-West diplomacy and equaled the Soviet Union and the United States as the leaders of an alliance of ostensibly independent nations supporting its foreign policy initiatives in the international arena. The multilateral Warsaw Pact was an improvement of earlier bilateral ties and serves as a mechanism for transmitting Soviet defense and foreign policy directives to the East European allies. The unit discussed Soviet garrisoning of Eastern Europe and provided additional layers of political and military control. In addition, the potential contributions of the East European armed forces to Soviet military strategy, as well as the use of the members' territory as significant assets.

5.0 SUMMARY

The unit discussed the important reasons for institutionalizing the informal and formal alliance system established by the Soviet Union through its bilateral and multilateral also multinational treaties with the East European countries. The unit specifically discussed the multilateral Warsaw Pact as an improvement of strictly bilateral ties as a mechanism for transmitting Soviet defense and foreign policy directives to the East European allies. Also, the strategic goals and functions of Warsaw Pact were also discussed in the unit.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMA)

1. Work out an argument that the strategy of the Warsaw Pact was the internal defense policy of the Soviet Union
2. Discuss the Military strategy of the Warsaw Treaty organization

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Broadhurst, Arlene Idol (1982). *The Future of European Alliance Systems*. Colorado: Westview Press, Boulder,

Fes'kov V.I.; Kalashnikov, K. A and Golikov,V. I. (2004). *The Soviet Army in the Cold War Years (1945–1991)* Tomsk: Tomsk University Publisher.

William, Lewis J (1982). *The Warsaw Pact: Arms, Doctrine and Strategy*, Institute for Foreign Policy Analysis.

Yorst, David S. (1998). *NATO Transformed: The Alliance's New Roles in International Security*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace Press.

UNIT 3 THE ROLE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

CONTENT

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Nuclear Weapons
 - 3.2 The Role of Nuclear Weapons
 - 3.2.1 Deterrent Role
 - 3.2.2 Non- Deterrent Role
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

After World War II the United States and the Soviet Union began a nuclear arms race that continued unabated throughout the 1960s. For most of the 1950s both countries concentrated on manufacturing atomic and hydrogen bombs and the intercontinental bomber force necessary to deliver them. Both countries also developed short-range and intermediate-range missiles that could be armed with nuclear warheads, as well as nuclear weapons to be used on the battlefield.

.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

On completion of studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Define nuclear weapons, mutual assured destruction
- Explain the development and construction of nuclear weapons
- Discuss the various roles of nuclear which include deterrent and non-deterrent
- A systemic explanation of the significant role and impact of nuclear weapons in preventing the Cold War from turning hot – armed conflict.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Nuclear weapons are derived from nuclear fission or nuclear fusion reactions and possess enormous destructive potential. This scientific breakthroughs started in the 1930s and continuing through the nuclear arms race and nuclear testing of the Cold War including the issues of proliferation.

Generally speaking, the use of weapons in warfare since the existence of man has developed through the various stages of world civilization. This is so because different ordinary implements and hand tools in primitive society have served as weapons. However, military technology has developed beyond the earliest known weapon and strategy of man which was setting forest or fields on fire, poisoning, plowing over, and setting ablaze large tracts of land. Also, the ancient practice and strategy of pouring boiling oil on its attackers as a means of defending a city under siege by pouring boiling oil on its attackers and the use of incendiary materials that stick to people's skin and burn them alive.

The nuclear revolution was a technology-driven revolution of military affairs. The nuclear revolution emerged during a conflict, and nuclear weapons have not been used in war since August 1945. The first fission weapons, also known as "Big Jims" were developed jointly by the United States, Britain and Canada during World War II in what was called the Manhattan Project to counter the assumed Nazi German atomic bomb project.

The development of nuclear weapons reached its peak during the Cold War when the Soviet Union and United States each acquired enormous nuclear weapons arsenals propel on rockets that could hit targets anywhere in the world. The United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, India, Israel, Pakistan, North Korea and South Africa are countries with functional nuclear weapons now. However, the issue of proliferation of nuclear weapons to new nations or groups is a major challenge to international peace and security. The threat to international peace as a result of the development, possession and activation of nuclear weapons by the United States and Soviet Union gave birth in 1955 to early warning protocols.

The Manhattan Project was headed by General Leslie Groves as a Military Policy Committee formed in 1942, as a result of British Scientists conviction that a fission weapon could be developed within a few years. The project was a synergy of top scientific minds including many exiles from Europe and funded by the United States and Britain without informing the Soviet Union. American physicist Robert Oppenheimer was the team leader, their goal was to produce fission-based explosive devices before Germany. Based on the production power of American industry, the

massive industrial and scientific project was sited across 30 different locations in the United States and Canada. The efforts of the Manhattan Project resulted in the creation of two fission bomb assembly methods - the two gun-type weapons, Little Boy (uranium) and Thin Man (plutonium) and the Fat Man plutonium implosion bomb in 1942.

The suspicion and distrust of the Soviet Union by West did not start in the Cold war like we have observed earlier that even when they were wartime allies against the Nazi Germany, the United States and Britain did neither considered it worthwhile to inform nor invite the Soviet Union to support the Manhattan Project. Nevertheless, the Soviet Union was well informed of the project which they code-name Enormoz, through its secret services and spies on the United States and Britain and the Soviet nuclear physicist Igor Kurchatov was carefully watching the Allied weapons development. Klaus Fuchs, German émigré theoretical physicist once involved the development of the implosion weapon divulge details of the Trinity device to his Soviet contacts.

Soon after World War II, the international community was confronted with the issue of who should control atomic weapons that many of the scientists who were part of the development project agitated for international control measure by transnational organizations like the newly formed United Nations (UN) or obliged the superpowers a purposeful distribution of weapons information. The UN proposed the Baruch Plan for international control and banning the use of atomic weapons but the Soviet Union vetoed the plan because it was obvious that the Soviet Union were being prevented from putting their full industrial and manpower might into the development of their own atomic weapons. Besides, American policy makers opted to pursue an American nuclear monopoly as a result of the deep seated distrust of Soviet intentions.

Though the Soviet Union had myriad of problems in securing production facilities and material, the Smyth Report (a sanitized summary of wartime effort on the production of the atomic bomb) released by the United States government was carefully studied by Lavrenty Beria and adopted it as a blueprint for the production of Soviet equivalent of Los Alamos, Arzamas-16 and physicist Yuli khariton led the scientific effort to develop the weapon. On August 29, 1949, the effort brought forth its results, when the USSR tested its first fission bomb, dubbed "Joe-1" by the United States, years ahead of American predictions. One significant thing about the first Soviet bomb was that it was the United States that first announced the news to the world when they detected the nuclear fallout it generated from its test site in kazakhstan. The United States President Truman looking for a proper response to the first Soviet atomic bomb test in 1949 reminiscent of Cold War rivalry announced a crash program to develop the hydrogen (fusion) bomb on 31 January, 1950. From that point, shortly thereafter the

Soviet Union developed her own atomic bomb, both countries developed even more powerful fusion weapons called "hydrogen bombs."

The United States efforts at fusion bomb became a reality when it tested the first fusion bomb code-named 'Mike' in Operation Ivy on 1 November, 1952, at Elugelab Island. The bomb is made of fusion fuel from liquid deuterium and had a large fission weapon as its trigger. Though, a prototype design the device could have been delivered from the largest planes because of its enormous size of over 20 ft (6 m) high and weighing at least 140,000 lb (64 ton), which does not include its refrigeration equipment that weighed 24,000 lb. However, this was a major breakthrough for military technology as the explosive capacity yield 450 times over the earlier atomic bomb.

Barely ten months after, precisely on 12 August 1953, the Soviet Union exploded its first thermonuclear device labeled Joe-4 by the United States. Unlike the United States design, the device designed by the Soviet physicist Andrei Sakharov was a deliverable weapon. The technical difference of this device has been greatly argued, because of its explosive yield not reaching the megaton range of a staged weapon and could not have been a true hydrogen bomb. Nevertheless, it was a substantial vehicle for Soviet Cold War superpower propaganda.

Still in search of a deliverable thermonuclear weapon, the efforts of the United States yielded it fruits when it detonated its first deliverable thermonuclear weapon code-named 'Shrimp' device of the "Castle Bravo" using isotopes of lithium as its fusion fuel. The device was tested at Bikini Atoll, Marshall Island. This development was a milestone because in the history of the United States military technological advancement, the device yielding 15 megatons was the worst radiological disaster to contaminate over 7,000 square miles (18,000km) causing radiation sickness, skin burn, cancer and birth defects even years after.

The hydrogen bomb age had a profound effect on the thoughts of nuclear war in the popular and military mind. With only fission bombs, nuclear war was something that possibly could be "limited." The "Castle Bravo" incident itself raised a number of questions about the survivability of a nuclear war. Proponents brushed aside as grave exaggeration claims that such weapons could lead to worldwide death or harm. The great power of hydrogen bombs made world-wide annihilation possible.

When the Soviet Union tested its first megaton device in 1955, the danger of contamination through extremely harmful fission product increased in the atmosphere because cities and even countries that were not direct targets would suffer fallout contamination. Thus, the survival of the world is hinged on the fate of the bomb-wielding superpowers.

The Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM) was introduced in the 1950s as the most important development in terms of delivery. Prior to this development, strategic bombers which were introduced at the wake of the Cold War were not as effective as missiles that were the ideal platform for nuclear weapons, and were potentially a more effective delivery system. The Soviet Union launched Sputnik on 4 October, 1957, as the first space missiles able to reach any part of the world. Two years after on 31 October, 1959, the United States launched her own satellite. The Space Race exhibited technology critical to the delivery of nuclear weapons, the ICBM boosters and attempts to defend against nuclear weapons.

Consequently, both superpowers began to develop large arrays of counterfactual radar to detect incoming bombers and missiles, fighters to use against bombers and anti-ballistic missiles to use against ICBMs. Also, civil defense mechanism were introduced - large tunnel as bunkers were constructed to save the leaders while fallout shelters were built for citizens and taught how to react to a nuclear attack.

During the Cold War, in addition to the American and Soviet nuclear stockpiles, other countries also developed nuclear weapons, though none engaged in warhead production on nearly the same scale as the two superpowers. Apart from the nuclear weapons developed by the United States and Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and People's Republic of China developed nuclear weapons though far smaller stockpiles but began the initial nuclear proliferation. Closely following the Soviet Union, on 3 October, 1952, the United Kingdom detonated its own atomic bomb in Operation Hurricane in Australia to become the next nation to Soviet Union to possess nuclear weapons. The capability of the United Kingdom in relation to nuclear possession lies in its submarines and nuclear-armed aircraft which help to galvanize nuclear deterrence during the Cold War. For instance, during the Cuban missile crisis of 1962, the Resolution class ballistic missile submarines armed with the American-built Polaris missile provided the sea deterrent, while aircraft such as the Avro Vulcan, SEPECAT Jaguar, Panavia Tornado and several other Royal Air Force strike aircraft carrying WE.177 gravity bomb provided the air deterrent.

On February 13, 1960, France detonated Gerboise Bleue in Algeria a French colony to become the fourth nation to possess nuclear weapons. The French nuclear deterrent in the Cold War was preponderant on the Force de frappe, a nuclear triad consisting of Dassault Mirage IV bombers carrying such nuclear weapons as the AN-22 gravity bomb and the ASMP stand-off attack missile, Pluton and Hades ballistic missiles, and the Redoutable class submarine armed with strategic nuclear missiles.

During the Cold War the People's Republic of China was the last to develop and detonated a uranium-235 bomb in a test codenamed 596 on October 16, 1964 and their first hydrogen bomb in 1967. During the Sino-Soviet split, there was apprehension

that the Chinese might use nuclear weapons against either the United States or the Soviet Union in the event of a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union. The nuclear deterrent of China in the Cold War include gravity bombs carried aboard H-6 bomber aircraft, the DF-2, DF-3 and DF-4 missile systems and in the later stages of the Cold War, the Type 092 ballistic missile submarine.

3.2 The Role of Nuclear Weapons

Nuclear weapons played an overwhelming oscillating role in the Cold War tension between the superpowers and to an extent provide inescapable explanation why the Cold War never turned hot. The destructive capacity of nuclear weapons is enormous and can create temperatures of 100 million degrees celcius far above the temperature in the center of the sun as a result the effects of nuclear explosions are not certain. According to the theory of nuclear winter, a nuclear war would generate high volume of carbon and dust in the atmosphere capable of preventing plant photosynthesis, which would have adverse effect on man. On a general note large scale nuclear war would destroy civilization. The destructive potential of nuclear weapons and the fear thereof reinforced the common goal of the superpowers to control the nuclear arms race. This, as a matter of obligation explains the nexus between military warfare and technology and politics. Thus, after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombing of 1945, nuclear weapons have not been used which also explains its capability as too powerful and too disproportionate.

The development of the Hydrogen bomb (H-bomb) in 1952 known as the second stage of nuclear revolution revived the concept of limited war. For instance, more than 55,000 American died in the Korean and Vietnam wars each and In Vietnam and Afghanistan the duo of the United States and Soviet Union accepted defeat rather than use nuclear weapons.

Before the development of nuclear arsenals war was a major method of resolving inter-states conflict but in the nuclear age especially during the Cold War crises replaced war. Worthy of note is that the Berlin crisis, the Cuban missile crisis and the Sino-Soviet split (Middle East crises) were serious provocations that played the functional equivalent of war or armed conflict but none of it happened.

In spite of the bitter ideological differences that existed between the superpowers, the two developed one common key interest by avoiding nuclear war even when they were engaged in proxy or indirect armed conflict in support of their allies. For instances, the non-interference posture of the United States in the Hungarian revolt against Soviet communist rule for fear of not provoking nuclear war. Similarly, the

Soviet Union did likewise in the west though with an exception to Cuba. Thus far, both superpowers maintain the status quo of nonuse of nuclear weapons

After the Cuban missiles crisis the diplomatic relations between both countries improved as leaders of both the United States and the Soviet Union decide to maintain a hotline between Washington and Moscow to facilitate instant communication especially in the event of any threat to international peace.

The relations between the superpowers were far moderate than in the early days of the Cold War, both superpowers became more flexible and commenced negotiations and signed a number of arms control treaties as a way to ensure stability in the nuclear system. The first treaty so signed was the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963.

Nuclear weapons galvanized a peculiar form of balance of power in terms of balance of terror in a bipolar system whereby each side adhere to a policy of stymieing the other's strength. Peace would be maintained by a balance of terror. Suffice it that, nuclear weapons produced the longest period of peace since the beginning of the modern state system. Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) explains the irony of developing of huge nuclear arsenals solely to discourage the other side from using its weapons.

The key strategy of nuclear weapons is deterrence. The doctrine of deterrence is predicated upon the fear of retaliation would prevent any state from initiating a nuclear attack. As it were then, it was critical to establish and display military prowess to instill fear in an enemy nation to deter attack. Nuclear deterrence is a sub unit of the doctrine of deterrence but played a significant role and the twist it brought into the Cold War military strategy.

According to John Lewis Gaddis, the "long peace" of the Cold War was a possible consequent of nuclear weapons and a direct result of the nuclear revolution.

We shall continue our discourse on the deterrent role of nuclear weapons shall be divided under two spheres namely the deterrent and non deterrent role of nuclear weapons.

3.2.1 DETERRENT ROLE

Prior to the Cold War, the conventional role and purpose of armed forces (military) was to fight and win wars, but according to Bernard Brodye in 1946 "... from now on its chief purpose must be to avert them. It can have almost no other purpose." Nuclear weapons changed the nature of warfare and how the superpowers approached international relations in the Cold War. For the military, its defense strategy was how

to absorb a nuclear attack and retaliate after receiving the deadliest blow as explained in the concept of second strike and to punish the enemy.

The prevention of aggression and war is the central role and objective of deterrence unlike the past which was preponderant on engaging in armed conflict either to defend or be on the offense as a measure to deter

During the Cold War the superpowers especially the United States and Soviet Union had attempted to deter threats against itself and against its allies and friends. The deterrence could be core, central, or fundamental when it involves the nation's homeland and extended when the threat is against allies and friends. For example, preventing Soviet aggression against NATO allies or vice versa when preventing United States aggression against Warsaw Pact allies, we were talking about extended deterrence.

Deterrence involves advocacy whereby potential aggressors are educated to cast away their ignorance in terms of the risk of aggression and cost of warfare far exceed the benefits. Also, more importantly, the aggressor must possess the necessary capabilities and the will to use them. Basically, it all about "if you do A, we'll do B, which could well be the destruction of the society." During the Cold War and the sphere of international politics punishment and denial are two ways used to persuade a potential aggressor that the costs and risks of aggression would be greater than the benefits

Punishment

The concept of punishment in nuclear deterrence is based on assured destruction when both parties subscribe to mutual assured destruction as enshrined in the 1972 Ballistic Missile Treaty when both the United States and the Soviet Union agreed not to take their population centers out of hostage. Punishment of unacceptable cost is imposed on an aggressor either by destroying urban/industrial or "counter value" targets, a targeting capability that does not require an especially high degree of accuracy. It is not limited to only offensive strike capabilities but also retaliatory, second strike capabilities which depends largely on survivability of first strike capability. The doctrine of survivability provokes the question of how do nations survive first strike? Nations can survive first strike by dispersing forces, rather than concentrating them, by deploying them underground in concrete, steel-reinforced silos; or by putting them out at sea in submarines that cannot be easily tracked and targeted.

Denial

Denial as a deterrent measure is preponderant upon a full range of offensive and defensive capabilities, not just to retaliate but to strike first, and all the capabilities needed for punishment and more. Denial places a premium on the ability to destroy

not just counter-value but military, “counterforce,” targets, especially the aggressor’s nuclear capabilities, such as its ICBMs and command and control centers. Counterforce targeting is much more demanding than counter-value targeting; hardened, underground target and mobile targets must be put at risk. Denial involves passive and active capabilities, higher degree of accuracy, full suite of nuclear war-fighting capabilities, civil defense and national antiballistic missile defense capabilities, concealment, point defense, dispersal and mobility, superiority, open ended and above all more expensive than punishment.

3.2.2 NON-DETERRENT ROLES

Nuclear weapons were only used in 1945 to end World War II and since then have had a truncated war-fighting role. Rather, it has assumed a status symbol as an indicator or attribute of major power status. In addition to their role as status symbols, nuclear weapons have served as an equalizer. For instance, the United States and its NATO allies relied on nuclear weapons to counter, or offset, the conventional advantage of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact during the Cold War.

Nuclear weapons have also served as a substitute for conventional forces thereby reducing defense spending as against the old order when nations want to pay conventional capabilities.

Lastly, nuclear weapons arguably have played a significant role in discouraging both horizontal and vertical proliferation. The enormous size of the United States nuclear arsenals has discourage others from attempting to increase their nuclear capabilities and thus far the United States have not reduced its nuclear arsenal below the 1700 – 2,200 warheads range stipulated by the Moscow Treaty

Self Assessment Exercise

Do a systemic explanation of the significant role and impact of nuclear weapons in preventing the Cold War from turning hot – armed conflict

4.0 CONCLUSION

In spite of the overwhelming military importance of conventional armed forces and the use of conventional weapons during the World Wars and the security of a nation, the development, production and delivery of nuclear weapons presented a higher level of warfare. Nuclear bombs could be launched from many corners of the globe; from air, sea, and land; from the ocean's and earth's surfaces and sub surfaces; from aircraft

carriers and infantry cannons; from submarines and bombers. During the Cold War mankind, was faced with the awesome threat of nuclear weapons. Neither superpower conceived the idea of starting a nuclear war because of the dangerous consequences especially with the Hiroshima and Nagasaki experience, that it might inadvertently destroy itself in the event of nuclear conflict. Today, both the minimalist and maximalist approaches to assured destruction have agreed that though there is a broader role for nuclear weapons it is true that the only role for nuclear weapons is the deterrence of the use of nuclear weapons. Suffice it to say that nuclear weapons have never been used against a nuclear enemy and thus far, there is neither a nuclear combat or a nuclear battle nor a nuclear war.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have examined the development of nuclear and hydrogen weapons and the role of nuclear weapons in preventing the Cold War from turning into hot war (armed conflict) especially within the ambit of nuclear revolution and deterrence.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAS)

1. Explain the nexus between the deterrent and non-deterrent role of nuclear weapons
2. Discuss the development of nuclear weapons and how it create a balance of power (balance of terror)

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Barry R. Schneider, "Passive Defenses Against Chemical and Biological Attacks," chapter 5 in *Future War and Counter proliferation: U.S. Military Responses to NBC Proliferation Threats* (1999)

Blackburn, Glenn (1989) *The West and the World Since 1945*. 2nd edition. New York: St. Martins Press.

Frederick R. Sidell, Ernest T. Takafuji, and David R. Franz (1997) (eds.), *Medical Aspects of Chemical and Biological Warfare*, is an excellent introduction to both the history and the medical aspects of biological warfare.

["http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Cold_War_weapons_of_the_Soviet_Union"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Cold_War_weapons_of_the_Soviet_Union)

Jervis, Robert (1988) "Political Effects of Nuclear Weapons" *International Security*, 13:2

Mandelbaum, Michael (1986) *The Nuclear Revolution*. England: Cambridge University

Mueller, John (1988) "the Essential Irrelevance of Nuclear Weapons" *International Security*, 13:2

Nye, Joseph S. Jnr. (2003) *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*, (2nd Edition) New York: Longman

Sagan, Scott D. (1993), *The Limits of Safety: Organization, Accidents, and Nuclear Weapons* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

UNIT 4 ARM RACE AND CONTROL

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Content
 - 3.1 Nuclear Weapons
 - 3.2 Arms Race
 - 3.3 Mutual Assured Destruction
 - 3.4 Arms Control
 - 3.4.1 Significance of Arms Control
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor-Marked Assignment
- 7.0 References/Further Readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The successful development of the Soviet first bomb stirred up apprehension, fear, and the West more than ever felt itself living with time bomb as well as eradicated the United States monopoly on nuclear weapons and set the field for the nuclear arms race (nuclear testing, nuclear strategy, and nuclear warfare) with its intrigue, struggle, negotiations, treaties and conventions. In addition, when Russia acquired nuclear capability of its own, to neutralize that of the United States, the bargaining position of the West with the decisive importance attached to nuclear weapon was reduced thereby creating the prospect of the missile gap.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

On completion of studying this unit, you should be able to:

- Define arms race, nuclear arms race, mutual assured destruction and arms control.
- Explain the development, meaning, process and challenges of nuclear arms race and control in the Cold War.
- Distinguish between the SALT I and II and other arms limitations treaties.
- Attempt a systemic explanation of the arms control agreement as a strategy of preventive diplomacy against armed conflict and balance of terror in the Cold War.

3.0 MAIN CONTENT

3.1 ARMS RACE

The term arms race, in its original usage, describes a competition between two or more parties for the best armed forces. Each party competes to produce larger numbers of weapons, greater armies, or superior military technology in a technological escalation. In contemporary usage, the term is also mean any competition where there is no absolute goal, which underscore the goal superiority in any competition as they attempt to prove their 'betterness'. Some early cases of arms race include the 1891 – 1919 World War I naval arms race including Germany, France, Russia, etc. Prior to the World War the superiority of the British Navy was a focal point of all and the Germans in particular envied their prowess that led to the costly building competition of Dreadnought-class ships. The arms race continued and developed among the victorious allies after the World War I with the emergent two antagonistic power blocs. Other instances of the usage of the term are the Greco-Turkish arms race, for many decades Greece and Turkey were involved in regional Cold War over an age long mutual distrust and hatred since the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople in 1453.

A conflict spiral-driven arms race is an action-reaction process in which two states are competitively engaged in the build-up of arms, concomitant with an increase in insecurity-generating misperception

3.2 NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

The nuclear arms race started in the Cold War, a period of high tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States. On both sides, perceived advantages of the adversary (such as the "missile gap") led to large spending on armaments and the stockpiling of vast nuclear arsenals. The superpower conflict and the arms race and control was a competition for supremacy between the United States and the Soviet Union including their allies during Cold War predicated on the balance of power. The central focus of arms race was not the conventional forces of armies and navies using their conventional equipment and air support, rather it was with the medium for delivering the nuclear weapons to their target. Thus, the arms race was a nuclear armament, where by each country perfect their capacity to produce and acquire adequate stockpiles of thermonuclear weapon far above any imaginable military purpose. It was not mobilization of human and material resources, in recruitment and production, but in scientific discovery and technological invention, (Halle, 1967). As a result, modern conventional wars are, to a considerable extent, wars between

machines and their operators, not between soldiers in open combat. It follows that the side with a more advanced scientific base and a stronger economy has a decisive edge. Because most poor nations have neither, they must import most of their weapons, and they often settle internal political conflicts not through an open fight between the well-armed state and its poorer opponents, but through guerrilla warfare.

During World War II, the United States was the first to create and develop the first nuclear weapon through the Manhattan Project to be used against the Axis aggressors. The emergence of the United States as a single leader with full nuclear capability, spurred Soviet Scientists who are aware of the potential of nuclear weapon to develop nuclear capability to neutralize the bargaining power of the West to create a balance of power. One important feature of the Cold War between the superpowers bothered on lack of trust that permeated their relationship since the World War II. The level of distrust was so high even when they had a common goal and enemy in the wartime alliance, that the United States could not trust the Soviets with their military technological advancement because the Soviet were almost always perceived as potential enemy. Though, the United States did not disclose its achievement but the Soviets ring of spies including the atomic spies kept Soviet leadership abreast of American progress.

Following the early development of the field of nuclear energy and Albert Einstein's theory of interchangeability of matter and energy, and also Leo Szilard's theory on nuclear chain reaction, military technology turned its research to finding military use for nuclear energy. The Manhattan Project was launched on 2 December, 1942, by the United States and Britain as a secret research program aimed at producing an atomic bomb before Nazi Germany. Enrico Fermi, an Italian emigrant headed a team of scientists at the University of Chicago laboratory in search of the first sustained nuclear chain reaction. Their efforts of rigorous research and development resulted in testing the first atomic bomb at Los Alamos, New Mexico in 1945. Soon after the test, United States War time President Truman ordered that the B-29 bomber 'Eniola Gay' drop an atomic bomb in the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and 'Bock's Car' on Nagasaki. This singular American action brought about the dramatic end of World War II.

The nuclear arms race is a manifestation of a deep-rooted fear that existed between the United States and the Soviet Union. Also, beyond the issues of fear lies the balance of power and struggle for supremacy between the superpowers, thus, the arms race was a reality which neither of them will accept the position of second fiddle. Thus, when the United States launched her first atomic bomb in 1945, the Soviet took it as a challenge and seriously concentrated her efforts on a military buildup. Suffice it that a military break through led to the development of more weapons by the other.

The arms control negotiations by the superpowers may not directly be a means of disarmament but a sure way of managing the arms race. Perhaps, this can be absolute truth because during the Cold War tension the development of arms increased on the one hand while on the other arms control treaties were negotiated and signed at the same time. No doubt, the process of negotiation presents some measure of relaxation of Cold War tension by keeping the arms race under some control. For instance, the Anti Ballistic missiles (ABM) treaty engendered limitation of arms production.

Neither superpower considered beginning a nuclear warfare as an option of bare face confrontation, provocation and diplomatic conflict because each was afraid of the possible danger of nuclear conflict. It is worthy of note that when such provocation and confrontation occurred during the 1948 Berlin crisis (Blockade and airlift) and 1962 Cuban missile crisis, none acted contrary rather they refrained from armed conflict which presupposes that deterrence was efficacious.

Broadly speaking, the arms race was capital intensive, therefore most countries including the superpowers were constraint to allocate a huge percentage of their budget to military expenditure at the expense of other expenditure subhead like education, health, etc. consequently, the large military expenditure may have inadvertently affected the Gross Domestic Product and contributed to the economic problems in the 1970s and 1980s.

3.3 MUTUAL ASSURED DESTRUCTION

Considering the capability of nuclear weapons, the Cold war superpowers – the United States and Soviet Union possessed can obliterate each other and the world at large. Ironically, the huge nuclear arsenals constructed ultimately stymie the other side from using its weapon. This was predicated on the fear of launching a devastating reprisal attacks especially through submarines known as second strike. This inadvertent concept that became a rule helped to maintain world peace in the form of balance of terror. According to Glenn Blackburn (1989) “a sobering way of referring to the “balance of terror” is the acronym MAD, or mutually assured destruction”. The concept of mutual assured destruction in practice availed both superpowers the knowledge of any attack upon the other would be devastating to themselves while in theory stymie them from attacking the other. One salient feature of the nuclear weapons was military diplomacy for extracting concession from the other, doctrine of deterrence and détente- relaxation of tension.

Because neither the United States nor Soviet Union could determine the nuclear capability of the other there was a general believe that there was no bomb gap and missile gap because the Soviet government have always exaggerated the power of

Soviet weapons. Nonetheless, there are still ambiguities about the missile gap that make it difficult to attribute the whole outcome of the nuclear capabilities. It described the superpowers' essential military stalemate.

An additional controversy formed in the United States during the early 1960s concerned whether or not it was certain if their weapons would work if the need should occur. All of the individual components of nuclear missiles had been tested separately (warheads, navigation systems, rockets), but it had been infeasible to test them all combined.

3.4 ARMS CONTROL

The definition of arms control and disarmament according to Hedley Bull: "comprises those acts of military policy in which antagonistic states cooperate in the pursuit of common purposes." The purpose of arms control is the enhancement of inter-national security in order to reduce the incident of inter-state conflict. Arms control negotiations may result to some far reach agreements which may be signed, observed and implemented. An arms control agreement is defined somewhat broadly as a bilateral or multilateral policy which attempts to regulate, limit or eliminate existing arsenals and prevent new ones, through either tacit or formal agreement, in order to reduce the incidence of inter-state violence. According to Thomas Schelling and Morton Halperin, "the essence of arms control is some kind of mutual restraint, collaborative action, or exchange of facilities between potential enemies in the interest of reducing the likelihood of war, the scope of war if it occurs, or its consequences." It therefore encompasses disarmament policies, which seek the complete reduction of a single class of arms, as well as nonproliferation policies, which try to avert the geographic spread of certain weapons

In spite of the fact that the nuclear arms race was a competition for supremacy in nuclear warfare between the United States and the Soviet Union with their respective allies during the Cold War. One important and salient goal which the superpowers pursued vigorously during the Cold War was the control of the nuclear arms race.

The principal arms control method of managing conflict spirals is to slow it down by specifying limits on the number of weapons pro-cured. An important distinction is between what Colin Gray has termed operational arms control, which regulates behaviour, and operational arms control, which regulates the types and quantity of arms." Examples of operational arms control measures are the 1959 Antarctica Treaty, the 1967 Outer Space Treaty and the 1971 Seabed Treaty, which all sought to keep the Cold War conflict spiral from leading to the deployment of nuclear weapons in remote areas.

The first attempt to control arms was the adoption of the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty in 1968. The goal of the treaty on the one hand was to stop weapons expansion by allowing those nations such as the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain, France and China which already possess them to keep them (Blackburn, 1989). On the other hand, nations such as Spain, Argentina, Brazil, India, Israel, Egypt, Pakistan, Iraq, South Africa, etc without nuclear weapons are obligated to submit to international inspection of their nuclear installation to ensure that nuclear energy would be used legitimately for peaceful purposes. Consequently, the treaty was not effective because of the existing disparity, as a result of restriction to possess and the right to retain nuclear weapons some important and aspiring nations refuse to sign the treaty.

Three ways have been identified for the proliferation of nuclear weapons namely vertical proliferation, horizontal proliferation and nongovernmental proliferation.

Vertical proliferation occurs when nations with nuclear weapons expand their nuclear arsenals. For example, as the superpowers advanced into laser technology otherwise known as light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation in search for new devices as laser weapons and ASATs or antisatellites.

Horizontal proliferation occurs when nations that did not have nuclear weapons acquire them. For instance, countries like India and other that possess technical expertise to build and tested their own nuclear weapon.

Nongovernmental proliferation according to Robert Jungk in his book *The New Tyranny* refers to the growing possibility that terrorist groups may soon be able to obtain small nuclear weapons (Robert Jungk, (1979) *The New Tyranny*, translated by Christopher Trump. New York).

The ineffectiveness of the Nonproliferation Treaty did not end the attempt to restrain the arms competition. The treaty seeking to prohibit emplacement of nuclear weapons on the sea bed and ocean floor known as the sea bed treaty was signed and went into force in 1970 and 1972 respectively. However, the Treaty lacked military significance because no nation wanted to place nuclear weapons on the sea bed.

Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) was the most important arms control negotiations during the Cold War. The negotiations began in 1969 and SALT 1 agreement was signed in 1972 by President Richard Nixon and Premier Brezhnev on behalf of the United States and the Soviet Union respectively. The goal of the treaty was to freeze the number of their strategic weapons for five years. The diplomatic understanding then was that the nuclear arsenals of both superpowers were roughly equal in size and capability. Strategic weapons are those which have an intercontinental range and thus can be used by either superpower to strike directly at the other while tactical weapons have shorter range (Blackburn, 1989)

One prevalent challenge of placing a freeze on weapons in the arms control race was how to determine when the two sides have equal capability in terms of size and megaton. For instance, at a time the United States possessed 1,054 missiles on land and 656 on submarines while the Soviets had 1,618 land based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and 740 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM).

The table below is showing the strategic nuclear missiles, warheads and throw-weights of the United States and the Soviet Union from 1964 -1982:

YEAR	LAUNCHERS		WARHEADS		MEGATONNAGE	
	USA	USSR	USA	USSR	USA	USSR
1982	2032	2490	11000	8000	4100	7100
1980	2042	2490	10000	6000	4000	5700
1978	2058	2350	9800	5200	3800	5400
1976	2100	2390	9400	3200	3700	4500
1974	2180	2380	8400	2400	3800	4200
1972	2230	2090	5800	2100	4100	4000
1970	2230	1680	3900	1800	4300	3100
1968	2360	1045	4500	850	5100	2300
1966	2396	435	5000	550	5600	1200
1964	2416	375	5800	500	7500	1000

(Gerards Segal (1987), *The Simon & Schuster Guide to the World Today*,s, p. 82)

It was also identified that that SALT 1 only limited the number of launchers and placed no restrictions on qualitative improvement of missiles and warheads. What this implies is that nations can equip their missiles with multiple warheads. According to Alva Myrdal (1976) even though SALT 1 placed some limits on the arms race, there was still plenty room for arms competition.

In the 1960 the superpowers developed antiballistic missiles, which could de-track a shoot missile in the sky from its target and protect target from nuclear attack. Missiles are equipped with bombs, which, together with the mechanisms that set them off, guidance systems, and some other components, are called warheads. A ballistic missile is essentially a rocket which shoots its warheads out to space and from there propels them toward their targets. From then on, the warhead's trajectory is determined by gravity. Because there is no air resistance in space, warheads fly with amazing speed - some 25 minutes after been launched, its warheads would begin exploding

Ballistic missiles could also be launched from submarines. Each missile-submarine carried a number of ballistic missiles, and each missile could be equipped with multiple warheads. Multiple warheads is one missile carrying several bombs aimed at different targets also known as multiple independent reentry vehicles (MIRV).

SALT 1 was able to place limitations of antiballistic missile system (ABM) by restricting the superpowers to two ABM sites located at the nation's capital and the other at an ICBM launching area but in 1974 the nations reduced the ABM site to one. Also, the treaty recognized the non effective defensive mechanism against nuclear weapons and followed the doctrine of deterrence in the event where one nation is able to develop an effective ABM system and feel safe to enter into nuclear conflict.

No doubt, the SALT 1 agreement was effective enough in that it limited strategic arms but a lot more contending issues and challenges were left unattended to. This gave birth to SALT II treaty which was preponderance on the ceiling agreement reached at Vladivostok by President Gerald Ford of the United States and Soviet Union Premier Brezhnev. The content of this treaty which was signed by President Jimmy Carter and Premier Brezhnev of the United States and Soviet Union respectively provided a ceiling of 2,400 nuclear launchers for each superpower, out of which 1320 could be multiple warheads. Though the treaty was not ratified and approved by the Senate of the United States and strongly opposed by American conservatives due to political reasons, the superpowers informally lived by the terms of the treaty until 1985 when it expired. Also, like other Cold War treaties, the superpowers never stopped developing new and sophisticated weapons.

In the climate of heightened anxiety, the attempt to control the arms race was a genuine and important aspect of détente when the superpowers were preoccupied with the task of pursuing peace and peaceful coexistence. For instance, beginning from 1973 they were obligated to consult on whatever issue that could threaten international peace through nuclear armed conflict; encouraged economic and cultural exchange; introduce new foreign policies and relax immigration policies. At the end, the relations between the superpowers improved tremendously than ever because of a number of arms control treaties and agreement were signed to relax Cold War tension.

According to Vally Koubi (1994) the arms control agreements are only feasible under three conditions: when trade-offs are comparable, when verification is reasonably accurate, and when existing weapons are easily reproducible. Thus, arms control agreement can fail in the sense that some simply fade away, others fail dramatically while others are never formulated because they are viewed, correctly or incorrectly, as infeasible, impractical or inappropriate. Several reasons have been identified to be responsible for the failure of arms control agreement. They include: an agreement that would have otherwise brought mutual benefit could not be secured because of mutual suspicion; either it was inappropriate to the situation, or it seriously disadvantaged one of the signatories. This sort of failure may or may not be based on a correct perception of the agreement.

3.4.1 SIGNIFICANCE OF ARMS CONTROL

The purpose of arms control is the enhancement of inter-national security in order to reduce the incident of inter-state conflict. An arms control agreement is defined somewhat broadly as a bilateral or multilateral policy which attempts to regulate, limit or eliminate existing arsenals and prevent new ones, through either tacit or formal agreement, in order to reduce the incidence of inter-state violence.

The purpose of the arms control process is to minimize the likelihood of war while preserving the security of states. A conflict spiral alleviating arms control agreement re-establishes normality in an inter-state relationship by reducing the intensity of the action-reaction process.

Contemporary arms control is a response to rapid arms accumulations made possible by the impact of the industrial revolution on military production. Arms control is seen as desirable either because it reduces the likelihood of a war desired by neither adversary, or because it reduces costs in deterrence against it.

Disarmament is expected to contribute greatly to peace by erasing the tools of war, erasing interstate conflicts, and curbing the willingness or ability of governments to treat the threat or use of force as legitimate.

The prime objective of both arms control and the balance of power as policy is to maintain security (the preservation of a state's independence), and second, to avoid war. Use of arms control attempts this by solving co-operation problems between states, thereby minimizing the occurrence of sub-optimal outcomes.

Arms control seeks to enhance the security of states by helping them co-ordinate their defence postures, and thereby reduce the fear they induce in their potential adversaries. Arms control enhances co-operation between states by prescribing rules and restrictions that are characterized by their regularity. Arms control achieves this through no-war pacts, limits on the deployment by number or type of military forces, by resolving insecurity by removing secrecy, and by putting costs on realignment with other states

From a policy standpoint, arms control is more likely to succeed in avoiding war if focused on security issues that are a function of co-operation problems, and less likely to succeed if it obstructs the free functioning of the balance of power

Self Assessment Exercise

Examine the causes of the arms race and arms control during the Cold War

4.0 CONCLUSION

The devastating effects and destructive potential of nuclear weapons culminated in the nuclear arms race and explains of the mutual desire and important goal which the conflicting superpowers shared in the control of the nuclear arms race. The nuclear arms race was predicated upon suspicion as a result both the United States and the Soviet Union manifested the deep rooted fear that they harbored toward each other before the post World Wars. Thus, both superpowers see arms control negotiations as a means of managing the arms race and nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. Generally, the arms race is capital intensive and expensive and may be the ostensible reason for the economic woes which the superpowers experienced in the 1970s and 1980s and which ultimately sank the Soviet Union.

However, arms control can actually enhance the equilibrium of the balance of power among states by facilitating co-operation among them. Therefore arms control and balance of power perform better than arms control alone in averting war. The purpose of the arms control process is to minimize the likelihood of war while preserving the security of states.

5.0 SUMMARY

In this unit, we have examined the development of nuclear and hydrogen arms and how the nuclear arms race and control stymie Cold War tension. Some strategies, treaties and agreement of nonproliferation of nuclear were also discussed.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT (TMAS)

1. To what extent did arms control prevented nuclear armed conflict?
2. Discuss the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons START I and II Treaties
3. Discuss the development and the pattern of proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Cold War
4. Explain the nexus between the arms race and arms control

7.0 REFERENCES/FURTHER READINGS

Hedley Bull (1961), *The Control of the Arms Race: Disarmament and Arms Control in the Missile Age*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, xiv. 3

Jungk, Robert (1979). *The New Tyranny*, translated by Christopher Trump. New York

Online version of: Nissani, M. (1992). *Lives in the Balance: the Cold War and American Politics*, 1945-1991.

Thomas C. Schelling and Morton Halperin, (1961) *Strategy and Arms Control* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

Vally Koubi, (1994) "Disarmament: A Theoretical Analysis," *International Interactions*, 19.

UNIT 5 COLD WAR TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Introduction
- 2.0 Objectives
- 3.0 Main Body
 - 3.1 What is a Treaty
 - 3.2 Cold War Treaties and Agreements
 - 3.3 Treaty Obligations and Impacts
- 4.0 Conclusion
- 5.0 Summary
- 6.0 Tutor Marked Assignment
- 7.0 Reference/Further readings

1.0 INTRODUCTION

International negotiations, agreements and treaties have played a central role in preventive diplomacy since the rise of the modern nation state. From the beginning of the Cold War, more treaties have been formed than in the preceding four centuries. Nations have signed treaties on topics ranging from trade to collective defense. As the scope and frequency of treaties in international relations continue to evolve, it is imperative that we increase our awareness of treaties and how they operate.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

In this unit, students will

- Develop a basic understanding of the elements of a treaty and the role of treaties in international affairs and conflicts
- Become familiar with treaties and agreements in the Cold War, the content and context and how the events affected conflict trajectories
- Examine the implications of the Treaty in contemporary international affairs
- Improve their ability to synthesize information and think critically
- Develop oral presentation and written communication skills.

3.0 MAIN BODY

3.1 WHAT IS A TREATY

Treaty has been defined to encapsulate the following: “The act of treating for the adjustment of differences, as for forming an agreement, negotiation: An agreement so made; specifically, an agreement, league, or contract between two or more nations or sovereigns, formally signed by commissioners properly authorized, and solemnly ratified by the several sovereigns, or the supreme power of each state; an agreement between two or more independent states; as, a treaty of peace; a treaty of alliance” (Source: <http://www.brainyquote.com/words/tr/treaty>). The Permanent Court of International Justice (PCIJ) noted on treaty that “it cannot be disputed that the very object of international agreement, according to the intention of the contracting parties, may be the adoption by the parties of some definite rules creating individual rights and obligations and enforced by national courts”. In both bilateral and multilateral treaties, the principle of reciprocity is an essential feature of any treaty.

3.2 COLD WAR TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS

The Cold War was in its essence a war of ideas. We can gain better insights into the conflict trajectories and preventive diplomacy by key actors of the Cold war by looking at the various Treaties, agreements and negotiations to relax tension and end the Cold War.

The Rio Treaty or Pact, also known as the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance for the maintenance of continental peace and security was signed on the 15th of August, 1947, at Rio de Janeiro.

The North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington on April 4, 1949 by the United States, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal and the United Kingdom. Greece and Turkey became its members in February 1952 and West Germany joined it in 1955. In order to achieve the objectives of the Treaty, the parties were expected to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. The NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) is aimed at strengthening the morale of Western Europe, and at halting the Soviet expansion westwards. NATO proved to be effective, as the Communists could not make any territorial gains in Europe or in the Atlantic area, after April, 1949.

Australia, New Zealand and the United States in 1951, entered into a Treaty called the Anzus Pact, in order to co-ordinate their efforts for the collective defense and

preservation of peace in the Pacific area. Most importantly, the Treaty aimed at keeping the Soviet influence away from the Pacific.

A Treaty, establishing the European Defense Community was signed at Paris on the 17 of May, 1952. The Treaty contained provisions for common political institutions, armed forces, budget and arms program. In 1951, precisely on the 8th of September, the Japanese-American Security Treaty was concluded. The US agreed to maintain American forces in and about Japan, (at the request of Japan) in order to deter armed attack on the country.

An armistice was signed on July 27, 1953. However, the Soviet and American troops continued to remain in both the Koreas. The cold war hostility continued.

The Treaty of Collective Defense of South-East Asia, known as SEATO was signed on the 8th of September, 1954, by the United States, Great Britain, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines, for the collective defense for preserving peace and security in the "treaty area."

On the 2nd of December, 1954, the United States and the Republic of China in Taipei signed the Sino-American Mutual Defense Treaty and came into force on 3rd of March, 1955. Article Ten (10) of the Treaty, provided that either party could terminate it one year after notice had been given to the other Party. The United States terminated the treaty on 1st January, 1980 when it established diplomatic relations with the Peoples Republic of China after notifying China on 1st January of its intention. The treaty consist of ten (10) articles. The content included the provision that if one country come under attack, the other would aid and provide military support. On the Cold War tension between Communism and Capitalism, the Treaty secured the Republic of China from the invasion by the Peoples Republic of China in the aftermath of the Chinese Civil War on mainland China. This treaty was limited in application to the defense of Taiwan and the Pescadores only. The Treaty also prevented republic of China from initiating any military action against mainland China since only Taiwan and Pescadores are included and unilateral military actions were not supported.

Iraq and Turkey in 1955, signed the Baghdad Pact. The Pact had military and economic aspects. Later, Britain, Pakistan and the United States entered into the Pact. It was aimed against the Soviet Union and also against the non-aligned Arab states.

The Mutual Defense Assistance Agreement was signed on the 19th of May, 1954, between the governments of Pakistan and the United States.

The Warsaw Pact was the Treaty of Friendship, co-operation and Mutual Assistance signed by Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland,

Rumania and the Soviet Union in May 1955, in order to confront the challenges from the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and United States.

After World War II, the Geneva Agreements were signed, under the agreement Vietnam was partitioned so that North Vietnam was to be under the Communists, and South Vietnam was to be under the French.

The United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain on 5th August, 1963 signed the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. It provided for a limited ban on nuclear tests in the atmosphere, beyond its limits, including territorial waters or high seas.

The United Nations in an attempt to curb superpower competition in space adopt The United Nations Outer Space Treaty of 1967 to prohibit national claims on celestial bodies and the orbiting of weapons of mass destruction. It also established open access to space for all nonaggressive purposes.

The General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution on the 12th of June, 1968, recommending the adoption of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty. The objectives of the treaty were to: (i) limit the spread of nuclear weapons from nuclear to non-nuclear states, (ii) encourage disarmament by nuclear nations, and (iii) allow all nations to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

The Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Kosygin and Chancellor of West Germany, Willy Brandt, on 12th of August, 1970, signed the Moscow-Bonn Agreement. Consequently, Brandt initiated measures for resolving the Berlin problem. The United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and France signed an Agreement on Berlin on 3rd of September, 1971.

The Chancellor of West Germany, Willy Brandt introduced *Ostpolitik*, also known as East politics. This foreign policy resulted in a nonaggression treaty between West Germany and Poland, the Soviet Union and East Germany. The aim of the Treaty was to resolve a number of outstanding territorial disputes arising from the World War II. The policy of *ostpolitik* made it possible for free movement across the East and West Germany border. Of course, border restriction were relaxed and people from West Germany were able to visit kinsmen and loved ones in East Germany for the first time after the construction of the Berlin wall.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) negotiations began 1969, in 1972 a SALT 1 Agreement was signed by President Richard Nixon of the United States and Premier Brezhnev of the Soviet Union. In May 1972, President Nixon visited Moscow and signed the Treaty on Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems and the Interim Agreement on certain measures. By this treaty the superpowers, assumed that their nuclear arsenals were of equal status, agreed to freeze the number of their strategic

weapons for five years. Brezhnev paid a return visit to the US in June 1973. Together with Nixon, he pledged to work for a lasting world peace and make an effort to end the nuclear race between the two countries. Barely two years from the first visit, President Nixon visited the Soviet Union in June July 1974, and agreed with Brezhnev to limit underground testing for five years.

The Vladivostok summit was held in November 1974. It was attended by President Ford and Brezhnev. They reached agreement on ceiling for a SALT II Treaty. They agreed on a limit on the number of offensive nuclear weapons like missiles launched from land, sea and air bombers and multiple warhead missiles. Both leaders also attended the 35-Nation Summit/Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe on 30th of July, 1975 at Helsinki. The Conference produced the Helsinki Agreement by which they concluded three major points: (i) a declaration that no European frontiers should be violated, which in effect legalized the frontiers established in 1945; (ii) an agreement to encourage economic trade between Eastern and Western Europe; and (iii) a pledge to encourage free movement of people and ideas within and between European nations

The United States, the Soviet Union and Great Britain concluded a Treaty in February 1971, for the prohibition of the deployment of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction on the sea bed, ocean floor, and the sub-soil thereof. On 26th of March, 1979, the Camp David Accord between Egypt and Israel was signed to reduce tension in the Middle East.

The Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF Treaty) for the destruction of Europe-based missiles signed on the 8th of December, 1987 between the United States and the Soviet Union. Under it, both Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan agreed to scrap their arsenals of intermediate range nuclear and conventional ground – launched ballistic and cruise missiles.

Pakistan and Afghanistan formally signed on the 14th of April, 1988, a United States and Soviet Union guaranteed Accord at Geneva. According to this agreement, the Soviet Union agreed to pull out all Soviet troops from Afghanistan.

In August 1988, South Africa, Angola and Cuba announced a cease-fire as agreed upon in Geneva.

The Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev visited China in May 1989. This visit resulted in an agreement on the reduction of armed forces on the Soviet-Chinese border.

3.3 TREATY OBLIGATIONS AND IMPACTS

The Warsaw Treaty or Pact was declared as defense alliance and contained certain articles bothering on: the maintenance of international peace and security; effective arms control measures; Obligation of member states to consult each other on all aspects of international relations; banning alliances prejudicial to the interests of the Warsaw Pact were banned - In the event of attack on any Warsaw Pact states they would have the right to individual or collective defence under Article 51 of the UN Charter. This clause was referred to and gave impetus to the invasion of Hungary in 1957 and of Czechoslovakia in 1968. In effect, this clause is similar to NATO's "an attack on one is an attack on all".

The outcome of the Helsinki Agreement resulted in: (i) American unconditional acceptance of Soviet domination in East Europe (ii) increase trade between Communist and non – Communist parts of Europe, (iii) The Soviet Union was compelled to allow more freedom of expression and emigration for its citizens which led to the policy of *glasnost* (openness)

A number of treaties and agreements had given substance to the concept of détente. The United States got Soviet support in ending the Vietnam conflict and the Soviet were allowed to buy American grains

Although, the arms control treaties placed restraint on the arms competition, the nuclear arsenal of the superpowers continue to increase and sustained military buildup in the 1960s and 1970s. Even though that SALT I placed some limits on arms race, there was still plenty of room for arms competition.

The later phase of the Cold War in 1970s and 1980s were very different. The United States and the Soviet Union had many contacts and they constantly negotiated on arms control.

In the aftermath of the Cuban missile crisis, arms control negotiation produced the Limited Test Ban Treaty that limited atmospheric nuclear test in 1963, and a non-proliferation treaty in 1968. Subsequently, this treaty led to increase trade and détente seem to be expanding. To increase trade so there would be carrots as well as sticks in the United States and the Soviet Union relationship to create balance of power in a bipolar world.

The aim of treaties were to negotiate a strategic arms control treaty to cap the nuclear relationship at relative parity

The Sino-American Mutual Defense Treaty had diplomatic significance because it prolonged and assisted Republic of China in maintaining legitimacy as the sole

government of the whole of mainland China until early 1970. Similarly, during the Cold War, this treaty helped United States policy makers to shape the policy of containment in East Asia together with South Korea and Japan against the spread of Communism.

The use of arms control negotiation in this sense was one method of trading off a global security disaster. Nuclear arms talks helped to define the superpower status, symbolized by the bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. Negotiations also served as a genuine tension – leaching mechanism. It was one of the few areas where the Cold War actors could discuss cooperation instead of confrontation and it reminded the two governments of their common interest. The objective was to make war unattractive, arms control agreements were aimed at reassurance and preventive diplomacy. This process of preventive diplomacy during the Cold War to a large extent enhanced restraint by creating tacit or explicit ground rules of conduct. The central focus of the United States and the Soviet Union nuclear arm control was to underwrite mutual deterrence and not to transform it.

The arms control during the Cold war was not limited to the United States and the Soviet Union bilateral negotiations. Both countries actual involved a great deal of network in some multilateral negotiations. The multilateral negotiation concerned military operations such as exercises and maneuvers, they were able to negotiate a series of confidence building measures including nuclear site inspection.

Self Assessment Exercise

Work out an argument that the Cold War Treaties resolved all issues of arms control.

4.0 CONCLUSION

In this unit, we have learnt that the Cold War arms control negotiations was aimed at reduction or limitation in conventional force level, even when they produce no agreements, had the effect of stabilizing the multilateral NATO-Warsaw Pact confrontation in Central Europe (Goodby) One reoccurring agenda of Cold War negotiations between the United States and Soviet Union was arms control and served to reinforce the special character of a bipolar world - the U.S.-Soviet relationship. Thus, the role of a third-party mediator in United States and Soviet bilateral talks was not necessary. However, when a third party such as the United Kingdom was involved in the limited nuclear test ban treaty, she played the role of facilitator. We went further to discuss the peace process and how arms control negotiations, formation of alliance such as NATO and Warsaw Pact produce treaties and agreement from time to time to reinforce détente and end to the cold War tension.

5.0 SUMMARY

This unit discusses some Cold War treaties, agreements and arm control negotiations. It went further to present the content and context, aims and obligations, significance and impact of treaties as preventive diplomacy and security in international relations and preservation of sovereignty especially in a bipolar world.

6.0 TUTOR MARKED ASSIGNMENT

- (1) Discuss the significance of Cold War Treaties and their impact on detente?
- (2) Arms control negotiations is preventive diplomacy. Discuss.

7.0 REFERENCE/FURTHER READINGS

Blackburn, Glenn (1989). *The West and the World Since 1945*. 2nd ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc

Fredman, Norman (2007). *The Fifty – Year War: Conflict and Strategy in the Cold War*. Naval Institute Press

Gaddis, J. L. (2005). *The Cold War: A New History*. Washington: Penguin Press

Goodby E. James (2001) “Global Security conflicts – Armament: Arms Control as Preventive Diplomacy Under Conditional Peace”

McCormick, T.J (1995). *America's Half Century: United States Foreign Policy in the Cold War and After*. Baltimore

<http://www.brainyquote.com/words/tr/treaty>)