

World War II: The Aftermath

by Tim Bailey

UNIT OVERVIEW

This unit is one of the Gilder Lehrman Institute's Teaching Literacy through History™ resources, designed to align to the Common Core State Standards. These units were developed to enable students to understand, summarize, and evaluate original materials of historical significance. Through a step-by-step process, students will acquire the skills to analyze, assess, and develop knowledgeable and well-reasoned viewpoints on primary sources.

In these lessons students will analyze three different sets of documents related to the end of World War II. The first set of readings deals with the trials of accused war criminals from Germany and Japan. In the second lesson the students will analyze the Truman Doctrine, and in the third lesson the documents center around the Marshall Plan, the US plan for both rebuilding Europe and quelling a rising tide of postwar communism. Students will be asked to compare and contrast American and Soviet views of the Marshall Plan.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to

- Analyze primary source documents using close-reading strategies
- Demonstrate understanding of complex text through critical thinking questions
- Demonstrate understanding of both literal and inferential aspects of text-based evidence
- Write a comparative or argumentative essay using text-based evidence

ESSENTIAL QUESTIONS

Lesson 1: Were accused war criminals in Germany and Japan dealt with in essentially the same manner after World War II?

Lesson 2: Was the Truman Doctrine an appropriate foreign policy or was it inappropriate interference in the affairs of other countries?

Lesson 3: Was the Marshall Plan a purely humanitarian measure on the part of the United States?

NUMBER OF CLASS PERIODS: 3–4

GRADE LEVEL(S): 7–12

COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.8.1: Engage effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on grade 8 topics, texts, and issues, building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.11-12.2: Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary that makes clear the relationships among the key details and ideas.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.SL.9-10.1.C: Propel conversations by posing and responding to questions that relate the current discussion to broader themes or larger ideas; actively incorporate others into the discussion to broader themes or larger ideas; actively incorporate others into the discussion; and clarify, verify, or challenge ideas and conclusions.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.W.9-10.1: Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.

LESSON 1

OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to

- Analyze primary and secondary source documents using close-reading strategies
- Demonstrate understanding of complex text through critical-thinking questions
- Demonstrate understanding of both literal and inferential aspects of text-based evidence
- Write a comparative/argumentative short-answer essay using text-based evidence.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Nuremberg Trial and the Tokyo War Crimes Trials (1945–1948)

Following World War II, the victorious Allied governments established the first international criminal tribunals to prosecute high-level political officials and military authorities for war crimes and other wartime atrocities. The four major Allied powers—France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States—set up the International Military Tribunal (IMT) in Nuremberg, Germany, to prosecute and punish “the major war criminals of the European Axis.” The IMT presided over a combined trial of senior Nazi political and military leaders, as well as several Nazi organizations. The lesser-known International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE) was created in Tokyo, Japan, pursuant to a 1946 proclamation by US Army General Douglas MacArthur, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers in occupied Japan. The IMTFE presided over a series of trials of senior Japanese political and military leaders pursuant to its authority “to try and punish Far Eastern war criminals.”

Source: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nuremberg

MATERIALS

- “The Nuremberg Trial (Excerpts).” Source: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nuremberg
- Charter of the International Military Tribunal (Excerpt). Source: *Trials of War Criminals before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10, Nuernberg, October 1946–April 1949*, Vol. 3 (Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, 1951), xiii–xiv. Available from the Library of Congress at www.loc.gov/rr/frd/Military_Law/pdf/NT_war-criminals_Vol-III.pdf.
- “The Tokyo War Crimes Trials (Excerpts).” Source: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nuremberg
- International Military Tribunal for the Far East Charter (IMTFE Charter) (Excerpt). Source: Treaty Database, Faculty of Law, University of Oslo Library, www.jus.uio.no/english/services/library/treaties/04/4-06/military-tribunal-far-east.xml#treaty-header1-2
- Analyzing the WWII War Crimes Trials: Critical Thinking Questions
- The WWII War Crimes Trials: Compare and Contrast

PROCEDURE

1. Before beginning this lesson, the students need to be familiar with events of World War II in Europe and the Pacific, particularly the Holocaust in Europe and Japanese atrocities such as the Bataan Death March.
2. Divide the class into groups of three to five students. These will be their “critical thinking groups.”
3. Discuss the information in the Historical Background.
4. Pass out the two secondary source texts, “The Nuremburg Trial” and “The Tokyo War Crimes Trials,” and the two primary source excerpts, “Charter of the International Military Tribunal” and the “International Military Tribunal for the Far East Charter (IMTFE Charter).”
5. Depending on the reading level of the students, you can have them read the documents in their groups or you can “share read” the documents with them. This is done by having the students follow along silently while you begin to read aloud, modeling prosody, inflection, and punctuation. Then ask the class to join in with the reading while you continue to read along, still serving as the model for the class. This technique will support struggling readers as well as English language learners (ELL).
6. Pass out “Analyzing the WWII War Crime Trials: Critical Thinking Questions.” Each student should receive a copy.
7. Ask the students the first critical thinking question. Explain that they must back up their answer with evidence taken directly from the texts. The students should discuss the question within their group and agree on an answer to the question. Have students compare answers with other groups. Make sure they are using textual evidence to support their answers.
8. Students will now complete the rest of the questions with their group, continuing to reach their answers through consensus.
9. Pass out “The WWII War Crimes Trials: Compare and Contrast.” The student groups should find similarities and differences in the war crimes trials held in Germany and Japan based on the texts.
10. Students will now write a short-answer essay based on the essential question for this lesson (Were accused war criminals in Germany and Japan dealt with in essentially the same manner after World War II?), written at the bottom of the compare-and-contrast organizer.

LESSON 2

OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to

- Analyze a source document using close-reading strategies
- Demonstrate understanding of both literal and inferential aspects of text-based evidence
- Write a comparative/argumentative essay using text-based evidence

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Truman Doctrine, 1947

The Truman Doctrine arose from a speech delivered by President Truman before a joint session of Congress on March 12, 1947. The immediate cause for the speech was a recent announcement by the British Government that, as of March 31, it would no longer provide military and economic assistance to the Greek Government in its civil war against the Greek Communist Party. 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.

At the time, the U.S. 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. 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. . . .

In light of the deteriorating relationship with the Soviet Union and the appearance of Soviet meddling in Greek and Turkish affairs, the withdrawal of British assistance to Greece provided the necessary catalyst for the Truman Administration to reorient American foreign policy. Accordingly, in his speech, 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.

Truman justified his request on two grounds. He argued that a Communist victory in the Greek Civil War would endanger the political stability of Turkey, which would undermine the political stability of the Middle East. This could not be allowed in light of the region's immense strategic importance to U.S. national security. Truman also argued that the United States was compelled to assist "free peoples" in their struggles against "totalitarian regimes," because the spread of authoritarianism would "undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States." In the words of the Truman Doctrine, it became "the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

Source: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, <http://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine>.

MATERIALS

- Teacher’s Resource: The Truman Doctrine: President Harry S. Truman’s Address before a Joint Session of Congress, March 12, 1947. Source: 100 Milestone Documents, www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=81
- Document Analysis: The Truman Doctrine (Excerpts)

PROCEDURE

You may choose to have the students do the lesson individually, as partners, or in small groups of no more than three or four students.

1. Discuss the information in the Historical Background. However, be careful not to reveal too much since you want the students to get much of this information from their close reading of the document.
2. Hand out the Document Analysis worksheet, which contains excerpts from President Truman’s speech to Congress.
3. Depending on the reading level of the students, you can have them read the document silently to themselves or you can “share read” the document as described in Lesson 1.
4. Students will use the Document Analysis worksheet to help them understand the speech. First, they will select the most important words or phrases in the text and copy those words into the box on the right. Second, they will summarize the text in their own words. Students can brainstorm as partners or in small groups but must complete their own Document Analysis worksheet. Remember to emphasize that they are to first select the author’s own words to determine what is important in the text and then summarize what they understand it to mean.
5. Initiate a class discussion with the question, What is the central argument being made in Truman’s speech? Have groups or individual students share their summaries and compare with other groups’ work.
6. Students will write a short essay that answers the essential question for this lesson: Was the Truman Doctrine an appropriate foreign policy or was it inappropriate interference in the affairs of other countries?

LESSON 3

OBJECTIVES

Students will be able to

- Analyze primary and secondary source documents using close-reading strategies
- Demonstrate understanding of complex text through critical thinking questions
- Demonstrate understanding of both literal and inferential aspects of text-based evidence
- Write a comparative/argumentative essay using text-based evidence

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Marshall Plan, 1948

In the immediate post-World War II period, Europe remained ravaged by war and thus susceptible to exploitation by an internal and external Communist threat. In a June 5, 1947, speech to the graduating class at Harvard University, Secretary of State George C. Marshall issued a call for a comprehensive program to rebuild Europe. Fanned by the fear of Communist expansion and the rapid deterioration of European economies in the winter of 1946–1947, Congress passed the Economic Cooperation Act in March 1948 and approved funding that would eventually rise to over \$12 billion for the rebuilding of Western Europe.

The Marshall Plan generated a resurgence of European industrialization and brought extensive investment into the region. It was also a stimulant to the U.S. economy by establishing markets for American goods. Although the participation of the Soviet Union and East European nations was an initial possibility, Soviet concern over potential U.S. economic domination of its Eastern European satellites and Stalin's unwillingness to open up his secret society to westerners doomed the idea. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the U.S. Congress would have been willing to fund the plan as generously as it did if aid also went to Soviet Bloc Communist nations.

Thus the Marshall Plan was applied solely to Western Europe, precluding any measure of Soviet Bloc cooperation. Increasingly, the economic revival of Western Europe, especially West Germany, was viewed suspiciously in Moscow. Economic historians have debated the precise impact of the Marshall Plan on Western Europe, but these differing opinions do not detract from the fact that the Marshall Plan has been recognized as a great humanitarian effort. Secretary of State Marshall became the only general ever to receive a Nobel Prize for peace. The Marshall Plan also institutionalized and legitimized the concept of U.S. foreign aid programs, which have become an integral part of U.S. foreign policy.

Source: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/marshall-plan

MATERIALS

- George C. Marshall (US Secretary of State), "Marshall Plan" Speech, Harvard University, June 5, 1947. Source: Speech by George C. Marshall, "European Initiative Essential to Economic Recover," June 5, 1947 (Excerpt), *Department of State Bulletin* 16 (415): 1159–1160. Available online from the

Harry S. Truman Library & Museum, www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/index.php.

- Andrei Vyshinsky (Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister), Speech at the United Nations, September 18, 1947 (Excerpts). Source: United Nations, General Assembly, Official Records, Plenary Meetings, 18 September 1947, 86–88. Available online at the Hathi Trust Digital Library, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/009263674>
- Analyzing a Speech
- The Debate Organizer

PROCEDURE

1. For this lesson students should be in groups of three to five students.
2. Discuss the information in the Historical Background. However, be careful not to reveal too much since you want the students to get much of this information from their close reading of the documents.
3. Pass out “‘Marshall Plan’ Speech.”
4. Depending on the reading level of the students, you can have them read the document silently to themselves or you can “share read” it as described in Lesson 1.
5. Pass out “Analyzing a Speech.” Answer Critical Thinking Question #1 as a whole-group activity. Make sure that the students use and cite evidence from the text to answer the question.
6. Students will now answer the rest of the questions with their group.
7. Discuss different interpretations developed by the students or student groups.
8. Repeat the process with Andrei Vyshinsky’s speech at the United Nations, passing out the text of the speech and “Analyzing a Speech” worksheets. If the students are confident with the process, you do not have to have the class answer Critical Thinking Question #1 as a whole-group activity.
9. Discuss different interpretations developed by the student groups.
10. The students will now create a “mock debate” to both reinforce their understanding of the issues over the Marshall Plan and evaluate their understanding through an oral presentation. The students will write the script for a hypothetical debate based on the issues raised in the primary sources they have been studying. Within each group, the students will choose one person to be a debate moderator. The rest of the group is split between American and Soviet representatives. The students will write the script as a team effort and everyone in the group will have a copy of the final script. It is important that all the students work on their own questions and answers and their counterparts’ questions and answers.
11. Hand out The Debate organizer. Each student will need four copies of the worksheet.
12. You will provide three questions that all members (American and Soviet representatives) of all groups must address during their debate:
 - a) What is the best way to rebuild the European economy?
 - b) Was the Marshall Plan a purely humanitarian measure on the part of the United States? (This is the essential question for Lesson 3.)
 - c) What will be the eventual outcome of the Marshall Plan?

13. The students should add another one or two questions as long as the answers can be taken directly from the primary source materials. Students can also construct responses that are in the form of a rebuttal. It is important that all arguments are based on the actual text from the documents.
14. Have students rehearse their debate.
15. Depending on the time available and the number of groups presenting, you can hold the debate during this lesson or the following day.
16. Wrap up: Have students discuss the questions and answers posed by other groups.

The Nuremberg Trial (Excerpts)

In August 1945, the four major Allied powers signed the 1945 London Agreement, which established the International Military Tribunal or IMT. The following additional countries subsequently “adhered” to the agreement to show their support: Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ethiopia, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Uruguay, and Yugoslavia.

. . . The Nuremberg tribunal consisted of one judge from each of the Allied powers, which each also supplied a prosecution team. The Nuremberg Charter also provided that the IMT had the authority to try and punish persons who “committed any of the following crimes”:

- (a) Crimes Against Peace . . .
- (b) War Crimes . . .
- (c) Crimes Against Humanity . . .

The IMT prosecutors indicted twenty-two senior German political and military leaders, including Hermann Goering, Rudolph Hess, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Alfred Rosenberg, and Albert Speer. Nazi leader Adolf Hitler was not indicted because he had committed suicide in April 1945, in the final days before Germany’s surrender. Seven Nazi organizations also were indicted. The prosecutors sought to have the tribunal declare that these organizations were “criminal organizations” in order to facilitate the later prosecution of their members by other tribunals or courts.

The Nuremberg Trial lasted from November 1945 to October 1946. The tribunal found nineteen individual defendants guilty and sentenced them to punishments that ranged from death by hanging to fifteen years’ imprisonment. Three defendants were found not guilty, one committed suicide prior to trial, and one did not stand trial due to physical or mental illness. The Nuremberg Tribunal also concluded that three of the seven indicted Nazi organizations were “criminal organizations” under the terms of the Charter: the Leadership Corps of the Nazi party; the elite “SS” unit, which carried out the forced transfer, enslavement, and extermination of millions of persons in concentration camps; and the Nazi security police and the Nazi secret police, commonly known as the “SD” and “Gestapo,” respectively, which had instituted slave labor programs and deported Jews, political opponents, and other civilians to concentration camps.

Source: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nuremberg

Charter of the International Military Tribunal (Excerpt)

II. JURISDICTION AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Article 6. The Tribunal established by the Agreement referred to in Article 1 hereof for the trial and punishment of the major war criminals of the European Axis countries shall have the power to try and punish persons who, acting in the interests of the European Axis countries, whether as individuals or as members of organizations, committed any of the following crimes.

The following acts, or any of them, are crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for which there shall be individual responsibility:

- (a) **CRIMES AGAINST PEACE:** namely, planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a war of aggression, or a war in violation of international treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing;
- (b) **WAR CRIMES:** namely, violations of the laws or customs of war. Such violations shall include, but not be limited to, murder, ill-treatment or deportation to slave labor or for any other purpose of civilian population of or in occupied territory, murder or ill-treatment of prisoners of war or persons on the seas, killing of hostages, plunder of public or private property, wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity;
- (c) **CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY:** namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war; or persecutions on political, racial or religious grounds in execution of or in connection with any crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated.

Leaders, organizers, instigators and accomplices participating in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing crimes are responsible for all acts performed by any persons in execution of such plan.

Source: *Trials of War Criminals before the Nuernberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10, Nuernberg, October 1946–April 1949*, Vol. 3 (Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, 1951), xiii–xiv.

The Tokyo War Crimes Trials (Excerpts)

In January 1946, . . . General MacArthur issued a special proclamation that established the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (IMTFE). . . . It laid out the composition, jurisdiction, and functions of the tribunal.

The Charter provided for MacArthur to appoint judges to the IMTFE from the countries that had signed Japan's instrument of surrender: Australia, Canada, China, France, India, the Netherlands, Philippines, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Each of these countries also had a prosecution team.

As with the IMT, the IMTFE had jurisdiction to try individuals for Crimes Against Peace, War Crimes, and Crimes Against Humanity, and the definitions were nearly verbatim to those contained in the Nuremberg Charter. The IMTFE nonetheless had jurisdiction over crimes that occurred over a greater period of time, from the 1931 Japanese invasion of Manchuria to Japan's 1945 surrender.

The IMTFE presided over the prosecution of nine senior Japanese political leaders and eighteen military leaders. A Japanese scholar also was indicted, but charges against him were dropped during the trial because he was declared unfit due to mental illness. Japanese Emperor Hirohito and other members of the imperial family were not indicted. In fact, the Allied powers permitted Hirohito to retain his position on the throne, albeit with diminished status.

The Tokyo War Crimes Trials took place from May 1946 to November 1948. The IMTFE found all remaining defendants guilty and sentenced them to punishments ranging from death to seven years' imprisonment; two defendants died during the trial.

Source: Office of the Historian, Bureau of Public Affairs, United States Department of State, history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/nuremberg

International Military Tribunal for the Far East Charter (IMTFE Charter) (Excerpt)

II - Jurisdiction and general provisions

Article 5

Jurisdiction over persons and offences

The Tribunal shall have the power to try and punish Far Eastern war criminals who as individuals or as members of organizations are charged with offences which include Crimes against Peace.

The following acts, or any of them, are crimes coming within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal for which there shall be individual responsibility:

- a. *Crimes against Peace*: Namely, the planning, preparation, initiation or waging of a declared or undeclared war of aggression, or a war in violation of international law, treaties, agreements or assurances, or participation in a common plan or conspiracy for the accomplishment of any of the foregoing;
- b. *Conventional War Crimes*: Namely, violations of the laws or customs of war;
- c. *Crimes against Humanity*: Namely, murder, extermination, enslavement, deportation, and other inhumane acts committed against any civilian population, before or during the war, or persecutions on political or racial grounds in execution of or in connection with any crime within the jurisdiction of the Tribunal, whether or not in violation of the domestic law of the country where perpetrated. Leaders, organizers, instigators and accomplices participating in the formulation or execution of a common plan or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing crimes are responsible for all acts performed by any person in execution of such plan.

Source: Treaty Database, Faculty of Law, University of Oslo Library, www.jus.uio.no/english/services/library/treaties/04/4-06/military-tribunal-far-east.xml#treaty-header1-2.

Name- _____ Period- _____ Date- _____

Analyzing the WWII War Crimes Trials: Critical Thinking Questions

Answer the following questions in complete sentences using evidence from both the primary and secondary source documents. Cite and incorporate that evidence in your answer.

Question #1- How were judges chosen for the Nuremberg trials?

Question #2- How were judges chosen for the Tokyo War Crimes trials?

Question #3- What was the range of punishments given at the trials?

Question #4- Are there any major differences between the crimes as defined by either the Constitution of the International Military Tribunal or the International Military Tribunal for the Far East Charter?

Question #5- Both trials found individuals guilty but only one indicted groups. Which groups were indicted and why those groups?

Question #6- Emperor Hirohito of Japan was not indicted for war crimes. If Adolf Hitler had survived the end of the war would he have been indicted? Use the text from these documents to provide evidence for your answer.

Name- _____ Period- _____ Date- _____

The WWII War Crimes Trials: Compare and Contrast

Use the chart below to analyze the Nuremberg Trial and the Tokyo War Crimes Trials.

Similarities	Differences

Using this information, write a short essay that answers the following question: Were accused war criminals in Germany and Japan dealt with in essentially the same manner after World War II?

Use evidence from both texts to make your arguments.

Teacher's Resource: The Truman Doctrine

PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN'S ADDRESS BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS,
MARCH 12, 1947

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress of the United States:

The gravity of the situation which confronts the world today necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress. The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved.

One aspect of the present situation, which I wish to present to you at this time for your consideration and decision, concerns Greece and Turkey.

The United States has received from the Greek Government an urgent appeal for financial and economic assistance. Preliminary reports from the American Economic Mission now in Greece and reports from the American Ambassador in Greece corroborate the statement of the Greek Government that assistance is imperative if Greece is to survive as a free nation.

I do not believe that the American people and the Congress wish to turn a deaf ear to the appeal of the Greek Government.

Greece is not a rich country. Lack of sufficient natural resources has always forced the Greek people to work hard to make both ends meet. Since 1940, this industrious and peace loving country has suffered invasion, four years of cruel enemy occupation, and bitter internal strife.

When forces of liberation entered Greece they found that the retreating Germans had destroyed virtually all the railways, roads, port facilities, communications, and merchant marine. More than a thousand villages had been burned. Eighty-five per cent of the children were tubercular. Livestock, poultry, and draft animals had almost disappeared. Inflation had wiped out practically all savings.

As a result of these tragic conditions, a militant minority, exploiting human want and misery, was able to create political chaos which, until now, has made economic recovery impossible.

Greece is today without funds to finance the importation of those goods which are essential to bare subsistence. Under these circumstances the people of Greece cannot make progress in solving their problems of reconstruction. Greece is in desperate need of financial and economic assistance to enable it to resume purchases of food, clothing, fuel and seeds. These are indispensable for the subsistence of its people and are obtainable only from abroad. Greece must have help to import the goods necessary to restore internal order and security, so essential for economic and political recovery.

The Greek Government has also asked for the assistance of experienced American administrators, economists and technicians to insure that the financial and other aid given to Greece shall be used effectively in creating a stable and self-sustaining economy and in improving its public administration.

The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists, who defy the government's authority at a number of points, particularly along the northern boundaries. A Commission appointed by the United Nations security

Council is at present investigating disturbed conditions in northern Greece and alleged border violations along the frontier between Greece on the one hand and Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia on the other.

Meanwhile, the Greek Government is unable to cope with the situation. The Greek army is small and poorly equipped. It needs supplies and equipment if it is to restore the authority of the government throughout Greek territory. Greece must have assistance if it is to become a self-supporting and self-respecting democracy.

The United States must supply that assistance. We have already extended to Greece certain types of relief and economic aid but these are inadequate.

There is no other country to which democratic Greece can turn.

No other nation is willing and able to provide the necessary support for a democratic Greek government.

The British Government, which has been helping Greece, can give no further financial or economic aid after March 31. Great Britain finds itself under the necessity of reducing or liquidating its commitments in several parts of the world, including Greece.

We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action and the United Nations and its related organizations are not in a position to extend help of the kind that is required.

It is important to note that the Greek Government has asked for our aid in utilizing effectively the financial and other assistance we may give to Greece, and in improving its public administration. It is of the utmost importance that we supervise the use of any funds made available to Greece; in such a manner that each dollar spent will count toward making Greece self-supporting, and will help to build an economy in which a healthy democracy can flourish.

No government is perfect. One of the chief virtues of a democracy, however, is that its defects are always visible and under democratic processes can be pointed out and corrected. The Government of Greece is not perfect. Nevertheless it represents eighty-five per cent of the members of the Greek Parliament who were chosen in an election last year. Foreign observers, including 692 Americans, considered this election to be a fair expression of the views of the Greek people.

The Greek Government has been operating in an atmosphere of chaos and extremism. It has made mistakes. The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done or will do. We have condemned in the past, and we condemn now, extremist measures of the right or the left. We have in the past advised tolerance, and we advise tolerance now.

Greece's neighbor, Turkey, also deserves our attention.

The future of Turkey as an independent and economically sound state is clearly no less important to the freedom-loving peoples of the world than the future of Greece. The circumstances in which Turkey finds itself today are considerably different from those of Greece. Turkey has been spared the disasters that

have beset Greece. And during the war, the United States and Great Britain furnished Turkey with material aid.

Nevertheless, Turkey now needs our support.

Since the war Turkey has sought financial assistance from Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of effecting that modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity.

That integrity is essential to the preservation of order in the Middle East.

The British government has informed us that, owing to its own difficulties can no longer extend financial or economic aid to Turkey.

As in the case of Greece, if Turkey is to have the assistance it needs, the United States must supply it. We are the only country able to provide that help.

I am fully aware of the broad implications involved if the United States extends assistance to Greece and Turkey, and I shall discuss these implications with you at this time.

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. This was a fundamental issue in the war with Germany and Japan. Our victory was won over countries which sought to impose their will, and their way of life, upon other nations.

To ensure the peaceful development of nations, free from coercion, the United States has taken a leading part in establishing the United Nations, The United Nations is designed to make possible lasting freedom and independence for all its members. We shall not realize our objectives, however, unless we are willing to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes. This is no more than a frank recognition that totalitarian regimes imposed on free peoples, by direct or indirect aggression, undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

The peoples of a number of countries of the world have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will. The Government of the United States has made frequent protests against coercion and intimidation, in violation of the Yalta agreement, in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. I must also state that in a number of other countries there have been similar developments.

At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one.

One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression.

The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio; fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way.

I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes.

The world is not static, and the status quo is not sacred. But we cannot allow changes in the status quo in violation of the Charter of the United Nations by such methods as coercion, or by such subterfuges as political infiltration. In helping free and independent nations to maintain their freedom, the United States will be giving effect to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

It is necessary only to glance at a map to realize that the survival and integrity of the Greek nation are of grave importance in a much wider situation. If Greece should fall under the control of an armed minority, the effect upon its neighbor, Turkey, would be immediate and serious. Confusion and disorder might well spread throughout the entire Middle East.

Moreover, the disappearance of Greece as an independent state would have a profound effect upon those countries in Europe whose peoples are struggling against great difficulties to maintain their freedoms and their independence while they repair the damages of war.

It would be an unspeakable tragedy if these countries, which have struggled so long against overwhelming odds, should lose that victory for which they sacrificed so much. Collapse of free institutions and loss of independence would be disastrous not only for them but for the world. Discouragement and possibly failure would quickly be the lot of neighboring peoples striving to maintain their freedom and independence.

Should we fail to aid Greece and Turkey in this fateful hour, the effect will be far reaching to the West as well as to the East.

We must take immediate and resolute action.

I therefore ask the Congress to provide authority for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of \$400,000,000 for the period ending June 30, 1948. In requesting these funds, I have taken into consideration the maximum amount of relief assistance which would be furnished to Greece out of the \$350,000,000 which I recently requested that the Congress authorize for the prevention of starvation and suffering in countries devastated by the war.

In addition to funds, I ask the Congress to authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of those countries, to assist in the tasks of reconstruction, and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished. I recommend that authority also be provided for the instruction and training of selected Greek and Turkish personnel.

Finally, I ask that the Congress provide authority which will permit the speediest and most effective use, in terms of needed commodities, supplies, and equipment, of such funds as may be authorized.

If further funds, or further authority, should be needed for purposes indicated in this message, I shall not hesitate to bring the situation before the Congress. On this subject the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government must work together.

This is a serious course upon which we embark.

I would not recommend it except that the alternative is much more serious. The United States contributed \$341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II. This is an investment in world freedom and world peace.

The assistance that I am recommending for Greece and Turkey amounts to little more than 1 tenth of 1 per cent of this investment. It is only common sense that we should safeguard this investment and make sure that it was not in vain.

The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died. We must keep that hope alive.

The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms.

If we falter in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world -- and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own nation.

Great responsibilities have been placed upon us by the swift movement of events.

I am confident that the Congress will face these responsibilities squarely.

Source: 100 Milestone Documents, www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?doc=81

... It is of the utmost importance that we supervise the use of any funds made available to Greece; in such a manner that each dollar spent will count toward making Greece self-supporting, and will help to build an economy in which a healthy democracy can flourish. . . .

The Greek Government has been operating in an atmosphere of chaos and extremism. It has made mistakes. The extension of aid by this country does not mean that the United States condones everything that the Greek Government has done or will do. We have condemned in the past, and we condemn now, extremist measures of the right or the left. We have in the past advised tolerance, and we advise tolerance now.

Greece’s neighbor, Turkey, also deserves our attention.

The future of Turkey as an independent and economically sound state is clearly no less important to the freedom-loving peoples of the world than the future of Greece. The circumstances in which Turkey finds itself today are considerably different from those of Greece. Turkey has been spared the disasters that have beset Greece. And during the war, the United States and Great Britain furnished Turkey with material aid.

Nevertheless, Turkey now needs our support.

Since the war Turkey has sought financial assistance from Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of effecting that modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity.

That integrity is essential to the preservation of order in the Middle East. . . .

Key Words or Phrases

In Your Own Words

George C. Marshall, “Marshall Plan” Speech, Harvard University, June 5, 1947

I need not tell you gentlemen that the world situation is very serious. That must be apparent to all intelligent people. I think one difficulty is that the problem is one of such enormous complexity that the very mass of facts presented to the public by press and radio make it exceedingly difficult for the man in the street to reach a clear appraisal of the situation. Furthermore, the people of this country are distant from the troubled areas of the earth and it is hard for them to comprehend the plight and consequent reactions of the long-suffering peoples, and the effect of those reactions on their governments in connection with our efforts to promote peace in the world.

In considering the requirements for the rehabilitation of Europe, the physical loss of life, the visible destruction of cities, factories, mines, and railroads was correctly estimated, but it has become obvious during recent months that this visible destruction was probably less serious than the dislocation of the entire fabric of European economy. For the past 10 years conditions have been highly abnormal. The feverish preparation for war and the more feverish maintenance of the war effort engulfed all aspects of national economies. Machinery has fallen into disrepair or is entirely obsolete. Under the arbitrary and destructive Nazi rule, virtually every possible enterprise was geared into the German war machine. Long-standing commercial ties, private institutions, banks, insurance companies and shipping companies disappeared, through loss of capital, absorption through nationalization, or by simple destruction. In many countries, confidence in the local currency has been severely shaken. The breakdown of the business structure of Europe during the war was complete. Recovery has been seriously retarded by the fact that two years after the close of hostilities a peace settlement with Germany and Austria has not been agreed upon. But even given a more prompt solution of these difficult problems, the rehabilitation of the economic structure of Europe quite evidently will require a much longer time and greater effort than had been foreseen.

There is a phase of this matter which is both interesting and serious. The farmer has always produced the foodstuffs to exchange with the city dweller for the other necessities of life. This division of labor is the basis of modern civilization. At the present time it is threatened with breakdown. The town and city industries are not producing adequate goods to exchange with the food-producing farmer. Raw materials and fuel are in short supply. Machinery is lacking or worn out. The farmer or the peasant cannot find the goods for sale which he desires to purchase. So the sale of his farm produce for money which he cannot use seems to him an unprofitable transaction. He, therefore, has withdrawn many fields from crop cultivation and is using them for grazing. He feeds more grain to stock and finds for himself and his family an ample supply of food, however short he may be on clothing and the other ordinary gadgets of civilization. Meanwhile people in the cities are short of food and fuel. So the governments are forced to use their foreign money and credits to procure these necessities abroad. This process exhausts funds which are urgently needed for reconstruction. Thus a very serious situation is rapidly developing which bodes no good for the world. The modern system of the division of labor upon which the exchange of products is based is in danger of breaking down.

The truth of the matter is that Europe’s requirements for the next three or four years of foreign food and other essential products—principally from America—are so much greater than her present ability to

pay that she must have substantial additional help or face economic, social, and political deterioration of a very grave character.

The remedy lies in breaking the vicious circle and restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole. The manufacturer and the farmer throughout wide areas must be able and willing to exchange their products for currencies the continuing value of which is not open to question.

Aside from the demoralizing effect on the world at large and the possibilities of disturbances arising as a result of the desperation of the people concerned, the consequences to the economy of the United States should be apparent to all. 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. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist. Such assistance, I am convinced, must not be on a piecemeal basis as various crises develop. Any assistance that this Government may render in the future should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative. Any government that is willing to assist in the task of recovery will find full cooperation, I am sure, on the part of the United States Government. Any government which maneuvers to block the recovery of other countries cannot expect help from us. Furthermore, governments, political parties, or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States.

It is already evident that, before the United States Government can proceed much further in its efforts to alleviate the situation and help start the European world on its way to recovery, there must be some agreement among the countries of Europe as to the requirements of the situation and the part those countries themselves will take in order to give proper effect to whatever action might be undertaken by this Government. It would be neither fitting nor efficacious for this Government to undertake to draw up unilaterally a program designed to place Europe on its feet economically. This is the business of the Europeans. The initiative, I think, must come from Europe. The role of this country should consist of friendly aid in the drafting of a European program and of later support of such a program so far as it may be practical for us to do so. The program should be a joint one, agreed to by a number, if not all, European nations.

An essential part of any successful action on the part of the United States is an understanding on the part of the people of America of the character of the problem and the remedies to be applied. Political passion and prejudice should have no part. With foresight, and a willingness on the part of our people to face up to the vast responsibility which history has clearly placed upon our country, the difficulties I have outlined can and will be overcome.

Source: Speech by George C. Marshall, "European Initiative Essential to Economic Recovery," June 5, 1947, *Department of State Bulletin* 16 (415): 1159–1160.

Andrei Vyshinsky, Speech at the United Nations, September 18, 1947 (Excerpts)

The so-called Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan are particularly glaring examples of the manner in which the principles of the United Nations are violated, of the way in which the Organization is ignored.

. . . This is clearly proved by the measures taken by the United States Government with regard to Greece and Turkey which ignore and by-pass the United Nations as well as by the measures proposed under the so-called Marshall Plan in Europe. This policy conflicts sharply with the principle expressed by the General Assembly in its resolution of 11 December 1946, which declares that relief supplies to other countries “should . . . at no time be used as a political weapon.”

As is now clear, the Marshall Plan constitutes in essence merely a variant of the Truman Doctrine adapted to the conditions of post-war Europe. In bringing forward this plan, the United States Government apparently counted on the cooperation of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France to confront the European countries in need of relief with the necessity of renouncing their inalienable right to dispose of their economic resources and to plan their national economy in their own way. The United States also counted on making all these countries directly dependent on the interests of American monopolies, which are striving to avert the approaching depression by an accelerated export of commodities and capital to Europe.

. . . It is becoming more and more evident to everyone that the implementation of the Marshall Plan will mean placing European countries under the economic and political control of the United States and direct interference by the latter in the internal affairs of those countries.

Moreover, this Plan is an attempt to split Europe into two camps and, with the help of the United Kingdom and France, to complete the formation of a *bloc* of several European countries hostile to the interests of the democratic countries of Eastern Europe, and most particularly to the interests of the Soviet Union.

An important feature of this Plan is the attempt to confront the countries of Eastern Europe with a *bloc* of Western European States including Western Germany. The intention is to make use of Western Germany and German heavy industry (the Ruhr) as one of the most important economic bases for American expansion in Europe, in disregard of the national interests of the countries which suffered from German aggression.

Source: United Nations, General Assembly, Official Records, Plenary Meetings, 18 September 1947, 86–88. Available online at the Hathi Trust Digital Library, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/009263674>

Name: _____ Period: _____ Date: _____

Analyzing a Speech

<p>Critical Thinking Question #1:</p> <p>What is the major claim being made by the author of this speech?</p>	<p>What textual evidence supports the author's claim?</p> <p>Does the claim that is being presented appear to be fact based or opinion based?</p>
<p>Critical Thinking Question #2:</p> <p>What is the "feel" or attitude of the speech?</p>	<p>Give evidence of the "feel" or attitude taken from this speech:</p> <p>How does this affect the speech's effectiveness?</p>

<p>Critical Thinking Question #3:</p> <p>What are the best (most convincing or most thought-provoking) parts of the speech?</p>	<p>Cite textual evidence to support your opinion.</p>
<p>Critical Thinking Question #4:</p> <p>Summarize, in your own words, the overall message of this speech:</p>	<p>What evidence in the text supports your summary?</p>

Name- _____ Period- _____ Date- _____

The Debate

Write moderator's question here:	Answer: Evidence from Text:
Write moderator's question here:	Answer: Evidence from Text:
Write moderator's question here:	Answer: Evidence from Text: