Royal University of Law and Economics

Final Report on

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD EUROPE DURING COLD WAR

Name of Student: Name of Academic Advisor:

Mr. KHARY RONY   Dr. KEM SAMBATH

International Program

Bachelor of International Relations

Cohort 5

Year of Submission 2017

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First and foremost, I would like to express my honor to beloved family, parents for giving birth to me at the first place, and who are have play a very important role in supporting me with every single thing in my life, and who have lead me to the wonderful path since I was born until now. Thank you for being a part of my life as always. I would like to show my gratitude to them first because without their supporting, love, caring, motivation, inspiration, and guidance, I will not be here nowadays. Thank you, I would never be able to complete this thesis without them.

Secondly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, **Dr. KEM SAMBATH** for his guidance, patience, and knowledge by providing me with comment, suggestion to improve my thesis and contribution to the outcome of this research.

Additionally, my appreciation goes to **Mr. SAU SIVUTHA**. I deeply appreciate and acknowledge your encouragement since the beginning of the program, especially with your consultant and care to all the students.

Beside my advisors, I would like to give a very special thanks to His Excellency **Dr. LUY CHANA**, Rector of the Royal University of Law and Economics, who has supported this program and providing us very qualified lecturers, comfortable facilities, and a very good university. I would like to give a deeply thank to our dean, **Dr. SOEUN SOPHORN** and our lecturers, who were very generous to give us their valuable time to discuss with and encourage us. I never forget to mention **Zaman University** that allows me to use their books to conduct the research on my topic.

Last but not least, I would like thank to the people who help me directly or indirectly involved from the beginning of my study until its completion. Especially, to my best friends who also help and give each other the best discussion and suggestion. Without any of them, I

will not be who am nowadays. Thank for all the unforgettable activities we have had together in the last three years.

ABSTRACT

Soon after the World War II ended, the democratic nations of the world become aware of the growing Soviet Union and the spread of communism. The United State believed that the containment of the growth of new communist and socialist states was the overall goal during the Cold War years. Containment was basically an effective policy. As the result of containment policy along with other components such as Truman Doctrine, the European Recovery Program or Marshall Plan, promoted the idea of sharing interest and cooperate between the United States and Europe. The world, particularly Europe, was not tilted heavily towards communism that achievement was an expensive one for the United States. The Cold War was significant because it greatly affected the history of the twentieth century. It shaped the world that we live in. As the Result, this thesis seeks to answer the question "what were the policies that the United States used during the Cold War?" and "How the United States changed the images of the Europe?" Specifically, the research will examine the relation that the United States has involved with the European integration during the Cold War.

Keywords:

American, Europe, Cold War,

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EC	:	European Community
ECSC	:	European Coal and Street Community
EEC	:	European Economic Community
ERP	:	European Recovery Program
EU	:	European Union
NAT	:	North Atlantic Treaty
NATO	:	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NSC 68	:	National Security Council Report 68
NSC	:	National Security Council
MSA	:	Mutual Security Agency
SALT I	:	Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty I
START	:	Strategic Arms Reduction Talks
US	:	The United States
USA	:	The United States of America
USSR	:	Union of Soviet Socialist Republic

INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The Cold war was the conflicted that developed after the World War II between powers in the Western Bloc (the United States, its NATO allies and other) and powers in the Eastern Bloc (the Soviet Union and its satellite states). The period of the cold war does not fully agree by the historians but the common date of the war was between 1947, the year that the Truman Doctrine was announced until the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. It is called the cold war because the both side never went to war directly with each other. It was the period that the both side could bring the nuclear destruction to the world. The United States and the Soviet Union raced to be ahead of one another in the nuclear weapon which much more powerful than the weapon that they used in the World War II.[1] The United States and Europe share a long and intertwined history, replete with many ups and downs. The modern transatlantic relationship was forged in the aftermath of World War II to deter the Soviet threat and to promote security and stability in Europe. NATO and the European Union (EU), the latest stage in a process of European integration begun in the 1950s, are the two key pillars upon which the U.S.-European partnership still rests. The U.S. Congress and successive U.S. administrations have supported both organizations as means to nourish democracy, foster reliable military allies, and create strong trading partners.[2] Containment was a United States policy using numerous strategies to prevent the spread of communism abroad. The word containment is associated most strongly with the policies of United States President Harry Truman (1945–53), including the

---

[1] Selfstudyhistory, "Cold War, Emergence of Two Power Block, Factors Leading to the Collapse of Soviet Union (1985-1991)" 2015. Accessed May 19, 2017. Available at <https://selfstudyhistory.com/2015/01/20/world-history-cold-war-and-contemporary-world-history/ >.
[2] Kristin Archick, "the United States and Europe: Possible Options for U.S. Policy" CRS Web: Congressional Research Service. (2005).

establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a mutual defense pact.[3] President Richard Nixon (1969–74), working with his top advisor Henry Kissinger, rejected containment in favor of friendly relations with the Soviet Union and China; this détente, or relaxation of tensions, involved expanded trade and cultural contacts.[4] President Jimmy Carter (1976–81) emphasized human rights rather than anti-communism, but dropped détente and returned to containment when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan in 1979.[5] President Ronald Reagan (1981–89), denouncing the Soviet state as an "evil empire", escalated the Cold War and promoted rollback in Nicaragua and Afghanistan. Central programs begun under containment, including NATO and nuclear deterrence, remained in effect even after the end of the war.[6]

2. Research Objective

History helps us to understand the change and how the society we live in came to be. The second reason history is inescapable as a subject of serious study follows closely on the first. The past causes the present, and so the present can causes to the future as well. That is why this final report will mainly focus on the challenge of the US foreign policy and how US foreign policy affected to the Europe during Cold War.

---

[3] Boundless, "The Cold War and Containment" 2016. Accessed May 19, 2017. Available at <https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-textbook/foreign-policy-18/the-history-of-american-foreign-policy-110/the-cold-war-and-containment-586-4260/ >.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

3. Scope and Limitation of Research

It would be important to notice that my study is mainly focus on the relation that the USA involves with the European integration project. It has discussed the issues of its achievements, criticisms, and its success.

4. Research Methodology

This final report is researched based on mainly on the secondary source from libraries and internet source. These data are collected from all source ranging from legal documents, policy paper, secondary data, reports, journals, and other electronic devices. I would like to analysis on the key relationships in which the USA has been involved in the Cold War. Especially, the transatlantic relationship with the European integration project. This relationship is not only with a single state but with the region which itself grown and become markedly more important in the world.

5. Structure of Research

This final paper is divided into three main important bodies:

Introduction:

This part is giving the brief information about the research and followed by research objective, scope and limitation, research methodology, and the structure of the research.

Three main important chapters as supporting bodies:

- o Chapter I: History and background of Cold War, the Cold War in Europe, and the two organizations: NATO and the Warsaw Pact.

- Chapter II: The US policy during Cold War: Containment policy, Truman Doctrine, and The Marshall plan.

- Chapter III: US policy toward EU during Cold War.

Conclusion:

Last but not least, given the overall of the conclusion of key relationship on which the USA has been involved in the Cold War, the relationship with the European integration project and how the United States change the influenced to the European Community during Cold War.

CHAPTER I: HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Cold War was the conflicted that developed after the World War II between powers in the Western Bloc (the United States, its NATO allies and other) and powers in the Eastern Bloc (the Soviet Union and its satellite states). The period of the Cold War does not fully agree by the historians but the common date of the war was between 1947, the year that the Truman Doctrine was announced until the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991. It is called the Cold War because the both side never went to war directly with each other. It was the period that the both side could bring the nuclear destruction to the world. The United States and the Soviet Union raced to be ahead of one another in the nuclear weapon which much more powerful than the weapon that they used in the World War II.[7] During Cold War, containment was a United States policy. It was using in numerous strategies to prevent the spread of Communism abroad. This policy was a response to a series of move by Soviet Union to enlarge its communist sphere of influence in Eastern Europe. Throughout the Cold War, American foreign policy towards the USSR was characterized by a perceived need to defend itself and its allies against the threat of communist expansion. The leaders of the USA repeatedly articulated a commitment to assisting and supporting like-minded and supposedly "liberal-democratic" states against any perceived left-wing threats. Some critics have gone so far as to argue that US foreign policy during the Cold War period until 1991 can, at its worst, be interpreted as an American willingness to support any regime as long as it was anti-communist or even if it were clearly authoritarian and undemocratic.[8]

---

[7] Selfstudyhistory, "Cold War, Emergence of Two Power Block, Factors Leading to the Collapse of Soviet Union (1985-1991)" 2015. Accessed May 19, 2017. Available at <https://selfstudyhistory.com/2015/01/20/world-history-cold-war-and-contemporary-world-history/ >.

[8] Talking Points, "U.S. Cold War Forign Policy – Containment" 2013. Accessed May 19, 2017. Accessed at < https://studyingthehumanities.wordpress.com/2013/07/14/u-s-cold-war-foreign-policy-containment/ >.

1.1. The Origins of the Cold War in Europe

The origins of the Cold War are not difficult to discover. The beginning of the Cold War can be tracked back to the Russia Revolution in 1917, which the year that the Soviet Union was established. In the year of 1917, most of the Russians people lost their trust to the leadership of the Czar Nicholas II. The government had corruption, the Russian economy was going backward, and he tried to dissolve the Russian parliament that establishes after the revolution in 1905.[9] A civil war erupted in Russia in 1918. On one side were the communists or Bolshevik and on the other side were the anti-Bolshevik White Army. A number if nations sent the troop to support the anti-Bolshevik, including the USA. In 1920, the communist party that leads by Vladimir Lenin won the war. In 1922, the communist party firmly established the communist dictatorship that we know as Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR).[10] The World War II left the United States and Russia as the two super powers in the world. They had very different idea how the Europe should be reconstructed. The war left the United States led allies in control of the West part and the Russia in control of the large of the Eastern part.[11] The two nations were rivals to each other with the very different forms of their government, economy, and ideologies.[12] The Russia started making the Soviet Union satellites while the United States and its allies restored democracy in their region.[13]

---

[9] History, "Russian Revolution" 2017. Accessed May 22, 2017. Available at <http://www.history.com/topics/russian-revolution >.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Robert Wilde, "The Cold War: the Definitive Struggle between Capitalism and Communism" ThoughtCo, 2017. Accessed June 2, 2017. Available at < https://www.thoughtco.com/introduction-to-the-cold-war-in-europe-1221198 >.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Selfstudyhistory, "Cold War, Emergence of Two Power Block, Factors Leading to the Collapse of Soviet Union (1985-1991)" 2015. Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at <https://selfstudyhistory.com/2015/01/20/world-history-cold-war-and-contemporary-world-history/ >.

1.2. The Cold War in Europe

When Harry S Truman became President in April 1945, much of Europe and Asia lay in ruins. Although the Axis powers (the Tripartite Pact was signed by Germany, Italy, and Japan on 27 September 1940, in Berlin.) had been defeated, an ominous new threat appeared on the horizon.[14] The United States and the Soviet Union, who were allies during World War II, emerged from the war as superpowers. Both Unite States and Soviet Union were increasingly in conflict with each other. In 1947, the efforts to maintain cooperation between those two superpower had broken down completely. President Truman, working closely with two assertive Secretaries of State, George C. Marshall (1947-1949) and Dean G. Acheson (1949-1953).[15] They took decisive steps to contain Soviet expansion in regions in which the United States had vital interests.[16] The United States was about to enter a new kind of war: the "Cold War." The Cold War was a geopolitical tension in the twentieth century between the United States of America, the Soviet Union respective allies, over political, economic and military issues, we also often known as the struggle between capitalism and communism.[17] The Cold War was often the tension of the military between NATO on one side and the Warsaw Pact on the other side. The aftermath of World War II left the United States and Russia as the dominant military powers in the world, but they had very different forms of government and economy, the former a capitalist democracy, the latter a communist dictatorship.[18] Both countries were rivals who feared each other, each ideologically opposed. The war also left Russia in control of

---

[14] Encyclopædia Britannica. "Axis Powers". Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Axis-Powers >.

[15] U.S. Department of State, "The World in 1945". Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at < https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/worldin1945 >.

[16] Ibid.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Robert Wilde, "The Cold War in Europe" ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at < https://www.thoughtco.com/introduction-to-the-cold-war-in-europe-1221198 >.

large areas of Eastern Europe, and the US led Allies in control of the West.[19] While the Allies trying to restore democracy in their regions, Russia began making Soviet satellites out of its 'liberated' lands; the split between the two was dubbed the Iron Curtain. In reality, there had been no liberation, just a new conquest by the USSR.[20] The West feared a communist invasion, both physical and ideological hat would turn them into the communist states. The US countered the Soviet invasion with the Truman Doctrine with its policy of containment to stop the communism spreading, and the Marshall Plan, massive aid aimed at supporting collapsing economies which were letting communist sympathizers gain power.[21] Military alliances were formed as the West grouped together as NATO and the East as the Warsaw Pact. By 1951, Europe was divided into two power blocs, American-led on the one side and Soviet-led the other side. Each side have atomic weapons which could explode each other anytime.

1.2.1. The Eastern Bloc and The Western Bloc

World War II ended in 1945 and most of the Europe were destroyed. Soviet troops occupied countries like Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and others. The Soviets also occupied the eastern half of Germany, while the Americans, British, and French occupied the other half. The two super powers had very different ideas of how Europe should be rebuilt.[22] As we know that the United States always want Europe to be rebuilt as the democratic region while Soviet always want Europe to be rebuilt as the communist region because of this, the Soviet moved quickly to establish communist puppet government in the countries that they occupied.[23] The western democracies tried but failed to prevent from the Soviet expansion. At

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Nate Sullivan, "The Eastern Bloc vs. the Western Democracies" Study. Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at < http://study.com/academy/lesson/two-super-powers-the-united-states-and-the-soviet-union.html >.

[23] Ibid.

the Yalta Conference in February 1945 and at the Potsdam Conference in July of 1945, the Allied powers met to discuss the composition of post-war Europe.[24] Under pressure from western democracies, Soviet leader Josef Stalin pledged to refrain from Sovietization and insisted he would allow free elections in occupied countries.[25] Stalin failed to keep his promise and through falsified elections and other subversive means, the Soviet Union helped install communist governments. Unwilling to risk outright war, there was little the western democracies could do except stand by and watch as Eastern Europe fell to communism.[26] The countries that came under the influence of communism became known as the Eastern Bloc, or the 'Eastern Bloc States.' In a famous speech, British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said that these countries had been placed 'behind the Iron Curtain.' The term 'Iron Curtain,' of course, was a figurative reference to the oppressive rule of communism.[27] Among the leading Eastern Bloc states were East Germany, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania, and Bulgaria. These states were held together by an agreement called the Warsaw Pact or the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance.[28] The Warsaw Pact was a mutual defense pact aimed at consolidating communist strength encountering the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO. NATO was the opposing mutual defense pact. Its member states were more or less the western democracies. Countries like the United States, France, Great Britain, Canada, and many others made up NATO. The important thing to remember here is that the Warsaw Pact stemmed from Soviet influence, while NATO stemmed from American influence.[29]

---

[24] Ibid.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Ibid.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.

1.2.2. NATO (The North Atlantic Treaty Organization)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is an intergovernmental military alliance of countries between Europe and North America based on the North Atlantic Treaty which was signed on 1949 and constitute a system of collective defense against the Soviet Union.[30] NATO was the first peacetime military alliance the United States entered into outside of the Western Hemisphere. After the World War II, with the ideologically opposed of the Soviet occupied a large scale in the Eastern Europe and still fear of the German aggressive, including the United States was concern about the spread of the communism in the Europe so the nation from the Western Europe tried to find a new form of the military alliance to protect themselves.[31] In 1947-1948, there were many events that caused the nations of Western Europe to concern about their physical and political security and the United States to become more closely involved with European affairs.[32] With the ongoing civil war in Greece, along with tensions in Turkey, led President Truman to assert that the United States would provide economic and military aid to both countries, as well as to any other nation which struggling against an attempt at the subjugation of the communism.[33] Soviet help the coup in Czechoslovakia result in a communist government holds the power on the border of Germany. Furthermore, the election in Italy as the communist party had made significant gains among Italian voters as well as event in the Germany also caused concern. Soviet Premier Joseph Stalin chose to test Western by implementing a blockade against West Berlin by implementing a blockade against West Berlin, which was then under joint U.S., British, and French control but surrounded by Soviet-

---

[30] Robert Wilde, "About the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)" ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at < https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-nato-1221961 >.

[31] Ibid.

[32] U.S. Department of State, "North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 1949". Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nato >.

[33] Ibid.

controlled East Germany.[34] This Berlin Crisis brought both the United States and the Soviet Union to the edge of conflict. These events caused U.S. officials to grow increasingly cautious of the possibility that the countries of Western Europe might deal with their security concerns by negotiating with the Soviets. However, to counter this possible turn of events, the Truman Administration considered the possibility of forming a European-American alliance that would commit the United States to bolstering the security of Western Europe.[35] The Western countries willing to consider a collective security solution. In response to increasing tensions and security concerns, representatives of several countries of Western Europe gathered together to create a military alliance. Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg signed the Brussels Treaty in March 1948. The treaty provided a collective defense; if any one of these nations was attacked, the others were bound to help defend it.[36] At the same time, the Truman Administration instituted a peacetime draft to increase the military spending. In May of 1948, Republican Senator Arthur H. Vandenburg proposed a resolution suggesting that the President seek a security treaty with Western Europe that would adhere to the United Nations charter but exist outside of the Security Council where the Soviet Union held veto power.[37] The resolution passed, and the negotiations started for the North Atlantic Treaty.

It took several months to work out the exact term of the treaty. The United States Congress see the afford of the international alliance but it still keeps concern about the language in the treaty. The countries in the Western Europe want to make sure that the United States wound intervene wherever there is an attack to the alliance but under the United States Constitution, Congress is the only who have power to declare a war. [38] The Negotiation worked toward to

---

[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid.

find a language that would reinsure the European States but also not to make the United States violate its own law too. Additionally, European commitments to collective security would need large-scale military support from the United States to help rebuild Western Europe's protection capabilities.[39] The result of these negotiation was the signing the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949. In the treaty, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, Luxemburg, Norway, Netherlands, Portugal are agreed to consider attack against one nation an attack against all also including with consultations about threats and defense matter.[40]

1.2.3. The Warsaw Pact

The Warsaw Pact also known as the Warsaw Treaty Organization was a political and military alliance between the Soviet Union and several Eastern Europe countries, signed on 1955 to create a centralized military command in Eastern Europe during the Cold War and to counter threat from the NATO.[41] We can say that the Warsaw Pact is like the Communist Alliance. It was created to in some way to respond to the creation of the NATO, but there is no direct confrontation between them with NATO. The creation of the Warsaw Pact was more straightforwardly motivated by the rearming of West Germany and its admission into NATO in 1955.[42] The objective of creating the Warsaw Pact was to coordinated defense among its member states in order to defense any attack from the outside states. There was also an internal security component that were useful to the USSR. The alliance gave more power to the Soviet to exercise even more control over the other communist states in Eastern Europe.[43] The strategy behind the formation of the Warsaw Pact was driven by the Soviet Union to dominate the

---

[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Robert Wilde, "The Warsaw Pact: Late twentieth Century Russian Tool" ThoughtCo, 2017. Accessed June 02, 2017. Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/the-warsaw-pact-3878466 >.
[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid.

Central and Eastern Europe. The treaty was signed in Warsaw that is why it called Warsaw Treaty. The treaty demanded the member states to defense any member that attacked by an outside force and also it set up a unified military command under a Soviet military leader named Marshal Ivan S. Konev.[44] The treaty was originally a 20 years agreement, and it officially dissolved in 1991.

1.2.4. Two Super Powers: The United States and the Soviet Union

As we can see that in the World War II history, both the United States and the Soviet Union allied to each other during the World War. Together both nations could end the Hitler. When the World War ended those two nations become the world super power and most powerful state in the world at that time.[45] As we know that Cold War was the prolonged period of tension between the United States and the Soviet Union. It was after the World War II until the fall of the Soviet Union. After the World War II ended in 1945, Soviet troops occupied countries like Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia, and also the Eastern half of Germany while the United States, British, and French occupied the other half.[46] The United States always wanted Europe to be rebuilt along with the Democratic lined but the Soviet Union was being a communist country that is why it has a different idea from the United States how Europe should be reform.[47] This two nations has a very different idea how Europe should be restructured. The Eastern Bloc is referring to the countries that fall under the influence of the communism. British Prime Minister Winston Churchill said that these countries had been an oppressive rule of communism. The Eastern Bloc States were East Germany, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia,

---

[44] History, "The Warsaw Pact is formed" 2017. Accessed June 2, 2017. Available at < http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/the-warsaw-pact-is-formed >.
[45] Nate Sullivan, "Two Super Powers: The United States and the Soviet Union," Study. Accessed June 2, 2017. Available at <http://study.com/academy/lesson/two-super-powers-the-united-states-and-the-soviet-union.html >.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.

Hungry, Albania, and Bulgaria, and they were held together by an agreement called the Warsaw Pact or the Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation, and Mutual Assistance.[48] The treaty was a mutual defense pact that aimed to strengthen the communist strength encountering the United States and its allies NATO. And was the opposing to the Warsaw Pact. Its member states were more or less from the Western Democracies such as the United States, France, Great British, Canada, and other that make up NATO.[49] The thing to remember is that the Eastern Bloc was driven by the Soviet Union and the Western Democracies was driven by the United States.

1.3. End of the Cold War

As soon as, the President Richard Nixon took the office, he began to implement a new approach to international relations. Instead of viewing the world as a hostile, "bi-polar" place, he suggested, why not use diplomacy instead of military action to create more poles? To that end, he encouraged the United Nations to recognize the communist Chinese government and, after a trip there in 1972, began to establish diplomatic relations with Beijing. At the same time, he adopted a policy of "détente" - "relaxation"–toward the Soviet Union. In 1972, he and Soviet Premier Leonid Brezhnev signed the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I), which prohibited the manufacture of nuclear missiles by both sides and took a step toward reducing the decades-old threat of nuclear war.[50] The Cold War heated up again when the President Ronald Ragan. He believed that the spread of the communism threatened the freedom to the world. As the result, he provided the financial and military support to the anti-communist governments and insurgencies around the world.[51] In 1980, Ronald Reagan became the

---

[48] Ibid.

[49] Ibid.

[50] History, "Cold War History" 2017. Accessed June 3, 2017. Available at <http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/cold-war-history >.

[51] Ibid.

president of the United States. He was a strong anti-communist leader, called the Soviet Union the "Evil Empire", and increased the spending on arms.[52] The US military developed the modern arms and technology such as the neutron bomb, cruise missile, and a defense system by using space satellites. By 1985, Soviet Union was in trouble and Mikhail Gorbachev became the leader of the USSR.[53] Soviet realized that they could not keep up with the arms race compete with the USA so they withdraw from the Afghanistan, opened that START (Strategic Arms Reduction Talks) with the USA, and signed the Intermediate Range Nuclear Force Treaty in 1987.[54] Mikhail Gorbachev began to reform the Soviet system by introduced two policies that redefined Russia's relationship to the rest of the world, "Glasnost" or political openness, and "Perestroika" or economic reform.[55] He influenced in the Eastern Europe. In 1989, every other communist state in the region replaced its government with a noncommunist.[56] In the November of the same year, the Berlin Wall that was the most visible symbol of the Cold War was finally destroyed and by 1991 the Soviet Union had fallen apart that is the end of the Cold War.[57] The left the Soviet Union collapsed and other countries like Hungary and Czechoslovakia were ousted the Communist regimes. The Demands for freedom soon spread to the Soviet Union. The BALTIC STATES of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania declared independence.[58]

---

[52] BBC, "The Collapse of Communism" 2014. Accessed June 3, 2017. Available at <http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/history/mwh/ir2/endofthecoldwarrev1.shtml >.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid.
[55] History, "Cold War History" 2017. Accessed June 3, 2017. Available at <http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/cold-war-history >.
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.
[58] U.S. History, "The End of the Cold War" 2017. Accessed July 01, 2017. Available at < http://www.ushistory.org/us/59e.asp >.

CHAPTER II: THE US POLICY DURING COLD WAR

2.1. The Cold War and Containment

Containment is a geopolitical strategy to stop the expansion of the enemy. It was well known as a Cold War foreign policy of the United States and its allies to stop the spread of the communism. As a part of the Cold War, this policy was a response to a series of moves by the Soviet Union to increase their communist influence in Eastern Europe and other part of the world. The basis of the doctrine was articulated in a 1946 cable by U.S. diplomat George F. Kennan during the post-World War II administration of U.S. President Harry S. Truman. At the end of the World War, Soviet Union was a close society under Joseph Stalin. Few states in the West had experience with the communist state and even fewer understood what motivated the Soviets.[59] In 1946, while he was Chargé d'Affaires in Moscow, Kennan sent an 8,000-word telegram to the Department, "long telegram" on the aggressive nature of Stalin's foreign policy. Kennan, writing as "Mr. X," published an outline of his philosophy in the prestigious journal Foreign Affairs in 1947. His conclusion was that "the main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be that of a long-term patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies." Containment provided a conceptual framework for a series of successful initiatives undertaken from 1947 to 1950 to blunt Soviet expansion.[60] Containment was a foreign policy of the United States that introduced at the start of the Cold War, by using numerous strategies to prevent the spread of Communism, otherwise the 'domino effect' would occur, where if one nation became Communist, the surrounding ones would

---

[59] U.S. Department of State. "George Kennan and Containment." Accessed June 9, 2017. Available at <https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/kennan>.
[60] Ibid.

follow communist either.[61] This policy was a response to a series of moves by the Soviet Union to enlarge its communist that interest in Eastern Europe. The basic doctrine was articulated by the US diplomat, George F. Kenan in 1946.

2.1.1. Kennan and Containment, 1947

George F. Kennan was Foreign Service Officer who formulated the policy of "containment," the basic United States strategy for fighting the Cold War with the Soviet Union. His idea which became the basis of the Truman administration's foreign policy first came to public attention in 1947 in the form of an anonymous contribution to the journal Foreign Affairs.[62] The article called "X-Article." "The main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union," He also wrote, "must be that of a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies."[63]

> To that end, he called for countering "Soviet pressure against the free institutions of the Western world" through the "adroit and vigilant application of counter-force at a series of constantly shifting geographical and political points, corresponding to the shifts and maneuvers of Soviet policy." Such a policy, Kennan predicted, would "promote tendencies which must eventually find their outlet in either the break-up or the gradual mellowing of Soviet power."[64]

His policy was controversial from the very beginning. Columnist Walter Lippmann, was a writer and reporter, attacked the X-Article for failing to differentiate between vital and peripheral interests. His article implied, the Soviet Union and its Communist allies should face down whenever and wherever they cause a risk of gaining influence.[65] Other criticized Kenan's

---

[61] Robert Wilde, "Containment: America's Plan to Contain Communism," ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed June 10, 2017, Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-was-containment-1221496>.

[62] U.S. Department of State. "Kennan and Containment, 1947." Accessed June 10, 2017. Available at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/kennan >.

[63] Ibid.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Ibid.

policy for being too defensive. The most notably criticized, the United States' policy should not be containment, but the "rollback" of Soviet power that declared during the election campaign in 1952 by John Foster Dulles.[66] Even within the Truman administration, there was a rift over containment between Kennan and Paul Nitze. Nitze, who saw the Soviet threat primarily in military terms, interpreted Kennan's call for "the adroit and vigilant application of counter force" to mean the use of the military power.[67] In contrast, Kennan, who considered the Soviet threat to be primarily political, advocated above all else economic assistance (e.g., the Marshall Plan) and "psychological warfare" to counter the spread of Soviet influence.[68] In 1950, Nitze's conception of containment won out over Kenan's. National Security Council Report 68 (NSC 68), a policy document that prepared by the National Security Council and signed by Truman, called for a drastic expansion of the U.S. military budget, but the paper also expanded containment's scope beyond the defense of major centers of industrial power to encompass the entire world.[69]

Even there were many criticisms and the various policy defeats that Kenan suffered in the early in the 1950s, containment in the general sense of blocking the expansion of Soviet influence remained the basic strategy of the United States throughout the Cold War.[70]

2.1.2. Truman Doctrine

President Harry S. Truman established that the United States would provide political, military and economic assistance to all democratic nations under threat from external or internal Soviet expansion. The Truman Doctrine effectively reoriented U.S. foreign policy, away from

---

[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid.

its usual stance of withdrawal from regional conflicts not directly involving the United States, to one of possible intervention in far away conflicts.[71] The Truman Doctrine was also a part of Cold War, both in how this conflict of posturing and puppets began, and how it developed over the years. The doctrine was created to encounter Soviet geopolitical expansion during the Cold War by supporting free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minority or by outside pressure, and it was announced on March 12th, 1947 by the President Harry Truman.[72] The doctrine was made up to respond to the crisis in Greece and Turkey. The US government believed that the Soviet Union supported the Greek Communist war effort and worried that if the Communists prevailed in the Greek civil war, the Soviets would ultimately influence Greek policy.[73] Truman asked Congress to support the Greek Government against the Communists. He also asked Congress to provide assistance for Turkey, since that nation, too, had previously been dependent on British aid.[74] The United States Believed that if the Soviet Union supported the Greek Communist war and worried that if the communists prevailed in the Greek civil war, sos the Soviet Union would ultimately influence the Greek policy.[75] In fact, Soviet leader Joseph Stalin had deliberately refrained from providing any support to the Greek Communists and had forced Yugoslav Prime Minister Josip Tito to follow suit, much to the detriment of Soviet-Yugoslav relations.[76] However, not only this problem that influenced President Truman's decision to activated aid to Greece and Turkey but with other foreign policy problem as well.[77] The United States believed that these two countries were in danger of falling

---

[71] U.S. Department of State. "The Truman Doctrine, 1947". Accessed June 10, 2017. Available at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine >.

[72] Robert Wilde, "The Truman Doctrine and the Cold War," ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed June 10, 2017. Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-was-the-truman-doctrine-1221569>.

[73] U.S. Department of State. "The Truman Doctrine, 1947" Accessed June 10, 2017. Available at < https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine >.

[74] Ibid.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ibid.

[77] Ibid.

into the Soviet sphere of influence.[78] Truman and the US wanted to stop any further countries falling within Soviet control, and the president's speech promised monetary aid and military advisors to Greece and Turkey to stop them buckling.[79] President Truman requested that Congress provide $400,000,000 worth of aid to both the Greek and Turkish Governments and support the dispatch of American civilian and military personnel and equipment to the region.[80] The Truman doctrine did not only aim to help these two countries but to expanded worldwide to cover assistance to all nations which threatened by communism and the Soviet Union.[81] In 1950, the Truman Doctrine was developed by NSC 68 which assumed that the Soviet Union was trying to spread its power across the world, decided that the US should stop this action and advocated more active with the military, the policy of containment, and fully abandoning previous US doctrine like Isolationism.[82] As the result, the military budget rose to $13 billion in 1950 to $60 billion in 1951.

2.1.3. Marshall Plan

To assist in the recovery of war-torn Europe, the Marshall Plan was implemented. In between 1948-1951, the Marshall Plan provided economic aid to 16 European countries struggling to rebound from the destruction of World War II. Marshall Plan was a US sponsored economic aid program help to rebuild the Western European, aimed at helping economic renewal and strengthening democracy after World War II. The official named the European Recovery Program (ERP), later become known as the Marshall Plan after the man who

---

[78] Robert Wilde, "The Truman Doctrine and the Cold War," ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed June 10, 2017. Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-was-the-truman-doctrine-1221569>.
[79] Ibid.
[80] U.S. Department of State. "The Truman Doctrine, 1947" Accessed June 10, 2017. Available at < https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine >.
[81] Robert Wilde, "The Truman Doctrine and the Cold War," ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed June 10, 2017. Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-was-the-truman-doctrine-1221569>.
[82] Ibid.

announced it, Secretary of State George C. Marshall.[83] The resulting European Recovery Program, or Marshall Plan, not only facilitated European economic integration but promoted the idea of shared interests and cooperation between the United States and Europe.[84] The Plan initially announced in 1947 during a speech by Marshall at Harvard University and it was signed into the law on April 3, 1948. Marshall Plan provided aid to 17 countries and estimated around $13 billion over a four years period. The 6 years of the Second World War damaged to the economies of the Europe, devastating both the landscape and the infrastructure. Cities and factories had been bombed, farms and towns were destroyed, populations had been moved, and millions of civilians had been either killed or maimed. The damage was severe and most countries didn't have enough resources to help even their own people. In 1946 Britain, a former world power, was close to bankruptcy, while in France and Italy there was inflation and unrest and the fear of starvation.[85] Several ideas to aid the rebuilding of Europe had been proposed, a plan that had been tried after World War one and which appeared to have failed utterly to bring peace so it was not used again. On the other hand, the United States was different because of the location is in a continent away, and the United States was the only country that did not suffer major devastation during the war so it was the United State that could help to rebuild Europe.[86] After the end of the war in 1945 until the beginning of Marshall Plan, the United States provide $14 million in loads. When the British could not continue to fight against the communism in Greece and Turkey so the Unites States stepped in to provide the military support to those two

[83] Jennifer L. Goss, "What Did the Marshall Plan Actually Do?" ThoughtCo, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2017. Available at < https://www.thoughtco.com/marshall-plan-economic-aid-1779313 >.

[84] U.S. Department of State, "North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 1949". Accessed May 15, 2017. Available at <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nato >.

[85] Robert Wilde, "The Marshall Plan - Rebuilding Western Europe after WW2," ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed June 15, 2017, Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/the-marshall-plan-1221199 >.

[86] Jennifer L. Goss, "What Did the Marshall Plan Actually Do?" ThoughtCo, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2017. Available at < https://www.thoughtco.com/marshall-plan-economic-aid-1779313 >.

countries.[87] The United States also afraid that communist group will gain further power from the Cold War and Soviet domination of Europe seemed a real danger and wishing to secure Europe market so they choose for a program of financial aid.[88] Additionally, President Truman believed that the only way to contain the spread of the communism and restore political stability within Europe was to first stabilize the economies of Western European countries who had not yet succumbed to the communist takeover.[89]

2.1.3.1. The Creation of the Marshall Plan

Marshall called upon two State Department officials, George Kennan and William Clayton, to assist with the construction of the plan. Kennan was known for his idea of containment, a central component of Truman Doctrine and Clayton was a businessman and government official who focused on European economic issues, he helped lend specific economic insight into the plan's development.[90] Marshall Plan was to provide specific aid to European countries to rebuild their economies by focusing on the expansion of their international trade opportunities. The initial announcement of the Marshall Plan was on June 5, 1947, during a speech by Marshall at Harvard University, however, it did not become official until it was signed into law by Truman ten months later.[91] The official named the European Recovery Program (ERP). During the years of the plan receiving nations experienced and economic growth between 15% - 25% which was quickly renewed and agricultural production

---

[87] Ibid.

[88] Robert Wilde, "The Marshall Plan - Rebuilding Western Europe after WW2," ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed June 15, 2017, Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/the-marshall-plan-1221199 >.

[89] Jennifer L. Goss, "What Did the Marshall Plan Actually Do?" ThoughtCo, 2017. Accessed June 15, 2017. Available at < https://www.thoughtco.com/marshall-plan-economic-aid-1779313 >.

[90] Ibid.

[91] Ibid.

sometimes exceeded pre-war levels.[92] With this plan, it can help push communist group away from power and created an economic divide between the rich west and the poor communist east as clear as the political.

2.1.3.2. Legacy of the Marshall Plan

By 1951, the World was changing. While the economics of Western Europe countries was stable, the Cold War was emerging as a new world problem. At the end of 1951, the Marshall Plan was replaced by the Mutual Security Act. This legislation created the short-lived Mutual Security Agency (MSA), which focused not only on economic recovery but also more concrete military support as well.[93] Nowadays, the Marshall Plan is widely views as a success. The economy of Western Europe rebounded significantly during its administration, which also helped to foster economic stability within the United States. The Marshall Plan also helped the United States prevent the further spread of communism within Western Europe by restoring the economy in that area. The concepts of the Marshall Plan also laid the foundation for the future economic aid programs administered by the United States and some of the economic ideas that exist within the present European Union.[94]

---

[92] Robert Wilde, "The Marshall Plan - Rebuilding Western Europe after WW2," ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed June 15, 2017, Available at <https://www.thoughtco.com/the-marshall-plan-1221199 >.

[93] Jennifer L. Goss, "What Did the Marshall Plan Actually Do?" ThoughtCo, 2017. Accessed June 16, 2017. Available at < https://www.thoughtco.com/marshall-plan-economic-aid-1779313 >.

[94] Ibid.

CHAPTER III: US POLICY TOWARD EU DURING COLD WAR

3.1. Introduction

This chapter is concerned with one of the key relationship on which USA has been involved in the Cold War, the relationship with the European integration project. This relationship is not only with a single state but with the region which itself grown and become markedly more important in the world. American foreign policy makers have generally agreed on their support for the integration in the region but it has challenged US foreign policy in some important area. This chapter will focus on the ways in which US policy makers have developed image of the European Community (EC) and now the European Union (EU) on the challenge posed by the European integration for US policy processes and the used of the US power. These challenges have been met in the very different condition of the Cold War. In term of context, US policy toward European integration have covered both the Cold War and the Post-Cold War period. In term of content, US policy makers have had to adapt to the European project that has expand both in scope and scale, and which has become a central feature in the foreign policies of individual European member states.[95]

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the ways in which American Policy makers have promoted and responded to these changes and also to point out some of the key areas of tension that emerged from the changing relationship between the USA and European integration. This chapter also review the key factor in the evolution of the relationship within US foreign policy until the end of the Cold War. Especially, on US images of the European integration process and on the responses to change.[96] This chapter also focuses on the ways in which the post-Cold

---

[95] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
[96] Ibid

War period has thrown up new changes and challenges and how US policy makers dealt with attentions to image and responses.

3.2. US Policy and European Integration

The end of the Second World War was the period of uncertainly in US foreign policy. The rise of the US liberal order was not a predetermined outcome, and indeed the initial us position on continued involvement in Western Europe was shaped by the desire to retreat to the American homeland but the increasing of the Soviet threat between 1945 and 1947 led US to redefine their policy toward Europe that had a great effect on the European integration.[97]

The central to this reorientation of US foreign policy was the Marshall Plan which known as the system of financial support and other assistance that contributed to the recovery and stabilization of the Western European countries. A speech by secretary Marshall made at Harvard University in June 1974 concentrated on the need for immediate economic assistance, but also had an explicitly political aim which is to stabilize or create democratic institutions and free markets, which were seen as two sides of the same coin. Between 1947 and 1950, the European Recovery Program (ERP) channeled $19 billion of US aid to those countries that accepted the ground rules, and by so doing also accentuated the Cold War division of Europe by excluding the countries of the developing Soviet Bloc.[98] The aid was given explicitly for the reason that the European recipients would cooperate in its distribution and the associated planning processes, it is possible to see this as the seed of the eventual European integration process. When in 1950 Robert Schuman and Jean Monnet proposed the Schuman Plan for the creation of a European Coal and Street Community (ECSC), this was generally welcomed in

---

[97] A. W. DePorte, "Europe between the superpowers: the enduring balance". (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986).

[98] Alan S. Milward, "The reconstruction of Western Europe, 1945-1951". (London: University of California Press, 1984).

the US administration as a further step in the recovery and consolidation process. The ERP and the ECSC together, it can be claimed, expressed the US position in the political economy of Western Europe and led to the Americanization of large parts of European industry.[99]

In some cases, US policy makers had reluctantly come to the conclusion that they needed a long-term commitment to European security, not just to economic and political recovery and that become the bottom of the North Atlantic Treaty (NAT) signed in 1949 by the USA and fourteen other members (Western European plus Canada).[100] It is important to note here that the NAT and afterward known as NATO are not strictly 'European integration' they were explicitly transition with a dominant US presence expressed in military and political structures One immediate consequence, though was a focus on the need to rearm West Germany in order for it to play its past in the defense of the 'western alliance'.[101] This led the French to propose a further step in European integration: the creation of a European Defense Community with a multinational structure and a common military command while it was not sponsor by Americans. This was eventually accepted as a way to create a robust European 'pillar' of the Atlantic alliance.[102] In 1954, it was defeated. Ironically by the French National Assembly, the Americans and the British stepped in to provide an alternative structure through which the West Germans could eventually join NATO and be rearmed as part of the Atlantic alliance.[103]

By mid 1950s, it could be argued that the American had achieved all of their key goals in respect of European integration. They had encouraged European cooperation in key industries, and had managed to get the West Germans integrated into the NATO command and political

---

[99] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid
[102] Ibid
[103] Edward Fursdon, "The European Defence Community: a history". (London: MacMillan, 1980).

structure. The State Department, US foreign policy elites saw European integration as an unquestioned and positive contribution to western security, and also to the development of a liberalized western world economy centred on the Atlantic area.[104] The Eisenhower administration wanted this to go further, through the entry into European institutions of Britain and other key NATO allies. Thus, when the original six member states of the ECSC set out in 1955 to create a European Economic Community (EEC), US policy makers saw this as positive, despite the fears of some that it might constitute a protectionist economic bloc that would damage American agriculture and industrial interests.[105] It is important to note, though that this position was not aligned of some with the immerging realities of life in the "new extort" The British proved strangely reluctant to immerse themselves in what they saw as a second rank organization, partly because of their perceived "special relationship" with the USA itself.[106] At the same time, the French saw the US enthusiasm for British membership as a sign of a malign hegemony, which led them ever more to strongly to emphasize the EEC's role as a point of resistance to US policies. President Charles De Gaulle, who held power in France from 1958 to 1969, was especially sensitive to the American theatre, and made constant effort to turn the West Germans and other from away their Atlantics orientation.[107] As a result, when in 1962 John F-Kennedy made a major speech calling for the development of a true Atlantic partnership was countered by calls from Paris for resistance to US domination and for the use of the EEC as a means of fighting back.[108] This was accompanied by a substantial flow of US foreign detect

---

[104] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

[105] Pascaline Winand, Eisenhower, "Kennedy and the United States of Europe". (New York: St. Martins Press, 1993).

[106] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

[107] Ibid

[108] David P. Calleo, The Atlantic fantasy: the U.S., NATO, and Europe (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970).

investment into the EEC, a factor that was to contribute greatly to integration at the transatlantic Level, and to become a significant influence on US foreign economic policy[109].

In the late 1960, there was some contradictory trends in US policies towards European integration. On the one side, there was the continuing rhetoric of Atlantic partnership as part of the broader Cold War system-a rhetoric which defined the EEC as part of the western system and as the economic equivalent of NATO. This rhetoric was strongly dedicated to the leading role of NATO in western security, and incidentally as a major source of US leverage over the countries of Western Europe.[110] On the other side, there was the rhetoric of adversarial partnership focusing on the challenge passed by the French and on the danger of a developing third way which might turn into a European form of neutralism or non-alignment.[111] This second rhetoric was given added force by the economic turbulence of the late 1960s, by the lass of dynamitic in the US economy. And by the feeling that the Europeans bad profited from US financial and military support without playing their full part in return.[112]

In this context, the Nixon-Kissinger foreign policy conducted between the late 1960s and the mid-1970s played a crucial catalytic role. In economic terms, Nixon and Kissinger subscribed to the USA was an ordinary country which needed to defend its national economic interests and to protect itself against those who took advantage of the liberal international economy.[113] In security terms, the Nixon Doctrine implied that American's allies would have to do far more to protect themselves and pay far more towards the costs of alliance, both in

---

[109] Lawrence B. Krause, "European economic integration and the United States". (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1968).
[110] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
[111] Ibid
[112] Ibid
[113] Richard N. Rosecrance, "America as an ordinary country: U.S. foreign policy and the future". (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976).

European integration. This policy stance held important implications. It meant that they could no longer rely on the USA as a benign hegemonic force in the global economy and that they could no longer count on the unqualified support of the USA for European defiance US policy makers came to see European integration as much more of a problem than a solution; the EEC's development of foreign policy cooperation, with its insistence that the Community was a civilian power implied to US policy makers that the Community was a means of hiding from international obligations and developing a form of the non-alignment that they feared and despised.[114] The Entry of the British into the EEC in 1973 the year of Europe and called for the conclusion of a new Atlantic treaty in line with the administration's idea of the global structure of peace, But this initiative, which had not been discussed with any European governments fell on stony ground in a year when the combination of EEC enlargement, conflict in the Middle East, and an accompanying oil price crisis preoccupied European policy makers, But this initiative, which had not been discussed with any European governments fell on stony ground in a year when the combination of EEC enlargement, conflict in the Middle East, and an accompanying oil price crisis preoccupied European policy makers.[115]

US policies toward European integration during the early 1970s might thus be summarized as a form of wary containment, but this misses the point that the EEC had become a genuine economic rival to the USA in a number of major areas. Although the Community's plans for economic, monetary, and political union by 1980 came to little or nothing, the 1970s as a whole gave evidence of the fact that the Americans needed the community as much as the community needed them. Thus, the process of adjustment in US policy positions and policy rhetoric could be observed, especially during the Carter administration between 1976 and 1980:

---

[114] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).
[115] Ibid

European were seen as partners in independence institution, although this was not without its own difficulties in a period of economic stagnation.[116] European foreign policy cooperation was a source of worry, for example over the Middle East where the community members were much more pro-Palestinian than was Washington, but as it become clear that European declaration would lead to little substantive policy change, this suspicion moderated.[117]

Much of this apparent reconciliation was dissipated by the events of the 'second Cold War' and by the arrival of the Reagan administration in 1980. Reaganism attacked the European on two fronts. First, it politicized and 'domesticized' American foreign economic policies, leading to a concentration on the needs of the US economy but also to a strong emphasis on the sin of 'trading with the enemy', in this case the Soviet bloc in particular. For example, some European, this rhetoric and the subsequent application of 'extra-territorial' measures to restrict trade with Soviet bloc was evident of US unilateralism and a form of imperialism; for other, such as the British, it was defined much more positively as a reassertion of US leadership. That is certainly the way the US administration saw it: the USA was the leader of the free world, and assuming its responsibilities. [118] The second area in which US foreign policy challenged European integration was in the development of the fledgling 'European' foreign and security policies. From here we can see again that the 'Containment' aspect of the US stance in position facing with European integration. US policy makers did not want to the European Community to develop in a way which to gradually destroy NATO or their ability to form a special relationships with individual EEC member states. In respond with this, Washington was prepared to use its connection with the British and others to ensure that any new developments

---

[116] Stanley Hoffmann, "Primacy or world order: American foreign policy since the cold war". (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980).

[117] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

[118] Ibid

in the community were moderated and always made subject to the primary role of NATO in ensuring European security.[119] During the late 1980s when the revival of the Western European Union created a platform for a distinct European defense identity, the White House was quick to emphasize the dire consequences of any attempt to duplicate or undermine NATO.[120]

3.3. Trends and Tensions

The review of US attitude towards European integration up to the end of the 1980s reveal that the relationship as a whole was characterized by a number of overall trends and a number of persistent tensions. For US foreign policy, a key trend was the move from apparently unqualified hegemony to the position where leadership had to be justified and legitimized.

- *Image and reality*: move from US hegemony to questioning of leadership and legitimacy; problem of 'leadership and followership'; 'stickiness' of adjustment of images and expectation in US policy making; influence of fluctuations in US and Soviet relations.

- *Politics, economics, and security*: shifting balance and linkages; intersection of the three areas, and consequent 'politicization' of economic issues especially in the 1970s (Middle East, 'new Cold War'); impact of intensification of European integration in the 1980s.

- *Empire, alliance, and interdependence*: challenge of US assumptions of European dependence, US capacity to 'divide and rule' through 'special relationships', tensions between 'imperial' assumptions, those of 'alliance', and

---

[119] Josef Joffe, "The limited partnership: Europe, the United States, and the burdens of alliance". (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Pub. Co., 1987).

[120] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

those of 'interdependence', affecting policies, institutions, and 'rule of the game'.[121]

Another associated trend was what might be called the problem of leadership and followership: by the end of this period, EC member state has become far less inclined simply to follow where the USA led, but at the same time there were areas where they could not collectively follow.[122] A third trend was in the adaptation of US policy makers' image of the EC: not surprisingly, these image often said more about the needs and priorities of US foreign policy than they did about the evolving realities of the European project, and they were also 'sticky', that is, resistant to change.[123] Finally, US policy makers' approach to European integration was clearly conditioned to significant degrees by events in US- Soviet relations, as Cold War tensions fluctuated and evolved in period of détente or 'new Cold War'. Thus, the European project could be seen as a pillar of the western alliance, as a breeding ground for neutralism or non-alignment, or as a source of often intense economic competition: In reality, of course, it was often all three of these of once, with consequent implications for the bloc and direction of policy.[124]

Alongside these trends and tensions in the images held by US policy makers went another set of significant connections and interactions. From the outside relations between the USA and European integration were an uneasy combination of the political, the economic, and the security related. Between 1950 and 1990, the balance and linkages between these three components of the relationship grew, shifted, and evolved, and this was a key issue for policy

---

[121] Ibid
[122] Ibid
[123] Ibid
[124] Ibid

makers in Washington.[125] Thus, during the 1950s and 1960s, it was tempting to see the integration process of somehow separate from the political and security dimensions of the relationship, and as somehow subordinate to the demands of NATO and of superpower diplomacy. In many ways this was never true, but the 1970s disposed of the myth in no uncertain terms. The politicization of economic issues (especially in the energy crisis), the use of economic sanctions (for example against Iran, or the soviet bloc in the 'new Cold War'), and the increasing attention to issues of high technology as matters of foreign or national security policy, all meant that US views of the 'economic' integration process needed to change.[126] As we mention above, these images were often 'sticky', and American policy makers found it difficult to adjust to the world of economic power, in which the preconditions for what letter came to be termed globalization were being established. By the end of the 1980s, with the initiation of new stages of European integration through the single Market Programmed, and with discussion of economic and monetary union in the EC, the tensions were still observable and if anything more severe than before.[127]

A third set of trends and tensions, strongly related to those described above, was in the stance of US foreign policy overall, as affected by and expressed in their relationship to European integration.[128] It can be argued that three central trends are observable in US policies towards the integration project. The first can be termed 'imperial' the integration project was subsumed willingly or unwillingly within the creation and maintenance of an American empire, in which translation relation were a central component.[129] A subset of this trend is the exercise

---

[125] Ibid

[126] Ibid

[127] Ibid

[128] Ibid

[129] Geir Lundestad, "Empire" by integration: the United States and European integration, 1945-1997". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

of hegemony and thee holding of hegemonic assumptions about the nature of US-EC relations, whether this relate to trade, to monetary relations or to foreign and defense policies.[130] In this trend, US policy makers assumed that the European project was essentially dependent, that they held the power to make the rules within which integration proceeded, and that they could also detach key EC member state when the need for special relationships' overrode the need for a relation with the EC as a whole.[131]

Alongside the 'imperial' component of US policies towards European integration went two other, not always compatible, trends. One was what might be termed 'alliance', according to which the relationship with the EC was a part of the broader Western system and subject to rules and conversation about leadership and followership.[132] As we have seen above, this dimension of US policy was consistent throughout the 1950-90 period, and the Europeans came increasingly to make their collective voice heard within the alliance structure. But this dimension was of course in tension with persistent 'imperial' tendencies, which might admit the needs for alliance but also emphasize. American structural dominance in all of the areas that really mattered. Both 'imperial' and 'alliance' trends were in tension with the third dimension of the relationship: that of 'interdependence'. The growth of transaction, exchange, and institutions in the Atlantic area during the 1950s and 1960s create a dense region of independence, in which the actions (both domestic and external) of each of those involved had implications for all of the others.[133] During the 1970s and 1980s this reality became more apparent, and US policy makers were faced with the need to incorporate interdependence thinking into their approach to European integration. Not only this, but they were compelled to

[130] David P. Calleo, "Beyond American hegemony: the future of the Western Alliance". (New York: Basic Books, 1987).

[131] Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, "US Foreign Policy". (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

[132] Ibid

[133] Ibid

go beyond interdependence into the realm of what some observers called 'interpenetration'-where US and European societies and economies were so closely linked that it was difficult to work out 'who is us' and 'who is them'. Not surprisingly, these views were more strongly rooted in some parts of the US administration than others, and in some administration than others, Thus the Carter administration in the late 1970s played heavily on the interdependence theme, but this was not welcomed by those within the political system and US society more broadly who believed in the restoration of US dominance. Equally, the Reagan administrations of the 1980s emphasized the 'imperial' of hegemonic aspects of the relationship by impact of alliance politic and interdependence.[134]

---

[134] Ibid

CONCLUSION

As the 1990s began, the Cold War was finally ended and the United States is still remaining superpower and we hope for a safer, more peaceful world would be speeded. Back to Cold War, since 1945, Americans were born into a Cold War culture that featured backyard bomb shelters, a space race, a missile crisis, détente, and the Star Wars defense proposal. As we know that the Cold War was a state of geopolitical tension after World War 2 between the Western Bloc (the United States) and the Eastern Bloc (Soviet Union). The Cold War was often the tension of the military between NATO on one side and the Warsaw Pact on the other side. In between 1947, was the year that the Truman Doctrine foreign policy promising to aid the nations that were threatening by the Soviet Union. Truman and the US wanted to stop any further countries falling within Soviet control, and the president's speech promised monetary aid and military advisors to Greece and Turkey to stop them buckling. The period of the Cold War does not fully agree by the historians but the common date of the war was between 1947, the year that the Truman Doctrine was announced until the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991.

The end of the Second World War was the period of uncertainly in US foreign policy, yet the USA has been involved in the Cold War in the relationship with the European integration project. American foreign policy makers have generally agreed on their support for the integration in the region but it has challenged US foreign policy in some important area. The central of this reorientation of US foreign policy was the Marshall Plan also known as the system to support both financial and assistance to recovery and stabilization of the Western European. It was concentrated on the need for immediate economic assistance but also aim to create democratic institute and free markets as well. Between 1947 and 1950, the European Recovery Program (ERP) channeled $19 billion of US aid to those countries. US policy makers had reluctantly come to the conclusion that they needed a long-term commitment to European

security, not just to recover the economic and political and that becomes the beginning of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. By mid-1950s, it could be argued that the United States had achieved all of their key goals in respect of the European integration. They had encouraged European cooperation as well as managed to get the West Germany to join NATO command. US wants to go further through the entry into European institutions of Britain and other key NATO allies. During the early 1970s, US policies toward European integration might be summarized as a form of wary containment, but it misses the point that the EEC had become a genuine economic rival to the USA in a number of major areas. The fact that the United States needed the community as much as the community needed the United States. When Reagan become the president, he attacked the European on two fronts. First of all, it politicized and domesticized American foreign economic policies, leading to a concentration on the needs of the US economy. The second area in which US foreign policy challenged European integration was in the development of the fledgling 'European' foreign and security policies. We can see again that the 'Containment' aspect of the US stance in a position facing with European integration. US policy makers want to develop European, yet they did not want to the European Community to develop in a way which to gradually destroy NATO or their ability to form a special relationship with individual EEC member states.

All in all, this thesis has explored one of the key relationships in which the USA has been involved since the end of the Second World War. The transatlantic relationship with the European integration project. This is not with a single state, but with an institutionalized region. American foreign policy makers have been consistent in their support for the European integration project. It has challenges US policy in a number of important areas. This thesis focus on the ways in which US policy makers have developed the image of the EC, on the challenge

posed by US policy processes for European integration and the use of its own power, in the way which these challenge have been met during the Cold War.

REFERENCES

<u>Books</u>

Archick, Kristin. "the United States and Europe: Possible Options for U.S. Policy" CRS Web: Congressional Research Service. (2005).

Calleo, David P. "The Atlantic fantasy: the U.S., NATO, and Europe". Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1970.

Calleo, David P. Beyond American hegemony: the future of the Western Alliance. New York: Basic Books, 1987.

Cox, Michael and Stokes, Doug. "US Foreign Policy". Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

DePorte, A. W. "Europe between the superpowers: the enduring balance". New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986.

Fursdon, Edward. "The European Defence Community: a history". London: MacMillan, 1980.

Hoffmann, Stanley. "Primacy or world order: American foreign policy since the cold war". New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980.

Joffe, Josef. "The limited partnership: Europe, the United States, and the burdens of alliance" Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Pub. Co., 1987.

Krause, Lawrence B. "European economic integration and the United States". Washington: Brookings Institution, 1968.

Lundestad, Geir. "Empire" by integration: the United States and European integration, 1945-
1997". Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Milward, Alan S. "The reconstruction of Western Europe, 1945-1951". London: University of
California Press, 1984.

Rosecrance, Richard N. "America as an ordinary country: U.S. foreign policy and the future"
Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976.

<u>Websites</u>

BBC, "The Collapse of Communism" 2014. Accessed June 3, 2017. Available at
http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/gcsebitesize/history/mwh/ir2/endofthecoldwarrev1.shtml.

Boundless, "The Cold War and Containment" 2016. Accessed May 19, 2017. Available at
https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-
textbook/foreign-policy-18/the-history-of-american-foreign-policy-110/the-cold-war-
and-containment-586-4260/ .

Encyclopædia Britannica. "Axis Powers". Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at
https://www.britannica.com/topic/Axis-Powers .

Goss, Jennifer L. "What Did the Marshall Plan Actually Do?" ThoughtCo. Accessed June 15,
2017. https://www.thoughtco.com/marshall-plan-economic-aid-1779313.

History, "The Warsaw Pact is formed," 2017. Accessed June 29, 2017. Available at
http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/the-warsaw-pact-is-formed .

History, "Cold War History," 2017. Accessed June 3, 2017. Available at
http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/cold-war-history.

History, "Russian Revolution" 2017. Accessed June 2, 2017. Available at

   http://www.history.com/topics/russian-revolution .

Robert Wilde, "The Cold War in Europe" ThoughtCo, 2016. Accessed May 25, 2017.

   Available at https://www.thoughtco.com/introduction-to-the-cold-war-in-europe-
   1221198

Selfstudyhistory, "Cold War, Emergence of Two Power Block, Factors Leading to the

   Collapse of Soviet Union (1985-1991)" 2015. Accessed June 15, 2017. Available at

   https://selfstudyhistory.com/2015/01/20/world-history-cold-war-and-contemporary-
   world-history/.

Sullivan, Nate. "Two Super Powers: The United States and the Soviet Union." Study.

   Accessed June 2, 2017. http://study.com/academy/lesson/two-super-powers-the-united-
   states-and-the-soviet-union.html.

Talking Points, "U.S. Cold War Forign Policy – Containment" 2013. Accessed May 19, 2017.

   Accessed at https://studyingthehumanities.wordpress.com/2013/07/14/u-s-cold-war-
   foreign-policy-containment/ .

U.S. Department of State, "North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 1949". Accessed

   May 25, 2017. Available at https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nato .

U.S. Department of State, "The World in 1945". Accessed May 25, 2017. Available at

   https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/worldin1945 .

U.S. Department of State. "George Kennan and Containment." Accessed June 9, 2017.

   Available at https://history.state.gov/departmenthistory/short-history/kennan.

U.S. Department of State. "Kennan and Containment, 1947." Accessed June 10, 2017.

Available at https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/kennan.

U.S. Department of State. "The Truman Doctrine, 1947" Accessed June 10, 2017. Available

at https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine .

U.S. History, "The End of the Cold War" 2017. Accessed July 01, 2017. Available at

http://www.ushistory.org/us/59e.asp.

Wilde, Robert. "About the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)." ThoughtCo.

December 16, 2016. Accessed May 25, 2017. https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-nato-1221961.

Wilde, Robert. "Containment: America's Plan to Contain Communism." ThoughtCo.

Accessed June 10, 2017. https://www.thoughtco.com/what-was-containment-1221496.

Wilde, Robert. "The Cold War: the Definitive Struggle between Capitalism and

Communism." ThoughtCo. Accessed May 22, 2017.

https://www.thoughtco.com/introduction-to-the-cold-war-in-europe-1221198.

Wilde, Robert. "The Marshall Plan - Rebuilding Western Europe after WW2." ThoughtCo.

Accessed June 15, 2017. https://www.thoughtco.com/the-marshall-plan-1221199.

Wilde, Robert. "The Truman Doctrine and the Cold War." ThoughtCo. Accessed June 10,

2017. https://www.thoughtco.com/what-was-the-truman-doctrine-1221569.

Wilde, Robert. "The Warsaw Pact: Late twentieth Century Russian Tool." ThoughtCo.

Accessed June 02, 2017. https://www.thoughtco.com/the-warsaw-pact-3878466.

Winand, Pascaline. "Eisenhower, Kennedy and the United States of Europe". New York: St.

Martins Press, 1993.