

'Eisenhower's new look strategy marked a fundamental shift in US cold war policy away from Truman's approach' Assess the validity of this view (25 marks)

Eisenhower (or 'Ike') and Truman were both presidents during a time in the cold war when the policy of containment was a key part in US policy making. Both of ~~their~~ their strategies and policies were similar due to this, therefore this essay will take the stance that the difference between Ike and Truman's approach was not in substance, but rather in tone and delivery.

a very clear and individual judgment

Both presidents took a hardline approach against communism, with both men being very anti-communist. Eisenhower continued Truman's belief in containment throughout his presidency. Both Presidents had the advantage of atomic monopoly and diplomacy, which both men used to their full advantage. They also had a heavy interest in Asia. All good points but I would like to read examples to evidence these points

Ike's new look strategy included the policies of 'Roll back', 'Brinkmanship' and 'massive retaliation', all things that had already been seen during Truman's presidency. Roll back was first seen to emerge in Korea when MacArthur, with Truman's permission, entered this strategy, in which they would try to claim back communist territories rather than just prevent the spread of communism. Brinkmanship and massive retaliation were certainly seen more clearly with Truman than they ever were with Ike. Both of these policies were enacted by Truman when the USA used nuclear bombs against Japan in Nagasaki and Hiroshima in August 1945. Despite Eisenhower's new look strategy, he was keen to avoid any sort of military confrontation, perhaps because any war with the USSR would be mutually assured destruction. It is suggested that most of Ike's talk seemed to be campaign rhetoric, or maybe he just did not have sufficient time to implement his policies properly. *possibly due to his 'get tough' policy* link back to the question

Eisenhower's main instrument of war was certainly nuclear weaponry. During his time in presidency 12% of US GNP was spent on armaments and he operated a policy of 'more bang for your buck' suggesting that an increased

reliance on nuclear weapons, over time, would be more economically viable than a standing army, therefore Ike drove for a smaller army and more efficient weaponry. Further evidence of this can be seen in his rejection of the Soviets 'Rapinski plan' in which conventional forces would be phased out and there would be a nuclear free zone encompassing the whole of Germany, Poland and Czechoslovakia. Truman, however, used the US dollar as his main instrument of war, which was clearly demonstrated through the Marshall plan in which he sent \$13 billion in aid to European countries to rebuild themselves after the war. This is a clear example of both men having the same policies, but using different methods in which to deliver on the policies. Truman used money to contain communism whereas Ike used military threat. Truman also differed from Ike in that he preferred the use of standing armies over nuclear weaponry or weapons of any sort.

What was the similarity between these policies?

link back to the question

Both presidents were focused on containment, but what did differ was where they were most concerned. Although Truman was concerned about Asia, he focused much more on Europe, whereas Ike focused on Asia, perhaps because Europe had been stabilised during Truman's era, or because Asia was a much more volatile arena under Ike, for example there were many skirmishes in the Taiwan Strait for Ike to deal with. The Truman Doctrine and the Eisenhower Doctrine were very similar showing a ^{close} ~~close~~ similarity in approach by the two presidents. The Truman Doctrine of 1947 ~~was established~~ established that the US would send political, military and economic assistance to any democratic nation under threat from authoritarian forces, however in practice it mostly operated in Europe. The Eisenhower Doctrine of 1954 established that Middle Eastern countries could request economic assistance or aid from US military forces if under threat of communism. The two doctrines are basically identical, but aimed at different regions of the world, they also show the difference in the instrument of war used as Eisenhower's is much more militarily orientated than Truman's.

+
excellent context

Ellenhowe's era further differed from the Truman Era in the use of espionage. Ellenhowe regarded covert operations as a routine instrument of foreign policy, this was helped by his close placing of men in power. John Foster Dulles, Ike's Secretary of State, was the brother of Allen Dulles, the director of the CIA at the time, therefore the CIA and government had very close connections. Ike put forward a policy of 'Open Skies' to the Soviets, which, unsurprisingly, was rejected by the USSR as a cover for American espionage. During the Ellenhowe Era U2 spy plane flights operated over Soviet territory, this consistent use of espionage was something that Truman didn't use to the same extent.

To conclude, Truman and Ellenhowe had almost identical ^{Cold War} foreign policies and strategy towards communism, however their approach to deliver these policies did differ in many cases, and they especially differed in tone, with Ike being rather more military minded and Truman more economically minded. Therefore, considering this, Ellenhowe's new Look Strategy did ~~make~~ a shift in approach to Cold War matters, however it did not make a shift, let alone a fundamental shift, in US Cold War policy away from Truman's approach, as Ellenhowe very much followed in Truman's footsteps.

I really like how you've provided a very unique judgment and incorporated contextual details not covered by my lessons.

One area I would like you to improve in is your signposting (linking back to the question) which I feel you could do to clearly evidence your analysis and balance.

21/25