Marquette University
e-Publications@Marquette

Master's Theses (2009 -) | Dissertations, Theses, and Professional Projects

Evolution of a President: John F. Kennedy and Berlin

Nicholas Labinski
Marquette University

Recommended Citation
Labinski, Nicholas, "Evolution of a President: John F. Kennedy and Berlin" (2011). *Master's Theses (2009 -)*. Paper 104.
http://epublications.marquette.edu/theses_open/104

EVOLUTION OF A PRESIDENT:
JOHN F. KENNEDYAND
BERLIN

by

Nicholas Labinski

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School,
Marquette University,
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts

Milwaukee, Wisconsin

August 2011

ABSTRACT
EVOLUTION OF A PRESIDENT:
JOHN F. KENNEDYAND
BERLIN

Nicholas Labinski

Marquette University, 2011

This paper examines John F. Kennedy's rhetoric concerning the Berlin Crisis (1961-1963). Three major speeches are analyzed: Kennedy's *Radio and Television Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis*, the Address at Rudolph Wilde Platz and the Address at the Free University. The study interrogates the rhetorical strategies implemented by Kennedy in confronting Khrushchev over the explosive situation in Berlin. The paper attempts to answer the following research questions: What is the historical context that helped frame the rhetorical situation Kennedy faced? What rhetorical strategies and tactics did Kennedy employ in these speeches? How might Kennedy's speeches extend our understanding of presidential public address? What is the impact of Kennedy's speeches on U.S. German relations and the development of U.S. and German Policy? What implications might these speeches have for the study and execution of presidential power and international diplomacy?

Using a historical-rhetorical methodology that incorporates the historical circumstances surrounding the crisis into the analysis, this examination of Kennedy's rhetoric reveals his evolution concerning Berlin and his Cold War strategy. It is argued that Kennedy began with a military strategy, flexible response, which was established in his Radio and Television Report in July 1961 and over the next two years this strategy evolved into a strategy of peace embodied in a policy of détente. Kennedy moved away from Eisenhower's Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD) strategy and the implied either-or choice of holocaust or humiliation toward a more flexible policy that gave the president many more options. By including a historical account of U.S.-German relations from World War II to Kennedy's ascension in 1961 to his untimely death in 1963, this study also connects Kennedy's rhetoric to important developments in U.S.-German relations and highlight's the president's crucial role in shaping this process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Nicholas Labinski

In no particular order, I would like to thank my mother, my father and my sister. I would like to Dr. Goldzwig, Dr. Ugland and Dr. Feldner for their support and guidance. I would like to thank God for providing me with the strength, wisdom and guidance on this project. And, a special thanks to Marquette University and the seven wonderful years of being a student and educator here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS……...……...i

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION

Background and Previous Studies….…….…..1

Rationale and Purpose……...6

Rhetorical Theory……..8

Rhetorical Criticism……...9

Rhetoric & History……..11

Rhetorical History……12

II. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1945-50: Postwar Settlement: A Cold Peace?..…….....15

1951-58: Western Growth, Eastern Unrest…….....55

1958-61: Rising Tensions: An Ultimatum at the Heart of Europe.....64

John F. Kennedy: A Presidential Worldview ...……...…….....66

The Berlin Issue…….....72

The Vienna Conference, 1961 …….....81

Lead Up to the July 25, 1961 Address..……..…….....91

III. RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

Kennedy's Radio and TV Address to the American People…..……..98

Historical Constraints: Potsdam, Yalta and Basis for Western Presence in Berlin…….....…….99

The Middle Ground: Flexible Response……..104

Personal Influences……...….109

Reaction: Words and the Berlin Wall…….....117

Why July 25, 1961 Matters……...128

The Fallout: The Berlin Wall …….....128

September 1961-October 1962: 'We Did Not Send Him to See the Opera in East Berlin'...…….....139

Cuban Missile Crisis: 'I Think the Other Guy Blinked' ……...148

European Split: Gaullists vs. Atlanticists …….…….....159

Kennedy's European Trip …….…….....162

Kennedy in Germany …….…….....165

Analysis of Kennedy's Remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz, Berlin The Berlin Effect: A City Embraces a President …….....171

Kennedy on the Attack: Accusations of Failure …….……178

Reunification: The Many Sides of Kennedy….....181

Kennedy Goes Roman: Civis Romanus Sum.…….……184

Identificational Appeals: Rudolph Wilde Platz …….……186

Why Rudolph Wilde Platz Matters……..191

Free University: Rudolph Wilde Platz's Counterbalance ……193

The Challenge Extended: Truth, Justice and Liberty….....194

Accusations and History: Kennedy's Other Strategy…….199

Détente: The Path Forward …….…….....204

Community Building: A Dual Audience……...……...205

The Rise of Brandt and the Dawn of Ostpolitik…….....210

Why Free University Matters……...214

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Epilogue: Kennedy's Legacy in Germany to Ostpolitik in the 1970s……216

Implications and Conclusions…….....228

Bibliography …….…….....238

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The idea of presidential rhetoric as a scholarly pursuit has evolved over the years, and is now seen as an interdisciplinary field with many different contributors and as a force in the academic world (Medhurst, 2008). Presidential rhetorical articles have increased in two key journals, *Presidential Studies Quarterly* and *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*. Since 2005, *Presidential Studies Quarterly* has published 19 articles or reviews of books on presidential rhetoric. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* has published approximately 40 articles concerning presidential rhetoric. The variety of articles being published in both journals demonstrates an increasing interest among scholars in presidential rhetoric. While these studies are filling in the scholarly knowledge Windt (1986) recognized there are still many topics and presidents that have not been examined by rhetorical scholars.

Background and Previous Studies

Existing scholarship on Kennedy addresses various aspects of his foreign policy addresses, but no existing rhetorical scholarship has focused on his three major speeches on U.S.-German relations and their role in U.S. policy toward Germany. Berlin was central to Kennedy's foreign policy, and while scholars have focused on either his *Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis* or his address at Rudolph Wilde Platz, no rhetorical scholar has analyzed both speeches together. In addition, there has been no scholarly rhetorical study of Kennedy's address at the Free University of Berlin, which provided Willy Brandt with the impetus to implement his Ostpolitik policy with East Berlin. The lion's share of literature on Kennedy and the Berlin Crisis comes in the form of historical research. Although much of this research is richly detailed and provides the context for the Berlin Crisis, it does not apply the techniques of rhetorical analysis.

Further, historians most often refer to the important lines and phrases from Kennedy's speeches and note the historical consequences of Kennedy's actions on the Cold War landscape.

Even Kennedy's speech writer, Theodore Sorensen (1965), provides an exclusive look inside the Kennedy administration, but his analysis of Kennedy is more historical than rhetorical. Theodore Windt Jr.'s (2003) study on Kennedy's speech writing process used all three German speeches as examples of the multifaceted atmosphere in which Kennedy's speeches were drafted, but Windt fails to critique any German address in depth. Rather, Windt examines the collaboration between Sorensen and Kennedy, and the evolution of Kennedy's rhetorical style over his political career. Other rhetorical studies include Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos (1995b), Goldzwig and Bostdorff (1994), and Meagher (1997) focus on Kennedy's personal characteristics or the pragmatic idealism present in his foreign policy speeches. These studies draw upon Kennedy's background and presidential campaign to show the formation and transformation of Kennedy's thought. These studies are essential to understanding Kennedy's actions and rhetoric in Berlin. Where Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos (1995a) examine Kennedy's Report to the Nation on Berlin, they give no substantial attention to the other two speeches in the context of the German question. In fact, Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos' (1995b.) previous study demonstrated the full dimensions of Kennedy's attempts at strategic balancing of idealism and pragmatism. My study will undertake this task by focusing on the German speeches. Kennedy's Berlin speeches are in fact a rich resource of presidential idealist-pragmatist appeals.

Daum (2008) offers a historian's book length account of Kennedy's 1963 European tour, and his visit to Berlin. Daum understands the importance of rhetoric and its importance in history. He understood Kennedy's trip to Europe as part of a larger drama that was unfolding in Europe, and Kennedy's trip to Berlin as the main act in the drama. Daum is one of the few scholars to discuss Kennedy's Free University address. Daum's early chapters provide the context for Kennedy's European trip. Daum understands the past relations between the U.S. and Germany, and is fully aware of how Kennedy's rhetoric factors into the relationship. His look at the impact of Kennedy's speech is helpful in understanding its significance and place in the history, but Daum's work is historical and not rhetorical.

Other studies by Pucci (1994), Dean (1991), and Meagher (2006) add to the scholarship on Kennedy, but they focus on a single Kennedy speech and do not examine Kennedy's policy on Germany from 1961 to 1963 as a coherent whole. Pucci's (1994) examination of the Berlin Crisis of 1961 ends with the erection of the Berlin Wall and there is little attention paid to the consequences of the Wall on Kennedy's foreign policy. Pucci's rhetorical scholarship provides insight into Kennedy's Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis, but he fails to link the original rhetoric on Berlin with the rising tension in U.S.-Soviet and U.S.-German relations or the evolution and implementation of Kennedy's German policy with the culminating act being Kennedy's trip to Berlin. Dean (1991) focuses only on Kennedy's 1961 speech, arguing that Kennedy was using the speech to bolster his presidential image and standing in the world community. Dean's appraisal of Kennedy is that he used transcendent language and an accusatorial strategy to unify a divided audience and achieve global influence. Meagher's

(2006) study explores how Kennedy built on his success in the 1961 Berlin Crisis to deliver his 1963 address at Rudolph Wilde Platz. But, Meagher does not apply any appreciable theory to explore Kennedy's rhetorical discourse. In trying to draw historical comparisons between Kennedy and Reagan's Berlin speeches, Meagher minimizes the importance of Kennedy's address as it relates to previous Kennedy speeches. In not analyzing multiple Kennedy speeches on German unification, we miss a crucial opportunity to understand how Kennedy's policies were created and how they evolved. It is also quite useful to track how Kennedy had his advisers review previous speeches in an attempt to maintain continuity in his policies (Windt, 2003).

The two most comprehensive studies of Kennedy's foreign policy rhetoric were those by Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos (1995a) and Silvestri (2000). Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos analyze Kennedy's major Cold War addresses, most notably his Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis, his Cuban Missile Crisis address, and the American University speech. Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos's major focus is on speeches that responded to a crisis, implemented a new policy or both. But, their scholarship does not include Kennedy's two major addresses in Berlin or how they transformed U.S.-German relations, U.S. policy in Germany, and German policy. Silvestri's (2000) work on Kennedy's foreign policy includes his Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis in 1961 and his speech at the Rudolph Wilde Platz in Berlin in 1963. Silvestri's critique of his Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis looks at how Kennedy used the Berlin Crisis as a pretext for his new flexible response strategy. Silvestri's treatment of the 1963 Berlin speech, however, focuses more on the two errors Kennedy made rather than any rhetorical devices used. Silvestri overlooks key elements of

Kennedy's rhetorical style and the implications of that speech. Silvestri focused on Kennedy's off-the-cuff remarks about challenging the Soviets in Berlin, which contradicted his peaceful overtures for détente a few weeks earlier, and he critiqued Kennedy's syntax error of the German phrase "Ich Bin Ein Berliner." Silvestri does little to connect the two speeches or examine them together rhetorically.

James Pratt (1970) examined three crisis speeches, delivered by Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson. Pratt noticed that Eisenhower and Johnson's speeches shared similarities, but Kennedy's crisis rhetoric was unique. Kennedy's speech was aimed at an international audience and sought to elicit their support, and he used the first person, which Pratt says was unusual in presidential rhetoric during crises. However, Pratt compares presidential crisis rhetoric and does not take a historical look at a particular president or issue.

The very nature of this study is different because my historical treatment seeks to account for the status of Berlin and U.S. commitments to Berlin and Germany beginning after the Second World War. My study also differs from previous research because I will focus on the coherence of Kennedy's German policy. In the previous research on Kennedy, scholars have examined multiple Kennedy speeches together, but no scholar has looked at multiple foreign policy speeches on one particular policy or country. As indicated earlier, Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos (1995a) present the closest example of studying consistency and coherency in Kennedy's public addresses, but their work spans Kennedy's entire career and focuses on his entire foreign policy, not one specific policy or the concerns about one specific subject, Berlin.

Rationale and Purpose

With the change in the American media landscape, from a print oriented world to an electronic environment, the casual and interpersonal politician was rewarded with electoral success. The ability to persuade is important for any politician, but it is crucial for to the president. Rhetorical presidents are adept orators who elevate their narratives to form effective arguments for audience consumption in a mass mediated message environment (Henry, Abbott, Houck, Laracey, Lucas, & Parry-Giles, 2008). Rhetorical presidents are able to set the terms of the debate about public policy, to set the agenda of the nation, and as David Zarefsky asserted, "[T]he power to set the terms of the debate is often accompanied by an advantage to win the debate" (Henry et. al, p. 342). Presidents use words to shape the worldview of the country, and to direct the citizenry toward the issues that are important in society (Bostdorff, 1994). The president's power rests in his ability to persuade the American public to support his initiatives (Tatalovich & Daynes, 1979). There are times when tough words or actions are needed from a president to reinforce the will of the nation. Thus, a president "must be willing to show iron from time to time, to make an example by what happens to resisters and trouble-makers" (Nieburg & Nieburg, 1991, p. 291). The ability to show strength in the world through tough action and oratorical prowess increases the president's credibility, especially when a president deals with a crisis. Indeed, for a president, words are interpreted as deeds.

The president has a variety of roles as the nation's Chief Executive and Commander-in-Chief. While the president has authority and responsibility in both domestic and foreign affairs, the two spheres differ dramatically. As Ted Sorensen notes:

> In domestic affairs, a presidential decision is usually the beginning of public debate. In foreign affairs, the issues are frequently so complex, the

> facts so obscure, and the period for decision so short, that the American people have from the beginning-and even more so in this century delegated to the President more discretion in this vital area; and they are usually willing to support any reasonable decision he makes (Windt Jr., 2003, 93).

In foreign affairs, the president becomes the embodiment of the nation. The nation is personified through the president's words and actions (Wander, 1984). In this study, I will treat Kennedy's three speeches in Berlin as a study in foreign affairs that will highlight how a president employs rhetoric in an effort to frame, interpret, and advance foreign policy for a variety of audiences. The study will employ both history and rhetorical scholarship in an effort to argue that Kennedy's rhetoric reveals his evolution concerning Berlin and his Cold War strategy. I argue that Kennedy began with a military strategy, flexible response, which was established in his Radio and Television Report in July 1961 and over the next two years this strategy evolved into a strategy of peace embodied in a policy of détente accentuated at his Free University address. Within these speeches, both history and Kennedy's personal characteristics and style influenced his rhetoric. To fulfill this purpose I will answer the following research questions:

> 1. What is the historical context that helped frame the rhetorical situation Kennedy faced?
> 2. What rhetorical strategies and tactics did Kennedy employ in these speeches?
> 3. How might Kennedy's speeches extend our understanding of presidential public address?
> 4. What is the impact of Kennedy's speeches on U.S. German relations and the development of U.S. and German Policy?
> 5. What implications might these speeches have for the study and execution of presidential power and international diplomacy?

In an effort to fulfill my purpose and describe the foundational assumptions I bring to the formulation of these research questions, I will discuss: (1) my position on rhetorical theory as a rationale for this study; (2) the role of rhetoric and rhetorical criticism; and (3)

the relationship between rhetoric and history and, and (4) the importance of studying rhetorical history. These topics will serve a basis for grounding my study before turning to two major goals for this study: (I.). an admittedly lengthy but necessary historical account of the post-World War II/Cold War era in Chapter II: Historical Context and (II.) using that pivotal history to inform my critical analysis of Kennedy's Berlin speeches in Chapter III: Rhetorical Analysis.

Rhetorical Theory

David Zarefsky (2008) argues that many rhetorical theories are grand, nonfalsifiable propositions, which often apply a category system to a particular case. According to Zarefsky (2008), the creation of categories which can result in grand theory may provide "heuristically a rich exercise, but the application of categories to cases is often quite mundane. The critic usually will find that the category system applies to the case and will conclude the theory…helps explain the case" (p. 636). Such a "cookie cutter" approach to theory can result in a disservice to rhetorical scholarly work. The critic who uses a theory and applies it to the case believing they found insight has "not really illuminated the case; he or she has shown the category system is versatile" (Zarefsky, 2008, p. 636).

Zarefsky (1998) observes that the division and distinctions are common practice in theory and in academic work and it is for this reason that rhetorical historians are often on the defensive because true discovery of knowledge in rhetorical studies counsels against these distinctions and divisions. Furthermore, Zarefsky (1998) argues that the distinctions between history, criticism and theory in rhetorical studies are "unnecessary and without foundation" (p. 20). Terrill (2003) states "All rhetorical study necessarily is

historical, after all, if only because thoughtful interpretations and interventions take time" (p. 298). An even stronger argument comes from E. Culpepper Clark and Raymie E. McKerrow who maintain "that rhetoric is a force in history and that rhetoric is a force in writing of history" (Terrill, 2003, p. 298). Clark and McKerrow (1998) contend that rhetorical history "is the conception of discourse as an instrument of power—a conception that makes possible an investigation of the ways in which language, used in the service of power, forms human subjectivity…The historian is always called upon to discern how rhetoric shaped or was shaped by concrete sociopolitical relations and, thereby to determine rhetoric's complicity with dominating groups" (p. 45). Having provided a rationale for the rhetorical historian as someone who may proceed productively sans a heavy theoretical orientation, I now turn to the role of the critic.

Rhetorical Criticism

This study will rely upon rhetorical criticism as a method of analyzing presidential discourse. For purposes of this discussion the term "rhetoric" refers to human attempts at persuasion. Rhetorical critics assume that discourse in not transparent in meaning, implication or significance (Zarefsky, 2008). Rhetorical critics seek to answer two questions: 1. What is going on here? 2. So what? Zarefsky concludes that answering the first question requires understanding the underlying dynamics of the work—its influence on people. Here one seeks to understand the "actual response of a specific audience and the degree to which that response can be attributed to the rhetorical work" (Zarefsky, 2008, p. 633). Bostdorff (1994) suggests that attempts to understand audience response to presidential public address are best mounted by interrogating identificational appeals used by the president to elicit response. Theodore Windt Jr.'s

(1986) research on presidential rhetoric shows that the "audience" for a speech goes beyond those who attend and extends to multiple constituents and constituencies who are exposed to the speech through the media. Often exposure means tuning into a nationally televised address or catching a mere snippet of coverage of the address when it is discussed in the print and electronic media. Rhetorical scholars are charged with the task of explaining the speech text and its meaning to the audience. Rhetorical criticism has highlighted the polysemy of language and its ability to have multiple voices at once to multiple audiences (Zarefsky, 2008). Audience analysis has identified this phenomenon of polysemy, and it is up to the rhetorical scholar to explain it.

The rhetorical critic is more of an artist, than a scientist, and regards the outcome of a rhetorical text as open, not inevitable. The accessibility of rhetorical criticism opens up the rhetorical text for debate over "why the rhetor made the choices that he or she did…what reprisals were invited by those choices, to theorize about the functions and consequences of the choices…[and] to evaluate the choices in the given case" (Zarefsky, 2008, p. 634). The openness of the rhetorical text allows the critic to evaluate the style of the text, which is often influenced by the rhetor. The *style* of the speech refers to how a rhetor typically speaks. As Burke notes, "style is the way in which rhetors adhere to personal values in their discourse" (Bostdorff, 1994, p. 19). James Barber and Hugh Blair researched presidential character, and made a connection between style and presidential character or the way the president "orients himself toward life" (Bostdorff, 1994, p. 21).

More importantly, rhetorical criticism allows the scholar to assess the effectiveness of the discourse's two principal functions: building community and inspiring people to achieve goals (Zarefsky, 2008). A presidential rhetor builds

community when he or she identifies with the audience and establishes a common bond with the people; thereby integrating isolated individuals into a public (Zarefsky, 2008). Inspiring people to achieve common goals is performed when the rhetor "articulates a vision or goal and motivates an audience to seek to pursue it" (Zarefsky, 2008, p. 638). While, historical-critical research has often been employed in rhetorical studies (e.g., Bostdorff, 2008; Kiewe 1994; Medhurst & Scott, 1990), I need to advance a more specific discussion of the relationship between rhetoric and history as a rationale for the considerable explication of history that is considered crucial to this study. Indeed, some readers may note upon finishing this study that its contents seem seems to have more to do with history than rhetoric. These readers' suspicions are well-grounded. I consider this study an enactment of rhetorical history.

Rhetoric & History

Martin J. Medhurst has argued that "rhetoric and history must be studied together, because both are complicated matters that directly impinge upon one another" (Bostdorff etc. al, 2008, pg. 358). A rhetorical perspective helps retain the human focus in historical research, and history helps place the rhetoric in context (Ball, 1998). Thus, "doing rhetorical history" allows the academic to consider "what persuasive discourse means within its historical context" (Ball, 1998, p. 63). Rhetorical historians can make informed judgments about the communication of the past, interweaving rhetoric, history, and criticism into probative narrative explanations. Kathleen Turner et al (1998) argue for a larger role for rhetorical history because it offers: "an understanding of rhetoric as a process rather than as simply a product; it creates and appreciation of both the commonalities among and the distinctiveness of rhetorical situations and responses; it

tests theory and complements criticism while standing as a distinct and valid approach in and of itself" (Turner, 1998, p. 2).

As indicated earlier, rhetorical criticism seeks to understand the message text in context, but rhetorical history "seeks to understand the context through messages that reflect and construct that context" (Turner, 1998, p. 2). Or, as Zarefsky notes, the rhetorical historian will look at "how messages are created and used by people to influence and relate to one another" (Zarefsky, 1998, p. 30). So while the speech texts remain important, using a historical approach enables me to connect Kennedy's rhetoric with the ongoing context of the Berlin Crisis, and draw commonalities and distinctions not only between the three Berlin speeches, but possibly other presidential crisis speeches or other president's remarks concerning the Berlin's unique position of being divided between East and West, which occurred from 1945 to 1989.

***Rhetorical Hist*ory**

Zarefsky (1998) answers one of the most important questions concerning the overall goal of my study, which is to use history as a lens for interpreting presidential rhetorical practice. The study of history is important because it aids in the understanding the past, history counters any notion of what happened had to happen by offering the roads not taken, and history helps broaden the human experience by bringing people out of their own boundaries and showing them the larger human experience (Zarefsky, 1998). History provides a connection between past and present, a parallel case used for evaluating existing conditions and charting a course for the future. History is used as a part of argument, a selective remembering to validate an action or course (Zarefsky, 1998). E. Culpepper Clark and Raymie E. McKerrow (1998) argue that history does not

need to function separate from the argument it contains. The rhetor "cannot argue in the present without a sense of history being implicated in the meaning of the argument" (Clark & McKerrow, 1998, p. 42). John Kennedy used historical allusions, metaphors and examples in all three of his German speeches and understanding how Kennedy used and was affected by history is an important factor when examining his discourse.

Communication scholars should undertake the study of rhetorical history because their efforts will help to define the rhetorical climate of an age. In defining the rhetorical climate of an age, communication scholars can help answer and examine "how people defined the situation, what led them to seek to justify themselves or to persuade others, what storehouse of social knowledge they drew upon for their premises, what themes and styles they produced in their messages, how their processes of identification and confrontation succeeded or failed" (Zarefsky, 1998, p. 31-32).

To fully understand what exigencies Kennedy was reacting to and acting on, an understanding of the history of Berlin since 1945 is needed. An explanation of the relationship between the U.S. and the Western Allies, and the U.S. and the Soviets is crucial. This background will inform Kennedy's Berlin addresses. The historical literature on the Berlin Crisis, in particular, is extensive and my study includes a lengthy description of the historical background leading to Kennedy's first address in July 1961. In addition, to fully understand the impact and consequences of Kennedy's rhetoric, one must understand the political and historical pressures Kennedy was under in 1961 and 1963.

In my analysis of Kennedy's three German speeches, I will trace the evolution of Kennedy's Berlin rhetoric, from his first speech in 1961 which proposed a military

strategy to his last speech in 1963 that called for a policy of peace. In the process, I will demonstrate how Kennedy created community among the multiple audiences through the use of idealistic language and goals. By setting these goals, he inspired his audiences to sacrifice and to meet the challenges he laid out in his speeches. Also, by using a rhetorical historical framework, I will be able to trace the evolution of Kennedy's rhetoric, from his first speech which proposed a military strategy to his last speech that called for a policy of peace. This examination of his rhetoric will trace how the historical events influenced Kennedy and how Kennedy's rhetoric influenced history. Finally, I will answer Zarefsky's question: So what? Why do Kennedy's speeches matter?

In sum, both texts and contexts matter. Analysis of presidential speech texts do not occur in a vacuum. One must view them within a specified context. Key to the speech context is the historical situation faced by the president when delivering his speech. The speech is shaped by the historical context and the historical context helps shape the rhetorical options available when a president presents his identificational appeals.

In the next chapter I will provide a diplomatic history of U.S.-German and the Cold War landscape from the end of World War II to 1961. Without an examination of U.S.-German relations beginning in final days of World War II and continuing through the early stages of the Cold War, it is hard to appreciate how Kennedy's rhetoric revolutionized U.S.-Germans relations. The historical background leading up to the 1961 Berlin Crisis will provide a basic understanding of U.S. Cold War policy, and will set the scene for the pivotal showdown over Berlin.

CHAPTER II. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1945-50: Postwar Settlement: A Cold Peace?

At the close of World War II, the announcement of unconditional surrender by Germany created the symbolic "other" in the minds of both Americans and Germans. Preconceived German notions of America dated back to 1776 (Ickstadt, 2004). Germans saw America as a "prison house of freedom where a disgusting mob exerts its uncouth dominance" (Ickstadt, 2004, p. 163). Americans lacked culture, according to the Germans. American culture was considered despicable, "Kramergeist," because American values were mainly perceived in terms of money and commerce (Ickstadt, 2004). Germany felt it was fighting to preserve its culture against the invading uncultured American hordes and their capitalist greed.

The American portrayal of Germans was no kinder. The American image of the Germans was shaped by the *Pocket Guide to Germany*, which warned Americans about the duplicity of the German people, feeding into the stereotype that all Germans were fanatical Nazi supporters (Goedde, 1999). Americans entering Germany in 1945 feared an indoctrinated citizenry bent on fighting the invaders to the death. Americans were warned that "during the war, Germany kept 500,000 trained killers at home, the black uniformed SS Guards" (Goedde, 1999, p.4), who would discard their uniforms, and attack American soldiers in the dark as civilians. Germany was portrayed as a hyper—masculine country dominated by men and the imagery of the indoctrinated Nazi stormtrooper or SS Guard still haunted the imagination of the American soldier (Goedde, 1999). The American discovery of Nazi concentration camps confirmed the expectations of U.S. army commanders' warnings about the barbaric nature of Germans.

The precarious position of a divided Berlin began in the waning months of World War II. The winter of 1945 was ending and the spring thaw was coming early throughout Europe. The Soviets were within an hour's drive of Berlin, with the Western Allies over three hundred miles away and recovering from the Battle of the Bulge, but the end of the war was in reach. Hitler's reckless advance on the Western Front had failed and the Soviets were preparing for their final offensive into the heartland of Germany: Berlin. Winston Churchill began looking for an end game in Western Europe and for a peace settlement. Churchill surmised that whoever held Berlin would hold a trump card in the peace negotiations (Gelb, 1986). The 'Big Three' were to meet at Yalta in February 1945 to discuss the postwar settlement of Europe. It would be the last time that Roosevelt, Stalin and Churchill were to meet in person. Churchill had misgivings about Soviet reliability and trustworthiness as the war began to wind down, but Roosevelt and Eisenhower believed the Soviets shared their aims of making sure Germany never threatened world peace again. Indeed, though Stalin led a totalitarian regime he was viewed as a reasonable man (Gelb, 1986).

As the Big Three prepared for the summit at Yalta, the role of the Soviets in the postwar global community was of some concern. By the end of the war, the Soviet Union had suffered 27 million casualties, both military and civilian, 90 times the number of Americans who died in the war. Stalin believed the expenditures in blood and treasure by each country should determine who gained what, and by Stalin's account the Soviets were due more than any other country. Stalin wanted to retain the territories he gained in the 1939 non-aggression pact with Hitler and for the countries on his borders to remain within the Soviet sphere of influence (Gaddis, 2005a). Stalin did not want a repetition of

the small power blocs that dominated Central and Eastern Europe in the 1930s. Stalin felt the Soviet Union should be the dominant military power in this region, as well as all of Europe (MacDonogh, 2007). Regarding the German issue, Stalin was open to various plans as evidenced by his support for the Morgenthau Plan, his advocacy for a divided Germany in Teheran, a united Germany with Allied zones of occupation at Yalta, and a single economic unit at Potsdam. While these positions may be characterized as mixed messages, he would not budge on giving Poles German land (MacDonogh, 2007). Stalin was quite clear that he would cede German land to Poland.

The major issue for the Soviets in 1945 and throughout Soviet history has been security. For Stalin, security meant personal security for himself and his regime, but also security from outside invasion and security for his ideology. Soviet security could be partially secured through courting spheres of influence, but because of heavy Soviet losses the only way for Stalin to ensure his gains was to take measures to maintain the peace throughout Europe (Gaddis, 2005a). At both Yalta and Potsdam, Stalin would insist on a *glacis* to its west, a large swath of land that any enemy coming from the west would have to pass through were they to attack Russia. If these lands were not to be absorbed into Russia, they should at the very least be pro-Soviet regimes eschewing any fascist or reactionary elements (Judt, 2005). World War II left the Soviet Union in a position of power globally, but greatly damaged economically by human loss and damaged land. Stalin's lasting dream for Europe was its domination by the Soviets, but he would settle for Soviet domination as far as the Rhine, with the British leading the rest of Western Europe (Gaddis, 2005a). Soviet hopes for domination of Europe hinged on

the communist ideology and its spread through Germany and into France, along with American withdrawal from the continent.

The allies gained by America would be crucial in shaping the postwar settlement. Roosevelt believed that without allied cooperation the world stood little chance of maintaining the peace. The postwar settlement the U.S. was banking on would be one where a new collective security organization would be created to prevent future wars by deterring and if necessary, punishing aggressor nations. A key corollary to the postwar settlement was renewed economic success that could be secured and protected by the collective organization of nations. Finally, Roosevelt knew the settlement had to be acceptable to the American people, unlike the Wilsonian settlement after World War I (Gaddis, 2005a). Concerning Germany, Roosevelt initially favored the Morgenthau Plan, but quickly retreated. By the time he reached Yalta, he favored a federal system with as many as five zones or as few as two zones (MacDonogh, 2007). Roosevelt's tried to implement his postwar vision at Yalta, but he found himself more in the role of mediator between the Soviets and British. While some of his vision lived on after his death, his untimely demise left the U.S. in a precarious position heading into the final postwar discussions at Potsdam.

The final stage of the war and the first stages of post-war Europe were set in February 1945. The Yalta Conference was the last time the Big Three leaders met to discuss post-war plans. Yalta opened with Stalin discussing the dismemberment of Germany and the establishment of a new government. Stalin had plans of dismembering Germany as early as 1941, when the war was bleakest for the Allies, and these plans had been passed to English foreign secretary Anthony Eden (Plokhy, 2010). Eden's

assessment of Stalin's plans in 1941 was "that dismemberment would be sustainable only if achieved by separatist movements on the ground" (Plokhy, 2010, p. 95). At Teheran in late 1943, Stalin still agreed with Roosevelt that Germany should be dismantled. At Yalta, Stalin pushed for a dismemberment plan to be drawn up by a commission of the Foreign Ministers, but like the Americans and the British, the Russians did not yet have a clear vision for a dismembered postwar Germany (Bessel, 2009). At Yalta, the Allied powers decided that Germany would be separated into occupation zones. The purpose of Allied occupations was to "destroy German militarism and Nazism and to ensure Germany will never again be able to disturb the peace of the world" (Report of Yalta, 1945). The Allied leaders agreed that:

> Under the agreed plan, the forces of the Three Powers will each occupy a separate zone of Germany. Coordinated administration and control has been provided for under the plan through a central Control Commission consisting of the Supreme Commanders of the Three Powers with headquarters in Berlin (Report of Yalta, 1945).

Stalin initially objected to French inclusion because he abhorred France's collapse in 1940, which he blamed for Hitler's attack on Russia in 1940 (MacDonogh, 2007). Roosevelt persuaded Stalin by admitting the Americans would not be able to leave troops in Europe indefinitely to patrol Germany, and that without U.S. ground forces the British needed help patrolling and keeping peace in Germany (Plokhy, 2010). The last point may have tipped Stalin in favor of French inclusion, but nonetheless the French were given a zone of occupation out of the Western Allies zone and participation rights in the Control Commission in Berlin.

The borders of the occupation zones were a British creation that Stalin rushed to accept because the British plan gave the Soviets more territory than the Soviets' original

proposal. The British proposal placed the Soviet zone boundary further west, a line that came to separate the GDR and the FRG (Plokhy, 2010). The Americans made little objection because they were wholly unprepared when the British proposed their plan in January 1944. The Americans believed that by the end of the war the Soviets and Americans would meet at the Rhine River, not the middle of Germany. Stalin also accepted the idea of a quadripartite government in the city of Berlin, raising the question of why the Soviets would allow Western Allied soldiers to be in Berlin, which was part of the Soviet zone. Stalin and the Soviets accepted this arrangement because he believed the Marxist-Leninist government installed in the Soviet zone would be a magnet for Germans to elect leaders who would unify Germany under Soviet control (Gaddis, 2005a). Prior to the development of the atomic bomb, the Americans still wished for Soviet intervention in the Pacific theatre against the Japanese. Roosevelt had been pushing Stalin to pledge his support for Russian intervention against Japan once the war was over in Europe. At Yalta, Stalin pledged his support to intervene against the Japanese in exchange for what would become a Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe (Stone, 2010). After the Soviet atrocities in Eastern Germany and the repression of freedom in Eastern Europe, Yalta became a “code-word for the willingness of the Western Allies to consign half of Europe to Stalin” (Stone, 2010, p. 21). Soviet intervention late in the Pacific theatre also gave Stalin a railway and two main ports in Manchuria (Stone, 2010). Roosevelt’s desire for Soviet support against Japan impaired Western influence in Eastern Europe and also strengthened communist support in China that led to a Sino-Soviet alliance. Truman’s bargaining with Stalin over Soviet support at

Potsdam was very different than Roosevelt's dealings at Yalta, but by then it was too late to change Soviet momentum in Eastern Europe.

Stalin had one more idea at Yalta concerning the zones of occupation, exclusive zonal responsibility. The British plan called for primary zones of occupation that allowed troops from any of the four occupying powers to cross and patrol in each other's zones. Stalin wanted exclusive zones, which meant American, British and French troops could not patrol or be stationed in the Soviet zone (Plokhy, 2010). At the time, none of the Western Powers objected to the idea of exclusive zones, but as the joy of victory faded and an icy atmosphere settled over Germany the impact of exclusive zonal control played a major role in the fate of Berlin and the history of the Cold War.

The vision of the wartime allies at Yalta focused upon the negative. Yalta largely defined what Germany would not be in the future. There was little discussion of how to rebuild Germany (Bessel, 2009); mainly because none of the major Allies, except a minor American bloc, that would be called the Berlin mafia, wanted to see a united and strong Germany. In addition, agreement at Yalta occurred in February 1945, when the Americans and British were recovering from the Battle of the Bulge and few American leaders believed the Western Allies could reach Berlin before the Soviets.

By April 1945, the Western Allies were having different thoughts on the postwar settlement, as the situation on the ground had changed. The Americans had driven deep into Saxony which was promised to be under Soviet control, and the British held a chunk of Mecklenburg (MacDonogh, 2007). The remaining leadership of the Third Reich, Hitler, Goebbels and Himmler hoped the Americans would reach Berlin and turn on the Soviets. Churchill wanted western control of Berlin as a counter balance for Soviet

assurances on their territorial acquisitions (MacDonogh, 2007). The British urged Supreme Allied Commander, Dwight Eisenhower, to use a narrow thrust attack to roll across the plains of Central Germany and for the Western Allies to strike at and capture Berlin. Eisenhower and the Americans disagreed with their ally's plan and their post-war assessment of the situation. Eisenhower preferred a broad attack that was less risky, but more significantly Roosevelt and the Americans did not see the Soviets as a threat. The Americans saw the Soviets as gallant allies that desired to end this ugly war as soon as possible and Roosevelt believed Stalin was a reasonable man that he could handle. Any sort of race across Europe to get to Berlin first would be pointless and shabby politicking on part of the Americans, the chief effect being antagonizing the Soviets (Gelb, 1986). Roosevelt would not get a chance to handle Stalin because in April he died from his long standing health issues. The Americans turned to Vice President Harry Truman to finalize a postwar settlement at Potsdam.

A mere five to six months after the "Big Three" met at Yalta the leadership of the Allies met again at Potsdam. Franklin D. Roosevelt had died and was replaced by Vice President Harry S Truman. Midway through the meeting Winston Churchill was removed from office when he lost the election in England. Only Stalin remained, leaving the Soviet Union with a major advantage as having the only leader fully briefed and present at all other Allied postwar discussions. Potsdam offered nothing new. There were no new decisions and virtually nothing was added to prior agreements. None of the problems or disagreements between the Allies were solved. What Potsdam does offer is a view of Europe two months after Germany's defeat (Dallas, 2005). What did change at Potsdam was how the Allies viewed each other. Truman was not swayed by Churchill's flattery

and a skeptical Truman felt that Churchill tried to “soft soap him” at Potsdam (Dallas, 2005, p. 548). Nevertheless, Truman did eventually see that Churchill occasionally dropped a pearl of wisdom amongst his ramblings. More important to the postwar settlement and increasing tension in the Anglo-American alliance was the recognition by Truman and the U.S. that the British economy was in disarray (Dallas, 2005). After the war had ended, Britain was entering into a postwar currency crisis that threatened to cripple the country. The price of the British Empire had sky rocketed since 1939 and all of the diplomatic and military expenditures on its empire were depleting an already thin British treasury. The only way Britain could survive was to impose voluntary conditions of restraint, which left the country poorer and bleaker than the defeated nations of World War II (Judt, 2005). Compared to the United States, the British were working with worn out and outdated machinery used by a worn out and war weary population. If the West was to maintain a foothold in Europe, the U.S. would have to play a new role that required a reversal of policy that Roosevelt had outlined.

The major push by Stalin at Potsdam was the recognition of the Polish-German border and the relocation of Germans that were in Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. At Potsdam, a formal agreement was reached about the eastern border of Germany, which was to run along the Oder and western Neisse rivers. Only Churchill believed the changing of the German border and the displacement of millions of Germans was a major issue. Truman believed the issue could be put off and finalized at a peace conference (Dallas, 2005). Churchill’s recommendations and discussions of Germany’s borders included the annihilation of the state of Prussia, the introduction of Stalin’s democracy into the heart of Europe, the entrenchment of Poles in the new “western Poland,” and the

cost of incorporating millions of Germans from these territories into an already decimated Germany (Dallas, 2005). Stalin's idea of democracy was not the same as the western notion of democracy. In the 'Declaration on Liberated Europe,' the term democracy was deliberately vague and the Allies fretted over the fate of Poland (Dallas, 2005). When Churchill left on the morning of 25 July, Stalin described democracy as being non-fascist states. He characterized the former German satellites of Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary as democratic nations and questioned why they had not been admitted to the United Nations (Dallas, 2005). Stalin's effort to define the new Soviet 'satellite' countries as democratic and gain their acceptance into the United Nations was his attempt to legitimize Soviet actions in Eastern Europe. These early actions would be precursors to the actions taken by the Soviets in Poland, Eastern Germany and other 'democratic' nations in Eastern Europe.

Akin with the change in the German border, Article XIII of Potsdam accords also called for the "transfer to Germany of German populations, or elements thereof, remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary" (Bessel, 2009, p. 214). The transfer of Germans back into Germany and the Soviet zone was supposed to be "effected in an orderly and humane manner," but orderly and humane were distinct exaggerations of what actually occurred (Bessel, 2009, p. 214). From the end of June 1945 and through August 1945, millions of Germans were forced out of these territories and back into Germany. Germans in Western Poland awakened in the middle of the night and had only minutes to take some personal belongings with them before they were marched sometimes at gunpoint to the nearest border crossing and left on the other side at the whim of Soviet troops (MacDonogh, 2007; Bessel, 2009). Evacuation was filled with

dangers including robbery by Polish militia units. If evacuees had any possessions remaining with them after crossing into the Soviet zone, they were easy prey for Soviet troops likely to take any remaining valuables. Expulsion also included forms of physical and sexual violence. In Czechoslovakia and Poland, Germans were beaten, raped, forced to perform humiliating tasks and subjected to sadistic violence in labor camps (MacDonogh, 2007; Bessel, 2009). The physical strain on the German population was only part of the toll the Allies, especially the Russians, levied against Germany. The economic reparations and other new policies placed a heavy burden on Germany. The economic fate of Germany, while discussed at Yalta, was finalized at Potsdam.

Germany was to pay $20 billion in reparations, with half the sum due to the Soviet Union (Dallas, 2005). The other major aspect of the Potsdam Accords included the Allies agreement that “during the period of occupation Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit” (Bessel, 2009, p. 375). The Allies were to impose and regulate common economic policies regarding currency, banking, central taxation and customs (Bessel, 2009). The Allied Control Council was to set up administration departments in the fields of finance, transport, communication, foreign trade and industry. The common economic policy was supposed to help maintain the cohesiveness of Germany with the eventuality of Germany becoming one nation again after Allied occupation and treaty agreements at a Peace Conference (Cecil, 1970). Controlling foreign trade was the key to overall economic treatment of Germany. If the Allies managed foreign trade on a zone by zone basis, instead of an all-German basis, then what started as a temporary division of Germany could become a permanent division. The two Germanys would have to deal with each other as separate companies engaged in economic trade rather than one unified

country with intrastate trade. Secretary of State James Byrnes did not believe that the reparations taken from Germany would be run on a unitary basis implying the U.S. knew there was going to be two Germanys (Trachtenberg, 2001). The French, who were not invited to Yalta or Potsdam, objected to the uniformity of a single economic unit in Germany. The French had the ability to veto any action taken by the Allied Control Council to implement a uniformity of policy (Cecil, 1970). French objections were twofold. First, occupation offered the French an opportunity to extract coal and steel from the Saar region without having to report this to a common economic council. Second, the French feared a united Germany. It threatened French security especially if Germany allied itself with the Russians and attacked France (Bessel, 2009). French objection carried little weight in the actions of the 'Big Three.' However, even before the agreement was finalized, each occupation zone was operating economically in its own way ignoring single economic unity clause stipulated at Potsdam.

The Potsdam Accords had a lasting impact in world relations, as objections and problems arose throughout the Cold War were attributable to the division of Germany. The intent of the Allies was to punish Germany after the war. Security was a goal of the Potsdam accords along with convincing the German people they had suffered a total military defeat and could not escape responsibility for the war (Hermens, 1947). The Accords placed collective guilt for the war on the German people and opened the door for collective punishment. As the Americans soon realized, the proclamation of collective guilt and the need for punishment would be detrimental to U.S. European policy. Many of the German people did not have a chance to defend themselves in a court. Moreover, people born after Hitler could be condemned to a life of economic injustice with the only

rationale being their German birth (Hermens, 1947). Even at Potsdam, a rift between the Allies was beginning to occur over occupation rights and democracy in Eastern Europe. Truman, who still believed all these issues could be solved at the Peace Conference, was slowly warming to Churchill's views of Stalin and Soviet intentions. Truman called out Stalin on the democratic legitimacy of Bulgaria, Romania and Hungary and pointed out that the Soviet commission never saw both the U.S. and British representatives at the same time to work out issues of German uniformity (Dallas, 2005). The Western Allies allowed the Soviets to move freely in Italy and other Western European nations, but the West was constantly under surveillance by Soviet intelligence in Eastern European countries (Dallas, 2005).

Lucius Clay credits French vetoes as saving Germany from falling under Soviet communist control. Anthony Eden gained support for the Bonn Conventions and the new Federal Republic of Germany by claiming the Russians never upheld the Potsdam Accords based on their actions in the Eastern zone of Germany (Cecil, 1970). Truman for his part made one last attempt at Potsdam to get European waterways open to international traffic to which Stalin quickly replied 'Nyet!' and added in English "No, I say no!" (Dallas, 2005, p. 567). Truman wrote to his mother calling the Stalinist regime a "police government pure and simple: a few top hands just take clubs, pistols and concentration camps and rule the people on the lower levels" (Dallas, 2005, p. 567). The era of good feeling between the U.S. and Russia was over, Truman's view of Russia was now solidified and the Cold War was set to begin, but first Western Germany needed to be saved from U.S. occupation policies.

While the French and Russians were intent on taking reparations from their occupation zones, the U.S. was intent on bringing New Deal-style democracy to the Germans (Rolleston, 1999). Unfortunately, the beginning of occupation in the American zone began harshly. The April 1945 Directive to the Commander and Chief of U.S. occupation forces, JCS 1067, outlined the U.S. policy for its occupation of Germany and stated that "Germany will not be occupied for the purpose of liberation but as a defeated enemy nation" (Report of Yalta, 1945). On May 8, 1945 the war in Europe ended with the unconditional surrender of the German Armed forces by Admiral Donitz (Herring, 2008). The surrender included a declaration of German guilt for the war, and dissolution of all powers possessed by the German government (Hansen, 1995). Germany was to blame for the war and was no longer a sovereign nation. Germans were to bear the brunt of Allied abuse, guilt and blame for Hitler's war.

American occupation began ruthlessly. America's leading General Dwight D. Eisenhower later stated that America ruled Germany as "conquerors, not as liberators" (Snow, 2008, p. 203). Germany was shattered. "There was no such thing as habeas corpus and there was no forum to which one could apply for a hearing" (Snow, 2008, p. 203). Germany was to be run under military law with the intent of bringing "home to the Germans that Germany's ruthless warfare and the fanatical Nazi resistance have destroyed the German economy and made chaos and suffering inevitable and that the Germans cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves" (Directive to Commander and Chief, 1945). Germans had no rights, and American commanders believed the stereotype of the untrustworthy German. American actions provided no comfort to the war weary German populace. American policy toward the

Germans was to make them pay for the war, but U.S. policy was leaving Germany in shambles (Rolleston, 1999). The U.S. instituted a no fraternization policy, which prohibited “any informal interactions between American soldiers and German nationals” (Goedde, 1999, p. 2). U.S. policy was to crush hopes and reinforce collective guilt for the war into the German psyche (Goedde, 1999). The basic social norms and institutions were absent, along with any semblance of German self-government. The absence of a social structure was worsened by German guilt for the war (Rolleston, 1999). German ineptness and weakness allowed America to dominate, but American domination was undercutting any support by the German occupation for U.S. rebuilding plans. American officials worried that rebuilding German industry would be criticized for restoring German war potential (Dulles, 2003). The ambiguities and harshness of U.S. policy left Germany in a disordered state. There was no U.S.-German relationship in 1945. If the U.S. did not help rebuild Germany, chaos would ensue or worse communism might overtake Germany.

The problems facing ordinary Germans civilians were compounded by the lack of a steady U.S.-German relationship. Without any American support, Germans were left helpless. Germans in the American zone of occupation were supposed to receive 1,500 calories a day, but that total was far from being met (Dulles, 2003). At high times during U.S. occupation, Germans received 1,275 calories of food a day, but at points during the occupation intake could run as low as 860 per day (MacDonogh, 2007). Threats to German POWs included prisoner abuse and death, and rape was a constant threat to German women. German POWs died from starvation, execution, and physical abuses. In approximate numbers, there were anywhere from 32,000 to 40,000 German POW deaths.

Rape charges in March and April 1945 were 402 and 501 respectively (MacDonogh, 2007). While a report in March 1945 by Ninth Army Courier Leiser indicated rape might be a frequent occurrence, there was difficulty calculating the numbers because it was assumed that some German women might prostitute themselves for food (Goedde, 1999). All told, rape and prisoner abuse was less in the American zone, than the Soviet zone, but the mistakes in early U.S. policy strained the tenuous relationship between Germany and America that was beginning to form.

U.S. policy toward the defeated German state followed the guidelines outlined at Yalta and U.S. directive JCS 1067. Under JCS 1067, Germany was to undergo a complete denazification, demilitarization and reeducation. Denazification included the removal and prohibition from public or private enterprises of any person who had been more than a nominal participant in Nazi activities, all active supporters of Nazism or militarism, and all persons hostile to Allied persons (Directive to Commander and Chief, 1945). All political activity inside Germany was to be prohibited. Germany had lost its Army and political sovereignty. The German state was divided between the Three wartime Allies and France. The loss of national sovereignty meant the rebuilding of Germany was left to the victorious wartime powers. German law was to be remodeled and reconstituted by the Americans. Any new German law, either national or local, needed approval by members of the occupation military government, and many of the new German laws were implemented by the military governments (Schraut, 2000). The rebuilding of the German state began as an Allied Power occupation project, but ended as project completed by the people of West Germany.

American soldiers began to go out among the German people, and found the Germans were not the indoctrinated Nazi fundamentalists depicted in the *Pocket Guide to Germany*. In particular, U.S. soldiers had a difficult time conceiving of women and children as the enemy. Germany changed from a masculine militant country to a feminine country in the minds of American soldiers. U.S. soldiers began to see themselves as providers and protectors for the defenseless population (Goedde, 1999). Children ran up to American soldiers asking for "cheving gum" or "choclat," women would grin, and old men and women would talk to pass the time of day (Goedde, 1999). The diminished role of Germen men in society removed the threat of German males portrayed in the *Pocket Guide to Germany*. The threat of a fanatical Nazi male or defense of the German homeland by SS men in civilian garb was removed from the American psyche (Goedde, 1999). A strong relationship between American soldier and German civilian was built, but the context was one of dependent-provider with the soldier being the provider to the civilian dependent.

Denazification was vilified by the Germans, but was a cornerstone of American policy in postwar Germany. A majority of Germans saw denazification as "too strict" and as "logical nonsense, judicial perversity and moral perfidy because it rested on the assumption of collective guilt" (Jarausch, 2006, pp. 52). Questionnaires issued by the Allies inflicted wounds on the self-worth of Germans, but Germans needed to fill out the questionnaires to get a certificate from the Allied government to get a decent paying job in Germany. The policy restricted the number of people available to fill important vacant positions in Germany, which caused a disruption in the rebuilding of Germany (Jarausch, 2006). With the slow change in American-German relations, denazification was called

off by 1948. Though denazification was a difficult and bureaucratic process, there were some positives. First, the Nazi Party was outlawed making sure there was no possible revivalism of Nazism in Germany. Second, major Nazi leaders were captured and eliminated from public life. Finally, Nazism as an ideology was discredited (Jarausch, 2006). With Nazism discredited and Allied occupation in place, there was an opportunity for a new political movement to take place in Germany.

Americans began to see a difference between Nazi Germany and post-war Germany. Not all Germans were guilty of waging war and antagonizing U.S. forces. At the same time the thaw between Germany and America was taking place, a hardening of lines between America and the U.S.S.R. was beginning. The new threat to America and the West was communism, not Nazism, and consumerism became the weapon of choice to fight communism. The best ambassadors of American culture were already in Europe as U.S. soldiers. American soldiers spread American consumer culture to Germans through their interactions with German children, women, and other civilians (Goedde, 1999). Over time the Germans became less of a threat, and more of an ally against Russia. Cultural exchanges and German societal changes prompted General Eisenhower to note the “rapid progress which has been made in the denazification and removal of all prominent Nazis from any part of German life” (Goedde, 1999, p. 15). Eisenhower’s declamation signaled a shift in U.S. military policy toward Germany and triggered a distinction by U.S. occupation forces between guilty and innocent Germans. The Truman Doctrine which was based in containment was outlined in 1947 by President Harry Truman officially shifted how Germany was treated, and created the foundation for a democratic Germany.

Yalta and Potsdam symbolized a return to prominence for the Soviet Union in Europe. Stalin was insistent on territorial aggrandizement at both conferences. The Western Powers were not willing at the time to offer much resistance to Stalin's wishes. The realization of a new Eurasian bloc represented a rise in Soviet world status. The land also provided Stalin and Russia with security, which was the most important issue for the Russians. If a future enemy wished to attack Russia, especially the Germans, they would have to cross a large swath of land (Judt, 2005). Two developments are important to the discussion and evolution of the Cold War. The countries lying between the Soviet zone of occupation and Russia were to be regimes friendly to the USSR, "free of fascist and reactionary elements" (Judt, 2005, p. 118), if they were not wholly absorbed into the Soviet Union. The other major development was the security Russia gained which came at the cost of German unity, with Russia attempting to ensure Germany never threatened Europe or Russia again.

Potsdam concluded with Russia gaining the right to extract and remove goods, services and financial assets from its German zone, but Russia also pursued the policy of removing factories and equipment from Western zones, with or without the approval of their fellow occupiers (Judt, 2005). It was here in Germany that the policies of the "Big Three" began to diverge and set up the Cold War. Stalin was intent on dominating Europe, but instead of fascism, Europe would be dominated by Soviet communism. The Soviet zone in Germany would attract Germans of the western three zones who would eventually vote to create a united Germany under a communist regime (Gaddis, 2005a). Russian security would be ensured by Soviet domination of Central and Eastern Europe.

Soviet action in Germany, however, spurned Stalin's dreams and led to a showdown between Western Allies and the Soviets.

The "magnet" regime that Stalin hoped to set up in the Soviet zone never materialized. Germans living in the Soviet zone did not readily accept Soviet collectivist doctrines. The Nazis had run a capitalistic economy. Germans in the Soviet zone were unwilling to nationalize their banks or implement a new system of land tenure. Soviet soldiers also looted far more than any other country's soldiers and wiped out all liquid assets (Dulles, 2003). Stalin's tactics in Germany did little to impress upon the German population that he intended to follow the Potsdam Accords and maintain the unity of Germany or help the German people. The de facto Communist led government quickly began extracting and dismantling all that fell into their grasp, including many German factories and industrial equipment leaving the Soviet zone impoverished. However unpopular the Americans, British or French were in the German's eyes, the Soviet regime was far worse (Judt, 2005). The Russian standing among the German people was low. Russian soldiers went about Berlin looting worker's houses. The section of Germany being turned over to Poland saw a good deal of buck passing and a great deal of confusion over what was actually occurring (Dulles, 2003). The Russians impressed the Germans as thugs. Ordinary citizens were not given food cards and travel was often on foot (Dulles, 2003). While the U.S. struggled to gain the full acceptance of the Germans, unlike the Russians, the U.S. never created an atmosphere of disharmony, animosity, and chaos. Initial Soviet actions proved to be disastrous in the future as the East German government, the GDR, never gained legitimacy. Soviet soldier's early action toward

German civilians, including numerous sexual assaults and pillaging, sowed the early seeds of discord between the occupiers and the defeated.

Reports of rape and abuse in the Western zones were disturbing, but paled in comparison to the actions of the Soviets. Women suffered the most at the hands of their new Russian occupiers. Russian commanders typically turned a blind eye to rape and pillaging in Germany.[1] Because of German actions in Russia in 1941 the Russians now found rape the perfect vengeance against these "racially superior German women" and an ideal way to humiliate German males (MacDonogh, 2007). Rape was condoned throughout the entire Soviet Army. Its top military and political figures sanctioned rape. Stalin told Yugoslav leader Milovan Djilas that it was necessary to understand that " if a soldier who has crossed thousands of kilometers through blood and fire and death has fun with a woman or takes some trifle" so be it (MacDonogh, 2007, p. 26). There was no one left to protect the German women. Most of the men in Germany were forced into military service and were either killed or in POW camps, and if any that remained tried to protect the women Russian soldiers would shoot them immediately (MacDonogh, 2007).

To German women, American men were attractive because few had suffered the deprivations of war the way the Russians had and American men were not crippled, but usually taller and more athletic (MacDonogh, 2007). German female attraction towards American GIs stemmed from a dependence on the GI for food and favors in return for companionship and sex, but also from the lack of German men (Goedde, 1999). The lack

[1] In Vienna, it is estimated that 87,000 women were raped with a slightly higher number in Berlin with the onset of Soviet troop arrivals (Judt, 2005). Between 1945-1947 approximately 2 million women were raped by Russian soldiers (Gaddis, 2005a). These numbers are probably lower than the actual number of rapes because they account for reports of women in the cities, not the outlying towns and only account for reported incidents of rape (Judt, 2005). Neither age nor social status mattered to the Russians, with reports that women as young as twelve and as old as eighty were raped, and the higher the social status the worse off a German was because the Russians abhorred the German's wealth.

of German men removed one of the biggest threats in the minds of American GIs, the German male as a fanatical Nazi seeking revenge. With the devastation of an entire male generation, German women came to depend on American servicemen. In return, American views of Germans changed. U.S. servicemen did not hold the German women responsible for the atrocities perpetrated across Europe (Goedde, 1999). The rare German youth did resent the presence and dominance of American GIs with German women, with the occasional fight between a German male who felt emasculated and an American GI (Goedde, 1999 and MacDonogh, 2007). The anger of many Germans towards Americans subsided with the reminder that in the Russian zone they would be shot, they were worse fed in the British and faced corruption in the French zone (MacDonogh, 2007).

American treatment of German women had a ripple effect in U.S. policy. The approximately 14,000 GI brides and 94,000 occupation children signaled an end to the U.S. no-fraternization policy (MacDonogh, 2007). U.S. action in Germany, while resented by some sects in Germany, provided many Germans with a better standard of living than the constant threat of rape and pillage present in the Russian zone. How American GIs treated women compared to their Russian counterparts helped forge the two different paths the U.S. and Soviets would take in the Cold War in Germany. The U.S. continued its role as protector and caretaker, while the Soviets became the face of brutalization and repression. The U.S. tried to make the Allied Control Council a legitimate government for all of Germany, but the Soviets merely kept the Council alive to exploit East Germany to bolster the Russian economy while simultaneously turning East Germany into a police state (Clay, 1962). The actions of the Soviets alienated the German population and delegitimized the actions of the Soviets in Germany. The Soviet

installed regime in East Germany that was to become the GDR lacked the legitimacy the Western created FRG gained immediately (Gaddis, 2005a). The West realized that if the Germans remained downtrodden and impoverished, Germany may become a communist state. America set about reconstructing Germany, which began with the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan.

The state of the German economy was still relatively weak in 1946-47, and hunger still loomed. A small effort was being made by American charitable organizations in 1946 to feed the starving German population. The previous American perspective on Germany prevented American relief agencies from sending food stuffs and CARE packages to German citizens. But, General Luscious Clay, military governor of Germany, realized the problem of trying to "develop democracy on a starvation diet" (Goedde, 1999, pp. 18). The warming of U.S.-German relations saw an increase in CARE (Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere) packages and food stuffs arriving in Germany, but a larger policy was needed to rebuild Germany. A new American policy outlined in 1947 by President Harry Truman officially shifted how Germany was treated. The run up to the Truman Doctrine began in 1946 with George Kennan's 'Long Telegram'.

George Kennan was the *charge d'affaires* at the U.S. embassy in Moscow in 1946 when he received a request to analyze a recent speech given by Stalin at the Bolshoi Theatre. In his speech, Stalin announced the Soviets would return to their pre-war emphasis on industrialization, war-preparedness, and the inevitability of conflict between capitalism and Communism; he explicitly told the West the Soviets would only deal with the West when it suited them (Judt, 2005). Resulting from Stalin's speech was an eight

thousand word telegram from Kennan to the Truman administration. The message explained Soviet behavior in terms of Russian nationalism and security fears, but Kennan also added a section on Soviet ideology. According to Kennan, “international Marxism, with its honeyed promises to a desperate and war-torn outside world” made Russian nationalism “more dangerous and insidious than ever before” (Bostdorff, 2008, p. 20). He explained that the Soviets were going to strengthen their military and industrial capacities to expand their global influence by supporting or establishing communist regimes around the globe (Bostdorff, 2008). Kennan maintained that there was nothing the West had done to incite the Soviets. Instead the Soviet ideology stemmed from the Stalinist regime. The Soviets’ regime had to treat the outside world as hostile because there was really no other reason for the Soviets to have a dictatorship. Without that dictatorship, the regime did not know how to rule and demand the cruelties and sacrifices that would be required (Gaddis, 2005a). Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram’ was one of the first instances of the insertion of ideology into the oncoming Cold War conflict.

Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram’ informed the Truman administration of the problem, but did not offer any concrete solutions. The answer to the problem was to come from George Marshall, Kennan and others inside the Truman administration. Clark Clifford, special counsel to Truman, and George Elsey, assistant to Clifford, prepared and delivered a report to Truman in September 1946 that greatly influenced Truman’s policy toward the Soviet Union. The Clifford-Elsey report drew on Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram,’ but unlike Kennan who discussed the Soviet Union’s historical security concerns and its current government’s ideology, Clifford and Elsey disregarded the Russians historical security concerns. Clifford and Elsey explained Soviet behavior on the fundamental

tenets of communist philosophy and described how communism and capitalism cannot coexist and that there was going to be an upcoming struggle between the two (Bostdorff, 2005). What Clifford, Elsey and to a certain extent Kennan missed about Stalin's February 1946 speech and Soviet action over the remainder of the year was that there was nothing really new to Soviet policy (Judt, 2005).

Stalin's rhetorical motivations reflected a return to the Bolshevik "hard" line before 1921 and between 1927 and the onset of the Popular Fronts (Judt, 2005). The Russians had a long standing fear of surprise attacks coming from the west. Hitler and Napoleon had both brought massive destruction and death using surprise attacks from the West. Stalin, like all dictators, feared internal and external threats to his power, since his regime was based on a minority coup that ruthlessly imposed a dictatorship. Stalin and the Russians would continue to perpetuate the fear that Germany remained the main threat to Russian security (Judt, 2005). The Truman administration missed these basic realities as well as the reduction of the Red Army from 11,365,000 to 2,874,000 soldiers in 1946. Stalin was risk averse, and believed that Western protest over Soviet action in the East was a mere formality for Western acceptance of Soviet intentions (Judt, 2005). Stalin planned on taking advantage of his assets in the upcoming cooling of relations with the West, but more focused plans were unclear. As Norman Naimark, historian of Soviet occupation of post-war Eastern Germany, concludes, "The Soviets were driven by concrete events in the zone, rather than preconceived plans or ideological imperatives" (Judt, 2005, p. 120). The West read everything the Soviets did in ideological terms, but completely missed the how much the Soviets were realist and pragmatists. Stalin wanted freedom to act in Eastern Europe and security from future attack, but he was not willing

to risk war to gain it. The Truman administration did not understand this and soon slowly ratcheted up tensions.

Initially the U.S. response to the Soviet Union was one of “patience and firmness” according to the Joint Chief of Staff (Gaddis, 2005b, p. 21). This differed from past U.S. strategy with the Soviets since the U.S. no longer felt the need to conceal disagreements with the Soviets. The U.S., in essence, began a policy of containment. The U.S. would draw a line and defend against future Soviet encroachment, strengthen U.S. military capacities, and continue negotiations with the Soviets for the purpose of persuading Moscow to accept U.S. positions (Gaddis, 2005b). This new policy would be the lynchpin of international relations. In Japan, the U.S. resisted any substantial role for Russian occupation of the defeated nation. In Germany, America cut off reparation shipments to Russia and began consolidating their zone with the British and French. The U.S. also offered the Russians a four-power treaty guaranteeing the disarmament of Germany for twenty-five years, a treaty Russia did not accept (Gaddis, 2005b). The new policy of patience and firmness become most manifest in the Truman Doctrine which was announced in March 1947.

A week before Truman went before Congress and annunciated the Truman Doctrine, he delivered a speech in Waco, Texas that presented some major ideas on free enterprise. The principles Truman advanced would guide U.S. support in Greece, Turkey and Western Europe. Truman called for the establishment of the International Trade Organization (ITO) under U.N. auspices to prevent economic warfare. He sought bipartisan support and tried to calm fears about an external governing body interfering in U.S. free trade. Truman also stressed how economics and politics were inextricable

partners with U.S. free trade and enterprise in the world. His speech was well received for its emphasis on bipartisanship, American world leadership and free enterprise (Bostdorff, 2008). Truman's intentions were clear; he was establishing a basis for U.S. economic aid to Greece and Turkey.

President Harry S Truman went before the United States Congress on March 12, 1947, to ask the Congress to send aid to Greece and Turkey, but the ramifications of his speech changed the American-German relationship. After outlining why Congress needed to send aid, Truman turned his attention to the spread of communism around the globe. Truman told Congress "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 able to work out a way of life free from coercion" (Truman, 1947). Truman protested the totalitarian regimes in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria and declared, "that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure" (Truman, 1947). Truman implied communism must be resisted not only in Greece and Turkey, but in all areas across the globe. Communist gains in other countries were legitimate threats to the security of the United States, and needed to be blunted (Edwards, 1989). One of the major areas of contention was Germany, which remained a strategic location in Central Europe, a fulcrum between Eastern and Western Europe. Germany had an enormous resource base and was filled with industrious people. Walter Judd (R-Minn.) pointed out the implications of the Cold War in Germany "that as Germany goes, so will go Europe" (Edwards, 1989, p. 140). Truman resolved that a communist Germany and a communist Europe would be a disaster. With the Truman Doctrine and the political significance of Berlin, American

prestige and loyalty was now tied to the fate of the free city located directly inside the heart of communism.

The speech received a standing ovation from both Democrats and Republicans, but as Dean Acheson recognized “this was a tribute to a brave man rather than unanimous acceptance of his policy” (Edwards, 1989, p. 131). The main criticisms of the policy were the amount of money needed to implement the policy globally, the wisdom of bypassing the U.N., and the bellicose nature of the proposal (Edwards, 1989). Congressional criticism of the address echoed some of the same sentiments that were being debated inside the Truman administration itself. Critics decried Truman’s universalist rhetoric, and especially the more aggressive sections added by Clark and Elsey. Kennan, who now headed the new Policy Planning Staff, privately believed the Truman Doctrine should be forgotten because he believed the U.S. could not defend free people everywhere (Gaddis, 1974). After the speech, administration officials spoke at Congressional hearings to emphasize that future requests for aid would be evaluated on an individual basis, and the likelihood of extending aid would be based on effectiveness. By September 1947, Truman argued that foreign aid dollars should be applied “where they can serve the most effectively to bring production, freedom, and confidence back to the world” (Gaddis, 2005b, p. 58). By 1948, Under-Secretary of State, Robert Lovett, more forcefully addressed the issue of constraints, maintaining that the U.S. could not underwrite the security of the world and had to make sure it did not overextend itself (Gaddis, 2005b).

The Soviets did not take offense to Truman’s grandstanding and speech (Judt, 2005). Stalin saw the speech as a direct response by the U.S. to the British inability to continue aid to Greece and Turkey. There was no fear in the Soviet Union regarding U.S.

intervention in Eastern Europe (Judt, 2005). The fear of war and worry over the warlike nature of the speech was a debate held in Congress, not Moscow. One of the reasons for this may have been the lack of a direct challenge to the Soviet Union. The speech used the word “totalitarian and other words to describe the enemy, Russia, but the words seemed targeted to domestic and international audiences who already knew who this terrifying enemy was. The replacement of communism with “totalitarian” also gave the administration plausible deniability with the Soviets. In addition, this alternative appellation demonstrated that the administration had something positive to offer, not just anti-communism (Bostdorff, 2008 and Gaddis, 2005b). The Truman Doctrine speech had raised the stakes in U.S. foreign policy. The problem looming for the Truman administration was how to contain the Truman Doctrine and keep it from becoming a blanket policy that would turn the U.S. into the world’s peacekeeper.

Initially, the administration applied the Truman Doctrine on a case by case basis successfully. It seemingly had abandoned universalism and employed economic and technological means selectively and asymmetrically in those centers of industrial-military power not controlled by the Soviet Union (Gaddis, 2005b). The administration also distinguished between the different types of communism, Maoism and Titoism, and had hopes these different manifestations would help roll back Soviet style communism. There was also the reassuring recognition that the Soviets were not fit for empire and imperial management (Gaddis, 2005b). As late as early 1950, the administration was stressing the difference between U.S. vital and peripheral interests in hopes of stemming the idea of resisting communism everywhere across the globe. The administration tried through the China White Paper, Acheson’s National Press Club speech, and several other statements

to retain flexibility in its policy (Gaddis, 1974). The onset of the Korean War and some of the administration's other actions caused the containment policy to become universal.

The Truman administration continued to speak in universalistic terms for limited problems because they believed a greater impression would be made on an isolationist Congress and on the Soviets if things were stated in unlimited terms. Unfortunately, after painting a picture of Soviet world domination with puppet regimes all around the world, the administration was having a difficult time explaining why the U.S. should not oppose communism everywhere around the world (Gaddis, 1974). The continued use of universalistic rhetoric, along with the 1948 Berlin Crisis and Mao's victory in 1949 began to change the perceptions of the administration and the public, and communism was increasingly seen as a monolithic enemy (Bostdorff, 2008). The onset of the Korean War, the strengthening of the Sino-Soviet relationship and the Chinese entry into the Korean War all led to the universal implementation of the Truman Doctrine, but there was a successful economic package outlined by Secretary of State George Marshall that had a major impact in Europe and Germany.

The Marshall Plan was conceived to prevent the spread of communism in Western Europe. America now planned to rebuild Western Europe, and make Germany a bulwark against communism. The United States feared that an impoverished Germany and Europe would be more susceptible to Soviet influence. To combat communism in Germany, the U.S. was intent on showing the Germans the benefits of capitalism (Boehling, 1999). On June 5, 1947, Secretary of State George Marshall announced the Marshall Plan at Harvard's commencement ceremony. Marshall outlined the complete breakdown of European economies, and Europe's sluggish recovery for lack of a peace settlement in

Germany or Austria. The danger in letting the sluggish economic growth and output continue was in the demoralizing effects on countries, and the possibility of war and conflict. Marshall argued that the U.S. must rebuild Europe and return it to normal economic health to ensure political stability and lasting peace (Marshall, 1999). The Marshall Plan marked a new beginning for the United States in foreign policy toward Europe.

The Marshall Plan was ingenious as it would help put Europe back on its feet and ease the pain of the many standing in bread queues. Europe's hungry and downtrodden were Marshall's greatest concern since they were the most likely to turn to communism (Stone, 2010). The Marshall Plan was a clean break with past proposals on rebuilding Europe. European countries could choose to accept or decline U.S. aid. If accepted, it was up to the individual country as to how to spend the money. Because the distribution of aid was also spread over a number of years, it was more of a structured strategic recovery program, rather than a disaster recovery fund. The sums of money given to Europe were very large, totaling $13 billion at the end of the Marshall Plan in 1952 (Judt, 2005). The plan also focused on integrating Western European economies, which included the West German zones under Allied Control. Russia and Eastern Europe did not accept the Marshall Plan fearing that U.S. capitalism and democracy would infiltrate and dominate their countries.

No longer mired in isolationism, the Marshall Plan placed the U.S. at the center of world affairs, and the U.S. targeted Germany to be a major beneficiary of its aid. The Marshall Plan strengthened the ties between the U.S. and Europe, which was further strengthened by the creation of NATO in 1949. European integration was another prong

of the Marshall Plan. Integration tied the Western European economies together, and strengthened the bond between the West and Germany (Stern, 2006). The point of the Marshall Plan was to rebuild and integrate Germany, not make Germany a dependent pariah. The Plan sought to preclude the economic and political impetus that led to the rise of Hitler (Judt, 2005). There were many in Europe who blamed the Americans for the sluggish European economy since the U.S. failed to deliver on the German reparations. America wanted to revitalize and integrate Germany into the European economy, but many Europeans feared the worst given Germany's recent past (Stone, 2010). Nevertheless, Germany was the lynchpin in saving the rest of Europe because of its central location and its vast resource and industrial capacity. Without a revitalized Germany, France would lack the coal needed to build new steel mills, Britain could not sustain their zone in Germany unless it recovered and the Lowland countries and Denmark would remain moribund if Germany could not buy their produce (Judt, 2005). Marshall sought to integrate Germany into the European Recovery Act.

In the summer of 1947, Marshall introduced the idea of melding the British and American zones into 'Bizonia,' and fifty-two representatives met in Frankfurt to discuss the west German economy. Reparations were scaled down to permit 10.7 tons of steel to be produced in the western zones. 'Bizonia' was officially included in the European Recovery Program (ERP), the official title of the Marshall Plan, and sixteen participating nations met to submit a project for increased output and exports, for financial stability and cross-border co-operation of all countries participating in the ERP (Stone, 2010). By February 1948, there were 104 deputies of the Marshall Plan working in Germany, and by June there was the 'Bank of German Lands,' which did not include East Germany.

The French had squabbled over the Saarland's coal, but by the summer of 1948, they joined their zone with 'Bizonia' and 'Trizonia' emerged, along with the basis for a new Germany (Stone, 2010). The Marshall Plan was a success in reestablishing German confidence and had the potential to build a new German nation.

The Plan saved Western Europe from what could have been devastating food and fuel shortages that could have given communists the needed boost and votes to come to power. The Europeans also sat down at a table for the first time in many years to discuss and co-ordinate their responses to Marshall's offer in 1947. The biggest boost, however, was to the European psyche. Europe broke with its legacy of chauvinism, depression and authoritarian solutions, and made a coordinated economic policy seem the norm rather than the exception (Judt, 2005). The key here was that Marshall allowed the European governments to spend the money as they saw fit. He signaled that he was not bringing Americanization and U.S. dominance, but rather helping Europe find its own footing.

The long term impact of the Marshall Plan in Germany was the creation of democratic enfranchisement among the Germans. Marshall saw enfranchisement as a path toward a consumer culture, privatization, and democracy (Castillo, 2005). By the early 1950s the world began to marvel at West Germany's economic turnaround, which was attributed to the Marshall Plan and influx of cheap labor from Eastern Germany (Stern, 2006). In the early 1950s, the United States set up the *Amerika zu Hause* (America at Home) in Berlin, an elaborate display intended to show Germans the typical American lifestyle. *Amerika zu Hause* was part of the Marshall Plan, and was described as a "gratifying demonstration of what can be accomplished in selling the American democratic way of life from the Berlin showcase" (Castillo, 2005, p. 270). The display's

opening in 1950 drew 15 percent of West Germany's population, and helped solidify West German-American relations. Drawing on the German legacy of Bauhaus design, the *Amerika zu Hause* display won rave reviews by Germans, and helped "draw the Weimar Republic and the [postwar] Federal Republic into the same elective lineage" (Castillo, 2005, 272). *Amerika zu Hause* was not merely a way of demonstrating model U.S. housing, but about creating a new German citizen rooted in democratic principles.

Marshall Plan funds were also used to subsidize the construction of single-family homes to promote the concept of private property. The concept of owning a home or living space had already helped shape the 1949 housing construction program of the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) of Konrad Adenauer (Boehling, 1999). The release of funds from the Marshall Plan to subsidize the construction of homes in Germany also favorably influenced the German culture and economy towards capitalism (Boehling, 1999). By connecting the Weimar Republic and the FRG, America attempted to persuade the Germans that Germany was always democratic at heart. Other institutions were also used to connect postwar Germany with its democratic past.

The *Amerika zu Hause* exhibits and the introduction of American sponsored libraries and information centers were successful in the U.S. goal of spreading the democratic ideal, but they did have their critics. Some Germans saw the American reeducation plan as arrogant and the long parade of guest visitors from America speaking to the Germans about democracy caused some Germans to question whether the "Americans were suffering from an obsession endlessly to talk about that verbal fetish, democracy" (Snow, 2003, 203). Many Germans believed denazification stabilized the country after Hitler, but the continued use of denazification programs and unrelenting

attempts to force a U.S. style democracy made the Germans feel marginalized. Germans believed that American style democracy was not necessarily the best option for a new Germany, only a German form of democracy would work best in a new Germany (Snow, 2003). U.S. reeducation and reorientation programs in Germany were successful in helping the Germans create a new democratic identity and the roots of a newly revitalized German republic were taking hold, but the new identity could never be an exact replication of an American style democracy. The Germans remained strong allies throughout the entire Cold War, but beginning in the late 1950s and coming to full fruition in the late 1960's was the new German democratic ideal that was independent of U.S. control.

In August 1947, as part of the European Recovery Act, America enacted JCS 1779, which formally acknowledged the American goals of economic unification of the Western zones of Germany, and German self-government (Judt, 2005). America's shift in policy toward Germany reflected Truman's rhetoric, Marshall's warnings about the threat of communism in Europe and U.S. support of European integration.

By 1948, the German economy was picking up steam, and currency reform was needed to make Germany stronger. The Western Allies decided upon currency reform for their zones and West Berlin, but the Soviets insisted they were only ones who could reform the currency in Berlin. On 16 June the Russians walked out of the Kommandatura, the joint managing body between the Allies on German affairs, in protest over the soon to be introduced Deutshemark (Stone, 2010). When the Allies introduced the Deutshemark on June 25, 1948, the Soviets stopped all remaining railway traffic to Berlin, which cut Berlin off from the outside world (Simpson, 1957). The Russians cut the railway on June

23 and by July 10 the canals were closed. The Allies were in a difficult position because there were no treaty arrangements covering land access by the Allies, but there were air rights (Stone, 2010). The Soviets were hoping to make West Berlin dependent on East Berlin supplies and slowly push Western personnel out. There was discord in the U.S. and West about the position of Berlin, which was militarily untenable. In an effort to avoid loss of American prestige, General Omar Bradley suggested withdrawing from Berlin before the Soviets put the squeeze on (May, 1998). General Clay and others knew the importance of Berlin could not be understated. As Soviet Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov stated, “What happens in Berlin, happens to Germany. What happens to Germany, happens to Europe” (Roberts, 2008, p. 26). A military option in Berlin was not possible because the Allies were heavily outnumbered. General Clay decided upon an airlift. Clay reasoned, “Our remaining in Berlin is essential to our prestige in Germany and Europe” (Roberts, 2008, p. 26). By abandoning Berlin, the symbolic beacon of Western superiority in the Soviet zone, a negative precedent would be set and German fears of being overrun by the Red Army would be realized.

June 26, 1947, marked the first day of the Airlift. American and British planes took off for West Berlin with supplies and landed safely at Tempelhof Airport in the American zone. Soon 1,500 flights a day delivered 4,500 tons of food, fuel, and supplies daily to West Berliners. During the blockade, Ernst Reuter, lord mayor of West Berlin, rallied Berliners to slightly lower their standard of living by decreasing their consumption of food and electricity to preserve their democratic freedom. Reuter became the first celebrated democrat of the new democratic Germany (Stern, 2006). Reuter symbolized to the world that democracy could succeed in Germany after the Third Reich. The Western

powers continued to pour in supplies to Berlin and with every plane that landed the West increased its prestige and prominence. The feeling throughout the West was summarized by British foreign secretary, Ernest Bevin, who stated, “We cannot abandon those stouthearted Berlin democrats who are refusing to bow to Soviet pressure” (May, 1998, p. 150). The Western Allies rallied to the defense of Western Berlin. The allies’ efforts made West Berlin seem no different than those that would be taken to defend New York or Los Angeles (May, 1998). After 11 months of flights the Soviets called off the blockade (Roberts, 2008). The city that was once the capital of Hitler’s Reich had become a symbol of democracy in Germany. The Berlin Airlift showed the resolve of a democratic Germany, and upheld American prestige.

General Clay concluded that the Soviet Blockade stemmed from their desire to weaken the U.S. position in Europe (Clay, 1962). There was serious consideration in Washington of a strategic Allied withdrawal from Berlin which some considered militarily indefensible, a political liability and a possible source of tension in the future (Gelb, 1986). Stalin viewed a rapid demobilization of U.S. forces, as a gateway for the Soviets to the Atlantic Ocean. As a result, the Soviets made the case that Berlin was not worth fighting over (Clay, 1962). Clay, however, believed that Moscow was not prepared to go to war over Berlin and when challenged the Soviets would back off (Gelb, 1986). The Berliners, for their part, never asked the West to stand down. Berlin found a new sense of identity and purpose in surviving these hardships. In sharing the hardships and struggle to preserve freedom, Berliners and Germans found common cause protecting democracy against the communists (Gelb, 1986). Evidence supports Clay’s claim that Stalin was not willing to risk war over Berlin in 1948-49. When the Blockade did not

achieve the aims Stalin set forth, he opted to end it. He changed his diplomatic agenda in 1949 and attempted to delay the creation of a new West German state (Judt, 2005). Ultimately, the Blockade had two unintended consequences—the creation of a new German state and the unification and revitalization of democracy in Western Europe.

Soviet refusal to deal with the "German" issue by uniting their zone with the three Western Allied zones gave the Western Allies little choice but to forge ahead with their own plans of creating a new German state. On September 21, 1949, the Western Allies created the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). Western German law was based on a constitution that guaranteed the rights of individuals, protection for the states and an adequate central authority. The final document shied away from the term constitution because its connotation was more permanent than the title "Grundgesetz" or "Basic Law" (Wells, 1949). The Western Occupation Allies did reserve the right to intervene in the FRG "if they considered that to do so was essential to security or to preserve democratic government or in pursuance of the international obligations of their governments" (Simpson, 1957, p. 90). Under the new German government, the question of Berlin still remained undecided. Berlin was to be considered part of Western Germany, but Berlin did not have voting membership in the legislative bodies of the FRG nor was it governed by the FRG. Berlin could send a small number of representatives to attend the legislative meetings in Bonn (Simpson, 1957). Certain rights derived from the surrender of Germany in 1945 remained reserved to the Three Powers. Included in these rights under Article 2 were the rights of Berlin. Under Article 6, the Three Powers were to consult the FRG in regard to the exercise of their rights relating to Berlin, and the FRG was charged to

cooperate with the Three Powers on the discharge of their responsibilities relating to Berlin (Simpson, 1957).

Allied security forces remained in the new Republic and Berlin, and continued their duties, but were now garrisoned for the protection and defense of the free world. The FRG's acceptance into NATO strengthened West Germany's ties with Western Europe, but this was seen as a threat by the Soviets. The creation of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in the Soviet Eastern sector was Russia's response to the FRG. The GDR was not recognized by Western powers as a legitimate state since it was not democratically elected (Simpson, 1957). The Western Powers delineated and published the respective rights and responsibilities of the Occupying Powers and the German government. There was never such a delineation of powers in Eastern Germany where the powers delineated to the Russians and GDR had always been left undefined (Simpson, 1957). The creation of the FRG and the tumultuous Berlin Blockade had a unifying effect on Western Europe.

The Berlin Blockade caused great panic in Europe. The fear that the Americans would leave haunted the FRG. This fear continued through John F. Kennedy's entire presidency. In May 1948, 700 delegates met in a 'Congress of Europe.' The British were even willing to support a Western Union complete with a Council of Europe and a Court of Human Rights (Stone, 2010). There was one drawback; the French had yet to get over their fears of Germany. The chaotic events of the Berlin Blockade, the Prague coup, the agreement and creation of a West German state and plans for NATO caused France to reconsider.

Robert Schuman, a French politician, came up with the ‘Schuman Plan’ at the insistence of Dean Acheson and French politician, Jean Monnet. The ‘Schuman Plan’ allowed France to take the lead in integrating the new West German state into the European economy by placing the entire French-German steel and coal production under a joint High Authority which opened the way for more members of Europe to join the community. The ‘Schuman Plan’ became the blueprint of European integration, including the new West German state, which proved to be an economic powerhouse moving forward. The German government led by Konrad Adenauer quickly signed the ‘Schuman Plan’ followed by Italy, Benelux and the Dutch. The British did not accept Schuman’s invitation, but in April 1951 a Paris Treaty was signed founding the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). The ECSC was a precursor to the future European Economic Community (EEC) and eventually the European Union (Judt, 2005). The Blockade resulted in the integration of the three Western Allied zones which then merged into a new German government aligned with Western Europe. This was directly the opposite of what Stalin wanted to happen in Germany.

Stalin wanted a united Germany under communist rule, but Germany was closer to uniting under democracy than communism. Stalin’s European policy and own errors are to blame for his loss of Germany. Historian Tony Judt (2005) argues while Stalin did not fear the Truman Doctrine because he wanted nothing to do with Turkey or Greece, it was his own miscalculations that doomed the Soviet cause in Germany. His mistakes began with his acceptance of rape and abuse of the German population in the Soviet zone after the war. The Soviets never gained the legitimacy or support the Western Allies did, even though the Germans were not particularly fond of the Western Allies. The West did

not abuse the Germans as badly as the Russians. Stalin preferred to wait, let Germany rot, and let it fall into his lap (Judt, 2005). Moscow expected the Western garrison in Berlin to pack up and go home leaving Berlin for the Soviets. Stalin thought the West would abandon Berlin after the typical disengagement of American forces after war (Gelb, 1986). Marshall knew that Stalin had Germany at his feet, and there was little militarily the U.S. or Europe could do about it. All Stalin had to do was accept the Marshall Plan and convince the majority of Germans of Moscow's good faith in seeking a neutral and independent Germany, and he could have controlled the future of German reconstruction (Judt, 2005). The majority of Germans preferred a united Germany over a divided Germany, as the FRG's main goal over the remainder of the Cold War was to reunify Germany, but Stalin had misread America's position to stay in Europe. Truman and Clay stood tough on Berlin, and despite the strong pressure from the Soviet Union, Berlin remained and a new Germany emerged. Truman, Clay and the Americans appeared as saviors that helped found a new era in Germany (Mathiopoulos, 1985). West Germany was experiencing a significant upward trend in economic and cultural sectors heading into the 1950s.

1951-58: Western Growth, Eastern Unrest

The early 1950s were a time of peaceful transition in U.S.-German relations, but Germany's Eastern sector under Soviet control faced a period of upheaval. Western Germany was working on re-establishing a sense of normalcy after the war within the new democratic confines of the FRG. The U.S. was turning its attention to Korea and the space race with Russia. With the creation of the FRG, the U.S. saw West Germany as a protégé which they were akin to psychologically. West Germany was being integrated

into the American system. Whatever harmed or threatened Germany injured the U.S. (Mathiopoulos, 1985). The Eisenhower administration was a great boon to the FRG. Germany became a significant and important trading partner with the U.S., and the personal relationship between John Foster Dulles, Eisenhower's Secretary of State, and German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer was strong. Adenauer accepted advice from Dulles on almost all issues, and Adenauer exerted influence over U.S. foreign policy (Mathiopoulos, 1985). Created in 1953, the Eisenhower administration outlined how the U.S. perceived its German ally in NSC 160/1. The outline included: a firm association with a united Germany or at least the FRG through an integrated European community, prevention of Soviet domination of all of Germany and a reduction in Soviet influence in West Germany, restoration of a united Germany that could prevent both communism and neo-Nazism, a healthy German economy independent of U.S. assistance, and maintenance of the Western position in Berlin (Mayer, 1996). The Eisenhower era was a "honeymoon" era in U.S.-German relations that was not present before or since (Mathiopoulos, 1985). While the Eisenhower years were a peaceful interlude after the chaos of the war and the tense Kennedy years, a significant event occurred in East Germany in 1953 that would have a lasting impact over the Cold War.

After the Berlin Blockade had ended, many of the communication channels between East and West Berlin were slow to reopen, but the transportation between the two parts of the city was quick to reopen. In a city of 3.3 million, there was sure to be a lot of interaction between the sectors and many lived in one sector, but worked in another. Berlin was a meeting place for not only people living in different sectors of Berlin, but also people from East and West Germany. While the daily interactions were

maintained, the political separation and drift between the democratic West and the communist east was rapidly increasing (Hofmann, 1969). Having two different economic and political ideologies ruling one city was a "crazy system, one East Berliner recalled. All you had to do [was] board a subway or [a] surface train…and you were in another world…[Y]ou could go from socialism to capitalism in two minutes" (Gaddis, 2005a, p. 113). The differences between the two systems boiled over in June 1953.

In early June, factory workers in Pilsen, Czechoslovakia stormed city hall and occupied the Skoda armaments factories burning pictures of Stalin and hoisting an American flag. A few weeks later German workers in the GDR began to get restless. Construction workers working on a high rise residential complex decided that the socialist government overworked them at a strenuous pace. A vote was taken and the workers decided to deliver a letter personally to GDR leader Otto Grotewohl. As the workers walked the streets of Berlin, they were quickly joined by other construction and factory workers till 10,000 workers ended up outside the GDR's Council of Ministers. None of the leaders of the GDR came out to meet the workers, and a junior minister who came out to try to placate the workers was booed vociferously and a general strike was called for the next day (Taylor, 2008). Approximately 400,000 workers went on strike the next day. Stalin, before his death, had encouraged the GDR leadership to accept reforms and compromises to stop the hemorrhaging of skilled workers from the GDR to FRG, but his advice had been ignored and now the workers were on strike (Judt, 2005). The authorities were quick to react, closing down plazas and alerting surrounding police stations that there might be trouble, but the protests continued as Germans coming across from the American zone joined in the protests calling for free elections, unity, law and

freedom, which were the foundational principles of the FRG (Taylor, 2008). Around this time, the first Soviet vehicles could be seen in East Berlin, but the protests only intensified with chants of “We want freedom, we want bread, we will beat all Russians dead!” (Taylor, 2008, p. 85). A full scale uprising was in the offing and the Germans were now calling for reunification of the country under the FRG.

The Soviets, who were informed of the potential dangerous situation the day before, decided to move Russian T-34 tanks into East Berlin. After a large crowd veered off toward Potsdamer Platz, the Russians made their move. Supervised by Stalin’s executioner, Lavrenty Beria, the Russians opened fire on the East Berlin protestors. Demonstrators fought back with stones, bricks and chunks of metal, but they were no match for the Russian firepower. Their guns swept the border area near West Berlin to contain potential escapees. A state of emergency was declared at 1:00 p.m. and once the tanks had broken the protesters’ momentum they moved quickly to seal the border. East German Kasernierte Volkspolizei (KVP) units moved in to round up the protesters, often brutally beating them and shooting them in the back as they tried to escape (Taylor, 2008). Nearly three hundred were killed, many thousands were arrested, of which 1,400 were given long prison sentences, and two hundred ring leaders were shot (Judt, 2005).

The 1953 uprisings gave communism a bad name across Germany and created irreparable harm between East Berliners and their government. The flow of refugees and skilled workers from East to West did not stop, but only intensified. Over 400,000 East Germans fled the GDR in the traumatic twelve months of 1953 with the number dropping to 200,000 in 1954 before rising again over the next three years (Taylor, 2008). The Soviets briefly thought about resigning in East Germany so a united neutral Germany

could be created, but that idea was quickly scrapped as the communists feared it would show weakness (Gelb, 1987). The repression exhibited by the Soviet regime in East Germany left the State Department with the conclusion that the Soviets were in control of its 'zone' for the foreseeable future. Non-intervention would be the official U.S. policy concerning matters in East Germany (Judt, 2005). The new U.S. policy was also unofficially applied to Eastern Europe, but was unbeknownst to Hungarian rebels in 1956.

Stalin's death in 1953 left a power vacuum in the Soviet Union. In 1956, Nikita Khrushchev became the leader of the Soviet Union. A speech by Khrushchev in February 1956 set off a new wave of rebellion in Eastern Europe. Khrushchev's speech denounced the crimes and monstrosities of the Stalinist era drawing a line between acceptable and unacceptable forms of communism (Judt, 2005). The release of the secret speech to the State Department and the subsequent leaking of the speech globally brought brief rejoicing across Europe (Stern, 2006). The speech was not released in the Soviet Union until 1988, but both the U.S. State Department and western communists quickly secured copies, which fueled new hopes for a more open Soviet Union. In denouncing Stalin and dismantling some of Stalin's infrastructure within the Soviet zone, Khrushchev overlooked Stalin's tight control over communist machinery (Judt, 2005). Without the fear of Stalin's iron fist, Poland and Hungary started envisioning a more open and democratic society.

In October 1956, Hungarian students began organizing and calling for reforms in the Hungarian government. The students drew up a 'Sixteen Point Manifesto' calling for industrial and agrarian reforms, greater democracy and rights to free speech and an end to

the petty regulations and restrictions under Communist rule. Imre Nagy was installed as Prime Minister and he acted quickly to institute democratic reforms. Nagy ended one party rule, asked the United Nations to recognize Hungarian neutrality and was moving towards withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact (Judt, 2005). When Nagy initially took power, the Soviets were confident that he could restore order, averting a crisis and the need for Soviet intervention. The Soviet approach to Poland was similar. Wladislaw Gomulka oversaw minor reforms in Polish society, but was a trusted Party man for the Soviets. Nagy's quick action, basing his authority on the will of the people, soon gave the Soviet's pause regarding Nagy's Party loyalty (Judt, 2005). Khrushchev was already losing an ally in Egypt, which was dealing with the Suez Crisis at the same time of the Hungarian revolt. When it came to choosing between Hungary and Egypt as allies, Khrushchev knew he needed to maintain strength in Europe. He chose to act in Hungary quickly and harshly, and he let Egypt drift away. Khrushchev's rationale for clamping down in Hungary was clear:

> If we depart from Hungary, it will give a great boost to the Americans, English and French—the imperialists. They will perceive it as weakness on our part and will go onto the offensive. We would then be exposing the weakness of our positions. Our party will not accept it, if we do this. To Egypt they will add Hungary. We have no other choice (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 130).

Khrushchev considered Egypt a lost cause for the Soviets and that Egypt would move into a neutral unaligned position in the Cold War. Hungary, on the other hand, was looking to move towards an alliance or pro-western alignment.

A confident Khrushchev moved quickly to put down the rebellion. Soviet T-34 tanks rolled into Budapest on November 4 and by November 7, 1956, Budapest was back under firm Soviet control. In the fighting and aftermath of the rebellion, approximately

2,700 died, 341 were tried and executed in the following years, and some 22,000 were sentenced to prison. Over 200,000 people fled Hungary or approximately 2% of the population (Judt, 2005). The downfall of Imre Nagy and the Hungarian rebellion put an end to the post-Stalinist liberalizing efforts (Taylor, 2008). Within the Soviet Union, the Hungarian revolts had a major impact. The revolts in Hungary and Poland were attributed to governments that had failed to provide an adequate standard of living. Khrushchev feared the same thing could happen in Russia if its economy failed. He ordered an immediate reexamination of the Soviet's five year plan, which called for more residential housing and more material goods for Soviet citizens (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). The Committee on Soviet Economic Policy informed Khrushchev that the Soviet Union economy was facing serious challenges, most especially with demands of simultaneously producing an excessively high industrial expansion and targets on agriculture that were unrealistic (Hatzivassiliou, 2009). Khrushchev also hardened his stance towards political dissent at home. Instructions were sent to the KGB to root out dissenters. Soon afterwards, soldiers and citizens who were believed to sympathize with the Hungarian reformers were sent to prison (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). The crushing of the Hungarian dissent demonstrated the ruthlessness of the Soviets and the impotence of the West in Eastern Europe (Stern, 2006). Western governments, especially in the U.S., were quick to learn the lessons from 1956.

Until the aftermath of the Hungarian revolts, the U.S. recognized the "impossibility of detaching Eastern European satellites from Soviet control, continued to encourage the 'spirit of resistance' there" (Judt, 2005, p. 318). Covert actions by the U.S. government were taken in Soviet controlled countries fostering conditions which would

make liberation of these satellite countries more favorable in the future. One of these liberalizing actions was Radio Free Europe, an American radio broadcast. Radio Free Europe broadcasts encouraged Hungarians to take up arms and advanced promises of imminent foreign support. Rebels were bitter and disillusioned with the lack of Western and American support (Judt, 2005). In response to the Hungarian and Polish rebellions, the U.S. drew up NSC5608/1 which stated, "the United States is not prepared to resort to war to eliminate Soviet domination of the satellites'" (Judt, 2005, p. 319). U.S. official policy was non-intervention in Eastern Europe.

After the tumultuous year of 1956, 1957 saw the dawn of a new European age led by France and Germany. With the Treaty of Rome, Adenauer along with Robert Schuman of France and Italy's Alcide De Gasperi created a common market between the FRG, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. The Treaty of Rome marked the beginning of new 'European' identity along with the economic integration that the U.S. had been stressing since the Marshall Plan. The older generation of Europeans had learned their lesson from the two World Wars and the younger generation was attracted to a "super-national identity" (Stern, 2006). The Hungarian revolutions also brought hope to the Germans. Shepard Stone, director of international affairs at the Ford Foundation, asked Fritz Stern to help write a proposition paper on German unification. Stern's draft recognized the danger and instability of Germany's division. He did not believe a united neutral Germany would be a stable minor nation because Germany was the third most powerful economy in 1957-58. A Germany politically adrift brought fears of giving into Soviet demands. Stern concluded, "the Federal Republic must remain integrated in the West, but that an Allied study of huge inner-German issues attendant on

reunification should be undertaken" (2006, p. 219). The idea of Germany reuniting overnight was foolish, but the West could "take heart…from the unpredictable power of man's spontaneous will to freedom, which has brought glory and misery to Hungary" (Stern, 2006, p. 219). The Hungarian Revolts brought a change in official U.S. policy towards Eastern Europe, but also brought hope in humankind's will to freedom.

The establishment of a communist GDR and a capitalist FRG juxtaposed the competing Cold War ideologies in the two separate German countries, while simultaneously serving the goals of the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. But, neither the Americans nor Soviets had the German's best interests at heart. The Germans wanted unification of their divided country. America and Russia used their respective power and influence to make a divided Germany a propaganda tool for the Cold War. The U.S. did legitimately help the West Germans, but West Germany was always part of the larger Cold War strategy for America. The goal of the Americans throughout the 1950s was to reunify the two Germanys into one unified state, but the Soviets were not open to a democratically unified Germany with ties to the West (Ross, 2004). America was solidifying the FRG's place in the Western Alliance, and the GDR and Soviets were clearly being outmaneuvered in Europe. The Eisenhower administration gave full sovereignty to the FRG, pledged American support to the FRG and Berlin's defense, and worked toward the peaceful unification of Germany (Lang, 1995). The FRG pledged rearmament within the NATO structure, joined the European Community, and worked toward the peaceful unification with the Soviet zone (Lang, 1995). The perceived political threat to Russia was severe and was causing rumblings of discontent in Moscow, but a more pressing issue was heating up in the GDR.

In Berlin, the lure of earning Western wages was tempting East Germans to cross into West Berlin to earn a living to enjoy the privileges of a capitalist lifestyle, while living cheaply in East Berlin. The GDR attempted to prevent East Berliners from crossing the border, but all attempts proved to be fruitless. Police sanctions and naming-and-shaming East Berliners did not stop the flow of workers and refugees heading west. The shortage of consumer goods in the GDR kept the flow of border crossers coming and was proving to be a propaganda coup for the West Germans and Americans (Ross, 2004). To regain lost momentum in Germany and at the behest of Walter Ulbricht, Khrushchev issued an ultimatum in 1958 threatening to sign a separate peace treaty with the GDR.

1958-61: Rising Tensions: An Ultimatum at the Heart of Europe

Khrushchev saw Berlin as the bone in the U.S.S.R.'s throat and "the testicles of the West. Every time I want to make the West scream, I squeeze on Berlin" (Taylor, 2008, p. 103). Tensions over Berlin and West Germany heated up in 1958, when Khrushchev gave an ultimatum to the Eisenhower administration: that the West must "liquidate the occupation regime' and turn West Berlin into a demilitarized "free city." If the West did not agree to this, Khrushchev would unilaterally sign a treaty with the GDR, and turn over the transit access to East Berlin to the East Germans, ending Allied rights in Berlin" (Taylor, 2008, p. 104). The war-ending peace treaty would require U.S., British and French soldiers to gain permission from Ulbricht to enter any part of Berlin via air or road (Kempe, 2011). According to Kempe (2011) Khrushchev's motives for issuing the ultimatum are many and range from political fears of German revanchism to pressure from GDR leader Walter Ulbricht, but three of the main reasons Khrushchev issued the ultimatum were: to gain the attention of President Eisenhower, who had been

disregarding his demands for negotiation on Berlin, Khrushchev's growing power at home after putting down a so-called anti-party coup in 1957, and the bleeding refugee problem in East Berlin (Kempe, 2011).

Soviet fears of foreign invasion from the West are deeply ingrained throughout Russian history and the traumatic events of World War II only increased Russian fears of German attack, even from a divided Germany. Khrushchev had fears, and as demonstrated by recent historical research, West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer had nuclear aspirations for the FRG. Adenauer desired nuclear weapons solely for the defense of the FRG, which was a result of fears created by Soviet actions. Eisenhower's nuclear sharing policy to European nations scared Khrushchev. Eisenhower believed that the British, French and Germans should have nuclear weapons and that America should help them acquire these weapons (Trachtenberg, 2001). However, Khrushchev was intent on not losing the propaganda battle with the West. Berlin was the GDR's capital and the fact that part of the city was noncommunist and under Western control was symbolically troubling (May, 1998). On a practical economic level, the GDR pronounced in 1958 that its task was to overtake West Germany in the consumption of basic goods by the end of 1961.

About a year after the pronouncement and Khrushchev ultimatum, problems arose in guaranteeing an adequate supply of consumer goods (Ross, 2004). The failure of the GDR to achieve a standard of living equal to the FRG was most apparent in Berlin where the opulence of the West was on display and the failures of the East became glaringly apparent (May, 1998). Skilled workers and anybody who wanted to escape the toils of socialism had an easy escape route simply by crossing into West Berlin from East Berlin.

The decision by the Soviets to spark a confrontation over Berlin is not illogical based on the fears the Soviets had about a strong, independent and nuclear Germany; their fears were bound to increase if Germany unified under a Western banner (Ross, 2004). The combination of all these factors led to Khrushchev's 1958 ultimatum and his insistence on resolving the Berlin issue within six months.

Eisenhower did not act on Khrushchev's ultimatum. Khrushchev toured the U.S. in 1959 calling for the urgent need to change the status of Berlin and proposing it as a topic to be discussed further at the Paris Summit in May 1960. The downing of a U2 reconnaissance plane over the Soviet Union caused Khrushchev to walk out on the summit in protest. He then insisted that after the 1960 presidential election the new president-elect needed to come to terms over Berlin (May 1998). Khrushchev would not admit it publically, but he was reluctant to hand over power to the GDR for fear the GDR would start a war the Soviets did not want. He still planned on using Berlin and superior Soviet military numbers in Europe to try to work out an agreement favorable to the Soviets. The next major developments would unfold in the Kennedy administration.

John F. Kennedy: A Presidential Worldview

John F. Kennedy grew up in a privileged household, with his father being the ambassador to England in the years leading up to World War II. Kennedy attended Harvard University, and graduated in 1940. In the same year he published *Why England Slept,* which analyzed the reasons England did not mobilize for the war earlier. In *Why England Slept,* Kennedy explored the short term flaws of democracy, though he was a proponent of democracy's long-term desirability (Meagher, 1997). In the short term, democracy's defects involved the unwillingness of the public to sacrifice for the long

term benefits of democracy. Without sacrifice, a democratic society would grow corrupt and morally weak. For Kennedy, democracy required an elite leader capable of manufacturing fear during a crisis situation to unify society while simultaneously focusing on the long-term health of the democracy (Meagher, 1997). Kennedy's study of Britain showed that public opinion coalesced around change as a negative, which caused Britain's slow response to Hitler. British Prime Minister, Stanley Baldwin, failed to motivate Britain to act; instead he inspired hopelessness among the people (Meagher, 1997). Kennedy admired Winston Churchill because Churchill stood against the "inertia of human thought" that captivated other British leaders. Political courage for Kennedy was nothing if not a leader standing on principle. Kennedy's democratic theory defined a leader as successful and politically courageous if "he supported the unpopular cause, and tried to change public opinion via the mechanism of fear" (Meagher, 1997, p. 476). Kennedy had not planned on entering politics, but in 1945 he decided to run for Congress.

Kennedy's first foray into politics was to run for an open House of Representative seat in the Eleventh Congressional District in Massachusetts. Kennedy began planning his campaign over a year before his election in 1945. The election for the House set the Kennedy blueprint that he would employ for both his senatorial and presidential campaigns: Always campaign much earlier than your opponents and outwork them, meet as many people face to face as possible, use house parties and receptions to meet voters and gain volunteers, follow up with everyone possible who attends your political events, and present an image to the public that is comfortable for you (Silvestri, 2000). Kennedy's hard work paid off, he took the Congressional seat with nearly a two to one

victory ratio. His career in the House was rather undistinguished; his only real accomplishment was his record of absenteeism due to his indifference, health issues or travels. In 1952, Kennedy won a seat in the Senate. Over his seven years in the Senate Kennedy's worldview and conception of democracy changed very little. In 1953, Kennedy married Jacqueline Bouvier. A spinal operation in 1954 that nearly cost him his life threw Kennedy into a period of somber reflection. He began researching and writing a book, *Profiles in Courage*, along with his aid Ted Sorensen, which won the Pulitzer Prize in 1957 (Sorensen, 1965). In 1956, Kennedy almost won the Vice presidential nomination, but more significantly he penned a foreign policy platform called "The Strategy for Peace." The principles therein were present in Kennedy's Berlin rhetoric.

After almost gaining the Vice Presidential nomination in 1956, Kennedy sought to take advantage of the national exposure. He set his sights on the 1960 Presidential nomination. Foreign policy was always Kennedy's greatest interest. It also provided him with a chance to display presidential ethos. In "The Strategy of Peace," JFK outlined a prescription for reenergizing American foreign policy. He argued that the U.S. needed to reestablish a sense of purpose and direction (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995b). He stressed an idealistic and action-oriented style of leadership. The Kennedy persona embodied this action-oriented style of leadership, which displayed a willingness to cope with the problems facing America while conveying an impression of knowing what policies, programs and actions would best serve U.S. foreign policy interests (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995b). Kennedy spent the next two years traveling across the country getting to know as many people as possible and discussing the problems that faced the country, especially in the realm of foreign policy (Sorensen, 1965). The U2 incident

provided Kennedy with the opportunity to show how the Eisenhower administration and his opponent in 1960, Richard Nixon, seemed to be without clear direction. Kennedy's "Strategy of Peace" evoked an air of crisis and drift in foreign policy, conveyed a sense of critical mission that only he could fulfill for the American people, and used extensive historical materials and examples (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995b). These rhetorical strategies resurfaced in JFK's Berlin Addresses. Kennedy's idealism allowed him to locate testing points for America's character and allowed him to rally supporters for his policies (Bostdorff & Goldzwig, 1994). Kennedy secured the Democratic nomination for the 1960 Presidential race against Richard Nixon.

In his 1960 presidential election bid, Kennedy attempted to make foreign policy a major issue, and remake the Democratic Party's foreign policy. Kennedy wanted to re-establish American foreign policy in a new purposeful direction and to restore a lost idealism (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995 b). In Kennedy's transition meetings with Eisenhower, he was horrified at the limited and inflexible war-fighting options he was given. If the Soviets attacked Berlin, he knew he was in no position to win a conventional war, but he and his European allies would be reluctant to exchange nuclear blows (Kempe, 2011). Kennedy was in a no-win situation in Germany, but this was a country Kennedy recognized as pivotal and important: "Our position in Europe is worth a nuclear war because if you are driven from Berlin, you are driven from Germany. And if you are driven from Europe, you are driven from Asia and Africa, and then our time will come next" (Kempe, 2011, p. 55). Given such a domino theory, Kennedy desperately needed an updated military strategy to defend Berlin and the West.

With Kennedy's election to the Oval Office, he gathered around him a young, energetic advising corps, "action intellectuals" or "whiz kids," who wanted to get the country going again. The action intellectuals shared Kennedy's idealism, and brought a sense of pragmatism that all problems could be solved through careful rational thought and weighing the positives and negatives (Herring, 2008). Kennedy's "Strategy of Peace" campaign as a Senator was the precursor to his New Frontier foreign policy during his presidency. The New Frontier suggested that America was done sitting back and giving up when things got difficult, but instead would adopt a zealous, can-do attitude and go out and solve the problem (Hartley, 1971). Kennedy's pragmatism provided him with the ability to calculate and then recalculate existing power relations. This was almost second nature to him. Kennedy's pragmatism helped him formulate broad rules that could be applied in any situation: avoid getting boxed into a corner, keep options open as long as possible, maintain lines of communication to opponents and friends and when it comes time to strike, strike hard (Freedman, 2000). The roots of Kennedy's Flexible Response initiative and his overall strategy for discussions with Khrushchev are connected with this political philosophy.

Kennedy adopted a foreign policy philosophy described by Philip Wander (1984) as "technocratic realism," which developed out of the university intellectuals, government bureaucrats, and skilled professionals that Kennedy assembled for his administration. A technocratic realist perspective viewed the world, specifically foreign policy, as a complex and interrelated web. Technocrats take a hard-headed, realist look at American interests; they conduct a cost-benefit analysis of various actions to determine the best way to proceed (Wander, 1984). According to Wander (1984) one major a

benefit of technocratic realism was being able to justify more moderate courses of action, which was not the case when the Eisenhower administration was confronting “evil” from a moralistic and monolithic view. Wander (1984) stresses that Kennedy’s pragmatic approach could evaluate a doctrine by its consequences, what it is good for and what other possible avenues of action could be taken. Part of Kennedy’s pragmatic approach was negotiation with the Soviet Union. Kennedy wanted a dialogue between himself and Soviet leader Khrushchev in an attempt to reduce the danger of nuclear conflict and explore areas of mutual interest that might help mitigate competition between the two powers (Hartley, 1971). Pragmatism plays a key role in Kennedy’s foreign policy, but like all American politicians, he also used idealism to legitimate his policies.

With his modern technocratic-realist team assembled, Kennedy was ready to move forward in developing his foreign policy. As Kennedy put the new challenge, we “must move forward to meet communism, rather than waiting for it to come to us and then reacting to it” (Herring, 2008, p. 704). Kennedy’s dislike of communism was not based on the differing political or economic ideology, but on his fear of communism’s ruthless ambitions (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy’s resolve to confront communism followed Truman’s containment ideology, which aimed at preventing the spread of communism around the globe. As Kennedy wrote to Khrushchev in 1961, “What your government believes is its own business; what it does in the world is the world’s business” (Sorensen, 1965, p. 514). Kennedy and his team feared another great World War, but were determined to lead the nation through perilous times to ultimate victory. This was a Wilsonian view of destiny, defending the nation and its democratic ideals (Herring, 2008). But, for all the Wilsonian idealism, Kennedy took a pragmatic approach

to communism and certainly did not want to provoke another great war. Kennedy's technocratic-realists viewed the Free World's superior economic and social systems as major advantages over the communist system (Wander, 1984).

Kennedy faced certain challenges that all Cold War presidents shared. More than any other president before him, and few after, Kennedy was well versed in the requirements for the rhetorical presidency. His college career and study of political ideology prepared him for the challenges he faced as president (Meagher, 1997). Kennedy was very sensitive to press coverage and went to great lengths to influence the media's coverage of his policies. He used the media to introduce and market policies, a standard that future presidents would follow. He charmed reporters making them feel as though they were true confidants, but he could quickly drop the relationship if he felt maligned. As a Cold War president, Kennedy would have to constantly balance charges of appeasing communism while refraining from rash actions and rushing into war (Freedman, 2000). Kennedy's mixture of idealism and pragmatism served him well in his efforts to keep the media on his side. One of Kennedy's biggest foreign policy tests began in Vienna 1961.

The Berlin Issue

Kennedy took office in 1961. He advocated a new policy with the Soviets that was premised on the U.S. preparing to "take risks to bring about a thaw in the Cold war" (Mayer, 1994, p. 85). This required "a new approach to the Russians" (Mayer, 1994, p. 85). This new approach by Washington triggered the fears of West German Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, whose opposition would be evident throughout Kennedy's presidency. Kennedy and his team of action intellectuals wanted to review all U.S. policy decision-

making, especially toward Germany, with fresh eyes (Freedman, 2000). Kennedy's roaming ambassador, W. Averell Harriman announced in Berlin in March 1961 that the U.S. did not consider itself bound by any previous negotiations with the Soviets on Berlin and that all such negotiations would "begin from the start" (Mayer, 1994, p. 86). A reporter also asked Kennedy why he did not mention Berlin in his Inaugural Address, to which Kennedy responded that it was "very difficult to name every area of trouble" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 175) Kennedy was hoping that his continued silence would encourage Khrushchev to let the problems in Berlin subside. Kennedy found it "difficult to understand why the Soviets found it necessary to question a situation with which, despite obvious disadvantages to both sides, we have managed to live for many years" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 175). In preparing to take U.S.-German and U.S.-Soviet policy in a completely new direction, Kennedy was hoping to restore the channels of communication between the two superpowers which, Kennedy believed, was the only way to progress in the Cold War.

Adenauer did not disagree with Kennedy's strategy, but he was worried by the new approach and Kennedy as a leader. Adenauer believed the U.S. government was deliberately keeping a low profile on Berlin. Kennedy told German Foreign Minister Heinrich von Brentano that as "long as there was a lull, however, he did not want to provoke either action or comment on the matter [Berlin]' (Mayer, 1994, p. 86). Any negotiations with the Soviets should occur after Germany was reunified, which, in turn, should foster a détente-like arrangement with Moscow (Mayer, 1996). Adenauer valued experience over intellectual brilliance and was wary of Kennedy's action intellectual foreign policy. Adenauer did not see the experience and discipline in Kennedy's

administration that he saw in Eisenhower's administration (Mayer, 1994). Faith in the Kennedy administration shrunk to new lows following the Bay of Pigs fiasco and reinforced Adenauer's fears of Kennedy's inexperience. Kennedy, for his part, felt that after meeting and talking with Adenauer for the first time that he had been "talking not only to a different generation but to a different era, a different world" (Smyser, 2009, p. 49). Throughout Kennedy and Adenauer's relationship the generation gap between the two caused them to see the world differently precipitating distinct differences in policy orientation. West German diplomat Wilhelm Grewe kept reminding Kennedy about the arrangements that gave the FRG its sovereignty, but Kennedy grew annoyed with this pedantry and told Grewe that line of thought was old-hat and the U.S. wanted to strike out in a new direction.

Adenauer's policy centered on Europe and his central priority was halting Soviet momentum across the continent. Reunification of Germany was his number one precondition for any détente discussions with the Soviet Union; he was against any sort of U.S.-Soviet rapprochement at the expense of German interests (Mayer, 1994). Adenauer based his foreign policy on the premise that the reunification of Germany in postwar Europe was the only possible context of a Western victory in the Cold War (Lunak, 2003). Kennedy and the Western Alliance were asked to agree to Bonn's policy of working toward the reunification of Germany, an act that tied the Americans to Europe and to the defense of the West Europe from Soviet attack (Freedman, 2002). Included in the Bonn platform was the non-recognition of the GDR. West Germany did not have any contact with the GDR. Von Brentano explained Bonn

> had for many years considered the question of discussion between the two Germanys and had found this impossible. The Government of the so-

> called GDR had no meaningful mandate to discuss reunification…The moment the Federal Republic started talking with the GDR it would place itself on the same level. This was not a question of prestige, but the moment that Adenauer and Ulbricht [the Communist leader of East Germany] sat down together…the Federal Republic would in effect abandon itself, and the consequences would be disastrous (Mayer, 1996, p. 26).

Although, Adenauer's public posture was to refuse to deal with the GDR, he was also criticized at home for slowly pulling the two Germanys apart. He chose to rehabilitate Germany by aligning the FRG with the West, many Germans felt this policy accentuated the differences with the GDR and created a further rift (Freedman, 2000). Adenauer wanted the West to pay homage to the reunification ideal, not negotiate behind the FRG's back with the Soviets. This issue greatly divided Kennedy and Adenauer (Freedman, 2000). The FRG's refusal to deal with the GDR caused problems between Kennedy and Adenauer because Kennedy wanted the Germans to solve German issues, while the U.S. and Soviets worked out global issues. Kennedy would end up urging Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt to begin détente with the GDR in 1962-63, but in 1961 the Americans and Germans were worlds apart, especially on Berlin.

Kennedy wished to stay away from becoming entangled in Berlin, but he could not escape the city's past, his differences with Adenauer concerning U.S.-German policy, and Khrushchev's demands to settle the issue. In an interview as a senator, Kennedy had noted that the U.S. pledge for reunification should not stand in the way of U.S.-Soviet relations. As Kennedy noted,

> Berlin and the problems suggested by Berlin are going to be with us for many years. I think, hopefully, we would like to get a commitment perhaps guaranteed by the United Nations, to reaffirm the concept of a corridor into Berlin and therefore free access…but German reunification, which represents the long-range goal, is certainly not in the cards for many years (Mayer, 1996, p. 8).

Kennedy's ideas on Berlin conflicted with those of Adenauer and the links to Berlin's past. The heroic effort made by Luscious Clay and the Allied Air force in 1949 to preserve the divided city made Berlin a "source of pride and a sort of prize" (Freedman, 2002, p. 3). Because Berlin was a symbol of hope for the Germans and a propaganda tool for the West Kennedy, like his fellow Cold War presidents, felt bound to Europe.

Another issue tying the Americans to Europe was American nuclear deterrence. Both the British and French gained nuclear arms, but neither would release the weapons to NATO for the common defense of Europe. The only nuclear deterrent preventing a Soviet conventional arms or nuclear attack was America's promise of massive U.S. nuclear retaliation (Judt, 2005). In January 1961, NATO cut the number of active divisions allocated for the European central front with the explanation that "the Americans tied their fate and their nuclear arsenal closely to that of Europe" (Freedman, 2000, p. 50). Any withdrawal by the Americans would threaten Western security because of a possible Soviet invasion.

Adenauer was not the only Western leader who disapproved of Kennedy's negotiation with the Soviet Union. British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan was the closest ally in terms of agreeing with Washington on how to deal with Berlin, but Macmillan fought two wars against the Germans. He believed America was the only country who could be counted upon of Britain's friends. Macmillan believed Allied rights in Berlin were "slightly tarnished" and that "the right of conquest that lay at the foundation of Western occupation rights in Berlin was wearing thin" (Smyser, 2009, p. 44). Macmillan though was the strongest proponent of negotiation with the Soviets over Berlin and believed that the West could not abandon Berliners. Macmillan stated, "I

would not much mind if [the negotiations] ended up with the recognition of the GDR government" as a price for settling the Berlin issue (Smyser, 2009, p. 45). Macmillan's idea of GDR recognition was contrary to Adenauer's advocacy of non-recognition and he believed Macmillan wanted to cede too many Western rights over Berlin.

The other Allied leader, French president Charles de Gaulle, opposed negotiations with the Soviets over Berlin. De Gaulle was not about to relent "just because Mr. Khrushchev whistled" (Smyser, 2009, p. 45). De Gaulle firmly believed the Soviets were not willing to push the West out by force and that Khrushchev did not want war. Therefore, he rationalized that the West needed to make no concessions on Berlin (Smyser, 2009). When Khrushchev issued his deadline, de Gaulle observed, "Khrushchev is bluffing and he'll never sign that treaty…It would be crazy and I'm sure he's not crazy" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 235). He also wanted to cultivate a strong relationship with Adenauer and the FRG. De Gaulle envisioned creating a Europe anchored in France, not in London or under Washington's protection. He believed that a strong Western Germany tied to France would be an economic powerhouse that could diminish American and British influence on the continent. De Gaulle was strongly suspicious of the Anglo-Saxons and still smarted at how London and Washington treated him toward the close of World War II and at the peace conferences (Smyser, 2009). De Gaulle feared German reunification because he wanted to balance the power of the Western Alliance between Europe and America (Lunak, 2003). While de Gaulle was fierce in his belief that the Soviets would not use force in Berlin and had no intentions of turning on his Western Allies, he continually attempted to upstage the Americans to gain favor with the FRG.

Throughout the Kennedy administration, there would be tension between France and America over how continental European policy should be handled.

Berliners and Germans in general did not put much faith in the British or French. They expected words of sympathy during times of danger, but they believed the key to a free Berlin was in America. If America wanted to keep Berlin free, they could, unlike the British or French. If the Americans wanted to let Berlin wither and die, they could (Smyser, 2009). The problem for Kennedy was that Khrushchev hoped to exploit the internal differences among the Western Allies. Khrushchev regarded the weakening of the bonds between the FRG and the West as the best way of preventing a possible rebirth of German expansionist policies (Lunak, 2003). Kennedy would have to show resolve and leadership in his public address on these issues while at the same time placating the various fears and holding the alliance together in private.

Khrushchev and the Soviets were inextricably tied to the GDR and East Berlin. Khrushchev was pushing for a four-power agreement involving a final peace settlement between the Allies from World War II and the two Germanys. Desperate for an agreement on Berlin, Khrushchev proposed to turn Berlin into a “free city” (Freedman, 2000, p. 59). For Khrushchev, unlike for Adenauer, détente between the U.S. and Soviets began in Berlin, whereas for Adenauer détente could only begin after a Berlin and German settlement had been reached (Freedman, 2000). Khrushchev’s ultimatum would be reiterated at the Vienna Conference to Kennedy. As the Soviet ambassador to the GDR noted:

> The presence in Berlin of an open and, to speak to the point, uncontrolled border between the socialist and the capitalist worlds unwittingly prompts the population to make a comparison between both parts of the city,

> which, unfortunately, does not always turn out in favour of Democratic Berlin (GDR) (Judt, 2005, 250).

The real threat perceived by Soviet officials was not an attack from the West, though the FRG's drive for nuclear weapons was worrisome, but rather the real threat was internal. The fleeing of thousands of trained workers from East Berlin and East Germany to the West through Berlin was leaving the GDR without skilled workers (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). The rate of exodus in Berlin grew faster every year, with about 199,000 people leaving Berlin in 1960 (Taylor, 2008). The economic conditions in East Germany were falling behind the powerhouse FRG economy.

The 1958 Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands (Socialist Unity Party of Germany or SED) pronouncement that they would overtake the FRG in economic output placed pressure on the Soviet Union and GDR to fulfill that promise, but neither country could boost the struggling economy. Within the GDR, leading economic functionaries were skeptical about catching the FRG. Public outcry occurred over recent Soviet success in the space program, the launching of Sputnik. East Germans and Berliners were irritated that the Soviets could spend lavish amounts on a space program to reach the moon, but could not prevent shortages of basic commodities (Ross, 2004). As a popular slogan in the GDR in 1959 snarled, "There's no cream, there's no butter, but on the moon the red flag flutters" (Ross, 2004, p. 27). The living conditions in East Berlin were no better. W.R. Smyser, a U.S. diplomat in Berlin during the crisis years, described East Berlin as belying whatever "Khrushchev might believe or say about the glorious future of Communism" (Smyser, 2009, p. 39). East Berlin was "drab, gray, and cheerless. The shops featured few of the consumer goods and food that one could easily find in West Berlin. Many blocks of the old city center, having been carpet-bombed by the allies

during World War II, still remained as empty lots. Most cars were official government or diplomatic vehicles" (Smyser, 2009, p. 39). East Berliners did not dare dress brightly because they were accused of succumbing to Western influences. They could lose their jobs, housing permits and student assignments if they were perceived too Western (Smyser, 2009). Given these various restrictions and threats, there is little wonder why thousands were leaving the socialism of the GDR behind for the freedom of West Berlin and West Germany.

In the Soviet Union itself, low birth rates were becoming a concern as labor was becoming scarce, but the reduction in armed forces announced in 1960 and other cuts kept the Soviet economy strong and a threat to the West (Hatzivassiliou, 2009). East Germany and much of Eastern Europe was not as fortunate as Russia. Between 1949 and 1961, about 2.7 million people either voted for freedom or a betrayal of socialism by leaving the GDR. The lack of goods in East Germany combined with the "economic miracle" in Western Germany created a migration of Germans from East to West. A shortage of consumer goods and housing in the GDR helped in the mass exodus along with the lack of career prospects for the youth, whose careers were tied to their social background. The mass migration of people cost the GDR approximately 2.5 to 3 billion DM (Ross, 2004). Factoring into the loss in capital in the GDR were the many East Berliners who lived in East Berlin cheaply and worked in West Berlin where they earned higher wages. The GDR tried stopping such action through police sanctions or naming-and-shaming campaigns that were completely ineffective (Ross, 2004). Walter Ulbricht exerted pressure on Khrushchev to put an end to this untenable and unnatural situation.

The Vienna Conference, 1961

Khrushchev went to Vienna with one major issue in mind; he wanted Berlin resolved. He took a leisurely trip through the Eastern bloc on his way to Vienna, and along the way he told a Czech Communist official that he planned to scare Kennedy into accepting any deal on Berlin and that the Soviets would take unilateral steps, if necessary, to end Western rights (Smyser, 2009). Heading into Vienna, Khrushchev knew very little about Kennedy. He was briefed by a KGB report that Kennedy was "unlikely to possess the qualities of an outstanding person" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 340) and that the new president was inexperienced in foreign affairs. Khrushchev believed he could best achieve his aims on the Berlin issue by applying pressure on Kennedy face-to-face, instead of negotiating a test ban treaty from afar, which he saw as an attempt by the Americans to take the lead in nuclear technology (Freedman, 2000). Khrushchev was also not averse to taking bold risks at Vienna because he saw the potential to reap rewards. He knew that NATO forces would soon be adding more West German, Bundeswehr forces. Reports circulating around the Kremlin showed that, by 1963, with the addition of the Bundeswehr forces earmarked for NATO, his Warsaw Pact advantage would not be so prominent (Lunak, 2003). The external pressure exerted on Khrushchev by the Berlin situation was only part of the reason he pushed hard on Kennedy.

Khrushchev viewed the U.S. political system as being a contest between militarists and moderates. His greatest fear was a takeover by the militarists in the U.S. government, which might lead to nuclear war. Khrushchev believed Kennedy to be a moderate, but feared his weak character could allow the militarist wing in the American government to take control. Nevertheless, Khrushchev believed that the Soviet's superior

number of conventional forces in Berlin and East Germany would induce the U.S. to agree to any deal involving Berlin (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Along with the U.S. folding on Berlin, the rest of the Western Alliance in Europe would follow suit because Khrushchev viewed the Western Alliance as nothing more than a smoke screen for U.S. dominance (Lunak, 2003).

While Khrushchev considered Kennedy a light weight, there was one person in the Soviet government who disagreed with Khrushchev's strategy, Anastas Mikoyan. Mikoyan feared that Khrushchev was gambling too much on the West not going to war over Berlin and feared that Khrushchev's bullying would back Kennedy into a corner, leaving Kennedy with no choice, but to go to war. Mikoyan was not ready to make as rash a judgment on Kennedy's character as Khrushchev (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Mikoyan also understood the depth of American commitment to Berlin. He thought that any "demands to change the regime in the air corridors might indeed risk war;" He suggested that Khrushchev "offer a constructive dialogue on Berlin, leading to an improvement in Soviet-American relations across the board" (Smyser, 2009, p. 59). Khrushchev disagreed with Mikoyan and believed a firm and unyielding position would carry the day. Mikoyan backed off and Khrushchev proceeded undeterred.

Khrushchev was also looking to institute a new fewer-guns-more-butter policy. The Sino-Soviet split, unknown to Americans at the time, was an impetus for Khrushchev to secure a quick victory on the Berlin issue in an effort to achieve a rapprochement between the U.S. and the Soviet Union (Beschloss, 1991). This would allow him to institute his new policies and focus his attention on the Chinese who were angered by his liberalizing reforms (Kempe, 2011). By taking a hard line on the Berlin issue,

Khrushchev was attempting to quiet his critics in China. Khrushchev also wanted to impress upon neutral third world countries that the Soviet Union was the undisputed leader in the world (Beschloss, 1991). In a fit of rage, he lambasted Mao and the Chinese for wanting a "demigod to blame when things go wrong…someone you can piss on…If you need Stalin that badly, you can have him—cadaver, coffin, and all!" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 43). Even with the difficulties arising with China, a tentative compromise with the Chinese was reached. The Chinese recognized that war was not inevitable with the West. They wanted Khrushchev's pledge for more energetic political warfare in the Third World. With a peace treaty favorable to the Soviets, Western guarantees of security and commitment would be undermined and uncommitted nations would view the Soviet Union as a rising force in the world (Beschloss, 1991). Vienna was the opportunity for Khrushchev to work out his problems with America and focus Soviet energies in different directions.

Going into the Vienna Conference, Kennedy had no clue what his Soviet counterpart was going to be like, nor did he have a focused agenda. Kennedy went to Vienna with the idea of showing toughness if he was pushed. However, Kennedy remained convinced similarities between the two powers that were obscured in the past could now be addressed and that the two nations could work together rationally to ease tensions (Freedman, 2000). Kennedy did have second thoughts about going to the summit after the Bay of Pigs failure; he told Nixon that his failure may have suggested to Khrushchev "that he could keep pushing us all over the world" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 158). Kennedy felt a summit would allow him the chance to demonstrate his strength and pursue direct talks with Khrushchev to call a halt to the Cold War (Beschloss, 1991). At

Vienna, Kennedy hoped to establish a relationship between the two leaders that would open communication channels for future talks (Freedman, 2000). Kennedy's central thesis was the two major nuclear powers should avoid "situations which committed their vital interests in a direct confrontation from which neither could back down" (Sorensen, 1965, p. 545). Feeling among the West ran from mild expectation to outright worry. Senators, businessmen and diplomats alike fretted that a summit held immediately after the Bay of Pigs was not a good time to negotiate and that the wily old Soviet statesmen would take advantage of a young idealistic president (Beschloss, 1991).

Kennedy prepared for Vienna by studying up on his opponent. He used various methods to size up Khrushchev from reading CIA reports to interviewing and talking with people who met him to reviewing all previous conversations held between the two (Sorensen, 1965). There were fears that the meeting was going to be used to create another international incident, especially in the CIA. Reports from the CIA characterized Khrushchev as 'folksy.' His speech was "larded with peasant proverbs and even biblical phrases," he was "the poor man's universal genius with solutions to all problems…an expert on everything" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 167). The CIA warned that Khrushchev might try to throw Kennedy off balance and that Khrushchev prided himself on his "mastery of the realities of the balance of power, he is imbued with the idea that he can utilize Soviet power to move the world toward communism during his lifetime" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 167). The two men had similar discursive traits. Both liked to use historical references and were unyielding, but courteous. Both argued vigorously, but civilly. Kennedy was more precise when speaking and Khrushchev, for his part, was more colorful. Kennedy initiated conversations and kept them on track, while Khrushchev spoke at longer lengths

(Sorensen, 1965). Vienna provided the two great leaders with an opportunity to speak about the three most urgent foreign policy issues: Laos, a test ban treaty and Berlin.

Vienna opened with the two leaders recalling their very brief first meeting in 1959 at a Senate Foreign Relations Committee meeting when Khrushchev was visiting America. Khrushchev began by one-upping Kennedy, when he remembered that he had "no opportunity to say much except hello and good-bye" because of Kennedy's tardiness (Kempe, 2011, p. 223). Khrushchev told Kennedy he heard at the time that Kennedy was a young and promising politician. To which, Kennedy quipped that he also had said at the time that "Kennedy looked too young to be a senator" (Kempe, 2011, p. 223). Khrushchev questioned Kennedy's memory because normally he "did not say such things because young people want to look older and older people like to look younger" (Kempe, 2011, p. 223). Khrushchev finished by joking about graying prematurely and sharing his years with the president or switching places (Kempe, 2011). The tone of the conference was set; Kennedy's short statements would be met by long diatribes from Khrushchev.

Berlin was the most somber and serious issue under discussion at Vienna. When the issue of Berlin was raised on the second day of the Vienna Conference, Khrushchev's tone grew harsher, more intense, and more insistent. A rearmed FRG, with the possibility of nuclear weapons, was a prospect the Soviets would not allow (Smyser, 2009). As the issue turned to Berlin, Khrushchev began by asking why there was no viable peace treaty to World War II and why Germany, the country that began the war, had been rearmed to the point that threatened a third world war. Khrushchev told Kennedy that he wanted to solve the German issue with him; otherwise he would sign a peace treaty with the GDR (Sorensen, 1965). Under the treaty, all Western "commitments stemming from

Germany's surrender will become invalid. This would include all institutions, occupation rights, and access to Berlin, including the corridors" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 216).

Khrushchev proposed a free city where troops from both the Soviet Union and U.S. would be present. Guarantees of noninterference by the Soviets would be ensured. Kennedy thanked Khrushchev for being frank, but he reiterated that Berlin was not Laos and the U.S. was not there merely because of someone's sufferance (Sorensen, 1965). The U.S. was in Berlin because "We fought our way there, although our casualties may not have been as high as the U.S.S.R.'s. We are in Berlin not by agreement of East Germans but by contractual rights" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 216). Kennedy maintained that America had been in Berlin for fifteen years and there was no reason to accept an arrangement inimical to U.S. interests (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy countered the Soviet claim at Yalta and Potsdam that they deserved the lion's share after the war. Kennedy was firm: "If we were to accept the Soviet proposal, U.S. commitments would be regarded as mere scraps of paper" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 216). Kennedy believed that if the situation in Berlin changed, the balance in Western Europe would change and the U.S could not afford that outcome. Khrushchev could not accept Kennedy's call to halt the Cold War and was infuriated by his willingness to ignore Soviet concerns in Berlin. If the Soviets renounced the ideal of dynamic world communism, it would further worsen the situation with the Chinese. Khrushchev was not pleased with Kennedy brandishing U.S. superiority with such abandon (Beschloss, 1991).

Khrushchev continued to push for a German peace treaty. He urged his idea of a free Berlin, an idea that in his opinion removed the obstacles between East and West. If East and West agreed on Berlin and Germany, the door was open to further peace

proposals globally. A peace treaty that recognized the GDR's boundaries and sovereignty would normalize the situation, but Khrushchev could not envision a treaty allowing the U.S. troops to remain in Berlin (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy asked if the treaty would alter Western access rights to Berlin, to which Khrushchev affirmed that access rights would be altered. This proposed change in rights crossed the red line for Kennedy on Berlin (Kempe, 2011). The West could only have rights in Berlin if new rights were negotiated with the GDR (Smyser, 2009). Kennedy argued that Khrushchev had no right to unilaterally break the Potsdam Accords. Khrushchev gave Kennedy six months, after which the Soviets would "disavow our responsibilities. And then anyone would be free to conclude a peace treaty" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 219). A separate peace treaty between each Western ally and the GDR would allow each power to maintain their prestige, which was precisely the reason Khrushchev gave Kennedy (Sorensen, 1965). Late in the afternoon, they tried one last time to broker an agreement. Khrushchev believed the U.N. could watch over the city and small contingents of U.S. and Soviet troops could be left in West Berlin. Kennedy opposed a Soviet troop contingent. Khrushchev told Kennedy, "I want peace. But if you want war, that is your problem," to which Kennedy replied, "It is you, and not I who wants to force change" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 223). Khrushchev countered by saying the Soviets were up to the challenge and that "It is up to the U.S. to decide whether there will be war or peace" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 223-224). Khrushchev concluded, "The decision to sign a peace treaty is firm and irrevocable. The Soviet Union will sign it in December" (Smyser, 2009, p. 70-71). Kennedy retorted, "If that is true, it will be a cold winter" (Sorensen, 1965, p. 586). The Summit was over. The standoff was

harrowing. The mood between the two leaders was bleak and the situation in Berlin was dire.

After the summit, Khrushchev was pleased with his performance, believing that he had dealt Kennedy a blow on the Berlin issue. A photo of the two, taken after the last exchange, left the press wondering why Kennedy's trademark smile had vanished (Beschloss, 1991). For his part, Kennedy was reported to be "not only anxious, but deeply upset" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 364). This report was confirmed by Austrian chancellor Bruno Kreisky whose nation hosted the Conference and who saw both leaders off. Kreisky and the president departed after the last meeting. When Kreisky met with Khrushchev, after seeing Kennedy off, Kreisky reported, "The President was very gloomy at the airport…He seemed upset and his face had changed. Obviously the meeting did not go well for him" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 364). Kennedy confided to James Reston that because of the Bay of Pigs, Khrushchev "thought anyone who was so young and inexperienced as to get into that mess could be taken. And anyone who got into it and didn't see it through had no guts. So he just beat the hell out of me…I've got a terrible problem" (Kempe, 2011, p. 257-58). Ted Sorensen (1965) held that the Berlin issue was the most sobering and grimmest discussion at Vienna and the topic with the least mutual understanding between Kennedy and Khrushchev. Kennedy later stated, "I did not come away with any feeling that…an understanding-so that we do not go over the brink…would be easy to reach" (Sorensen, 1965, p. 549).

Kennedy ended up looking weak; forming the perception that Khrushchev carried the day. Kennedy worried, "I've got a terrible problem; if he thinks I'm inexperienced and have no guts, until we remove those ideas we won't get anywhere with him. So we

have to act" (Smyser, 2009, p. 74). Kennedy was a man who strongly believed that power was "as much a function of perceptions as of hardware, position, or will: minute shifts in its distribution or even the appearance of such shifts—could cause chain reactions of panic to sweep the world, with potentially devastating consequences" (Gaddis, 2005b, p. 200-201). He was frustrated by his performance at Vienna and on the plane home his anger finally overcame him. He cursed Khrushchev as a "bastard" and a "son of a bitch." He could not rationalize being "stuck in a ridiculous situation. It seems silly for us to be facing an atomic war over a treaty preserving Berlin as the future capital of a reunited Germany when all of us know that Germany will probably never be reunited" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 225). He recognized Khrushchev's Berlin predicament as economic and had much sympathy for him; with West Berlin's thriving economy draining East Germany of its talent, but he was still frustrated at Khrushchev's stubbornness (Kempe, 2011). However, American prestige was on the line and Kennedy knew he had to keep America's long standing commitment to the city. If he did not, then American prestige would suffer and conducting effective foreign policy would be very difficult. Kennedy was frustrated that he seemingly had allowed Khrushchev to place him in a position of weakness and that he had failed to negotiate terms with Khrushchev, lessening his ability to improve U.S.-Soviet relations.

However, Kennedy may have had more impact than he realized. Shortly after Vienna, Khrushchev commented that Kennedy had been "tough," especially on Berlin, and he liked the President personally, but that Eisenhower was more reasonable and easier to get along with (Sorensen, 1965, p. 550). Khrushchev was also impressed with Kennedy's intelligence because "he did not rely on his staff for prompting during their

discussions," and the president seemed "more intelligent than any of the [p]residents before him" (Silvestri, 2000, p. 182). The Vienna conference had been a stalemate. Khrushchev was not swayed by Kennedy's charm and reason, and Kennedy did not panic at Khrushchev's tough talk. While no progress in the Cold War was made, both men defended their nation's interest. Both had made a lasting impact on the other, and both had expressed steadfastness and pointed arguments (Sorensen, 1965). The President had made no concessions on either the Berlin issue or on the idea of an immediate peace treaty (Taylor, 2008). Kennedy's resolve on Berlin may have given Khrushchev some pause on moving forward on any peace treaty between the Soviets and the GDR. Khrushchev expected to roll over Kennedy, but as he noted to a reporter when he left "We parted each sticking to his own opinion" (Sorensen, 1965, p. 550). Kennedy may have looked beaten and downtrodden, but he had proven the KGB wrong; he did not lack character.

Khrushchev's offensive and bellicose style aimed at drawing concessions from Kennedy. Khrushchev was gambling that the West's greater fear of war would allow him to extract concessions on Berlin (Freedman, 2000). Khrushchev wanted to gradually push the West out of West Berlin, but he could not be expected to risk war by sending in Soviet troops to drive the West out (Lunak, 2003). Unbeknownst to the East Germans, Khrushchev's bellicose rhetoric about missile parity with the U.S. was false. So while the East German government was willing to go the distance with Khrushchev over the Berlin issue, it was Khrushchev who was having second thoughts about handing over the reins of Berlin to the GDR; he feared they might start a war with one of the Western powers. The East Germans were simply unaware that Khrushchev was bluffing about his boasts

on missile production (Freedman, 2000). The greater the crisis became, the more the weaknesses of the GDR were made manifest. East Germans and Berliners saw the threat of war or at least a looming closure to the borders and began leaving in droves. The rising threat of crisis coupled with a 1960 food shortage raised the risk of riots in the East. By February 1961, a 40 percent increase in émigrés occurred from February 1960, and by March, 16,098 East Germans left (Freedman, 2000). Khrushchev's performance at Vienna may have shaken Kennedy to the core, but it only added to the sense of fear and crisis in East Germany.

If there was going to be war, Kennedy had only six months before the Soviets signed a separate peace treaty with the GDR. Kennedy needed a new Cold War strategy. From the beginning of June 1961 to July 25, 1961, the Kennedy administration worked on creating a new strategy. The administration was aided by the old Cold Warrior, Dean Acheson, and some vital intelligence from U.S. spy agencies.

Lead Up to the July 25, 1961 Address

Kennedy's plane ride after Vienna was described by his Air Force One aide, Godfrey McHugh as "like riding with the losing baseball team after the World Series" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 223). Kennedy recalled Dean Acheson, a veteran of Stalin's blockade of Berlin in 1948-49, to advise him on the Berlin situation in early March 1961, prior to Vienna. Acheson would be called upon again to advise the administration in the wake of Vienna. Acheson's aid recalled that he looked "better and younger than I have seen him in years" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 242). Acheson felt the Europeans had just watched "a gifted young amateur practice with a boomerang when they saw, to their horror, that he [Kennedy] had knocked himself out" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 242). Acheson

would challenge and prod the Kennedy administration to offer solutions (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Acheson firmly believed Western resolve had ended the first Berlin Crisis. Now he advocated an immediate conventional buildup and cautioned the administration not to negotiate with Khrushchev until the Soviets understood U.S. determination to defend American interests by force if necessary (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Acheson's report on the Soviets concluded that they were using military threats to gain political concessions from the U.S. and would not actually go to war. National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy supported the Acheson report telling Kennedy that "Berlin is no place for compromise and our general friendliness and eagerness for improvement on many other points really requires strength here in order to be rightly understood" (Schake, 2002, p. 31). Acheson believed that "only by winning the test of will can we change the Soviets' purpose" (Schake, 2002, p. 32), which, it was felt, could only be achieved by a significant military buildup of conventional forces.

Even before Acheson's report appeared, Kennedy was promoting Maxwell Taylor's ideas on conventional weapons, and their importance in Cold War strategy. Maxwell Taylor distinguished himself in World War II. He proved his grit in the Battle of the Bulge. General Taylor argued against Eisenhower's nuclear policies of the 1950s. Kennedy and his administration agreed with Taylor's assessment. Kennedy saw the expansion of options to deter undesirable shifts in the balance of power as a necessary creation (Gaddis, 2005b). Taylor was upset that Eisenhower's heavy reliance on nuclear weapons devalued the currency of deterrence (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Kennedy concurred with Taylor believing Eisenhower had used nuclear threats to achieve changes in the power balance leaving nations few options below the nuclear level (Gaddis,

2005b). Taylor promoted a balanced approach with a buildup of U.S. non-nuclear conventional forces that could be used in conventional warfare. By building up the non-nuclear forces, Taylor believed a message could be sent to the Kremlin about the seriousness of U.S. determination in deterring Soviet action. Conventional forces would demonstrate to Khrushchev that conventional warfare was still possible in the nuclear age. America's refusal to either call Khrushchev's bluff or go to war over Berlin fed into Khrushchev's belief that the U.S. was too timid to face consequences of nuclear war, which was exactly what Khrushchev believed heading into Vienna (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). By giving Kennedy a middle option, flexible response, the U.S. would be able to meet commitments around the globe without being forced into the dreaded two-choice option of either humiliation or nuclear war.

Kennedy was contemplating all his actions, including the full Achesonian option, which included declaring a state of national emergency. Acheson was prompting Kennedy to call up reservists and put the United States on full military alert by requesting a national emergency. Prompting Acheson's request, besides his hard line approach, was a series of bellicose speeches made by Khrushchev in June and July. For example, in one speech Khrushchev stated, "If certain [W]estern powers do not wish to respect the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic and if, for this reason, they believe they have the right to resort to force, it is the right of the highwayman. A highwayman can be beaten off only with a stick" (Pucci Jr., 1994, p. 61). On July 8, Khrushchev announced a one-third increase in the Soviet military budget and boldly proclaimed, "our armed forces [will] administer a worthy rebuff to any aggressor if he dares raise a hand against the Soviet Union or our friends" (Pucci Jr., 1994, p. 61). As tensions continued to rise,

between January 1961 and August 1961, 160,000 refugees fled from East Germany to West Germany, with approximately 60,000 fleeing in June and July alone (Mayer, 1996; Pucci Jr., 1994). Walter Dowling, U.S. ambassador to the Bonn Republic, told Kennedy on July 12 that the flow of refugees was reaching a critical scale and that revolts similar to 1953 might break out (Mayer, 1996). With the rising tensions, Kennedy was able to set the terms for debate through his use of the media. He employed a number of press conferences between the Vienna Conference and his address on July 25 in an effort to accuse the Soviet Union of manufacturing the crisis and to rebuff Khrushchev's proposal for a "free city" in Berlin. For Kennedy, what was "free" for the Soviets was the slow disintegration of rights for West Berlin (Pucci Jr., 1994).

Events leading up to Kennedy's July 25 speech proved pivotal. In mid June, the CIA provided Kennedy with information on the state of the Soviet Union. The CIA had been working with an agent inside the Soviet military intelligence service, Oleg Penkovsky. The CIA reported that Khrushchev believed the West would not risk war over Berlin, and the Soviets did not want war over Berlin; they only wanted to threaten the West in an effort to jump start negotiations with the GDR on access rights to West Berlin (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Western recognition of the GDR would go against long standing Western policy and potentially stress its alliance with the FRG. To recognize the GDR would give the GDR legitimacy in world affairs (Mayer, 1996).

All of this wrangling must be seen against the backdrop of nuclear capability. The Corona satellite program had replaced U-2 spy missions, and the latest reports showed that there were only two intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) sites between Leningrad and the Ural mountains, with eight total launch pads. The missile gap Kennedy

had complained about turned out not to be true. Instead of a major Soviet advantage, it was the U.S. who held the advantage. The Soviets had fewer than twenty missiles, enough to destroy New York and Washington if accurate. The U.S. had over two hundred Titan and Atlas missiles and hundreds of new Minutemen missiles in development (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Even with this evidence, Kennedy remained unsure which direction to take with tensions in Berlin rising.

The most compelling advice given to Kennedy was by former President Eisenhower, who advised Kennedy not to overreact. The declaration of a national emergency in Ike's view "would be the worst mistake possible in that it would give Khrushchev the idea that all [he] has to do is needle us here and there to force us into such radical action" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, 371). Kennedy's cabinet meetings also took up the issue of national emergency. Bundy cautioned that there is no "limited" national emergency and Dean Rusk warned that a declaration would have "a dangerous sound of mobilization" (Freedman, 2000, p. 70). Kennedy had also tapped then Harvard University professor and future Secretary of State Henry Kissinger as a consultant in his administration. Kissinger was against the national emergency, arguing that Khrushchev would be more impressed by a broad continued improvement and buildup of American military might (Smyser, 2009). Sorensen cautioned Kennedy against engaging "Khrushchev's prestige to a point where he felt he could not back down from a showdown, and provoke further or faster action on his part in stepping up the arms race" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 257).

Robert McNamara made the winning argument to Kennedy when the National Security Council met on July 19. McNamara argued that a national emergency would not

need to be declared before September 1 at the earliest, and that he did not want a large reserve force on hand without a mission (Freedman, 2000). As Bundy noted, there could be no “limited” national emergency and a declaration to that effect would be “a quantum jump” (Freedman, 2000, p. 70). McNamara’s proposed timetable for deployment in a non-national emergency situation was acceptable to Kennedy. He demonstrated that forces would be available if the crisis deepened, but his plan ensured that the deployment of forces would not be seen as a mobilization that would worsen the situation. Kennedy chose to “lean forward” on negotiations. By establishing American resolve, Kennedy would be negotiating from a position of strength and prohibit Khrushchev from choosing the “framework of discussion” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 257). Also in the July 19 meeting, Kennedy received the “Outline on Germany and Berlin”— a report assembled by Assistant Secretary of State, Foy Kohler and Office of German Affairs, Martin Hillenbrand. The report was a blue-print for the New Frontier strategy for working with the Adenauer government. It outlined four major tenets: the presence and security of Western forces in West Berlin, the security and viability of West Berlin, physical access to West Berlin, and the security of the Federal Republic against attacks from the East (Mayer, 1996). Kennedy had now made all the necessary decisions for responding to Khrushchev’s ultimatum issued at Vienna, but he added one more section to his upcoming speech that would cause some controversy and set an ominous tone for his address, civil defense.

In a July meeting, Kennedy was discussing civil defense when the issue of fallout shelters was brought up. He asked for the number of casualties if the Soviet Union attacked America with nuclear weapons. The response was around seventy-nine million

people would be killed, a number that shocked and horrified Kennedy. He was advised that if fallout shelters were built and implemented on a massive scale the number could be reduced to fifty million, still a very large number, but a reduction of about one-third. Kennedy decided he would ask Congress for $207 million for civil defense (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy was now prepared to announce his plans to America. He had chosen a middle ground of a slow military buildup of conventional forces that would allow him flexibility in responses to crises, but did not initiate a national emergency. He decided that America needed to be educated on the potential costs of nuclear war and initiate a civil defense plan for civilians. Most significantly, Kennedy hoped to regain the superior negotiation position he lost at Vienna and ultimately open up negotiations on détente with Khrushchev.

After the Vienna Conference, Kennedy commented to John Kenneth Galbraith, ambassador to India, "There are limits to the number of defeats I can defend in one twelve-month period. I've had the Bay of Pigs and pulling out of Laos. I can't accept a third" (Smyser, 2009, p. 78). The Bay of Pigs came at great cost to Kennedy's presidential ethos. The immediate after effects were protests and rallies on American campuses, demonstrations in Moscow and Eastern Europe, and picketing at the White House. An article in the *New York Times* observed, "that the expedition has involved the United States in a tremendous loss of prestige and respect…The reviving confidence of the United States' Allies in its qualities of leadership has been shaken" (Pucci Jr., 1994, p. 54). Arthur Schlesinger reported, "In one day American prestige collapses lower than in eight years of Eisenhower timidity and lack of determination" (Pucci Jr., 1994, p. 54). Laos was not as big a blow as Cuba, but Kennedy's waffling on whether to intervene in

Laos diminished his perception as a firm leader with his allies and his adversaries (Pucci, 1994). In July 1961, Kennedy hoped to avoid a "third loss" in Berlin and reestablish his ethos as leader of the Western Alliance. On 25 July 1961, Kennedy would appear before the American public on television to deliver a momentous address on the state of foreign affairs, specifically Berlin and how the U.S. was going to respond to the Soviet challenge.

Chapter III. Rhetorical Analysis

Kennedy's Radio and TV Address to the American People

Kennedy delivered his *Radio and Television Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis* from the Oval Office on July 25, 1961. On hand were seven television and newsreel cameras, White House aides, Secret Service men, technicians, still photographers, and print reporters, over sixty people in total jammed into the office (Beschloss, 1991 & Kempe, 2011). One aide remembers Kennedy looking tense and nervous, and the president complained about the heat, mopping up his hair and going outside before delivering the speech (Beschloss, 1991). The Oval Office was sweltering that night as Washington hit a high of 94 degrees that day and the air conditioning was turned off for better sound quality (Kempe, 2011). Jacqueline, watching from Hyannis Port, felt "a little shooting pain of fright" and worried "even Jack might not be able to make this crisis turn out for the best" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 260). *New York Times* columnist James Reston predicted the speech would "inaugurate a new flexible policy, not only for Berlin, but for the whole 'cold war' front" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, 376). Kennedy looked into the camera and delivered his speech. Kennedy's July 25, 1961, speech was delivered from the White House via television, reaching an estimated 50 million U.S. viewers (Freedman, 2000).

The purpose of Kennedy's speech was to introduce his new policy, flexible response, and to reinforce the resolve of the Western Alliance, specifically to show that America now had options and was no longer chained to a grim humiliation or holocaust either-or. Flexible response would be presented as a means of answering the Soviet challenge and give Khrushchev pause before he acted precipitously. Kennedy called West Berlin "the great testing place of Western courage and will, a focal point where our solemn commitments…and Soviet ambitions now meet in basic confrontation" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy intended to show his mettle as a presidential leader. Kennedy wanted to impress upon Khrushchev that the United States was going to honor its commitments to its European Allies.

Historical Constraints: Potsdam, Yalta and Basis for Western Presence in Berlin

The rationale behind the 1961 Berlin crisis and Khrushchev's 1958 ultimatum was the Allied presence in Berlin. Khrushchev hoped to sign a treaty with the GDR granting the GDR the rights currently held by the Soviet Union under the quadripartite agreement finalized at Yalta and Potsdam. The Soviets attempted to act unilaterally without consent from the other three major governing powers. Khrushchev's proposed treaty would change the legal status of all four major powers in Berlin by forcing the West to gain access from Ulbricht and the GDR. This change in legal status could have granted the GDR the power to remove the Western Powers from Berlin. The Allied successful defense of Berlin during the Blockade and the prosperous West German economy created the conditions for the refugee problem and the drain of East German industrial talent. These historical pressures bore down on Khrushchev and influenced his actions at Vienna, which called for a direct response from Kennedy.

Kennedy's *Radio and Television Address* was his response to Khrushchev's ultimatum. Kennedy defended American and Western rights in Berlin by citing the origins of American presence in Berlin and the legal rights granted to the Americans at Yalta and Potsdam. America was in Berlin "as a result of our victory over Nazi Germany—and our basic rights to be there, deriving from that victory" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy further stated, "These rights have been repeatedly confirmed and recognized in special agreements with the Soviet Union" (Kennedy, 1961). Western access to Berlin "cannot be ended by any act of the Soviet government" (Kennedy, 1961).

Kennedy defended American rights in Berlin based on historical and legal precedent. In the lines quoted above, Kennedy established the basis for American presence in Berlin. Any change in these rights originating with a Soviet unilateral treaty would be a violation of the Potsdam and Yalta agreements. America, along with the Western Allies and the Soviet Union, defeated Nazi Germany. After the defeat, the four governing powers agreed to the legal status of Berlin. Though Kennedy wanted to look at Berlin and Germany with fresh eyes, he was bound by the historical pacts at Yalta and Potsdam, as well as the tradition of American Cold War presidents had established to defend Western rights in Berlin.

Khrushchev's counterargument could have been that Berlin was part of East Germany. However, Kennedy identified the flaw in this argument and countered, "Berlin is not part of East Germany, but a separate territory under the control of the allied powers" (Kennedy, 1961). With Berlin being the capital of Nazi Germany, the Allies divided the city rather than giving it as a prize to one allied power. The implication being that each allied power could govern its respective zone according to their prerogative, but

that Berlin was to be jointly governed until Germany was reunified. Kennedy grounded his legal argument in a clause that the Soviets had agreed to in 1945.

Kennedy was an astute student of history and often alluded to or cited historical events or figures to buttress his arguments in his *Radio and Television Address*. To support his call for remaining in Berlin and to strengthen the resolve of the West, Kennedy used a historical reference to America's strength by citing the battle of Bastogne in World War II. Kennedy rebuked those who believe West Berlin is untenable by stating "I hear it said that West Berlin is military untenable. And so was Bastogne. And so, in fact, was Stalingrad. Any dangerous spot is tenable if men—brave men—will make it so" (Kennedy, 1961). These two lines provide insight into Kennedy's thinking on Berlin. First, both Bastogne and Stalingrad were defensive battles, won by a strong willed mentality and toughness. Kennedy's allusion to these battles demonstrated he was not going on the offensive in Berlin, but merely maintaining America's defensive stance since 1945. He also established a link between Berlin and Bastogne. Just as Berlin was surrounded by a numerically superior enemy, so too were the Americans at Bastogne in 1944, yet they survived and defeated the Nazis. Bastogne served both as a symbol and rationale as to why the Americans were not going to give in under Soviet pressure.

Second, Kennedy harkened back to a time when the Americans and Soviets were allies. Each can celebrate their defensive victory and take pride in their military accomplishments. However, it also served as a reminder that only fifteen years prior, these two great superpowers worked toward the common good of humanity. The Soviet Union and United States do not have to be adversaries, but they can work toward the common good of humanity. However, Kennedy continued, "We do not want to fight—

but we have fought before" (Kennedy, 1961). This line reasserts the American will to fight and establishes strength in possible future negotiations. Nieburg and Nieburg (1991) have called on presidents to show mettle at critical junctures, and this is one of the instances where Kennedy showed American strength. By demonstrating American strength and will to fight, Kennedy attempted to dissuade Khrushchev from pushing his Berlin policy any further.

A third historical image is found in Kennedy's statement, "a beacon of hope behind the Iron Curtain, an escape hatch for refugees" (Kennedy, 1961). Here Kennedy used juxtaposition of light, the beacon, symbolizing warmth, softness and freedom emanating from darkness, the Iron Curtain, which conjures imagery of steel, darkness and impersonality. The "beacon of hope" also refers back to the allusion of America as a "city upon a hill" shining light to all corners of the earth. Supporting the "city upon a hill" metaphor Kennedy further alludes to the fact that America cannot separate Berlin's safety "from our own" (Kennedy, 1961). Berlin's cause is America's cause. Americans were to view Berlin and Berliners as a similar and co-equals in democratic ideals and goals. Kennedy's idealism sought to transcend the differences between Adenauer and himself and to create a new vision of Berlin and solidify the U.S.-German relationship.

Zarefsky (2008) notes that rhetors can work to create community and shared vision. In Kennedy's *Radio and Television Address,* he does this with the Western Allies by recounting their shared success from World War II to the present: "the challenge of European chaos in 1947, of the Berlin Blockade in 1948, the challenge of Communist aggression in 1950" (Kennedy, 1961). The basis of the Western Alliance and the success of the alliance was not based solely in ideology, but common history, shared struggle and

victory. “[T]he Atlantic Community will not forget either its history or the principles which gave it meaning,” stated Kennedy (1961), as he sought strengthen the Alliance for its biggest challenge, the Soviets in Berlin. Kennedy’s reference to the Western Alliance also demonstrated the limitations of American power. Kennedy recognized the ambitions, goals and policies of his main allies. The president was not in a position to dictate policy or unilaterally break from his allies’ policy.

France, Britain and West Germany all had their own ambitions, policies and opinions on how to react to the Soviet threat. Kennedy’s ambitions were curtailed by each country’s global position and historical concerns. France feared a strong and united Germany, the British were facing the end of empire and economic stagnation and the West Germans cared about unification before any further negotiations. Kennedy needed to balance these concerns rhetorically and build support for his policies through rhetorical community building.

Kennedy’s historical references accomplished two goals. First, he wanted to remind America and the West of their common struggles and the history that had brought the Alliance together. By reminding the Alliance of its past, Kennedy hoped to strengthen its future. The Western Alliance had triumphed through many difficult crisis situations in the past. The present situation was just a new challenge, but a challenge that could only be overcome if the West remained unified in the face of a common threat. America and Western Europe not only shared a common history, but also similar values and economic and political systems. Second, by recounting Western history, Kennedy was hoping to deter Khrushchev’s plans in Berlin. Both leaders knew the strength of the West was derived from its unity. Kennedy’ historical references were strategic and argued that

every Soviet challenge had only solidified the unity of the Western Powers. Another Soviet challenge would only strengthen the West again against the Soviets. Kennedy wanted to persuade Khrushchev to back down and lessen the Soviet pressure on Berlin, resorting to diplomatic channels to solve the current crisis.

The Middle Ground: Flexible Response

Kennedy sought to prevent any undesirable shifts in the balance of power. Kennedy believed that the Eisenhower administration did not plan for shifts in power by relying too heavily on nuclear deterrence (Gaddis, 2005b). Kennedy veiled his criticism of the Eisenhower administration in his address when discussing the limitation of choices presented by an “atomic holocaust” or “surrender” policy (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy and his administration took it as their personal responsibility to expand the number of options open to the president in times of crisis (Gaddis, 2005b). Kennedy’s July 25, 1961 speech was Kennedy’s opportunity to expand the number of options open to the U.S., but also for Kennedy to become the embodiment of the nation in foreign affairs. As Wander (1984) has noted, presidents often become the embodiment of the nation when addressing foreign affairs.

Kennedy’s proposed flexible response was part of a military strategy to deal with Khrushchev’s threats at Vienna. Leaving Vienna, Kennedy had remarked upon the fact that he had gotten the hell beat out of him. His previous foreign policy failures had weakened his presidential ethos. He used the policy of flexible response not only to create more options, but to reestablish faith in American vision, leadership, and policy. One of the major ways to restore faith in America was to offer a vision, and one of the

principle functions of discourse is to inspire people to achieve goals by articulating a vision (Zarefsky, 2008).

Kennedy's vision entailed a new military option that could also provide a flexible negotiating strategy. This strategy acknowledged Khrushchev's desire to stabilize East Germany, but did not abridge Western rights (Gaddis, 2005b). As Kennedy acknowledged in largely sympathetic terms, "the Soviet Union's historical concern about their security in Central and Eastern Europe, after a series of ravaging invasions, and we believe arrangements can be worked out which will help to meet those concerns" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy also left open negotiations saying, "we shall always be prepared to discuss international problems with any and all nations that are willing to talk" (Kennedy, 1961). By offering both a military strategy and negotiating strategy, Kennedy was keeping open all possible avenues of this action, putting into operation a major tenet and strategy of the Kennedy administration.

Kennedy rejects the Achesonian proposal for a state of emergency,

> While it is unwise at this time either to call up or send abroad excessive numbers of these troops before they are needed…I intend to take, as time goes on, whatever steps are necessary to make certain that such forces can be deployed at the appropriate time without lessening our ability to meet our commitments elsewhere (Kennedy, 1961).

By rejecting the Achesonian state of emergency and replacing it with a clear new military strategy, Kennedy was showing his strength as a leader. He was becoming the leader he hoped America would be in the world, strong, cool under pressure and capable of handling any threat; not indecisive, panic stricken and trigger happy when threatened.

Flexible response was originally devised as a means of maintaining Allied rights in West Berlin. Kennedy defined flexible response as having "sea and air lift capable of

moving our forces quickly and in large numbers to any part of the world" (Kennedy, 1961). These forces would be capable of being placed "in any critical area at the appropriate time a force which combined with those of our allies, is large enough to make clear our determination and ability to defend our rights at all costs…We intend to have a wider choice than humiliation or all-out nuclear action" (Kennedy, 1961).

To implement flexible response, Kennedy called for an increase in the armed forces budget, making more men available for deployment, increased numbers in the Navy and Air Force, retention of older equipment, and money for the procurement of non-nuclear weapons, ammunition and equipment. Kennedy asked for $3.2 billion increase in the Armed Forces with $1.8 billion going towards conventional forces. For those who feared the budget increase would strain the American economy, Kennedy assuaged such fears, "This improved business outlook means improved revenues; and I intend to submit to the Congress in January a budget for the next fiscal year which will be strictly in balance" (Kennedy, 1961). While not intent on ruining the economy or destroying the American infrastructure to achieve his goal, Kennedy did caution that there might have to be an increase in taxes, but he was confident that America would "bear the burden" to preserve freedom (Kennedy, 1961).[2]

Kennedy's flexible response strategy was a global military strategy to protect freedom, "The immediate threat to free men is in West Berlin. But that isolated outpost is

---

[2] Republicans were worried that the economy could not handle Kennedy's $3.454 billion in budget increase; however, they did not understand Kennedy's personal economic beliefs. The Kennedy administration's "new economics" viewed the foreign policy expenditures as a benefit to the domestic economy: "We are recovering strongly from this year's recession…And for the first time since fall 1959, our gold position has improved and the dollar is more respected abroad. These gains, it should be stressed, are being accomplished with Budget deficits far smaller than those of the 1958 recession" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy believed the economy not only could withstand, but would benefit from the proposed increases in national defense and domestic civil defense. Paul Samuelson, one of Kennedy's economic advisors, stated "[A]ny stepping up of these programs that is deemed desirable for its own sake can only help rather than hinder the health of our national economy in the period immediately ahead" (Gaddis, 2005b., 203).

not an isolated problem. The threat is world-wide…We face a challenge in Berlin, but there is also a challenge in Southeast Asia" (Kennedy, 1961). By offering a clear vision and set of goals, Kennedy was reestablishing himself as a world leader, repairing the damage he incurred from the Bay of Pigs, Laos and Vienna. His historical failures had damaged America's position in the world. In his July 25, 1961, speech Kennedy became the embodiment of America and reassumed the leadership of the West. Flexible response offered a clear strategy that the Western bloc could rally around. It also was an appealing strategy to Third World neutral countries because it was not just a diatribe against communism, but a global strategy that had the potential to ease tensions and protect freedom.

Kennedy used the civil defense portion of his speech to build consensus among the American people for his policies. According to Tatalovich and Daynes (1979), the power of the presidency rests in the ability to gain public support. By offering every citizen protection, Kennedy provided his American audience material rewards for their support.

The civil defense section of the speech seems out of place, but had its roots in Acheson's national emergency plan. Acheson wanted to call a national emergency to raise awareness in America about the seriousness of the Soviet threat. Acheson reasoned that a large program of air raid shelter construction would galvanize the population and prepare them psychologically for the test of wills (Kempe, 2011). The national emergency failed, but Kennedy did outline the dire consequences of following the road to war in the civil defense section. While the risk of nuclear war was always present, most American politicians rarely addressed the issue. However, Kennedy directly addressed

the issue in this portion of the speech. The American people had never heard an American president speak so directly and chillingly about nuclear war (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy warned the American public "To recognize the possibilities of nuclear war in the missile age, without our citizens knowing what they should do and where they should go if bombs begin to fall, would be a failure of responsibility" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy continued,

> In the event of an attack, the lives of those families which are not hit in a nuclear blast and fire can still be saved – if they can be warned to take shelter and if that shelter is available…In contrast to our friends in Europe, the need for this kind of protection is new to our shores…I hope to let every citizen know what steps he can take without delay to protect his family in case of attack. I know that you will want to do no less (Kennedy, 1961).

Kennedy decided to raise the issue of civil defense as a way to dissuade a Soviet attack on America by influencing the Soviet estimates of inflicted damage and carnage on America (Beschloss, 1991). American territory in 1961, with the exclusion of Pearl Harbor, was rarely the scene of attack by outside powers.

The average American was unaccustomed to thinking America was vulnerable to attack. Along with provoking fear, Kennedy's discourse promoted new awareness and preventive measures.[3]Kennedy used a strategy of fear by speaking so forthright about the dangers of nuclear war, but his candid discourse gained him the support of his American audience. Kennedy's flexible response policy seemed to be a reasonable and rational

---

[3] After July 25, the American people received the benefit of federal funding for the civil defense of the country. Reports predicted that between 35 million and 40 million lives that could be saved by the program, but there still would be a cost of some 140 million lives lost (Freedman, 2000). Plans were developed to build public fallout shelters, with food, medicine and water. Over the next year land was surveyed and plans were for the creation of 54 million fallout shelters over the next four years. While the program was initially financed it soon got caught up in the dispute over our national ability to survive a nuclear war. The majority of people quickly realized there was no real defense in the event of a nuclear war; only the prevention of nuclear war could save lives (Freedman, 2000). Kennedy's civil defense policy eventually lost steam.

policy that slowed the nuclear option, especially in comparison to the humiliation or holocaust policy of Eisenhower. Kennedy positioned himself as a Cold War moderate with a slow escalation policy and his temperate offer to negotiate with the Soviets. Kennedy received support from all sides, though Republicans and some letters received at the White House argued that Kennedy should have increased taxes or cut social programs to pay for his spending, but for the most part the overall response was supportive; some went so far as to suggest assassinating Khrushchev (Beschloss, 1991).

Personal Influences

John F. Kennedy has been characterized as a charismatic president and orator (Nieburg & Nieburg, 1991). Kennedy's charismatic style can be attributed to his delivery, which provided "assurance even as he talked of 'grave trouble to come;' projecting a sense of 'mystery, sex appeal, to-the-manner-born confidence' that audiences viewed as leadership" (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995a, p. 14). Flaws in Kennedy's early speeches were detectable in his quick pace or the strain in his vocal cords, but when he remembered to pace himself appropriately Kennedy employed "a conversational tone which was at once engaging and persuasive" (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995a, p. 14).

Studies by Bostdorff (1994), Zarefsky (2008), and James Barber and Hugh Blair (Bostdorff, 1994) all found connections between discourse and the personal style or orientation of the rhetor. Kennedy's July 25, 1961 *Radio and Television* address offered insight into Kennedy's character and personal values. The rehearsal of Kennedy's worldview discussed previously will factor into his style in this current speech and the two later speeches that I will analyze. Other characteristics of personal rhetorical style identified by Bostdorff and Goldzwig (1994) on Kennedy's blending of idealism and

pragmatism and Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos (1995b) with Kennedy's action-oriented leadership style can be seen in these three speeches.

In foreign policy, Kennedy mixed arrows and olive branches when delivering major speeches. The dual propositions of war and peace negotiations were products of Kennedy's pragmatic realist approach to foreign policy, and his realization that foreign affairs are often complex. Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos (1995a) also note that Kennedy's addresses presented a stark dualism between the free world and the communist world, contesting freedom versus tyranny, and West versus East. Another of Kennedy's dualistic approaches was his willingness to negotiate, but also maintain a strong military in case of war. Kennedy's statement, "In short, while we are ready to defend our interests, we shall also be ready to search for peace- in quiet exploratory talks, in formal or informal meetings" (Kennedy, 1961), best highlights his dualistic approaches on peace and war. Kennedy used juxtaposition of contrasting terms or phrases to draw meaning from conflicting phrases (Dean, 1991). In the preceding line, Kennedy juxtaposed a military threat with a peace offering. This juxtaposition represents Kennedy's ambivalence toward communism. On one hand, Kennedy stood firmly against this system of beliefs and its ambitions in the world. This view stemmed from Kennedy's idealistic side. On the other hand, Kennedy greatly feared nuclear war, was opposed to communism not because of its ideology, but because of its actions in the world (Sorensen, 1965) and because his pragmatic side rationalized consistent threats toward Khrushchev increased tensions and decreased global security.

Another example of Kennedy's ambivalence and fear of war was manifest in his conclusion. Here Kennedy referenced the two world wars, "In each case serious

misjudgments were made on both sides of the intentions of others, which brought about great devastation. Now, in the thermonuclear age, any misjudgment on either side" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy stressed his fear of misjudgment, which echoed his fear of miscalculation in superpower relations discussed with Khrushchev at Vienna, to which Khrushchev "went berserk" according to Kennedy (Smyser, 2009, p. 65). But, this is an example of Kennedy's personal beliefs influencing his rhetoric. These personal beliefs were influenced by the historical events of Kennedy's lifetime, the world wars, Khrushchev's belligerence at Vienna, and the crisis over Berlin. While Kennedy the idealist wanted a free world, Kennedy the pragmatist understood that cooperation with the Soviets was the best policy to achieve peace first, and then work towards changing the East. This distinction can be seen in the many instances of Kennedy's juxtaposition of threats and peaceful negotiations.

Zarefsky (Henry et al., 2008) maintains that whoever can set the terms of the debate is in better position to win the debate. Kennedy's remarks about the Soviets being the source of the Berlin crisis, both at Vienna and at his July 19 press conference, shaped the structure of the debate and put the Soviets on the defensive. Kennedy had set the terms of the debate, accusing the Soviets of creating the Berlin Crisis and in this speech he would further develop this framework by placing the Soviets on the defensive for their actions. Kennedy begins his speech by listing the offensive actions Khrushchev and his associates had undertaken over the last few weeks including various threats and an increase in the Soviet military budget. Khrushchev's biggest threat was to end the Western presence in Berlin, something Kennedy said he "cannot permit" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy reminded his audience "It is the Soviets who have stirred up this crisis

and are trying to force a change. It is they who have opposed free elections. It is they who have rejected an all-German peace treaty, and ruling of international law" (Kennedy, 1961). The blame for the current crisis is "Moscow, not Berlin. And if war begins, it will have begun in Moscow and not Berlin" (Kennedy, 1961).

Kennedy's statements were targeted to convince the Soviets that they were to blame and that America was not willing to be pushed out of Berlin. Yet, despite the tough talk, the president held out hope for useful negotiations:

> we shall always be prepared to discuss international problems with any and all nations that are willing to talk—and listen—with reason. If they have proposals—not demands—we shall hear them…We have previously indicated our readiness to remove any actual irritants in West Berlin, but the freedom of that city is not negotiable (Kennedy, 1961).

This is yet another example of Kennedy's willingness to enter into negotiations and juxtapose a threat with accusations. He was aiming to set the terms for future negotiations, along with strengthening the position of America at the negotiating table. By implying the Soviets negotiated in bad faith, he wanted to shift world opinion toward the American position that the Soviets started the Berlin Crisis framing the debate in favor of the American position.

"Nothing creates unity like a perfected victim" (Dean, 1991, p. 537), Kenneth Burke reminds us. Burke indicates that when employing a rhetoric of victimage, a rhetor tries to unify an audience by identifying a common villain. The rhetor can then blame the evils in society or the world on that specified villain (Dean, 1991). Kennedy's identification of the Soviets as the perpetrators of evil, and West Berliners as the victims of Soviet aggression juxtaposes helpless Berliners against Soviet aggressors. This helps unite the various Western audiences. Audience members in the West identify themselves

with Kennedy's ideals of freedom, and distance themselves from the tyranny of Communism. The Western audience can identify with the President's causes and purposes, and can rally around the democratic principles of the Western Alliance (Dean, 1991).

One of the pervading beliefs in Moscow and East Berlin was the eventuality of the GDR surpassing the FRG economically and culturally. Kennedy goes on the attack against this impression of socialism's superiority: "If anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, compared to East Germany feelings about their regime, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in Berlin, and if possible…And let us hear at that time from the two and one-half million refugees who have fled the Communist regime in East Germany-voting for Western-type freedom with their feet" (Kennedy, 1961). The East could not respond to Kennedy's attack on the refugee situation because historical fact supported Kennedy, the flow of refugees from East to West was crippling the East's economy and was bringing the regime perilously close to implosion. The strength of socialism paled compared to the robust West German economy, highlighting the systemic problems with communism.

Kennedy's belief in the inherent flaws in democracy manifested itself rhetorically in the creation of challenges to his audiences. Gaddis (2005b) remarks that "It was as if Kennedy had accepted Dulles's old argument that challenges were desirable, even necessary, to bring out the best in the American people" (p. 232). Dulles's maxim fits perfectly with Kennedy's belief in the short term flaws of democracy. Kennedy's July 25 address to the nation is filled with challenges to the audience. Kennedy (1961) cited challenges in "Berlin," "Southeast Asia," and "our own hemisphere." To combat these

challenges to U.S. and Western prestige and power in the world, Kennedy challenged America and the Atlantic community to continue to assist developing nations, educate children, work towards disarmament, and to prevent the slowdown of the economy (Kennedy, 1961). The path to a prosperous and safer world is to practice the discipline of meeting and overcoming challenges. Challenges provide a platform for Kennedy to demonstrate his leadership and unify his audience. Offering a solution to the challenge, in this case flexible response, Kennedy fostered a shared vision among Western countries and the American people providing him a solid communal base that supported his vision.

Nieburg and Nieburg's (1991) study on Presidential power reveals that charismatic leaders, like Kennedy, are effective during crisis situations in persuading the audience or audiences to see the world from a particular perspective. This was most evident when Congress passed the needed legislation to implement flexible response (Silvestri, 2000). However, JFK's charismatic character was on minimal display in the July 25 speech due to its somber tone. Sorensen (1965) maintained that the speech was hampered by an "overcrowded, overheated office" (p. 591). Still, Kennedy was able to gain support for his Berlin policy. Kennedy's belief that democracy needed a crisis to spur sacrifice for the short term so that the long term benefits would materialize was evident. As Kennedy noted, the costs of flexible response "will require sacrifice on the part of many of our citizens" (Kennedy, 1961). Indeed, he went to great lengths to describe the shared burden the new policy would require:

> I am well aware of the fact that many American families will bear the burden of these requests. Studies or careers interrupted; husbands and sons will be called away; incomes in some cases will be reduced. But these are burdens which must be borne if freedom is to be defended—Americans have willing borne them before—and they will not flinch from the task now (Kennedy, 1961).

Kennedy used the Berlin Crisis to change U.S. foreign policy and turn America in a direction that will be beneficial in the long term. Kennedy's policy would increase the combat ready number of Army divisions from 11 to 16, which was estimated to be able to handle with major wars in Europe and Asia and a "minor" crisis elsewhere. Kennedy believed this new turn helped in the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis leaving Khrushchev with no choice but to withdraw (Gaddis, 2005b). Kennedy asked for the nation's patience and cautioned that "there is no quick and easy solution" (Kennedy, 1961).

Influenced by Kennedy's action-oriented style of leadership, which stressed personal responsibility, Kennedy used the "I" pronoun and a conversational tone in his July 25, 1961 address. Kennedy's conversational tone was employed at the beginning of the speech when Kennedy used the phrase "I want to talk frankly with you tonight…" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy sets a personal tone throughout the speech using the first and second person voice with "I" or "we" which assists the audience to imagine Kennedy talking directly to them. These pronouns reinforce the immediacy of Kennedy's televised image. Kennedy took responsibility for America's actions in Berlin: "I shall bear this responsibility under our Constitution for the next three and one-half years" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy's assumption of responsibility can be traced back to his worldview of believing the leader needs to be strong and assume responsibility in a crisis, and reaches back to Kennedy's analysis of Baldwin who had failed to motivate his country. Kennedy renounced any interpretation that he would be an idle figure while the communists "drive us out of Berlin, either gradually or by force" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy used his charisma and personal beliefs heavily in this speech to inspire Americans to action; this was most apparent in his closing remarks.

Kennedy's closing remarks were a late addition to his speech, but as Sorensen noted, those closing personal remarks created an exchange between the president and audience that strengthened his appeal (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy asked his secretary Evelyn Lincoln to record the closing of his speech beginning with the words "Finally, I would like…" (Kempe, 2011, p. 308). As Kennedy spoke these words to Lincoln, she could hear the pain in his voice, the halting words of a man carrying a burden. Kennedy asked her to type up the conclusion. Lincoln could not remember a time when Kennedy added so much to the end of a speech a couple hours before its delivery (Kempe, 2011). Kennedy concluded, "I ask for your help, and your advice. I ask for your suggestions, when you think we could do better. All of us, I know, love our country, and we shall all do our best to serve it" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy's identification with his audience's fear helped create the bond between the American people and himself.

Sorensen (1965) recalled Kennedy wanting to end the speech on a personal note. Kennedy's ending was quite somber, "more somber, in fact, than the American people were accustomed to accept, more somber than any previous Presidential speech in the age of mutual nuclear capabilities" (Sorensen, 1965, p. 592). Though Kennedy's speech was somber, that tone helped create a bond with the audience because Kennedy's words were forthright. The president clearly defined how the U.S. was confronted with a dangerous situation, and his discussion of bomb shelters and the need for civil defense exemplified the danger.

Reaction: Words and the Berlin Wall

Zarefsky (2008), Windt Jr. (1986) and Bostdorff (1994) all suggest that the audience reaction to discourse is a crucial part of rhetorical criticism. Zarefsky (2008) explains that discourse is polysemic and can have different meanings to different audiences. I will now examine the polysemy of Kennedy's discourse by looking at the reaction of the Americans, Western Allies, West Germans and Berliners and Soviets, as well as the historical fallout from Kennedy's speech. I will offer a critique on how successful Kennedy was at building community and inspiring his targeted audiences at achieving some of the goals he proposed.

After the speech, Kennedy walked out of the Oval Office without a word to anyone. He went back to his personal quarters alone (Beschloss, 1991). In retrospect, Sorensen (1965) felt the weakest part of the speech was in JFK's call for negotiation over West Berlin. The Western Alliance's lack of unity over negotiations tempered any success for such an appeal. France was unwilling to negotiate, the British were against risking war without negotiations, and the Germans were against both the French and British positions, while Kennedy favored negotiations. Sorensen (1965) also recognized that the delivery was hampered by an overcrowded and sweltering office, and noted that the discussion of domestic civil defense was out of place and unduly alarming. But, the speech's other chords were strong, and were even considered belligerent by Khrushchev (Sorensen, 1965). At the time, these reservations were not shared by the rest of the American public or other officials.

Lyndon Johnson, Kennedy's Vice President, remarked "That boy is cool," and Richard Nixon remarked "If he has to press that button, he will…He's tough. I know. He beat me!" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 261). Reports from around the country portrayed the

difficulty of being a great leader of a troubled nation, “yet he conveyed the impression that he was the most troubled citizen of all” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 261); while the *Indianapolis News* praised Kennedy’s rhetoric, “America had been waiting for that kind of talk from the White House” (Beschloss, 1991, p.261). Media outlets across the nation supported Kennedy, but the crucial support needed to be won in Congress, which would fund the flexible response initiative.

The immediate reaction by Congress to Kennedy’s address was positive. Following Kennedy’s address, Congress communicated its willingness to increase the funding Kennedy had requested (Silvestri, 2000). Kennedy helped ensure Congressional support by using the “we” persona when discussing action America would take. Kennedy also stated multiple times: “I asked from the Congress” or “I shall not hesitate to ask the Congress” and told the nation that the specific details of his requests “will be presented to the Congress tomorrow” (Kennedy, 1961). Calling for Congressional action had two main benefits. First, Kennedy included Congress in the decision making process making them equals in foreign policy and responsible for the defense of Berlin and the world from communism. Being an action-oriented leader, Kennedy’s speech demonstrated to the American public he was active in fighting communism. He now left it to Congress to follow his lead and pass his requests. Second, it displayed unity within the U.S. government, there was no dissension in the U.S. ranks, an idea Khrushchev had eschewed. After the speech, Khrushchev was forced to recalculate. Either he would be faced with a united moderate government or, more likely, he now feared that the militarists had taken over and nuclear war could start at any moment. Either way,

Kennedy had reestablished American threat in the minds of the Soviets and gained Congressional and public approval for his policies.

Kennedy's biggest success was gaining the support of the American people-- the audience he called upon to make the largest economic sacrifices to fund flexible response. Harkening back to his inaugural address, Kennedy argued "that every American wants to pay his fair share, and not leave the burden of defending freedom entirely to those who bear arms…we cannot fail to meet our responsibilities" (Kennedy, 1961). America will bear any burden for freedom in the world. Kennedy included himself in the sacrifice in his closing remarks,

> I shall bear this responsibility under our Constitution for the next three and one-half years, but I am sure that we all, regardless of our occupations, will do our very best for our country, and for our cause. For all of us want to see our children grow up in a country at peace, and in a world where freedom endures (Kennedy, 1961).

This passage from the speech portrayed Kennedy as being the most disturbed American citizen. It also helped create a bond with the American audience because he was one of them, an ordinary citizen who shared the same burden they did. They were able to identify with Kennedy's concern. Kennedy was able to recognize their fears and successfully channel those fears to create identity with his audience. The sacrifice by Americans will be difficult, but Kennedy succeeded in pointing Americans toward a common goal; America must face and surpass this challenge because the fate of the free world relies on the American character and will. The reward for Americans sacrificing and overcoming the crisis is creating a world where "Freedom can prevail—and peace can endure" (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy was successful in strengthening the American

community by identifying himself as one of them and his Cold War strategy offered a vision that many Americans could support.[4]

Kennedy's second audience in his July 25, 1961, speech was the Western Alliance. He needed to reassert his leadership following the disaster in Cuba at the Bay of Pigs and Kennedy's waffling on support in Laos. Western leaders were privately questioning Kennedy's ability to lead the alliance against the Soviets (Pucci Jr., 1994). While Europe could never stray too far away from the American nuclear shield, a disharmonious Western Alliance was exactly what Khrushchev was hoping to achieve. This would help make Soviet advances against the West easier. Kennedy wanted to reestablish his presidential ethos and reassume firm command of the Western Alliance. Early in his speech, Kennedy states "The NATO shield was long ago extended to cover West Berlin" and that "The United States is there [Berlin]; the United Kingdom and France are there; the pledge of NATO is there—and the people of Berlin are there" (Kennedy, 1961). This is a reassurance of America's commitment to both NATO and its allies that America is not leaving Europe in a lurch, but that America is ready to lead the alliance. Kennedy ends his call to the nations to step up to the challenge of communism by telling every nation,

> It is a challenge to every nation which asserts its sovereignty under a system of liberty. It is a challenge to all those who want a world of free choice. It is a special challenge to the Atlantic Community—the heartland of human freedom. We in the West must move together to in building military strength. We must consult one another more closely than ever before. We must together design our proposals for peace, and labor together as they are pressed at the conference table. And together we must share the burdens and risks of this effort (Kennedy, 1961)

---

[4] In the days following the speech, thousands of telegrams reached the White House running twenty to one in favor of Kennedy; a Gallup Poll showed 85 percent of Americans were ready to risk war to keep U.S. troops in Berlin (Freedman, 2000, p. 71). Another 85 percent believed America should remain in Berlin, and a White House poll found 75 percent approved of the use of troops to defend Berlin (Pucci Jr., 1994).

Kennedy warns that “if there is one path above all others to war, it is the path of weakness and disunity” (Kennedy, 1961). Kennedy offered the Western Alliance a clear vision of how he would lead them in the Cold War. It was up to those nations to accept or reject his vision. He had already established a common history and shared values in his speech, but the West was more worried about his lack of vision and apparent haphazard approach to world affairs. His vision in his *Radio and Television* address allayed many of these fears.

By demonstrating resolve, Kennedy seemed presidential and portrayed himself as an indispensible head of state. In the wake of the July 25 address, the Allied response to Germany was positive. Britain began calling up reservists, and the *Laborite Daily Herald* said, “President Kennedy has made it clear there will be no surrender to Russian threats” (Silvestri, 2000, p. 185). Britain and France were especially supportive of Kennedy’s stand and praised him for balancing military firmness with a willingness to negotiate (Pucci Jr., 1994). Italy and India were a bit more wary, believing that tensions were rising as they had in 1939 (Silvestri, 2000). The Berlin crisis helped Kennedy reestablish America’s sphere of influence in global affairs and reasserted Kennedy’s presidential ethos (Pucci Jr., 1994). Kennedy regained the confidence of Western leadership, which he lost during the Bay of Pigs fiasco, through stressing the strength and unity of the Western Alliance.

Kennedy’s speech was received differently on the other side of the Iron Curtain. Coming out of Vienna, Khrushchev was fairly certain that the Americans would not go to war over Berlin; but after Kennedy’s speech, Khrushchev was given pause. One of Kennedy’s hopes in delivering the speech was to reduce the chance Khrushchev could

quickly and easily take West Berlin. The other purpose was to convince Khrushchev that the U.S. might go nuclear to prevent humiliation (Beschloss, 1991). Khrushchev's comments to Italian premier Amintore Fanfani highlighted Khrushchev's primary concern, "the possibility that Kennedy would respond to unilateral measures in West Berlin with conventional weapons under the false assumption that he would be able to keep the conflict at a controllable level" (Lunak, 2003, p. 75). This was a scary prospect to the Soviet premiere. Kennedy's speech seemed to have influenced Khrushchev in a manner that corresponded with U.S. aims.

Khrushchev's immediate reaction to Kennedy's address was that "Kennedy had declared preliminary war on the Soviet Union" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 377). Kennedy's speech was more belligerent than previous addresses. While Khrushchev may have worried that the militarists had taken over the U.S. government, and he might also have felt he must act before a U.S. attack (Freedman, 2000). Most American newspapers had missed Kennedy's call for negotiations, instead focusing on the defense buildup and fallout shelter preparations (Beschloss, 1991). The following day Khrushchev called GDR leader Walter Ulbricht, telling him "we have to use the tension in international relations now to circle Berlin in an iron ring. This must be done before concluding a peace treaty" (Fursenko, 2006, p. 377). John McCloy was invited to fly from Moscow to Pitsunda by Khrushchev. McCloy reports Khrushchev used bellicose language, warning that "if war broke out, Kennedy would be the last President of the United States. The next war would be decided by the biggest rockets. These were under the Soviet Union's command" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 263). The Soviets were ready to respond to all

provocations and may have been legitimately worried about U.S. intentions (Freedman, 2000). Circles inside the U.S. agreed with Khrushchev's initial reading of the speech.

Berlin was used as a rallying point for expanding the arms race, baptizing the flexible response doctrine, and setting the superpowers on a more dangerous course with the road to negotiation being significantly narrowed (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995a). Supporters of Kennedy believed the press did not pay attention to the peace offerings; something Khrushchev originally had missed as well (Goldzwig & Dionisopoulos, 1995a). The bellicose tone did have positive effects for Kennedy in future Soviet relations. Yuri Andropov, General Secretary of the Communist Party in the 1980s, complained privately that Khrushchev had pushed Kennedy into an arms race with the Soviet Union which it could not afford and could not win (Smyser, 2009). Khrushchev's view of American intent also changed. Two months before he was sure the Americans would not go to war over Berlin. Attending a conference of the Warsaw Pact in August, Khrushchev stated, "War is possible. In view of the fact that the Americans were not risking as much as the Europeans, the Americans could start it" (Lunak, 2003, p. 74). Once again, Khrushchev blamed this change on the militarists whom he believed had gained the upper hand in the U.S. government. A more reasonable assumption could be he misjudged Kennedy (Lunak, 2003). Kennedy could not allow himself to be portrayed as giving way under pressure and the fate of U.S. prestige was now tied to the freedom of West Berlin. Khrushchev began to worry whether or not he had read Kennedy right at Vienna (Smyser, 2009). Khrushchev would need to scour over Kennedy's speech a few more times before identifying the options Kennedy had actually provided.

A closer reading by Khrushchev of Kennedy's words revealed that Kennedy had actually implied that America would not intervene in East Berlin. Within the speech Kennedy often referred to the defense of "West Berlin" or "West Germany," which marked a stark contrast from previous American presidents who always spoke of Berlin as a whole. According to Frederick Kempe (2011) there were seventeen "West" qualifiers in front of Berlin. This distinction insinuated that the Soviets and GDR that they could act how they pleased in East Berlin, as long as they did not interfere with Western legal rights. Kennedy's address laid out exactly what Khrushchev could and could not do in Berlin (Smyser, 2009). Anonymous sources leaked that Kennedy was willing to negotiate and might be flexible on certain issues, now that American resolve had been established and the peace overtures had initially been overlooked (Beschloss, 1991). It was Kennedy's insistence on a free West Berlin, and Allied rights to East Berlin that had driven Khrushchev's primary attention. Kennedy never maintained that East Berlin had to be free. As Kennedy later admitted to adviser Walt Rostow, Khrushchev could build a wall, "And we won't be able to prevent it. I can hold the alliance together to defend West Berlin, but I cannot act to keep East Berlin open" (Smyser, 2009, p. 89). Khrushchev would come to realize that he had been given an opening. JFK provided a tacit signal to Khrushchev that he could stem the tide of refugees, extricate both superpowers from a dangerous situation, and save Soviet prestige. Khrushchev would order Ulbricht to build a wall to divide the city.

After the meetings in August with the British, Americans, French and West Germans, Kennedy moved ahead on his own to settle the German issue. He continued exploratory talks with Soviet ministers and representatives at meetings in New York,

Washington and Moscow. Khrushchev and Kennedy began to use back channels, rather than employ traditional diplomacy. Kennedy reached out to Khrushchev's son-in-law, Aleksei Adzhubei, who was editor of *Izvestia* and gave him an interview (Silvestri, 2000). The July 25 speech had mixed reviews in the Soviet Union. Negotiations and communication channels were kept open, but the Soviets remained wary of Kennedy's militant rhetoric and were unsure what to make of his peace offerings.

The West Germans, for their part, picked up immediately the careful specification of West Berlin as the vital center of interest, a theme that largely overshadowed the quadripartite agreement reached at Yalta and Potsdam in 1945 (Freedman, 2000). Instead Kennedy referred to the free access between East and West guaranteed at Potsdam, the "endangered frontier of freedom runs through divided Berlin…The Soviets government alone can convert Berlin's frontier of peace into a pretext for war" (Kennedy, 1961). Referring to the boundary as a "frontier of peace" hardly suggested disapproval of a wall, but McGeorge Bundy years later observed that the speech may have given Khrushchev the encouragement to close the border to lessen tensions. According to Bundy, "Kennedy could have spoken more vaguely, more of Berlin and less of West Berlin…the speech thus revised might have been more broadly deterrent to Khrushchev" but "distinctly less persuasive to Americans," who were being asked to make painful sacrifices (Beschloss, 1991, p. 279).

The use of "West" Berlin reinforced Kennedy's message from Vienna, the GDR and Soviets could do what they liked in East Berlin. Sorensen proudly showed a draft of the speech to James O'Donnell, an official in the U.S. Information Agency, who after closely reading the speech worried about Kennedy's reference to "West" Berlin and the

recognition of Soviet historical concerns. O'Donnell wondered if Kennedy was buying into Russian fears of resurgent German militarism and if he was forever ceding Eastern Europe (Kempe, 2011). Sorensen was upset that O'Donnell was missing the hard-line approach Kennedy was taking and he argued that the speech was only recognizing reality. O'Donnell suggested removing the qualifier "West," a simple solution, but after an hour of argument Sorensen protested: "I can't monkey around anymore with the text of this speech…this speech has been churned through the mills of six branches of government. We have had copies back and forth for ten days. This is the final version. This is the policy line" (Kempe, 2011, p. 315). Sorensen left his lunch with O'Donnell in a huff. Sorensen had beat off other attacks on the speech from the Berlin Mafia, the group of senior officials who had followed Berlin and fought for the defense of the city (Kempe, 2011).

Another reason Kennedy may have referred only to West Berlin was that he and his administration had come to the conclusion that there would be two Germanys presently and probably for foreseeable future. The administration determined that "neither the peace treaty nor the substitution of East Germans for Russians along the Autobahn [was] a fighting matter" (Schake, 2002, p. 34). This decision partially explains the reason Kennedy referred to only West Berlin and not all of Berlin.

When Kennedy's words were heard by Berliners and Germans, they all had the same reaction. Kennedy was willing to protect U.S. rights in West Berlin, but he would not object if Khrushchev stopped the refugee problem. Egon Bahr, the assistant to Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt, commented, "This is almost an invitation for the Soviets to do what they want with the Eastern sector" (Smyser, 2009, p. 89). Few in the Kennedy

administration expected the speech to solve anything. In early August, Rusk met with representatives from Britain, France and West Germany and they could not agree on either the timing or substance of a proposal to Moscow to end the “abnormal” situation in Berlin (Freedman, 2000).

German chancellor Adenauer was confused by Kennedy’s remarks. He initially wrote Kennedy a letter of support a day after the speech endorsing his call for a military buildup. Adenauer told Kennedy, “It is good to know that in times such as these the United States assumes the leadership in the NATO Alliance, in the conflict between the free world and the Communist world” (Mayer, 1996, p. 37). After learning of the whole proposal and outline and how that would affect West Germany, Adenauer opposed Kennedy’s speech. He questioned why America would emphasize a military buildup, while simultaneously emphasizing negotiation. Adenauer saw this as sending mixed messages to the Allies and encouraging the Soviets to act to split the Western Alliance (Kastner, 2002). Adenauer had also recognized Kennedy’s reference to only West Germany or Berlin, and this was of great concern to him. The omission of the shared U.S.-German goal of German reunification undercut fifteen years of U.S.-German policy. Kennedy’s qualifier of “West” Berlin had undercut his community building remarks when he spoke of West Berlin as a “beacon of hope” and insinuated that Berlin was the same as an American city, it was, but only West Berlin. To many Berliners, this was disheartening because they did not see a West and East Berlin, but a common city, with a common history and a community of people. Many Berliners and Germans worried how this might embolden Ulbricht and Khrushchev.

Why July 25, 1961 Matters

Kennedy's *Radio and Television* address introduced a military strategy to what Kennedy viewed as a military crisis. Khrushchev's bellicose tone at Vienna and his July 1961 announcement of raising Soviet military expenditures all signaled a military confrontation in Berlin. Kennedy, in turn responded with a military strategy, flexible response that called for the slow build up of military forces, the growth of the military budget and civil defense expenditures for the American people. Kennedy was reacting to the historical circumstances that confronted him in 1961. He appeared weak after Vienna which hampered his negotiating position with the Soviets. Kennedy believed the only way to right the situation was to reassert American military strength. He achieved success in building up the American military, but as we will see Kennedy's words on July 25 had lasting historical effects in Berlin and the world, and the military buildup did not solve the issue of Berlin. His speech also created a new problem, a crisis of confidence and a fracturing of his West German audience from the Western Alliance. West Berliners and Germans felt betrayed by Kennedy's speech and the U.S.-German relationship was at its lowest point since immediately after World War II. Kennedy now had to respond to this crisis and in the two years between his *Radio and Television* address and his trip to Germany, he and Khrushchev would bring the world to the brink of nuclear war.

The Fallout: The Berlin Wall

Zarefsky (2008) observes that one of the main principles of rhetorical criticism is to "address the question of the actual response of a specific audience and the degree to which that response can be attributed to the rhetorical work" (p. 633). The following

history of the Berlin Wall will portray how Kennedy's speech on July 25, 1961, influenced the historical events surrounding the erection of the Wall.

The increase in refugees flowing out of East Berlin demonstrated that East Berliners interpreted Kennedy's remarks in the same way that Khrushchev, Bahr, and Ulbricht would, that the U.S. would do nothing to stop a solution to the refugee problem. East Germans interpreted Kennedy's speech as a sign that if they wanted to leave, the sooner the better (Smyser, 2009). East Germans were now more fearful than ever that the open border and escape hatch to the West might now be closing. Beginning with Khrushchev's July 8 speech indicating a rise in Soviet defense expenditures, 26,000 people left what Macmillan called the Marxist Heaven of East Germany for a Capitalist Hell or at the least purgatory of West Berlin (Beschloss, 1991). A week after Kennedy's July 25, 1961 speech, Senator J. William Fulbright (Dem., AR) commented:

> The truth of the matter is, I think, the Russians have the power to close it in any case…if they chose to close their borders, they could, without violating any treaty. I don't understand why the East Germans don't close their border because I think they have the right to close it (Beschloss, 1991, p. 264).

Kennedy never repudiated Fulbright and McGeorge Bundy reported favorably to Kennedy about Fulbright's comments (Kempe, 2011). Diplomat Llewellyn Thompson cabled Kennedy from Moscow telling Kennedy that he expected the Germans to "seal off the sector boundary in order to stop what they must consider intolerable continuation of the refugee flow through Berlin" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 265). Kennedy told Rostow

> Khrushchev is losing East Germany. He cannot let that happen. If East Germany goes, so will Poland and all of Eastern Europe. He will have to do something to stop the flow of refugees. Perhaps a wall. And we won't be able to prevent it. I can hold the Alliance together to defend West Berlin, but I cannot act to keep East Berlin open (Beschloss, 1991, p. 265).

Kennedy knew that Macmillan wanted no commitments in East Berlin and de Gaulle did not state what he would do in any contingency. Kennedy wanted to be precise and limited in his remarks and that was what he accomplished (Smyser, 2009). With that, the fate of East Berlin was sealed. Within a couple of weeks, the East Germans and Walter Ulbricht would construct one of the most dehumanizing markers of the Cold War, the Berlin Wall.

Ulbricht told Khrushchev a day after Fulbright's comments that he could close the air corridors and all access routes between West Berlin and West Germany in order to stop refugees from leaving. Khrushchev agreed that something needed to be done to stop the refugee problem, but the closing of air corridors was too risky and might precipitate war (Smyser, 2009). The solution settled upon was a wall that closed the border between the two Berlins.

Three factors that led Khrushchev to give the go ahead and build the Wall were Ulbricht's insistence that the refugee problem needed to end, Kennedy's July 25 speech, which implied that the East they could do what they wanted in East Berlin, and West Germany's threat of an embargo if a treaty was signed (Smyser, 2009). Khrushchev would later admit the wall was "a hateful thing," but "[w]hat should I have done? More than 30,000 people, in fact the best and most qualified people from the GDR, left the country in July…[T]he East German economy would have collapsed if we hadn't done something soon against the mass flight…So the Wall was the only option" (Gaddis, 2005a, p.115).

On August 7, Ulbricht informed the Poltiburo that the plan with approval from Moscow was to close the border on Sunday August 13 which became known as Stacheldrahtsonntag, Barbed Wire Sunday (Taylor, 2007). In the week leading up to the

border closing, 9,869 refugees left East Germany for the West. If this number continued for a year, over half a million people would have left the East for the West dwarfing the number in 1953. The flow of refugees reinforced Kennedy's sentiment, expressed in his July 25 address, that East Berliners "who have fled the Communist regime in East Germany [were] voting for Western-type freedom with their feet" (Kennedy, 1961). Operation Rose went into effect at one minute past midnight on August 13, 1961. The East announced that traffic between the two Berlins would be halted until further notice. People were standing in the subways waiting for trains in a mix of bewilderment and desperation. When dawn broke at five o'clock in the morning, East German construction brigades and their armed escorts were already at work. Berlin had been caught by surprise (Taylor, 2007). At first the wall was just a barbed wire barrier, but then it became a twelve foot high concrete barrier almost a hundred miles long. Along the entire span of the wall were guard towers, minefields, police dogs and orders to shoot to kill anyone who passed it (Gaddis, 2005a). The wall was intended to prevent the impending capitalist invasion from the West, but with the Kampfgruppen standing with their backs to the wall and pointing their guns inward, the clear impression was the Wall was a prison to keep East Germans in, not to keep the West out (Ross, 2004).

The Western response to the Wall displayed marked indifference. President Kennedy was at Hyannis Port with his family and other members of his administration were out or at home on that Sunday. When Dean Rusk first learned about the erection of the Berlin Wall, he decided not to call the president until harder information came into the office. Rusk concluded, "Western powers had never considered East Berlin in itself an issue over which they were willing to go to war. However much they should deplore

the partitioning, they should not think of changing the lines of demarcation by force" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 272). Kennedy received a message from Washington disclosing that the wall had been erected in the afternoon. He immediately called Rusk and asked "What the hell is this? How long have you known? Was there any warning in the last two or three days?" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 272-73). Rusk said he could not be certain but perhaps the Russians were trying to end, not just control the refugee flow. There was no need for Kennedy to rush back to Washington in Rusk's mind. Kennedy told Rusk to issue a statement saying that the "violations of existing agreements will be the subject of vigorous protest through appropriate channels" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 273). Kennedy told Rusk to go the ballgame he intended on attending and Kennedy continued his plans for sailing.

Macmillan was hundreds of miles away from London that weekend hunting grouse with his nephew. When Macmillan was informed of the erection of the wall, his reaction, much like Kennedy's, was indifference. He, too, continued his weekend vacation. The British ambassador to West Germany, Sir Christopher Steel, commented, "I must stay that I personally have always wondered that the East Germans have waited so long to seal this boundary" (Taylor, 2007, p. 45). Steel's main concern was that the U.S. maintained a rational approach. He sought to meet with the Americans to work on a common strategy. French leader Charles De Gaulle was at his country home in Colombey-les-Deux-Eglises and was so relaxed about the Berlin issue that he did not return to Paris until August 17 (Taylor, 2007). De Gaulle saw the Wall as "physical proof that the Kremlin has given up hope of frightening the Americans, the British and the French into allowing them to lay hands on the city" (Smyser, 2009, p. 120).

From the global perspective, the Wall was not necessarily the catastrophe it first appeared. NATO feared that the increased rhetoric from Moscow toward Turkey and Greece, along with the intensification of Warsaw Pact military maneuvers in August 1961, was a sign that the Berlin Wall was not purely defensive. The NATO assessment overlooked the influence of the East German government on Soviet policy making in the episode (Hatzivassiliou, 2009). The U.S. outlook and response was truer to the Soviet's true intentions. The official response by the U.S., formulated by both Kennedy and Rusk, was as follows:

> Available information indicates that measures taken thus far are aimed at residents of East Berlin and East Germany and not at the Allied position in West Berlin or access thereto. However limitation on travel within Berlin is a violation of the four-power status of Berlin and a flagrant violation of the right of free circulation throughout the city…These violations of existing agreements will be the subject of vigorous protest through appropriate channels (Gelb, 1987, p. 184).

The bland response by the U.S. was intended to steer clear of any flame of revolt remotely similar to the 1953 East German uprising and the 1956 Hungarian rebellion (Beschloss, 1991). Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs, Foy Kohler commented, "The East Germans have done us a favor" (Smyser, 2009, p. 105). For anyone to assume the Wall was a sign of Eastern strength, rather than weakness, was counter to conventional thinking at that time (Ross, 2004). The Wall was perceived as a negative symbol of communism, but the West Germans still wanted a response from the West.

Adenauer's biggest concern after the erection of the Wall turned to Berlin and the prevention of an uprising on the scale of 1953. The lesson of 1953 with Soviet tanks rolling into Berlin and the untold number of civilian deaths was fresh in his mind.

Previous border closings by the GDR caused Adenauer to stay out of Berlin. Instead, he opted to work on his election campaign. He believed that if he rushed off to Berlin it would only raise the sense of crisis in the city. Also, with Berlin being in four-power control there was little Adenauer could realistically accomplish (Kastner, 2002). In an interview in 1963, Adenauer recalled the West's reticence to act:

> After the Berlin Wall began to go up…absolutely nothing yet happened…even though the Russians had broken their treaties and erected the wall, the Americans put up with it…The Americans even tried to tell us that it was a good thing because the flow of refugees was stopped (Mayer, 1994, p. 88).

Adenauer continued with his campaign because he believed it was the best way to combat the ultimate Soviet and East German aims (Kastner, 2002). Even in these dire circumstances, Kennedy was hoping to negotiate with the Soviets. Bundy believed that "while closing off the East Berlin border was a most serious matter…in realistic terms, it would make a Berlin settlement easier" (Mayer, 1994, p. 89). Negotiations with the Soviets were tough to swallow for the FRG and Adenauer because Kennedy had also considered negotiating with the GDR.

The FRG believed any negotiations with the GDR would make the separation of Germany more permanent (Mathiopoulos, 1985). Adenauer reacted critically and bitterly to Kennedy's reconfiguration of U.S. prerogatives in Germany without consultation. The Wall made reunification, Adenauer's main foreign policy goal, seem impossible. The Americans were more concerned over Western access to East Berlin than reunification. As such, the touchstone of U.S.-Soviet relations was no longer centered on the reunification of Berlin and Germany (Lang, 1995).

The biggest change that would occur with Adenauer over the next two years was his mindset. While always believing that the FRG's most reliable ally had been America, he slowly came to see America as unreliable and not having the best interests of Germany in mind. Adenauer slowly began to orient his policy toward France. The chancellor came to see de Gaulle as the more trustworthy ally (Kastner, 2002). Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt, who initially irritated Kennedy, would become one of the staunchest supporters of U.S. policy and presented a stark contrast to Adenauer.

Brandt, like Kennedy, was a young politician who was charismatic and rhetorically gifted. Brandt gave a speech on August 16 in reaction to the presence of a barrier that was to erase all hope for reunification of the two Berlins (Passey, 1973). In his address, he tried to temper the anger in West Berlin by telling its citizens to accept the new situation as the allies had asked and to avoid incidents that might provoke retaliation or an uprising. Nevertheless, he seemed to also call for a vigorous response, "Berlin expects more than protests. Berlin expects political action" (Smyser, 2009, p. 112).

Comparing the wall and the West's inaction to Munich, a reference to the Western failure to stop Hitler, Brandt lamented, "Our countrymen in the Soviet Sector and the Soviet Zone now carry the heaviest burden" (Gelb, 1987, p. 218). Brandt warned of the consequences of failure

> The illegal sovereignty of the government of East Berlin has been recognized…I consider this a serious turning point in the postwar history of the city, such as has not been experienced since the blockade. This development has not altered the will to resist of the population of West Berlin, but it has succeeded in casting doubt upon the capability and determination of the Three Powers to react…The Soviet Union has used the [East German] People's Army to achieve half of its proposals for a "free city." Act Two is only a question of time. After Act Two we would find a Berlin which resembles a ghetto. Having lost…the symbol of hope

> for reunification, it will also be cut off from the free section of Germany (Gelb, 1987, p. 219).

He informed the assembly that he wrote a letter to Kennedy in which he pleaded for American action and warned of a crisis of confidence in Berlin. He asked Kennedy to reinforce the Berlin garrison and to consider declaring Berlin a three-power city. Brandt even suggested bringing the issue to the United Nations (Smyser, 2009). Brandt's own disappointment in the West is reflected in his declaration that "Kennedy cooked our goose" (Passey, 1973, p. 121).

Brandt was able to read the temperament of his audience and gave them courage and confidence in the face of difficult times for many Berliners. He inspired them with idealistic lines such as: "Here it is no longer a concern for the rights of the Western powers, but rather that the rights of men be restored" (Passey, 1973, p. 122-23).

The Wall, however, would figure prominently in Brandt's Ostpolitik. With the Wall's erection, the GDR gained 16 million hostages and cut off 2 million West Berliners. The Wall created a humanitarian need on both sides, which Brandt would try to address. Ostpolitik's stroke of brilliance was its recognition that the Wall could not be removed, so the next best step was to make it transparent (Hofmann, 2007). However, acceptance of the Wall and humanitarian work remained a few years in the future. Anger in Berlin arose from the wait-and-see approach being taken in Washington, but Brandt emerged as "the voice for the feelings of betrayal over the slow reaction of the West" (Passey, 1973, p. 121). Brandt's public disclosure of his letter to Kennedy brought international pressure on the United States to act.

Kennedy was furious over Brandt's public disclosure of the letter and its contents. When Kennedy heard of Brandt's remarks, he responded by saying "Who does he think

he is?" (Smyser, 2009, p. 112). The president felt Brandt had overstepped his position greatly (Daum, 2008). Kennedy did take some of Brandt's comments to heart (Smyser, 2009). But the publication of the letter redirected anger at the Wall away from those responsible and back toward the Western powers, which irritated Kennedy (Daum, 2008). Kennedy began to worry about the crisis of confidence facing West Berlin. General Clay called General Maxwell Taylor and told Taylor to tell Kennedy that he could not ignore what had happened. Kennedy respected Clay who was not only a hero in Berlin, but a leading figure in the Republican Party. The president was also unhappy that the word appeasement was attached to his acceptance of the Wall (Smyser, 2009). As a demonstration of strength and commitment, Kennedy chose to send Vice President Lyndon Johnson and Berlin Blockade hero, Lucius Clay to Berlin along with a contingent of 1,500 troops. Kennedy believed Berlin needed a morale boost. By sending the vice president and a symbolic hero, the president hoped to rally the spirits of Berliners and stave off some of the ill effects of the Wall.

Clay and Johnson arrived in Berlin on August 19 and stayed until August 20. Johnson and Clay were overwhelmed by Berliners who demonstrated their support for their actions. Johnson's reception of the troop contingent sent a clear message that the Americans had the courage to act in Berlin even though they accepted the Wall (Smyser, 2009). The trip by Clay and Johnson helped create solidarity between America and Berlin and helped regenerate public trust in the United States on the part of the West Germans (Daum, 2008). The symbolic act of solidarity was also an opportunity for Kennedy to discipline Brandt, as Kennedy told Johnson to speak with him and "to make clear to him that he should cease criticism of the United States" (Daum, 2008, p. 29). The decision by

Kennedy also marked an evolution in his presidency, as it was the first time he opted to go against his top military advisers, as well as Charles Bohlen, the leading Soviet expert and a towering figure in politics (Smyser, 2009). The trip helped erase doubts in the minds of West Germans and Brandt believed the U.S. troop reinforcements "made a deep impression on the Russians – and when they are impressed they are less likely to take risks" (Passey, 1973, p. 125). Opinion polls from Germany revealed that 83 percent of West Berliners and 67 percent of West Germans approved of Johnson's trip, and 63 percent of West Berliners and 39 percent of West Germans believed the trip was a sign of the seriousness of America's commitment in Berlin (Daum, 2008). After reaching the lowest point in U.S.-German relations with the erection of the Berlin Wall, Kennedy's decision to send Clay and Johnson helped put the U.S.-German relationship on more solid ground.

The Berlin Wall was supposed to establish a new power structure in East Berlin by depriving ordinary East German citizens with the "trump card" of emigrating west. The Wall, much to the GDR's surprise, did not solve the problem, but merely reconfigured it (Ross, 2004). Indeed, with the hindsight of history, the initial belief that the Wall solved the problems of the East and was a victory for Moscow was proven wrong (May, 1998). The chronic labor shortage and lack of productivity incentives were inherent traits of the planned economy and remained problems in the GDR whether or not there was an open border. The Wall locked in a frozen, rigid social structure and the border closure helped foster a rapid decline in social mobility in the GDR. Citizens could no longer earn higher wages in the West and return and be "rich" in the East. The growing dissatisfaction in the East forced residents to accept certain amounts of Western

culture to make up for the loss of social mobility. Although there was an increase in living standards after 1961, there was little progress on the development of a popular political consciousness associated with the East German regime (Ross, 2004). Partial control of the city was no substitute for controlling the entire city for Eastern leaders (May, 1998). While the economic benefits increased, East Germans still lagged behind the West. With the Wall's presence, the juxtaposition of two Berlins put a sharp focus on the success of the West and the dismal failure of the East (May, 1998).

Heading into September 1961, Kennedy had decided to enter into negotiations with the Soviets. De Gaulle was against the negotiations, but Kennedy indicated he would move forward. He told Adenauer that he was seeking talks "over Berlin only because public opinion and the sheer logic of thermonuclear war demand such a course of action" (Mayer, 1994, p. 90). Kennedy warned Adenauer to protect against government leaks because they were grave threats to the talks (Mayer, 1994). Moscow interpreted the call for negotiations as a simple matter with a simple rationale: "[T]he Americans are looking for ways to come to an agreement with us, because the West has recognized de facto that an unacceptable state of affairs will come into effect after we conclude a peace treaty with the GDR" (Lunak, 2003, p. 77). When talks continued with Rusk, and he offered a non-nuclear zone in Central Europe or a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, Khrushchev withdrew his deadline of agreeing to a Peace Treaty before the end of 1961 (Lunak, 2003).

September 1961-October 1962: 'We Did Not Send Him to See the Opera in East Berlin'

Kennedy was grappling with the Berlin issue when he asked the CIA to reappraise the emergency assessment they issued in June. The CIA reported that their June estimate

of Soviet capability was too high, and in fact, the Soviets had thirty-five operational ICBMs. One week later, General Lemnitzer lowered the figure to ten to twenty-five, and unlike America's missiles that were in hardened silos, the Soviet missiles were not in silos and cumbersome to launch (Beschloss, 1991). The CIA also had all the locations of the missiles thanks to satellite imagery from the Pentagon. This information basically dropped the value of a first strike Soviet attack to limited value and almost none for a second strike. As State Department intelligence chief Roger Hilsman recalled, "The whole Soviet ICBM system was suddenly obsolescent" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 328). In late October, Kennedy had McNamara's deputy Roswell Gilpatric speak to the Business Council in Hot Springs about the superiority of the U.S. position. Kennedy was wary of telling the Soviets about the large missile gap favoring the Americans because he feared Khrushchev would speed up the Soviet ICBM program, but Kennedy sanctioned the speech. The president reasoned that if Khrushchev believed he still had nuclear superiority, he might bring the world close to war (Beschloss, 1991). The speech was about to coincide with a challenge by American forces in Berlin over access rights to East Berlin, which caused Khrushchev to react harshly as he felt Kennedy was trying to embarrass him on the international stage. To make the situation more tense, General Clay challenged the Soviets and the GDR in Berlin.

General Clay had been sent to Berlin to help boost the morale after the Berlin Wall. Kennedy kept Clay on in Berlin as his personal representative. Soon American military forces would find themselves in a frightening standoff with Soviet forces. The incident began when Allan Lightner, the senior American civilian in West Berlin, crossed into East Germany and was stopped by East German Vopos, People's Police, who

demanded to see identification. American license plates had always been relied upon to enter East Berlin. Lightner refused because the U.S. did not recognize East German authority. He demanded to see a Soviet official, but the Vopos refused (Beschloss, 1991). Lightner referred the matter to Clay.

Clay decided to test the East again and the next morning he sent an American civilian with U.S. military number plates through the checkpoint. He was refused and asked to see a Soviet officer, again no one appeared. About an hour later Clay sent ten American tanks within 50 to 60 meters of the checkpoint with the two front tanks mounted with bulldozer blades (Taylor, 2008). Clay was testing the delineation of powers between the Soviets and the GDR, a concept not firmly established in the GDR's founding, unlike the clear definition of power between the FRG and the Western Powers.

Back in Moscow, Khrushchev was wondering if Lightner was the harbinger of a new belligerent policy. Little did Khrushchev or the East know, it was Clay, not Kennedy, who was responsible for this new provocation. When Kennedy found out, he complained "We didn't send him over there to go to the opera in East Berlin." (Beschloss, 1991, p. 333). The East replied, with Soviet approval, that only Allied personnel in uniform would be allowed to enter (Beschloss, 1991). Clay kept sending vehicles with American military personnel across the border a few hundred yards and having them return as a show of U.S. strength and will. On October 25, Clay ordered 10 M-48 Patton tanks to the crossing point. By evening, 30 Soviet tanks were making their way towards the Friedrichstrasse. Clay asked if he could make a raid into the East, tearing down bits of the Wall on the way back. Rusk denied this request (Trauschweizer,

2006). Clay continued to play his theatrical game, trying to send civilians over with American military personnel.

On October 26, three jeeploads of soldiers wearing bullet-proof vests with bayonets fixed escorted a Ford Taunus into East Berlin. The East Germans bellowed, “This is the worst example of international impudence the world has ever known,” to which a man from the provost-marshal’s staff replied, “You seem to have forgotten that we do not recognize you, and God forbid we ever should” (Taylor, 2008, p. 281). On October 27, the Soviets brought up their tanks which they disguised by putting mud on the insignia of the tanks because Russian tanks would have called into question GDR sovereignty (Smyser, 2009). U.S. officials monitoring the radio waves found out the crews were speaking Russian, not German. Clay immediately called a press conference and claimed the harassment was not by the GDR, but by the Soviets (Smyser, 2009 & Taylor, 2008). Marshal Konev who was in Berlin attending a conference was the senior Soviet military adviser in Berlin. He ordered the Soviet tanks to block the American tanks because he was worried what Ulbricht might do in the tense situation (Smyser, 2009). When American tanks arrived in the morning, the two superpowers directly squared off with armed forces for the first and only time during the Cold War. The scene made for dramatic photographs; it was a tense situation for all involved (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006).

Khrushchev was in constant contact with Konev because he did not want the situation to get out of control (Smyser, 2009). Kennedy directed his brother, Robert, to work on a solution to the standoff. Robert had contacted Georgi Bolshakov, a KGB officer working in D.C. as a press attaché (Taylor, 2008). JFK asked RFK to relay this

message to Bolshakov: “The situation in Berlin has become more difficult,” RFK explained. “Today our ambassador met with Soviet Foreign minister Gromyko, who refused our declaration regarding the recent incidents that have occurred in Berlin. It is our opinion that such an attitude is not helpful at a time when efforts are being made to find a way to resolve this problem” (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 404). RFK asked for a four to six week period for the U.S. and its allies to work out its stance on Berlin. He asked for calm and for increased efforts to keep Berlin out of the headlines (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). The U.S. expressed its willingness to be flexible in talks with the Soviets over Berlin, if Khrushchev would remove his tanks within 24 hours (Mayer, 1996).

Sometime before 11:30 P.M., Moscow time, Khrushchev decided to remove his tanks. As he later explained, “I knew Kennedy was looking for a way to back down. I decided therefore that if I removed my tanks first, then he would follow suit; [and] he did” (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 404). The next day Khrushchev gave orders to remove the Soviet tanks from Berlin, and within twenty-four hours Kennedy ordered the same. The standoff was over (Trauschweizer, 2006). The superpowers were not about to go to war over one man’s refusal to present identification at the checkpoint.

With the resolution of the Checkpoint Charlie incident, the next year was relatively calm. Kennedy was able to get Adenauer to accede to negotiations with the Soviets over Berlin as long as Western rights were preserved; he also accepted an expansion of Bonn’s forces in NATO from eight to twelve divisions. In return, Kennedy pledged not to bargain over the Oder-Neisse Line, recognize the GDR or neutralize Central Europe. Kennedy rejected Adenauer’s request to have a share in NATO decision

making (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy publically shared Soviet concern over West Germany if they gained nuclear power. JFK observed:

> As long as German forces are integrated into NATO…there is security for all…Now, if the situation changed, if Germany develops an atomic capability of its own, if it developed missiles or a strong national army that threatened war, then I would understand your concern, and I would share it. After all, we have had two wars in Europe, as well as you (Mayer, 1994, p. 92).

Kennedy was not going to allow Germany to gain a nuclear capability. The CDU newspaper in Germany *Christ Und Welt* reported, "No American president for many years has expressed such a deep distrust of Germany so clearly" (Mayer, 1996, p. 62). Kennedy was irritated again that the German press castigated him for weakness on Berlin when he had taken so many risks to ensure the safety of the city. Kennedy had increased his military budget to protect Berlin and he had forced Khrushchev to stand down less than a year ago. He was even more irritated that the French were seen as heroes, even though they were the ones stirring the pot about America's commitment to Europe and questioning what America's role should be on the continent (Freedman, 2000).

Khrushchev was looking for away to rebalance the power between the two superpowers. As Kennedy noted, "Power…was as much a function of perceptions as of hardware, position, or will" (Gaddis, 2005b, p. 200). Gilpatric's speech had reasserted America's dominance and suggested that global power had shifted, even though it was merely a perception, for in reality the U.S. had always had nuclear superiority. Kennedy sanctioned Gilpatric's speech because he wanted to end Khrushchev's grandiose dreams of Soviet dominance, suggest to the Third World and non-aligned states that the U.S. was the true superpower and, ultimately, gain the upper hand in negotiations (Beschloss,

1991). Khrushchev now looked for a quick and cheap way to restore the perception of power in the world.

Kennedy's toughness on Berlin and the Gilpatric speech had undermined Khrushchev's position at home. Khrushchev was in denial about U.S. strength. He publically rejected "the notion that a few nuclear weapons were all a nation needed to deter aggression" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 380). Unfortunately for Khrushchev, by his own logic, the more nuclear weapons a nation had the more military and political power the nation had. His failure to drive out the Americans after four years of bluster was turning him into a target for criticism among the Soviet leadership and people. By his own standards, the Soviet Union was in deep trouble since the U.S. might be planning a first strike (Beschloss, 1991). Khrushchev's threats failed against superior U.S. firepower and Kennedy's refusal to back down.

By January 1962, Khrushchev was asking Kennedy if they should initiate private bilateral talks on the Berlin and German issue. Kennedy was amenable because he had a new idea for access routes to Berlin. Kennedy wanted to propose a thirteen-member "International Access Authority" to control ground and air routes to West Berlin. The members would include the USSR, the GDR, two more Eastern states, the three Western powers, the FRG and West Berlin with three neutral states being Sweden, Switzerland and Austria (Smyser, 2009). The possibility of East German participation in the IAA, which amounted to tacit recognition, was an issue that could separate Adenauer and Kennedy. The U.S.'s prescription came to be known as the "Principles Paper." Unfortunately, its release would create more suspicion on the part of the German Chancellor, who read the document as yet another cause for concern.

Prior to the leak of the Principles Paper in the spring, Robert Kennedy had visited Berlin in February. RFK's speech was important for two reasons. First, he urged his audience to accept and embrace the idea of peaceful coexistence between East and West. Second, Brandt was very much impressed by the president's brother and RFK, for his part, was impressed by Berlin. In RFK, Brandt found an important contact in the White House (Hofmann, 2007). The Principles Paper outlined JFK's negotiation strategy with the Russians in the coming months. In spring 1962, the papers were leaked to the press. The Papers included provisions on

1. The establishment of mixed West and East German technical commissions to oversee cultural and technical contacts, and promote mutually beneficial economic exchanges;
2. The development of policies regarding nondiffusion of nuclear weapons; and
3. A suitable declaration regarding nonaggression between NATO and Warsaw Pact powers (Mayer, 1996, p. 68-69).

In April, Adenauer responded rather icily:

> Up to now the repeated attempts to open negotiations with the Soviet Union on Berlin have failed. The latest proposals of the Department of State compromise decisive elements concerning not only Berlin but also the German question, which exceed all previous offers made to the Soviet Union. I have considerable objections against some of these proposals and I would urgently request you, my dear Mr. President, to consider interrupting, for the time being, the negotiations and using this time to reexamine all problems concerning Berlin (Mayer, 1994, p. 94).

Kennedy was surprised that Adenauer found anything startlingly new and decisive since he believed all relevant issues were discussed between Adenauer and Rusk in March. By May, Adenauer was publically questioning Kennedy's efforts to negotiate with the Russians over Berlin (Mayer, 1994). The "Principles Papers" had soured U.S. relations with Bonn and drove Adenauer even closer to de Gaulle.

Brandt followed the break between Bonn and Washington closely. Brandt had toyed with the idea of internationalizing the communication lines between East and West Berlin in 1958 under U.N. guarantees and in 1960 Bahr suggested to Brandt an "international or exterritorial corridor of whatever technical kind" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 53). Brandt had learned that the GDR would participate in the IAA, but not control the corridors. The negotiations between the West and the USSR on broader topics were hindered by the lack of Western maneuver on Berlin. America was "determined to broaden the basis of negotiations by marking congruent interests in questions of European security in a 'new approach' in order to obtain 'barter objects', which can be brought into the Berlin discussion" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 53). The barter objects included non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and declarations of reunification of force, much of which was unsavory to traditional West German positions. Brandt was not Adenauer, Berlin was not Bonn and his position was aligning with the American position (Hofmann, 2007). Kennedy's long held position that the Germans were going to have to solve some of their own issues was becoming more prominent in his policy development on Berlin.

By late June 1962, Brandt and Rusk met. Brandt was ready to launch his main project: "the necessity to take some action to create holes in the wall by political means' and suggested no less than six ways of going about this, including the German-German technical commissions envisioned in the draft principles" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 59). As an internal memo in the Kennedy administration stated "The Germans clearly have to carry the ball…we might be able to come up with means for facilitating continuous East and West German contacts which could be useful to us politically" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 59).

Rusk was convinced of Brandt's potential. He believed that Berlin had fewer illusions than the FRG and would go farther in opening up inter-German discussions (Hofmann, 2007). In early October 1962, Brandt delivered a guest lecture at Harvard. Carl Kaysen, Kennedy's Deputy National Security Advisor, noted that Brandt's lectures had two themes. First, progress toward reunification could only be made by some kind of détente with the Soviet bloc. Second, Brandt believed Berlin could only be dealt with in the larger context of the Cold War (Hofmann, 2007). Brandt's views were now consistent with Kennedy's and were useful in exemplifying German support for Kennedy's policies. Before Kennedy had a chance to continue his détente strategy between the two Germanys, the Cuban Missile Crisis would bring the world to the brink of nuclear war.

Cuban Missile Crisis: 'I Think the Other Guy Blinked'

Khrushchev saw his policies in Berlin as failing and he needed to restore the balance of power in the world. He saw Cuba as an opportunity to both restore the balance between the two superpowers and as a way to gain some concessions on Berlin. Khrushchev firmly believed that a U.S. invasion of Cuba was imminent and inevitable (Beschloss, 1991). Khrushchev continued to believe the imperialists were gaining control of the Kennedy administration and influencing his actions (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). His solution was to send nuclear missiles to Cuba to act as a deterrent. He would notify Kennedy of their presence by a personal letter. The U.S. intelligence agencies would not know about the missiles for eight weeks. Khrushchev believed Kennedy would conceal the embarrassing information, as he did with the Bay of Pigs and Berlin, from the public until after the elections in November. Khrushchev even thought Kennedy might view the missile installations as solely defensive. Khrushchev believed the missiles were defensive

and likened them to American missiles in Turkey and Italy (Beschloss, 1991). Khrushchev's belief that Kennedy would silently accept missiles less than 90 miles from America was, of course, quite misguided.

Khrushchev firmly believed that placing missiles in Cuba would restore the balance of power between the two superpowers. Sergei Khrushchev, Nikita's son, remembers the nuclear imbalance "naturally tormented our leadership a great deal" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 385). Mikoyan, who originally questioned Khrushchev's strategy at Vienna, again questioned his logic on the Cuban missiles. He predicted the Americans would never accept missiles so close to their homeland, but believed Khrushchev had only two thoughts on his mind "Defend Cuba and repair the imbalance. But defending Cuba was his first thought" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 385). Andrei Gromyko, a leading Soviet Minister, cautioned, "I must say frankly that putting our missiles in Cuba would cause a political explosion in the United States. I am absolutely certain of that, and this should be taken into account" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 387). Khrushchev hoped Kennedy would react as he had to the Berlin Wall—act surprised, send a formal protest, and then tell the American people this was not an issue the U.S. was willing to go to war over. Khrushchev's view may have been formed by William Fulbright's claim that U.S. national existence would not "be in substantially greater danger than is the case today" if missiles were in Cuba (Beschloss, 1991, p. 392). Khrushchev may have thought Fulbright was speaking for Kennedy.

Khrushchev also noted that America used other countries around the globe for staging grounds, so why should this be any different for the Soviet Union. Khrushchev crowed: "It was high time America learned what it feels like to have her own land and

her own people threatened" and he was ready to give America "a little taste of their own medicine" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 393). Khrushchev firmly believed that missiles would make Cuba safer. Most experts advising Castro believed the missiles would make Cuba a target for the U.S. (May, 1998). Khrushchev thought the Americans would merely make a rhetorical fuss over missiles placed in Cuba. Khrushchev thought he might be able to go to New York and make a moderate speech proposing U.N. police in place of Western soldiers in West Berlin. With the threat of nuclear war in play over missiles in Cuba, the U.N. might find his proposal reasonable and accede. Kennedy would have been hard pressed to oppose it (Smyser, 2009). The scenario did not play out as the premier had hoped.

Kennedy received the news of the Cuban missiles from Bundy on the morning of October 16, 1962, around 9 A.M. (Sorensen, 1965). He was taking in his morning papers in his bedroom when Bundy told him the news. Kennedy, though angry at Khrushchev's efforts to deceive him, received the news calmly and immediately recognized the danger of the situation. Kennedy's experts believed this sort of precipitous action was wholly uncharacteristic of Soviet policy (Sorensen, 1965). Dean Rusk warned Kennedy that Khrushchev's move in Cuba could be merely diversionary with his true aim being Berlin (Beschloss, 1991). Regardless of Khrushchev's aims, Kennedy initially had six options to choose from: do nothing, bring diplomatic pressures to bear on the Soviets, undertake missions to Castro to divide Cuba and Russia, use indirect military action such as a blockade on Cuba, conduct an air strike or launch an invasion (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy rejected options one and two based on the shift in global power they would create. Talks with Castro or Khrushchev were also set aside (Sorensen, 1965). Some thought that

Khrushchev might want to trade Cuba for Berlin: “This ought to be brought to Castro’s attention. It ought to be said to Castro that…the time has now come when he must take the interests of the Cuban people—must now break clearly with the Soviet Union, prevent this missile base from becoming operational” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 432). An invasion of Cuba had very few supporters (Sorensen, 1965). The administration was now left to choose between a blockade and an air strike.

Robert McNamara, Kennedy’s Secretary of Defense, was afraid of accidental nuclear war. He warned that someone might somehow get his thumb on the button against the wishes of the Kremlin: “We don’t know what kinds of communications the Soviets have with those sites. We don’t know what kinds of control they have over the warheads” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 434). Around the same time Mikoyan worried about the same concerns in discussions inside the Kremlin. He criticized Khrushchev who wanted to hand over control to the Cubans. He reasoned, “If the Americans were to understand the missiles are under our control, they would proceed from the assumption that we would not attempt some kind of [nuclear] adventure since we know what the consequences would be” (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 472). Mikoyan believed that if the U.S. knew Castro had his finger on the button, the U.S. might take some sort of action against the island. Mikoyan was successful in persuading Khrushchev to “keep the missiles as Soviet property under our exclusive control” (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 472). Back in Washington, Rusk brought up one of Khrushchev’s major dilemmas --the fact that the U.S. does not have to live under “fear of his nuclear weapons to the extent that he has to live under fear of ours. Also, we have nuclear weapons nearby—in Turkey and places like that” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 434). At the time there were fifteen Jupiter

IRBMs in Turkey (Beschloss, 1991). In Rusk's advice, Kennedy may have found his answer to the Cuban Crisis, but there was still the question of Berlin and its relationship to the Cuban Crisis.

Rusk believed that "Berlin is very much involved in this. For the first time, I'm beginning really to wonder whether maybe Mr. Khrushchev is entirely rational about Berlin" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 434). Other evidence supporting the Cuba-Berlin link was the construction of an aboveground oil pipeline across East Germany to fuel Soviet troop deployments in West Berlin. This was an unmistakable message to Kennedy from Khrushchev that he was willing to go to war over Berlin and "if Russian blood were shed in Cuba, American blood would surely be shed in Germany" (Kempe, 2011, p. 494) However, historian Tony Judt (2005) has argued that Khrushchev was entirely rational on Berlin during the missile crisis. The Soviets could have taken Berlin at any time with their superior conventional forces, but with U.S. prestige and nuclear armory attached to West Berlin, Khrushchev had no intention of invading West Berlin or risking nuclear war in Germany. For Judt, the problem with Kennedy and the Americans was that they believed all Soviet moves led back to Berlin and overestimated all of Khrushchev's moves (Judt, 2005). Whatever Khrushchev's motives in Cuba were, Kennedy's personal beliefs and inability to accept inaction in times of crisis prodded him to act.

The administration's immediate assumption was that it was going to take the missiles out of Cuba either by force or diplomacy. This assumption seemed to contradict Kennedy's remarks in March that there was not "a significant difference between a nuclear warhead stationed in this area and one five thousand miles away" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 447). Khrushchev took cognizance of JFK's remark and that may have helped

him decide to place missiles in Cuba. McNamara also believed that missiles in Cuba may have increased the speed and accuracy of a Soviet first strike, but the Soviets still could not match the American advantage (Beschloss, 1991).The blockade option was chosen as the best way to rid Cuba of the missiles. It was originally downplayed for its drawbacks. A blockade had been associated with Berlin. Another drawback was if Soviet ships ignored it, the U.S. would be forced to fire the first shot, and the administration did not even know if the blockade route was open to implementation. The biggest drawback was that the blockade took time and prolonged the crisis (Sorensen, 1965). One faction in the Kennedy administration, including Acheson, Nitze, McCone and Dillon, came to power when the U.S. held a strong nuclear superiority and believed America's nuclear advantage would carry the day as it did in Berlin. The other faction comprised of McNamara, Thompson, RFK and Sorensen had come to power when there was nuclear parity between the U.S. and Soviets. This latter faction thought an air strike was dangerous and that Kennedy's use of gradual force in Berlin should again be employed in Cuba (Beschloss, 1991).

By October 20, Kennedy was leaning towards a blockade because it was a limited, low-key military action rather than a direct air strike. A blockade offered Khrushchev the choice of avoiding conflict by keeping his ships away. This option allowed the administration a more controlled escalation (Sorensen, 1965). McNamara argued an air strike would cause retaliation somewhere else in the world, probably Berlin. In endorsing the blockade, he felt that quarantine was the only military course compatible with American leadership of the free world (Beschloss, 1991). As long as the Pentagon

could not be sure that all missiles would be destroyed in an air strike, a blockade was “far less likely to provoke a nuclear response” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 479).

Kennedy went with the blockade because he wanted options, but also to give Khrushchev options too, as he had done in Berlin. He wanted to stay away from the dreaded humiliation or holocaust scenario. He hoped the blockade would slow down escalation and prevent a nuclear war. Kennedy was also reminded that a first strike surprise attack was how Japan attacked the U.S. at Pearl Harbor and how his generation abhorred that type of treachery (Sorensen, 1965). The Organization of American States (OAS), made up of the countries on the North American continent, needed to approve the blockade. While Sorensen and others fretted that the OAS could take a long time to act, the OAS approval for a blockade came on October 23 and the world waited to see what would happen next.

On October 22, the day before the OAS agreed to the blockade, Kennedy gave a televised speech to the nation briefing them on the state of affairs in Cuba. A Congressional leader called after the speech congratulating Kennedy and expressing how much better he understood and supported Kennedy’s policy. According to Sorensen, some Americans panicked, but most Americans felt pride (Sorensen, 1965). For most Americans, a major crisis over nuclear weapons seemed imminent and the nation shuddered as it contemplated potential nuclear annihilation. Kennedy warned against any “hostile move” where the U.S. was committed—especially against “the brave people of West Berlin” (Beschloss, 485). The president also cautioned that the crisis might last months and require the sacrifice of American citizens. JFK said that his goal was “not the victory of might, but the vindication of right” (Sorensen, 1965, p 704). Khrushchev was

furious and initially thought of storming the blockade. He told the Soviet people that Kennedy was placing Cuba under blockade and that Khrushchev was putting all forces in combat readiness. The premier failed to tell the Soviet people that Kennedy's actions were precipitated by his sending nuclear warheads to Cuba. Moscow portrayed Kennedy's actions as pure aggression (Beschloss, 1991). Khrushchev ultimately chose not to heat up the crisis. Radio Moscow noted the illegality of American action, but promised that "not a single nuclear bomb will hit the United States unless aggression is committed" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 489).

Khrushchev had decided not to test the blockade for two reasons. He wanted to avoid escalating the confrontation and he did not want any Soviet technology to fall into the hands of the Americans (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). By October 24, all Soviet surface ships had either stopped or received orders to reverse course. The threat of American naval blockade seemed to be working. Ex-COMM, Kennedy's group of advisers during the Cuban Missile Crisis, was informed that twenty ships nearest the barrier had stopped or turned backed. Kennedy gave the orders to allow them to do so, "Get in direct touch with the *Essex* and tell them not to do anything but give the Russian vessels an opportunity to turn back" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 498).

The mood in the Kremlin was somber on October 25. Khrushchev wanted to take the initiative before events in Cuba spiraled out of control. He wanted tactical flexibility and would be willing to remove the missiles if Kennedy pledged not to invade Cuba. Khrushchev tried to explain the retreat in the best possible light, but he clearly took a credibility hit (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Khrushchev believed that by getting this pledge from Kennedy his gamble would at least gain future security for Cuba.

On October 26, Khrushchev sent Kennedy his offer to dismantle the Soviet missile bases under UN supervision, Castro would promise never to accept offensive weapons of any kind. In return the U.S. would pledge not to invade Cuba (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Either late on October 26 or early on October 27 Khrushchev was given Walter Lippmann's article discussing the idea of removing the Turkish missiles in exchange for the Cuban missiles. Khrushchev wondered if Kennedy was trying to send him another signal (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). The Soviet ruling apparatus allowed Khrushchev to send another letter asking for the removal of the Turkish missiles.

When Kennedy received the letter, members of his administration wondered why Khrushchev made this new demand. Kennedy was left wondering if hard liners force him into this position (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). The idea of removing the Turkish missiles had come up early in the crisis by an adviser who served in the Eisenhower administration. This adviser told Kennedy the missiles in Turkey and Italy were nearly obsolescent and of little military value, and they were forced upon their host countries. Other officials sharply criticized him and he backed down (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy and his administration ignored the call to remove the missiles in Turkey believing it was a propaganda ploy and focused on Khrushchev's first letter. He had Robert Kennedy and Ted Sorensen help him compose a reply in which Kennedy called for the cessation of work in Cuba on nuclear sites in return for a pledge for the U.S. not to invade Cuba. Kennedy sent his brother to deliver this message to the Soviet Ambassador with a verbal message that the point of escalation was at hand, either there was going to be peace and disarmament or overwhelming retaliatory action unless the President received immediate notice the missiles were to be withdrawn (Sorensen, 1965). Khrushchev responded

immediately. Kennedy's terms were accepted, inspection would be permitted and the confrontation was over (Sorensen, 1965).

As for the Turkish missiles, the two super powers arranged a secret agreement. As Kennedy saw it, the U.S. could be in an "unsupportable position if it rejected Khrushchev's new demand to remove Turkish missiles" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 527). Kennedy had tried to get the missiles out the year before because they were not militarily useful. The president felt that giving up the "Turkish missiles would look like a fair trade" to any rational man (Beschloss, 1991, p. 527). If the U.S. did not give them up, Kennedy would have a hard time explaining military action in Cuba (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy told RFK to let Khrushchev know that the U.S. was "glad to discuss" Turkish missiles with him—"once we get a positive indication that they've ceased their work in Cuba" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 527). RFK told Dobrynin, the Soviet Ambassador, that "If that was the only obstacle to achieving the regulation I mentioned earlier, then the president doesn't see any insurmountable difficulties in resolving the issue" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 489). RFK added it would take four to five months because "the greatest difficulty for the president is the public discussion of the issue of Turkey" (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006, p. 489). The Russians received and accepted the message. The Turkish deal would remain secret. The Cuban Crisis was over.

Khrushchev now had to break the news to the Soviet people who were stunned to hear the gravity of the situation. The entire week the Soviet media downplayed the event, never letting on how close the world was to nuclear war over Cuba. Now they learned that Khrushchev was withdrawing missiles from Cuba when all week they were told the missiles were an American fabrication (Beschloss, 1991). Khrushchev's gamble did not

improve the nuclear imbalance, and most of the world saw his retreat as a humiliation. The premier's nuclear blackmail policy had proved to be too risky. It gave his military opponents a great victory and left Moscow leaders wondering whether their brilliant but impulsive leader might now be more of a liability than an asset (Beschloss, 1991; Taylor, 2008). The people in the Soviet Union remained unaware that Khrushchev had succeeded in getting the missiles out of Turkey; they were not told because of the compact between the two superpowers.

What was not known until Soviet archives were opened was that Khrushchev had already accepted the first proposal, without the Turkish missiles, as his concession letter stated. It was only after hearing from Robert Kennedy that he felt relieved that America had slightly backed down (Fursenko & Naftali, 2006). Khrushchev later claimed the entire crisis was created to get the U.S. to pledge that they would not invade Cuba: "for the first time in history the American imperialist beast was forced to swallow a hedgehog, quills and all. And that hedgehog is still in its stomach undigested…I'm proud of what we did" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 562). Khrushchev also did not achieve his aims in West Berlin. What he really wanted was a free city. Kennedy acquired additional presidential ethos in Berlin; he would be seen as the man who stood up to Khrushchev and protected Berliner's rights in the darkest days of the Cold War.

Kennedy had stood eye to eye with Khrushchev and had not blinked, but it was an exceedingly close call. Khrushchev thought he had Kennedy after he did not oppose the Berlin Wall, but Kennedy faced him down on Cuba and finally proved his mettle in tangling with the Communist leader (Taylor, 2008).

European Split: Gaullists vs. Atlanticists

One of the main principles of American diplomacy in Europe since 1947 had been European integration. Removing the constant antagonism between France and Germany would boost the long term health of Europe. The Marshall Plan, the European Defense Community, the European Coal and Steel Community and the Common Market were all efforts by the U.S. and other European countries to strengthen their ties to each other. De Gaulle's election to power in France was welcomed by Eisenhower, but soon Ike and Kennedy would discover de Gaulle's opposition to a plan for Europe (Mayer, 1996). Beginning in the summer of 1962, de Gaulle and Adenauer exchanged official visits and a friendship bloomed. De Gaulle called Germans "ein grosses Volk (a great people)" something the Germans had not heard for a long time, even from German leaders (Smyser, 2009, p. 206). De Gaulle stressed the idea that Germany and France had an obligation to build a common Europe together. De Gaulle's no negotiation policy with Russia specified no deal on Berlin and no negotiations until Khrushchev proved himself ready to seriously negotiate. This was music to Adenauer's ears. Kennedy and the British were willing to negotiate with the Soviets on any topic, which remained a constant concern for Adenauer (Smyser, 2009). In de Gaulle, Adenauer found a friend and ally who was unwilling to throw away German priorities for larger Cold War interests.

De Gaulle needed Germany to fulfill his vision of Europe. He wanted to see the states of Western Europe cooperate "in the political, economic, and cultural sphere, as well as that of defense" (Mayer, 1996, p. 81). This new Europe would coordinate the governments of the Western continental Europe so they would act in concert with each other and rely on Paris as its capital (Mayer, 1996). What de Gaulle was really aiming for

was an unbreakable French-German bond and a Europe that was independent of both Russia and America. With France anchoring Europe, both France and Germany would be secure and Europe could recover its greatness. Adenauer had less lofty aims, but he needed a trustworthy ally to help protect his state.

On January 22, 1963, the rapprochement between Germany and France reached its zenith in the Élysée Treaty signed in Paris. Adenauer signed the treaty because he did not want to have to choose between France and the United States, as he saw both nations as indispensible partners (Mayer, 1996). Adenauer did not want to break off his alliance with the United States and embrace de Gaulle's version of Europe decoupled from the U.S.; he just wanted to secure friendship with France (Daum, 2008). As Adenauer's State Secretary, Karl Carstens explained, "If Germany did not complete this process of cooperation with France, the resulting insecurity and tension would only strengthen Soviet Russia" (Mayer, 1996, p. 93). Adenauer identified common interests between the Germans and French that were not always present in relations with America. An interview with Adenauer in March 1963 revealed that Adenauer's two great ambitions in political life were to tie Germany firmly to France and to tie Germany firmly to the United States. The U.S. was already firmly established, and with the Élysée Treaty he had accomplished his second goal (Smyser, 2009). What resulted from the Élysée Treaty was Kennedy's trip to Germany and the split in the German government between Gaullists and Atlanticists.

Gaullists became known as supporters of de Gaulle's vision of a French dominated Europe that was almost entirely independent from America and Russia. Atlanticists became a pro-American sect, especially in Germany, and were recruited from

all political parties in Germany that supported strong relations with America. They worked to thwart the plans of the Gaullists. Thanks to their efforts the Élysée Treaty was not ratified until May 1963, with an added preamble that underscored Germany's allegiance to the United States and the North Atlantic community (Daum, 2008).

Kennedy reacted in horror to the treaty between France and West Germany. What was worse was a week before the Élysée Treaty, de Gaulle vetoed British application for the European Economic Community (EEC). De Gaulle did not believe the British had the best interests of Europe in mind. He always saw the British and the Americans as the dreaded "Anglo-Saxons" who shared little with the traditions or interests of continental Europe (Smyser, 2009). Kennedy feared that the new Franco-German bond could possibly be extended to Moscow and that the Western Alliance might come unglued. Kennedy had given an address in July 1962 calling for closer American, British and European contacts and community, what would be known as his dumbbell plans for the trans-Atlantic alliance (Smyser, 2009). Kennedy may have never intended to share that power given his overbearing style of alliance politics, but it was offered nonetheless (Hofmann, 2007). Kennedy was not alone in his outrage, Acheson called the treaty "one of the darkest days of the postwar period" (Daum, 2008, p. 35). American High Commissioner in Germany, John McCloy complained that he was "more deeply disturbed about the turn of events [in Europe] than I have been since the end of the war" (Daum, 2008, p. 35). Furthermore, "many Americans who…see in Berlin a symbol of the common destiny of Germany and the United States are now disquieted" (Daum, 2008, p. 35). George Ball stated, "I can hardly overestimate the shock produced in Washington by

this action or the speculation that followed" (Mayer, 1996, p. 91). Even after the added preamble, Kennedy would now favor Brandt and Bahr in Berlin over Adenauer in Bonn.

Brandt was becoming more important to Kennedy. His undivided support of Kennedy's policies during 1962, including his support of Kennedy's European policy and Cuban policy earned him high regard. More importantly, with a split in Germany between Gaullists and Atlanticists, Brandt was an Atlanticist of the first order. He disagreed with de Gaulle on almost every position, though he did pay him personal respect. Brandt favored British participation in the EEC; he believed in American leadership and nuclear deterrent over French guarantees. Brandt joked to the U.S. mission about the choice between "the US nuclear deterrent and French military bands" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 77). In Germany, Brandt rallied against the treaty and worked with the Atlanticists to craft the preamble's support for the North Atlantic community. Abroad he curried American support writing Kennedy "I can not speak for the German Government. However, I do want to let you know, with these personal lines, that in Berlin we never forget the friends who protect us, and who in critical times would have stood by us alone" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 78). It was a blatant attempt by Brandt to get on board with the Americans as their German advocate, and it worked. However, Kennedy needed something to boost his image in Germany and Europe. He decided upon a European trip in the early summer 1963.

Kennedy's European Trip

West Germany extended an invitation to Kennedy before the Élysée Treaty, but with the warming relationship between Adenauer and de Gaulle, Kennedy saw a trip as both a challenge and opportunity. The trip could reinforce why the U.S. presence was

necessary in Europe and deflect the danger posed by the possibility of a West German-French alliance. Khrushchev traveled to East Berlin a few times, but de Gaulle's never traveled there. A trip by Kennedy to Berlin would present a chance to one-up de Gaulle and score points in the East-West political alignment. Most importantly, when de Gaulle went to West Germany in 1962, in the exchange of trips between Adenauer and himself, he fostered positive feelings toward the German-Franco relationship. Kennedy wanted to reassert the German-American relationship and as much as the administration did not want to admit it, the trip could easily be interpreted as a "popularity contest with de Gaulle" (Daum, 2008, p 65). Kennedy hoped his trip would create an iconic image of presidential leadership similar to what the meeting of Adenauer and de Gaulle accomplished at the Reims cathedral.

Kennedy had three main objectives in his trip to Europe. He wanted to bypass de Gaulle and demonstrate the trans-Atlantic community was under firm American leadership. The demonstration was meant to be both for the Western allies and the Soviet Union. Washington hoped to use Kennedy's personal charisma to shine a positive light on the U.S. and to win a vote of confidence for America over de Gaulle. Kennedy's next objective was to win Western Europeans over to the idea of peaceful coexistence with antagonistic political blocs (Daum, 2008). These two goals worked in concert with each other as the first was to demonstrate Kennedy was not going to make secret deals behind his allies' backs, while the second showed his allies the administration's global strategy concerning the Soviet Union. Kennedy's last objective was economic, with the hopes of reducing its balance-of-payments deficit and to advocate cuts in the tariffs between Europe and America (Daum, 2008).

Weeks before Kennedy left for Europe, he gave an important Cold War commencement address at American University on June 10, 1963. The American University speech was one of Kennedy's most pragmatic and calculated. In it, he sought to build public support for his test ban treaty, mollify Khrushchev after a misunderstanding about inspections, and overcome Soviet skepticism that he was willing to jeopardize his domestic position to push a controversial agreement through the Senate (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy broke with long standing Cold War assumptions in creating what he called a "strategy of peace" (Daum, 2008). At American University, JFK linked what had been scattered ideas in his administration into a cohesive plan for peace. Kennedy denied aspirations to a Pax Americana in the world, instead appealing for a global and genuine peace that would make "life on earth worth living" and a peace enjoyed by all nations (Daum, 2008, p. 82). Kennedy told Americans that they would need to reevaluate their attitudes toward the Soviet Union and communism. He wanted to reach out with concrete actions and enforceable agreements with the communists to overcome ideological deadlock. The president warned against condemning the Soviets and their people, instead asking Americans to focus on their sacrifices and achievements. Kennedy believed that the two superpowers have joint interests in survival in the nuclear age. The time had come to abandon the reigning bi-polar mentality and seek new strategies to solve conflict (Daum, 2008). The essence of Kennedy's speech was the pursuit of détente through direct negotiations with the Soviets (Mathiopoulos, 1985). These words could not have found a more willing accomplice than Willy Brandt.

Egon Bahr wrote to Brandt that Kennedy's American University speech was "a gift from heaven" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 80). Brandt had read Kennedy correctly; President

Kennedy was fully committed to détente. Brandt praised the speech when he was in New York only a few days later and when he returned to Germany he began quoting it in support of his Ostpolitik policy (Hofmann, 2007). Brandt did not get a chance to meet with Kennedy in early June after the speech because Kennedy was coming to Berlin a few weeks later. What a left-wing French newspaper called "Kennedy's seduction voyage" was about to begin and Kennedy's image in Germany would be changed forever (Beschloss, 1991, p. 603).

Kennedy in Germany

Kennedy arrived in Bonn on June 23 and was set to tour Germany for three days, ending in Berlin on June 26. Adenauer met Kennedy at the airport. Adenauer used the opportunity to address the media and remind Kennedy in his welcoming remarks about his promise in his American University speech regarding no deals with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy was not perturbed by Adenauer's reminder, since he had come to expect West Germany's constant need of reinforcement over American support. Kennedy used his opportunity at the airport to reassure Adenauer of U.S. commitment stating "Your safety is our safety, your liberty is our liberty, and any attack on your soil is an attack upon our own" (Daum, 2008, p. 84). From the Cologne-Bonn airport, Kennedy rode in an open car with Adenauer, exposing himself to the public in what Daum (2008) described as a communal event between the people of Germany and Kennedy. As the car reached the outskirts of Cologne, thousands of people were gathering, chanting "Ken-Ne-Dy! Ken-Ne-Dy!" (Daum, 2008, p. 85). The president was overwhelmed by the outpouring of support from the people of West Germany; he gave a brief speech in Cologne and attended mass at the Cologne cathedral.

The public saw far less of Kennedy on his second day in Germany. The president spent most of June 24 talking with Adenauer and meeting West German president, Heinrich Lubke. Adenauer and Kennedy discussed German-Franco and German-American relations. Kennedy seemed to feel better about the state of U.S-German relations after his meetings with Adenauer, especially after the recent German purchase of arms and increased support of the multilateral nuclear force (MLF) (Daum, 2008). Adenauer admitted that for domestic reasons he could not publically accept Poland's western border as depicted in the Oder-Neisse line, but in practice he accepted it (Daum, 2008). In his dinner toast that evening, Adenauer did not call for German reunification and Kennedy responded in kind by simply stating how moved he had been by the "opportunity to come face to face" with the German people (Daum, 2008, p. 91). The meetings and dinner helped thaw the icy relationship the two had in the past, but it was Kennedy who took the lead. By praising the outgoing Chancellor in his public addresses, the president not only warmed the often strained relationship but set the tone for the rest of his visit to Germany.

Kennedy traveled to Frankfurt on June 25, one day before he went to Berlin. An estimated one million people assembled at the Frankfurt City Hall, all of them chanting "Ken-Ne-Dy! Ken-Ne-Dy!" Kennedy again made a short speech, like the many he made previously. The president discussed the historical relationship between Germany and America. JFK's most symbolic gesture before Berlin came during the speech he delivered at the Frankfurt Paulskirche, the church where German delegates met in 1848 through 1849 before being forcibly disbanded in May 1849 (Daum, 2008). The delegates met to discuss German unity and democracy in the face of the authoritarian government that was

currently in place during the European 1848 revolutions. By speaking there, Kennedy associated himself with the tradition of liberalism and democracy in Germany. Frankfurt was known as the cradle of German liberty (Silvestri, 2000). His presence sent a message to the world to accept West Germany as a free and democratic nation (Daum, 2008). Kennedy's Frankfurt City Hall address espoused three main ideas: the Atlantic partnership, the establishment of a free trade zone in the Atlantic community and an Atlantic partnership involved in creating an integrated and strong Europe that could defuse Cold War tensions (Daum, 2008). William Tyler, from the Department of State, remarked that the President's popularity "went far beyond anything that could be accounted for by any act…Something about him…just seemed to echo in the hearts and voices of all the people when they greeted him" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 604).

Kennedy finished the day by attending a reception in Wiesbaden. As he entered Wiesbaden, which had a large American population, Kennedy passed a sign that read "Ask Not What You Can Do for Your Ford Dealer, Ask What Your Ford Dealer Can Do for You" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 604). At Wiesbaden, the president led a toast and issued a rave review of his first three days in Germany, remarking that upon leaving office he would leave an envelope with the instructions "Go visit Germany" to the next president when things do not seem to be going his way (Daum, 2008). The next morning Kennedy traveled to Berlin.

It had been 18 years since Berlin had hosted an Allied head of government from the West. At that time, the Allied leaders had met at Potsdam in 1945 at the end of World War II. Back then, Berlin was a desolate and bombed out city, but in 1963 the city had been rebuilt and the topography and symbolic landscape was quite different than what

Truman had experienced in 1945. Kennedy's objective once reaching Berlin was to see, to be seen, and to publicize his activities for global consumption (Daum, 2008). He would mix with Berlin's people, visit its urban hubs, and bring attention to the division the Wall represented, both symbolic and real. At the Wall, JFK would peer into the East, but did not cross the border, even though he retained the legal right to do so. The spectacle attracted some 1,500 journalists both local and foreign and over 100 Washington based White House correspondents (Daum, 2008).

At 9:40 in the morning on June 26, 1963, Kennedy landed in Berlin in the French sector. Lucius Clay was worried about Kennedy's safety during his Berlin trip, but Kennedy shrugged it off. When Clay found out Kennedy was unfazed, he told him "You haven't had any reception yet. You just wait until you get to Berlin. You're going to see something you've never really seen before" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 605). Kennedy was greeted by Adenauer, Brandt and Otto Bach, the president of the Berlin parliament. Along his 33 mile drive through West Berlin he was joined by Adenauer and Brandt. More than one million or 60 percent of the adult population in West Berlin would greet the president on the road way, roof tops or hanging off the lamp posts (Hofmann, 2007). The speeches at the airport were kept short. Kennedy was greeted with "Hail to the Chief" and reviewed the honor guard, but there were no national anthems. The Berlin Kennedy saw before him was very different than the one he visited in 1939 as a stopover on his way to Prague and the one he saw as a press correspondent in 1945. Kennedy got into his car and as the drive began the now-famous chorus chants of "Ken-Ne-Dy! Ken-Ne-Dy!" commenced once again (Daum, 2008). As Kennedy drove through West Berlin, he was showered with colored paper and balloons. The confetti and balloons gave the

impression of an American election campaign or tickertape parade, impressing some observers with the notion that West Berliners were more American than West Germans (Daum, 2008).

Kennedy was driven around West Berlin and strategically shown landmarks that helped disassociate the city with its Nazi past. Kennedy entered the Hansa Quarter, which had buildings erected by several internationally renowned architects who represented West Germany and West Berlin's new architectural internationalism. The architecture helped reconnect Germany with its pre-1933 architectural past that had been shown in the *Amerika zu Hause.* From the Hansa Quarter, Kennedy passed a modern style business building in Ernest Reuter Platz, the Amerika Hause and then went down Joachimstaler Strasse and crossed the Kurfurstendamm—the long shopping street that Berliners think of as their Broadway. This portion of the tour included the revitalized capitalism in Germany and the connection to America with the Amerika Hause, the U.S. information center in Berlin (Daum 2008). Kennedy also drove past the Victory Column, a Prussian military monument as he arrived at the Congress Hall to give a short speech.

At Congress Hall, the president would appear before the sixth national Congress of Industrial Trade Union of Construction Workers. It was the first time a Western head of government had ever officially visited a German labor Congress. Kennedy's attendance connected him to the special relationship between the German and American labor movements. One line from his speech resonated strongly with the audience, "West Berlin is my country" (Daum, 2008, p. 131). Kennedy referenced a longer quote by Benjamin Franklin that was on display in Congress Hall, his message symbolized the

repeated sentiment that West Berlin is America's Berlin (Daum, 2008). After the speech, Kennedy's motorcade then continued.

Kennedy's motorcade traveled behind the Soviet War Memorial and past the Reichstag. His next stop was at the Brandenburg Gate where he tried to look across into East Berlin, but the GDR had hung banners between the columns limiting the president's view. Kennedy's reaction to the Wall was mixed. Some described Kennedy as having his normal aloofness, while others describe him as deadly serious. *Time* reporter Hugh Sidey observed, that Kennedy "looks like a man who just glimpsed Hell" (Kempe, 2011, p. 499). Kennedy, Brandt and Adenauer got out at Checkpoint Charlie and were led up a new staircase by General James H. Polk, the U.S. commander. They gazed to the East and saw a sign that read "We welcome Kennedy also on behalf of East Berliners" (Daum, 2008, p. 134). Also, a small group of East Berliners waved to the president. As Kennedy looked out, he was reminded of the extensive and vigorous building projects in West Berlin. When he gazed upon the East, JFK was reminded of the desolation of his trip through Berlin in 1945 (Silvestri, 2000).

At the Wall, Kennedy's radiant smile reportedly had disappeared and he seemed a changed man, his lips firmly shut and pressed together. An NBC report stated, "Kennedy was not smiling as he left the Wall…It seemed obvious that the president had been emotionally aroused by what he had seen" (Daum, 2008, p. 135). Many observers felt that the Wall had "moved him deeply" (Daum, 2008, p. 135). The Wall marked the physical and emotional limitations of Kennedy's New Frontier vision and policies.

As Kennedy approached Schöneberg City Hall, he passed two other architectural symbols of U.S. support for Berlin: the American Memorial Library and the Airlift

Memorial. When the motorcade arrived at Dudenstrasse, the crowd could no longer be contained. Homemade confetti began falling down upon the motorcade and one television reporter commented, “Just like New York” (Daum, 2008, p. 135). Finally, Kennedy reached the back of Schöneberg City Hall, where he was to give one of his two major speeches that day (Silvestri, 2000). Estimates put the number of West Berliners from four hundred thousand to a million and a half waiting for Kennedy outside Schöneberg Hall chanting “Ken-Ne-Dy! Ken-Ne-Dy! (Bruner, 1989; Silvestri, 2000). After his speech at Rudolph Wilde Platz, Kennedy traveled to the Free University to give his second address. As will become evident, the two speeches were very different in tone, style and message.

Analysis of Kennedy’s Remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz, Berlin
The Berlin Effect: A City Embraces a President

Kennedy’s reception in Berlin was unlike any other he received in his presidency. However, his reception in 1963 was very different than if he would have visited Berlin in 1961 or 1962. Berliners wanted to thank Kennedy and demonstrate their gratitude for his leadership during the trying Berlin and Cuban Missile Crises (Smyser, 2009). Over a million of them came out to cheer his motorcade and at least half that number attended his first address at Rudolph Wilde Platz.

The physical setting of Berlin prompted Kennedy to focus upon the differences between the communist system and the democratic system. He used the rhetorical tactic of juxtaposition in his Rudolph Wilde Platz speech to demonstrate and accentuate these differences. Kennedy’s thirty-three mile motorcade throughout the city was designed to establish West Berlin’s separation from its Nazi past and display the international and American influences on its architecture (Daum, 2008). Relations between the two countries were remarkably poor after World War II, with America instituting a policy of

denazification and non-fraternization. The West forced upon Germany the concept of collective guilt for another world war. The Marshall Plan and Western cultural exports, including the Amerika zu Hause, in the 1950s improved relations. The architectural exports of this era were now on display for Kennedy's visit, which created a stark contrast between East and West Berlin. Kennedy's peek over the Berlin Wall revealed a drab and dour city that neither resembled the city he saw before the war nor the vibrant new West Berlin. Without Kennedy's physical presence and tour of the city, he would never have been able to fully identify the stark differences.

The scenic environment is reinforced by JFK's continual references to the city throughout the speech including his refrain "Let them come to Berlin" (Kennedy, 1963a). Kennedy used the repetition of the phrase to drive home the point rhetorically that communism and democracy, East and West are different physically, mentally and culturally and Berlin presented the starkest example of these differences. Kennedy's boast was emotionally driven by his experiences throughout the day and his emotions carried him beyond what he had planned to say, but the message he spoke carried more weight in Berlin than a lecture on Berlin's past (Beschloss, 1991). Unlike his report on the Berlin Crisis in 1961, where the global Cold War landscape influenced his speech and policy decisions, Kennedy's remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz were derived from Berlin, both from its people and from the passions of the moment.

Kennedy's embrace of the moment is evident throughout his speech. The first half of Kennedy's speech is largely extemporaneous, off-the-cuff and certainly not part of the planned remarks (Daum, 2008). Kennedy returned to the planned remarks beginning with a paragraph that began "What is true of this city…" and Kennedy stayed true to the

manuscript until he ad libbed his last remark reemphasizing his commitment to the city (Kennedy, 1963a). According to the original text, Kennedy was to discuss the dramatic postwar history of Berlin: the Berlin Blockade, the 1953 uprising, Khrushchev's 1958 ultimatum and the Berlin Wall. He was then supposed to reiterate the U.S. position on Berlin since 1961 and the American essentials regarding West Berlin (Daum, 2008). Instead, caught up in the moment, Kennedy went on the attack criticizing the Soviets and the failures of the communist system.

Kennedy dropped the cautionary phrases "hard journey" ahead or the Wall would fall "sooner or later" and instead used transcendence in expressing his hope for a better future "where this city will be joined as one" (Smyser, 2009, p. 224 & Kennedy, 1963a). The most lasting and memorable phrase, "Ich bin ein Berliner," is not in any of the original manuscripts for Kennedy's speech (Daum, 2008). He inserted his German phrases mentally on his drive through the city that morning and wrote them down on note cards in the moments leading up to the speech in Willy Brandt's office (Smyser, 2009 & Daum, 2008). Kennedy's attempts at German in this instance were rather botched because "Ich bin ein Berliner" translated literally means "I am a jelly doughnut." He should have said "Ich bin Berliner," "ein Berliner" was a jelly doughnut (Silvestri, 2000). It turns out Kennedy and his two tutors debated the grammar of the phrase. The tutors advised him to use the article "ein" because without it he would be suggesting he was born in Berlin, perhaps, confusing his audience and losing the emphasis of his point (Kempe, 2011).

As Bundy later recalled, Kennedy "had no feeling for any foreign language. So there we were on the goddamn airplane coming down on Berlin while he repeated the

phrase over and over again…and it worked. God, how it worked!" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 605). Even with Kennedy's grammatical mistake, the crowd roared. No matter the true origin of the phrase, it is one of the memorable moments in rhetorical history and it cemented Kennedy's legend in the city.

The rhetorical strategy of "Ich bin ein Berliner" was to create identity with the West German audience. Historically, Kennedy gave his American University address a few weeks prior on U.S.-Soviet coexistence and now he was trying to gain West German and Berlin support for this policy which required increased inter-German relations. At Rudolph Wilde Platz, Kennedy attempted the art of "building community" and "inspiring people to achieve collective goals" (Zarefsky, 2008, p. 638). As contrary as it may seem, with Kennedy's attacks on communism at Rudolph Wilde Platz, his strategy was succeeding. Kennedy was building support for his leadership position, before building support for his policy. This was a two-step approach. At Rudolph Wilde Platz, with his attacks on communism and inspirational rhetoric Kennedy bonded with West Berliners and Germans. At the Free University, Kennedy would garner support for his détente policy, which would gain acceptance as historical events will illuminate.

Kennedy used "Ich bin ein Berliner" or "I am a Berliner" to cement the communal bonding between himself and the West Berliners. His motorcade through the city where Berliners could see Kennedy and he could see them, a strategy of visibility, began the communal experience. Now, rhetorically Kennedy was reinforcing their bond by stating that he was a Berliner. Kennedy stayed away from telling Berliners "America" or the "West" commits to your defense; he staked his own prestige on Berlin's freedom. By coming to Berlin and declaring himself a citizen of Berlin, Kennedy and America's

prestige were now publically entwined more tightly with the embattled city than ever before.

By referring to himself as a Berliner, he tapped into Berlin's past and made Berlin's struggle against communism his struggle against communism. The historical constraints that Kennedy wanted to ignore when it came to Berlin, the strong U.S. commitment that forced him to support Berlin no matter what and German unification, were now embraced. By physically being in Berlin and experiencing the warmth of its citizens, the president embraced the common history of: the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Blockade, creation of the FRG and survival through the 1961 Berlin Crisis and 1962 Cuban Crisis and finally the German desire for reunification. He understood these events from the Berlin perspective and how American support in each event influenced U.S.-German relations.

Kennedy's closing statement had made all the difference: "All free men, wherever they may live, are citizens of Berlin, and, therefore, as a free man, I take pride in the words "Ich bin ein Berliner" (Kennedy, 1963a). No other line in the speech associated Kennedy with Berlin more than that statement. This statement helped Kennedy transform himself rhetorically from an American bystander watching and reacting to Berlin from afar, to a Berliner who stands on the frontline of this Cold War struggle. This statement carried more weight and resonated more strongly, than his similar but less personal and less eloquent statement "West Berlin is my country," that had been addressed to the trade union that morning (Smyser, 2009, p.224). Kennedy's similar phrasing supports Windt, Jr.'s. (2003) claim that Kennedy reviewed his speeches to maintain consistency in his policy. Kennedy underscored Berlin's pivotal role in the

struggle for liberty, “You live in a defended island of freedom, but your life is part of the main.” Kennedy’s conclusion makes all free people citizens of Berlin and Berliner’s part of the larger global democratic community.

To a city and a people that found themselves the lone outpost of democracy in a communist country constantly being harassed and threatened, this identification with the larger global community and Kennedy’s identification with Berlin could not have meant more. As Gerhard Wessel, Adenauer’s military intelligence chief said years later of Kennedy’s statement, “Never underestimate the psychological influence of this one sentence…With the Germans, it was the decisive sentence that changed the feeling, made them feel that Kennedy was a great President and a friend of the Germans” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 606). Kennedy identified with the West Berliners, with their struggle for freedom, and with their hopes for reunification and a better future.

Kennedy used the physical separation of East and West by the Wall to portray the divisions in Berlin and the differences between the free world and communist world. In his off-the-cuff remarks telling people to come to Berlin, Kennedy used juxtaposition to drive home the differences between the two systems. Many of the sympathetic sentiments people in the West had toward communism, e.g., “communism is the wave of the future” or “communism is an evil system, but it permits us to make economic progress” (Kennedy, 1963a), was rebuffed by Kennedy’s insistence for them to come to Berlin. Kennedy’s tour of Berlin reinforced this juxtaposition because before arriving in Berlin Kennedy did not fully and personally understand the differences between the two Berlins until he visited the city. He came to believe that others could not understand this

difference unless they too came to Berlin where the eighteen years of history, since the last time the city was united, provided a clear demonstration of the differences.

Kennedy stood alongside Adenauer, Brandt and Clay, three of the most recent towering historical figures in the city giving him another level of identification and community with the Berliners; a physical display of solidarity. Adenauer was the Chancellor of Germany and considered to be the “Father of the Federal Republic” (Bruner, 1989). Clay was the hero of the Berlin Airlift and was a staunch supporter of Berlin’s rights as evident in the Checkpoint Charlie showdown. Brandt was a link to the present in Berlin and represented the future direction of the city and the country (Bruner, 1989). The physical presence of all three men standing with Kennedy gave him another level of identification and solidarity with Berlin visually reinforcing his identification with the German community. Kennedy had presided over a symbolically charged persuasive event.

Sorensen and Bundy did not realize how far the president would deviate from his script (Smyser, 2009). Sorensen (1965) later noted that Kennedy told him how the trip made him understand the necessity of ultimate reunification and that moved him to extemporaneous eloquence. The scene called for inspiration and off-the-cuff remarks by Kennedy, who, for one rare instance, allowed the emotion and pageantry of the day to sway his remarks. His moving visit to the Berlin Wall and infectious cheers and enthusiasm from the crowd carried the day. Berlin was inspired and the young president had been deeply moved.

Kennedy on the Attack: Accusations of Failure

Kennedy's remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz had a much different tone than his American University speech a few weeks earlier where he preached coexistence and détente. Near the beginning of his speech, Kennedy previews his intent to contrast two very different systems of government, "Today, in the world of freedom," he intones, drawing the line of division between democracy and communism (Kennedy, 1963a). Next, Kennedy uses the juxtaposition of a divided city that is part communist and part democratic to further reinforce the differences between the two systems. The juxtaposition receives heavy emphasis in his interpretive remarks about the ongoing Cold War conflict:

> There are many people in the world who really don't understand, or say they don't, what is the great issue between the free world and the Communist world. Let them come to Berlin. There are some who say that communism is the wave of the future. Let them come to Berlin. And there are some who say in Europe and elsewhere we can work with the Communists. Let them come to Berlin. And there are even a few who say that it is true that communism is an evil system, but it permits us to make economic progress. Lass' sic nach Berlin kommen. Let them come to Berlin (Kennedy, 1963a).

Setting the two different systems apart allows Kennedy to employ an accusatorial tone toward the Soviet Union. Kennedy flatly denied the equality between the two systems. He clearly portrayed democracy as the ideal government for advancing freedom. Instead of taking the opportunity to ease East-West relations at one of its most critical physical locations, Kennedy uses the speech to ramp up the idealistic language, confront communism, and attack the Soviet system.

Kennedy's most pronounced condemnation of the Soviet system, and perhaps the most damning line in the speech is cast and hardened in the following words: "we have

never had to put a wall up to keep our people in, to prevent them from leaving us…the most obvious and vivid demonstration of the failures of the Communist system, for all the world to see…it is…an offense not only against history but an offense against humanity" (Kennedy, 1963a). In pointing to the Wall as the ultimate symbol of the failure of the communist system, Kennedy's discourse veers from the approach he had adopted since the beginning of his presidency, which was to work with the Soviets, even during the construction of the Berlin Wall. It certainly contradicted the thrust of the American University address. Nevertheless, for his immediate audience, the president's presence in Berlin and visit to the Wall allowed him to embody his testimony in a unique and compelling way, which helped him powerfully legitimate his claims.

These attacks against the communist system allowed Kennedy to use historical events from the preceding eighteen years to condemn the Soviet policy in East Germany and Berlin. The failure of the Soviets to establish the GDR's legitimacy was finally rhetorically proclaimed. The illegitimacy of the GDR included the chaos of the postwar years when Soviet troops raped and pillaged Germans on a massive scale, the crushing of freedom movements in 1953 East Germany and 1956 Hungary and the failure to provide basic commodities to its citizens were finally annunciated as failures of the communist system. The refugee problem was at the heart of the Berlin Wall. The Wall's construction had its roots in these historical events, but up until this day no president had criticized the Soviets publically in the condemning tone that Kennedy took. All presidents, even Kennedy, commented privately on the atrocities of Soviet troops in 1945, the suppression of rights behind the Iron Curtain and ragged state of the GDR. These historic failures

influenced Kennedy's rhetoric and emotions, while simultaneously providing the basis for Kennedy's anti-communist rhetoric.

Kennedy's remarks about the Berlin Wall symbolized communism's failure on the world stage. But those remarks were also unique because besides the discussion of the Wall at Rudolph Wilde Platz and three quick references to it later in his tour, Kennedy never mentioned the Berlin Wall publically again (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy focused his public remarks on the Soviet failure to work toward détente, keep their promises or he questioned their true interest in negotiating, but he never publically called the Soviets out on their political, cultural and humanistic failure regarding the Berlin Wall. His criticism of the Wall as "an offense not only against history but an offense against humanity, separating families" was his most blatant attack on the communist system of government. It was the hallmark of JFK's juxtaposition of democracy and communism. Kennedy gained credibility in his critical stance on communism because of his pragmatic stance toward democracy. He stated "Freedom has many difficulties and democracy is not perfect" (Kennedy, 1963a). But even with its imperfections, it far outweighs the dehumanizing effects of communism.

Kennedy's other idealistic juxtaposition explored the concept of freedom. He remarked, "Freedom is indivisible, and when one man is enslaved, all are not free" (Kennedy, 1963a). Here again Kennedy overtly denies the concept of peaceful coexistence because by Kennedy's own account the people in East Berlin are living under communist systems and are not free. Their freedom can neither be divided nor rationalized. When government is forced upon people and they are forcibly detained, they suffer the fate of the unfree. Here again, Kennedy was critical of the GDR's legitimacy,

this time not based on legal or historical grounds, but based on a moral argument. The legitimacy of the GDR is undercut, not because of its political ideology, but because it lacked the support of its citizenry. The people of East Berlin and East Germany did not choose the GDR or its officials, the way West Germans chose the FRG and Adenauer; Ulbricht was forced upon East Germans. The Soviet's imposed the regime on their zone so it would not be absorbed into a free, democratic and capitalist West. The Soviet reaction was directly correlates to their historic fears of being attacked from the West and their fear of German revanchism. This lack of popular sovereignty in East Germany made East Germans unfree because they lacked a voice in how they were governed.

The Wall symbolized that communism was to blame for the separation of families, division of husbands and wives, brothers and sisters and a tear in the national fabric. It was not the free choice of Germans or Berliners to be separated, but it was a forced separation imposed by the communists on Germany, on Europe and on the world. In failing to work with capitalists and democratic nations, the Soviets are made to stand for the enslavement of people around the globe. When criticizing the Soviets for failing to negotiate in good faith, Kennedy retained his credibility because since his inauguration he had consistently maintained a willingness to negotiate.

Reunification: The Many Sides of Kennedy

It is Kennedy's high-minded personal style that made his call "to lift your eyes beyond the dangers of today, to the hope of tomorrow" compelling (Kennedy, 1963a). His nod to the ultimate goal of reunification was part of the ultimate goal of freedom (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy's uses the ideal and universalistic principles of freedom, hope and determination as a rhetorical means of keeping Berlin an "outpost for democracy"

amid communism. Kennedy praises Berliners still living with “vitality and ... force, and . . . hope and the determination” as residents of West Berlin (Kennedy, 1963a). The trials Berliners have gone through should afford them the right “to make a free choice. In 18 years of peace and good faith, this generation of Germans has earned the right to be free” (Kennedy, 1963a). The greatest means of making the world free from tyranny and oppression lies not in conventional or nuclear arms, but in the hearts and wills of free people everywhere. West Berlin was not able to have a military or send soldiers to NATO because of the four-power agreement, but by indicating that Berlin has been on the front lines for almost two decades and that the weapons for victory are not merely material but metaphysical and moral, Kennedy identifies West Berlin’s crucial role in defending freedom. Kennedy pointed Berliners’ role in the larger struggle. Instead of being cut off from the world or unable to influence the larger Cold War contest, Berliners armed with determination and faith in freedom could impact the future of Germany and Europe.

The reward for these years of patience and strength in fighting the Cold War was reunification. Kennedy told his audience, “When all are free, we can look forward to that day when this city will be joined as one and this country and this great Continent of Europe in a peaceful and hopeful globe” (Kennedy, 1963a). Kennedy rewarded his audience for their faith and patience in him by setting reunification as an ultimate goal. This clear goal that was so desired by many Germans helped Kennedy persuade his audience to support his policy. Between Kennedy identifying himself as a Berliner and setting the goal of reunification, he strengthened the U.S.-German relationship through his personal diplomacy.

However, Kennedy's call for German reunification was an objective that would be realized years in the future. In his closing, he remarked

> What is true of this city is true of Germany-real, lasting peace in Europe can never be assured as long as one German out of four is denied the elementary rights of free men…So let me ask you, as I close, to lift your eyes beyond the dangers of today, to the hopes of tomorrow, beyond the freedom merely of this city of Berlin, or your country of Germany, to the advance of freedom everywhere, beyond the wall to the day of peace with justice, beyond yourselves and ourselves to all mankind (Kennedy, 1963a).

Kennedy's pragmatism was on display as he advances his idealistic hope of a free Germany, Europe and world. Even as he looks toward a time "beyond the wall to the day of peace and justice," Kennedy (1963a) does not guarantee an immediate communist retreat or reunification tomorrow. Rather, this is a long term goal requiring common effort. Kennedy needed to temper his audience's expectation because he knew the challenges of reunification were going to be difficult. First, there was the difficulty in uniting the GDR and FRG politically because of the Cold War atmosphere. While this was a difficult problem, the physical separation was an easier problem to solve than the mental separation created by the Wall with two opposing systems and histories being created. The physical division created different histories and values between the East and West, even though on both sides of the Wall they were ethnically German. This uniting of people with different ways of living into a complete whole would produce growing pains and would need time and patience to succeed. Second, Kennedy was well aware of the 1953 uprisings and he did not want to include any rhetoric that could set off riots in the West against the Wall. He instilled hope for the future, but tempered enthusiasm for any immediate action against the GDR.

Kennedy's pragmatic challenge to the West Berliners and Germans is reminiscent of his July 25, 1961 speech, to Americans. He called for patience and faith in his vision. His remark about Berlin being besieged is linked to his historical allusion to Bastogne in 1961. He offered the challenge of remaining patient, strong and vigilant as a way to prepare his audience for his forthcoming détente policy, originally announced at the American University, but soon to be reiterated to the Germans at the Free University. The challenge consisted of working with the GDR to open up holes in the Wall and opening up the people of the East to Western influence. This policy would be emphasized more in his Free University speech.

Kennedy Goes Roman: Civis Romanus Sum

One of the trademarks in a Kennedy speech is his references to history. In his July 1961 speech, Kennedy referred to Bastogne, Stalingrad and recounts Berlin's postwar history. Robert Kennedy urged his brother to say something in German when he spoke in Berlin. On his way to Germany, Bundy came up with a few phrases for Kennedy to use. Kennedy wanted to know what the proudest boast was for the Romans to use, which was civis Romanus sum or I am a Roman citizen (Beschloss, 1991). In his remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz, Kennedy chose to use Bundy's suggested Latin boast the Romans used, "civis Romanus sum" and its German equivalent "Ich bin ein Berliner" (Kennedy, 1963a). The references continued to build community between America and Berlin. The phrases identified America and Berlin with one of the original free societies and republics, Rome. America had long associated itself with Ancient Rome and Greece, the birth places of democracy and republicanism, with its association of free rights and a political system established in the constitution. By adding in the historical reference to

Rome, Kennedy was integrating German history with the universalistic ideals of freedom espoused by America, Rome and Greece.

Kennedy's use of the historical *Civis Romanus sum* was an appeal to the German population and he used it to identify himself as a German. The roots of the phrase that helped form 'Ich bin ein Berliner' are important for the rights and ideals it transmitted. *Civis Romanus sum* was a declaration of Roman citizenship to claim the rights, privileges and protection Roman citizenship carried. It is most cited and memorialized by Marcus Tullius Cicero. Besides the legal protection the phrase offered, it was also used to identify with one's community and create a sense of community (Daum, 2008). Kennedy had once used the metaphor in a speech in New Orleans in 1962. At one point in the speech, Kennedy boasts "Two thousand years ago the proudest boast was to say, 'I am a citizen of Rome.' Today, I believe, in 1962 the proudest boast is to say, 'I am a citizen of the United States'" (Daum, 2008, p. 152). The speech writers for Kennedy left out the phrase, but Kennedy's trip to the Berlin Wall stirred up his emotions and as he departed from his planned speech. He fell back on this line from his New Orleans speech (Daum, 2008). This shows not only his excellent memory, but a classic characteristic of Kennedy as a speech maker; he always studied his previous public statements. Kennedy believed, "[e]very speech put his career on the line, reflecting choices for which he would be praised or blamed" (Windt Jr., 2003, p. 96). Kennedy directed his speechwriters to go back and look at his speeches to make sure he achieved unity and consistency (Windt Jr., 2003).

By linking Berlin to Rome, he pays the Berliners a double compliment. Berliners are placed on equal footing of the new "Romans" in America and that makes them equal

partners in the new “Pax Americana” (Daum, 2008). Kennedy’s historical metaphors are used to transcend time and place and link idealistic principles to support all freedom seekers and protectors. The main historical metaphor at Rudolph Wilde Platz is the link between Rome, America and Berlin. Through this historical metaphor Kennedy was transformed into a Berliner and Berliners into Americans and Romans. The shared values of freedom and republican democracy are transferred from Ancient Rome to Berlin through this American president. In the process, Kennedy increased Berliners’ and Germany’s national and international prestige. This goes a long way in repairing their image that just eighteen years ago was tarnished by Nazism. Kennedy used the historical metaphor to help rehabilitate the German image internationally and to inspire pride among its citizens.

Identificational Appeals: Rudolph Wilde Platz

Despite Ulbricht’s instructions to keep East Germans away from the Wall and prevent them from viewing the Kennedy motorcade, they could still follow the visit on Western radio or television signals broadcast over the Wall. Most East Germans and Berliners were able to listen to Kennedy’s speech, even though they were not able to partake in the historic event (Smyser, 2009). Kennedy’s long diatribe about the differences between communism and democracy, the free and unfree, implicates all citizens of Berlin, not just those living in the Western sector. Kennedy remarked, “one German out of four is denied the elementary right of free men” which is followed quickly by a call for German unification (Kennedy, 1963a). The East German audience who may hear the speech over the Wall or on the radio broadcast from West Berlin could take heart in the knowledge that Kennedy was also calling for their freedom. Even those who were

supposed to support the East German regime, like the wife of a Politburo member of the GDR Communist Party, telephoned a friend and described the speech as “fabulous.” Her friend agreed (Smyser, 2009, p. 226). This showed the far reaching and inspirational effects of Kennedy’s rhetoric not only on West Berliners, but East Berliners too.

While East Berliner’s cheered privately, West Berliners roared publically. Kennedy received the most overwhelming reception of his entire political career in Berlin—from his motorcade to his speech in front of Schöneberg Hall (Sorensen, 1965). In attendance that day was Horst Teltschik, who helped Helmut Kohl negotiate German reunification with Mikhail Gorbachev. Along with a dozen university friends, Teltschik went to the square at 8 A.M. to get a good spot and had to lock elbows to keep from being separated and crushed. Like Klaus Scharioth, later German ambassador to Washington, Teltschik never forgot the speech. For many Berliners, Kennedy’s speech remained one of the greatest experiences of their lives (Smyser, 2009).The interruption of Kennedy’s speech with chants of “Ken-Ne-Dy!” and roars of support were to be expected, but it was the crowd’s final reaction at the end of Brandt’s speech, which followed Kennedy’s, that was not expected (Daum, 2008).

Brandt was the new American choice to lead Germany into the era of détente, initially in Berlin alone, but eventually the chancellorship. On this day though, Brandt was nervous. Kennedy’s speech had just exploded the idea of détente. Brandt was most affected by Kennedy’s impromptu attacks on Communism. Since the erection of the Berlin Wall he was the one German politician to defend the American position of détente, as evident in his remarks at Harvard in 1962. Brandt was also wary during Kennedy’s speech because in three weeks his press secretary Egon Bahr would be attending a

conference at the Evangelische Akademic Tutzing, a conference for politicians and intellectuals. At this conference, Bahr was going to unveil Brandt's version of détente between the two Germanys, Ostpolitik, in an effort to ease East-West tensions (Daum, 2008). Thus Brandt stood and watched nervously as his plans for Ostpolitik seemed to have been threatened.

As Brandt finished his speech, the crowd called for Kennedy again. Adenauer encouraged the president to step forward. Kennedy came to "Old Man" Adenauer's side, and this time the two stood together smiling and waving at the crowd. The crowd began to chant for Adenauer, a man who had been distant and detached from the city as Chancellor of West Germany, a man who remained nonchalant when the wall was built and a man who had hesitated to go to West Berlin a few days before. The crowd chanted "Konny, Konny" embracing the chancellor with an American-sounding nickname. The American sounding version of Konrad was a double triumph for Adenauer since the American nickname also symbolized West Berliners celebrating themselves as American Berliners, different than other West Germans. Adenauer's unexpected inclusion made him part of this new shared experience in U.S.-German relations (Daum, 2008). The day's celebration and communal experience with Kennedy created a new identity for Berliners. No longer were they merely Germans, but Westerners and Americans. Kennedy's identification as a Berliner raised the status of Berlin to the equal of an American city. Though, Kennedy may have expressed these sentiments in 1961, it was not until Kennedy arrived in Berlin and had shared a communal experience with the Berliners did they fully understand the seriousness of America's commitment and perhaps only then did Kennedy fully realize Germany's yen for reunification.

West Berliners and Germans were elated at Kennedy's words and in general the majority of Americans responded positively, but Kennedy's advisers, especially Bundy and Sorensen were not particularly thrilled with Kennedy's impromptu sections. Both Bundy and Sorensen were in attendance and looked on uncomfortably; they believed the tone failed to promote negotiations with the Soviets (Smyser, 2009). Not only did the speech seem to undo Kennedy's peace speech at American University, but it raised his advisers' worst fears. The speech seemed to directly refute even the possibility of coexistence with the Soviets, which was exemplified most sharply with the stinging rebuke: "there are some who say in Europe and elsewhere we can work with the Communists. Let them come to Berlin" (Kennedy, 1963a). Bundy, who favored the more diplomatic earlier text, told Kennedy in a classic understatement: "I think you went a little far" (Smyser, 2009, p. 226).

American diplomats throughout Europe told their host government that Kennedy did not *literally* mean that the West could not work with communism; his words were idealistic rather than strict prescriptive guidelines for diplomacy (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy however disagreed with his advisers' assessment and the worried diplomats. Kennedy now believed he understood German desire for unification and he now saw Berlin as a place to build his legacy, not merely a place he inherited and had to defend. Kennedy was a new president and redefined the U.S.-German relationship (Kempe, 2011). While Kennedy did make some changes to his upcoming Free University speech, leaving the door open for Khrushchev over arms control, he did not believe he had gone too far at Rudolph Wilde Platz.

The one audience that was most likely to receive the speech as hostile was the one audience that overlooked the speech. Khrushchev focused on Kennedy's American University address and his calls for peace there. If Khrushchev had taken Kennedy's remarks at city hall literally, the world may have inched closer to war again (Beschloss, 1991). Fortunately for Kennedy, Khrushchev wrote off Kennedy's speech as rabble-rousing Cold war rhetoric. Khrushchev wisely quipped two weeks later

> If one reads what he said in West Germany, especially in West Berlin, and compares this with the speech at the American University, one would think that the speeches were made by two different Presidents…[Kennedy was] competing with the President of France in courting the old West German widow. Both try to win her heart, which has already grown cold and which often prompts its possessor to utterly unconstructive thoughts. And if this widow is courted the way these two wooers woo her…the widow can become conceited and think that the solution of world problems really depends on her (Beschloss, 1991, p. 608n.)

Khrushchev's ambitions in Berlin had been curtailed, he chose to focus on commending the American University speech as "the best statement made by any President since Roosevelt" (Freedman, 2000, p. 269). Khrushchev's positive attitude towards the speech could perhaps be attributed to the ongoing Sino-Soviet split (Freedman, 2000). The varied audiences in international affairs heard and took what they were supposed to from Kennedy's remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz.

Kennedy's success in creating a shared vision and community are evident in the warmth and the numerous outbursts of cheering during his Rudolph Wilde Platz address by the West Berliners. By bringing Adenauer along with him to Berlin, he was able to gain a favorable turn in U.S.-West German relations. His rhetoric soared over the Wall and broke down the physical barrier standing between the Germans, as the conversation of the Politburo wife and her friend demonstrated. He was successful in building

consensus among the average German on both sides, though Brandt was a bit alienated by Kennedy's accusations of not being able to work with the communists, but Brandt's fears would soon be allayed. The most divided audience on the speech was Kennedy's own advisors and the president himself. Kennedy held firm that there was nothing to worry about, though his advisors greatly worried about the potential political damage. Luckily, for them, Khrushchev did not read into the speech a bellicose tone; rather, he merely ascribed the tone to a man being carried away by an enthusiastic crowd. Rudolph Wild Platz was a success for Kennedy and his legacy in Berlin.

Why Rudolph Wilde Platz Matters

Kennedy typically preferred to stay away from the crowd-baiting demagoguery of his political Boston grandfathers, but not on that day (Beschloss, 1991). Kennedy had spoken the words his audience wanted to hear like any good politician. The half million strong had not come to listen to Kennedy give an academic lecture on the history of the two nations or how compromise needed to take place with Khrushchev and Ulbricht. No, the Berliners came to listen to the young and energetic president who protected them and beat back Khrushchev in 1961 and 1962, at Checkpoint Charlie and in Cuba. They were there to be inspired. The overflow of enthusiasm from the audience and Kennedy's own personal emotions overcame his vaunted reason. It was one of the few instances in Kennedy's career when personal emotion overtook his public persona (Silvestri, 2000). The personal emotion also extended his charisma. He used nonverbal hand gestures and pounded his fists to emphasize his points. Since one of the pre-trip objectives was to see and to be seen by Berliners, Kennedy was intent on smiling and enjoying himself in an effort to set the right mood (Daum, 2008).

Rhetorically Kennedy's speech at Rudolph Wilde Platz is important because it demonstrated the power and importance of creating a shared vision and communal experience with your audience. Kennedy's identification as a Berliner erased his failures of 1961 and cemented his legacy in Germany. He identified with his audience by stating he was a Berliner, in their foreign tongue and shared his vision of a free and united Germany and Europe. His attacks on communism, while they ran counter to his official policy, endeared him to the crowd. Kennedy's off-the-cuff remarks were dangerous politically, but genius rhetorically as he fearlessly stated what every Berliner knew to be true and what many in the West turned a blind eye toward. It was the first of a two part rhetorical strategy. First, at Rudolph Wilde Platz Kennedy established identification with his West German audience. Second, at Free University, he would sell them on his détente policy and their part in the policy, opening up of inter-German relations.

Analysis of Rudolph Wilde Platz and Kennedy's historical tour of the city also demonstrates the importance of personal diplomacy and physical connection with your audience. His physical presence in the city accentuated his remarks, but also allowed him to personally grasp the situation and understand a different perspective on the situation. Analysis of Rudolph Wilde Platz is important because of Kennedy's ad lib remarks during his speech. As Zarefsky (2008) argued studying rhetoric can "address the question of the author's intention" (p. 633), which in the case of Kennedy's ad lib remarks makes his rhetoric more personal than planned speeches. Kennedy's personal beliefs had shown through clearly: his anger at the Berlin Wall and his seeming failure to act, the failures of the communist system are abundant, but military rollback was not the answer indicated by his pragmatic temperament on reunification. Idealism, pragmatism and accusatorial

tactics are well founded rhetorical strategies expressed in Kennedy addresses, and history and its metaphors are ways of building cohesions, creating community and expressing ideals.

Free University: Rudolph Wilde Platz's Counterbalance

The potential political damage Bundy and Sorensen believed Kennedy had incurred at Rudolph Wilde Platz was largely repaired at the Free University. The speech at Rudolph Wilde Platz may have inspired the public, but it left Brandt and Bahr tentative about their future plans for détente. Their fears were soon calmed as Kennedy gave his most important address in Berlin at the Free University (Hofmann, 2007). The Free University (FU) was firmly entrenched as part of the topography in America's Berlin. The FU was established with direct American support both financially and intellectually. The University was spread across an extensive landscape giving it a suburban feel that resembled American universities. It was very close to the U.S. ideologically and was well known for its hospitality to U.S. professors and openness to American developments in the social sciences Assembled from both the Free University and the Technical University, some 10,000 to 15,000 professors and students were in attendance for Kennedy's speech. In 1963, there were approximately 13,400 Germans and 800 foreign students attending the Free University (Daum, 2008). Sorensen and Bundy pushed Kennedy to be more conciliatory toward the Soviets and to make sure Khrushchev understood that what Kennedy had said earlier was to rally Berliners (Smyser, 2009).

At the Free University, Kennedy uses the polysemy of his discourse to reach to different audiences, the West Germans and Berliners and the global audience embodied in the future leaders and "citizens of the world" present. Kennedy also uses his speech at

the Free University to build support for his détente policy. In the next section, I will examine how Kennedy used his personal style of juxtaposing idealism and pragmatism to achieve a shared vision. I will then examine Kennedy's peace policy, détente. I will conclude with a discussion how Kennedy sought to build community for his policy of détente.

The Challenge Extended: Truth, Justice and Liberty

In his closing remarks earlier that afternoon, Kennedy offered a vision of Germany's future where Berliners and Germans "earned the right to be free, including the right to unite their families and their nation in lasting peace" (Kennedy, 1963a). At the Free University, he discussed what the next generation needed to take their rightful place in history The future generations, Kennedy implied, will be able to transcend the past twenty years of history of war and confrontation in Europe and work towards a new horizon in Europe if they keep in mind three ideals: truth, justice and liberty. Kennedy draws attention to the confluence of American ideals with those of the Free University. Such ideals will only flourish under a democratic form of governance.

Kennedy firmly believed in issuing a challenge to the American people to secure their commitment to his vision. The president's rhetorical treatment of German audiences was largely the same. Kennedy offered a set of challenges to the German people to work towards a peaceful coexistence and the long-term goal of reunification.

Kennedy enumerated the three ideals and defines the essence of each. Truth forces people to "face the facts as they are, not to involve ourselves in self-deception; to refuse to think merely in slogans…let us deal with the realities as they actually are, not as they might have been, and not as we wish they were" (Kennedy, 1963b). The second

ideal, justice, “requires liberty…[which] requires us to do what we can do in this transition period to improve the lot and maintain the hopes of those on the other side” (Kennedy, 1963b). The last ideal Kennedy speaks to, liberty, which will manifest itself in “A united Berlin in a United Germany, united by self-determination and living in peace. This right of free choice is no special privilege claimed by the Germans alone. It is an elemental requirement of human justice” (Kennedy, 1963b). In speaking to these three ideals, Kennedy used transcendent language in the form of universal principles to create a shared vision in his German audience. These are principles that Kennedy believed should be accorded to all men and women; principles that can transcend physical barriers.

Kennedy’s challenge of reunification through the application of the three ideals provides a broad outline and crucial set of principles. However, the Germans would need guidance from the past to achieve these lofty goals. In stark contrast to the bellicose attacks on communism that were present in the afternoon, Kennedy now espoused cooperation with the East as the method to advance a lasting peace and reunification of Germany and Europe.

Truth, justice, and liberty serve as thematic tools for both organizing Kennedy’s Free University speech and providing lynchpins for specific steps toward the ideal of reunification. To realize *truth* in international affairs and inter-German relations, Kennedy calls upon the FRG to finally recognize the East: “we all know that a police state regime has been imposed on the Eastern sector of this city and country” (Kennedy, 1963b). The long standing FRG policy of non-recognition of the GDR created tension between Bonn and Washington when attempting to coordinate German policy. Kennedy does not request or order the FRG to accept the GDR’s social structure or propaganda

that East Berlin is a socialist paradise or even democratic, but merely asks his audience to accept the reality that the country exists. Kennedy wants a de facto recognition of the GDR because pretending the GDR does not exist could harm future reunification efforts.

To help bring about truth in relations, Kennedy suggested, “We must first bring others to see their own true interests better than they do today” (Kennedy, 1963b). This directly supported Kennedy’s claim that the GDR was disillusioned by its own propaganda, but a continued policy of ignoring the GDR’s existence by the FRG damaged inter-German relations and overall German identity. But, it was also intended for his West German audience to examine the truth of their situation and examine the two questions of non-recognition: What is the best policy for reunification? and How does non-recognition help my German kin in the East? He cautioned, “The peaceful reunification of Berlin and Germany will, therefore, not be either quick or easy” (Kennedy, 1963b). Truth was only the first step Kennedy proposed. Using truth as a measure, Germans and Berliners on both sides of the Wall were to submit to a candid appraisal of the situation and fully examine the best courses of action. Kennedy was confident the superior Western systems of democracy and capitalism would prevail over their Eastern socialist counterparts.

The second step, *justice*, frames an appeal to move beyond the mere recognition of the situation in the East and offers practical solutions for West Berliners and Germans to adopt. JFK asserted,

> It is important that the people on the quiet streets in the East be kept in touch with Western society. Through all the contacts and communication that can be established, through all the trade that Western security permits, above all the contacts and communication that can be established, above all whether they see much or little of the West, what they see must be so

> bright as to contradict the daily drum beat of distortion from the East (Kennedy, 1963b).

Kennedy's concept was a micro version of détente, daily interactions between East and West Germans over mundane and basic tasks, trade, communication and other common issues. Détente is not rallies and slogans filled with anger, but taking the time and effort to carefully carve out a mutual coexistence that works toward solving problems. The strength and benefits of the West will attract East Germans and Europeans so that "when the possibilities of reconciliation appear, we in the West will make it clear that we are not hostile to any people or system providing they choose their own destiny without interfering with the free choice of others" (Kennedy, 1963b). Freedom is not hostile or threatening, but welcoming of diversity from the East. Here Kennedy premises the success of détente on freedom and negotiation between East and West mitigating his threatening tone at Rudolph Wilde Platz.

The first two steps of truth and justice offer a pathway to obtain the final goal of liberty and reunification. More important than the final goal of reunification, which has always existed among Germans, was the course Kennedy had laid out to achieve liberty. Tatalovich and Daynes (1979) argue that a president's power rests in his ability to persuade and Zarefsky (2008) noted the importance for a leader to present a clear vision to gain support. For Kennedy to be successful at the Free University, he needed to present a clear plan that could be accepted by the Germans. Kennedy's two step plan to gain reunification was a logical course and offered Germans a means to gain their desired end.

The final pillar justice demanded that West Berliners and Germans work together on ground level issues to make progress on the larger issue of unification. These interactions will demonstrate to Easterners the good intentions of the West and the

failures of communism including the inability to provide basic goods and services. West Berliners have no higher calling than to stay in Berlin and “to show your neighbors democracy at work, a growing and productive city offering freedom and a better life for all” (Kennedy, 1963b). Kennedy’s rhetorical success at the Free University was grounded in his ability to create a clear vision of how to achieve a common goal, which he, too, now supported -- the final goal of reunification. By presenting a challenge and vision to achieve this goal, Kennedy built presidential ethos. As Kennedy did in 1961, he provided a strategy for achieving peace in the world, not just virulent attacks on communism. The leadership and vision present in this speech made Kennedy appear presidential as he contributed viable options for peace, reunification of Germany and Europe and ending Cold War divisions. In both speeches, he was able to set the terms of debate, direct the citizenry toward the important issues that must be solved and became the embodiment of the nation.

Kennedy offered one final challenge is to all who listen and accept his message. Kennedy concludes “This is not an easy course. There is no easy course to the reunification of Germany, the reconstitution of Europe. But life is never easy. There is work to be done and obligations to be met—obligations to truth, to justice, and to liberty” (Kennedy, 1963b). The challenge is to be accepted and met by all, Easterner or Westerner. Kennedy’s message was directed to all those who can see past the current state of division and look forward to a reunified country and reconstituted continent. For the person who holds those values and for the person who yearns to be free, the choice is easy, but the path will be difficult. History and liberty is on the side of those willing to accept the challenge of working with the East and opening up their society to the West.

In examining these multiple challenges, three rhetorical strategies deserve attention. First, as discussed already, Kennedy created a shared vision and common goals for his audience to rally around so he could gain support for his policies. Second, he used the challenge to orient his audience toward a common goal. Kennedy had previously used the challenge strategy in 1961 to create community and orient his audience toward a common goal. At Free University, the goal remained, but Kennedy used his speech to orient his audience toward a particular path to take. Finally, he used the juxtaposition of idealism and pragmatism. Each of the three principles were employed as universal terms that transcend time and place and could symbolically unify people that were physically separated. However, each of these ideal principles was accompanied by pragmatic steps that could be taken to reach that ideal state. Kennedy did this not to dampen the mood of his audience, but to be realistic about the situation and provide concrete steps for action. These two seemingly opposing ideas complemented each other rhetorically. An overly idealistic speech would raise the audience's expectations to unrealistic levels and an overly pragmatic speech would lack the inspirational unifying principles for the audience to rally around. Kennedy's blending of idealism and pragmatism served his ends well.

Accusations and History: Kennedy's Other Strategy

At the Free University, Kennedy's approach to accusations was largely comparative. He focused on the West's superior economy and popular sovereignty in contrast to the East. Kennedy argued that Western culture can "contradict the daily drum beat of distortion from the East" (Kennedy, 1963b). Kennedy's accusations are more opaque here and meant to keep the door open for negotiations between the two countries. Kennedy wanted to temper his bellicose rhetoric after the afternoon speech, but also to

reaffirm his pragmatic belief that only negotiations could improve the Cold War. The idle rhetoric and boasting between nations must be abandoned for real and lasting solutions to work. The entire tone of the speech is oriented toward the long term success of détente and the reunification of the continent, which he believed could be best achieved through mutual cooperation.

With the exception of maintaining the U.S. commitment to West Berlin and the freedom of Western Europe, Kennedy did not make any concrete threats against the Soviet Union. Kennedy did not the attack the communist system until he discussed the ideal of truth, which meant recognizing "a police state regime has been imposed on the Eastern sector of this city and country" (Kennedy, 1963b). Even this accusation makes no direct attack on communism nor does it even mention communism as an instigator of police state regimes, much less the Soviet Union. Kennedy later refers to the police state as "an anachronism," but again his accusations lack the vitriol of his earlier speech when he declared the communist system was a failure. At the Free University, JFK was merely comparing the two economic systems (Kennedy, 1963b). His only mention of the Soviet Union was "The people of the Soviet Union, even after 45 years of party dictatorship, feel the forces of historical evolution. The harsh precepts of Stalinism are officially recognized as bankrupt…So history, itself, runs against the Marxist dogma" (Kennedy, 1963b). Even this accusation fails to indict the Soviet Union as evil or sinister in world affairs. Rather, it is a veiled recognition of Khrushchev's moderate approach and success in ending the policies of Stalin.

Kennedy had tempered his bellicose rhetoric from earlier in the day at Rudolph Wilde Platz. Kennedy returned to the theme of peaceful coexistence and working with

each other through negotiations. There was one aspect to Kennedy's rhetoric that remained present at the Free University, his historical allusions and examples.

From the Battle of Bastogne reference in his July 1961 speech to *Civis Romanus Sum* a few hours earlier at Rudolph Wilde Platz, Kennedy always used historical references to accompany his points. At the Free University, Kennedy employed panoply of historical references and discusses the concept of history with a discourse against communism. Kennedy's historical references include such diverse references as the foundation of education, Prince Bismarck, the American Revolution and Goethe's advice on international strife. For example, Kennedy quotes Goethe as saying "With sufficient learning a scholar forgets national hatreds, stands above nations, and feels the well-being or troubles of a neighboring people as if they happened to his own" (Kennedy, 1963b). Here Kennedy associates one of Germany's great writers with his idea of détente. This concept is especially poignant to the Germans whose communist neighbors are not foreigners, but are Germans. By using Goethe Kennedy is tying Germany's past ideals as an appeal for realizing his present goal, making Germany a part of the détente process.

Kennedy's historical references to great German leaders or visionaries and America's founding fathers and inception is another example of Kennedy identifying associations between the two countries through history, either by comparing them directly or ordering his speech so that they complemented each other. Similar to Kennedy's interweaving Roman, American and German ideals together earlier in the day, the president now links the histories of the two nations together on a deeper level than in the past. Previous historical connections mentioned by presidents revolved around the major events from 1945-1963, which most of his audience lived through and could

connect as shared experience. Kennedy took the historical ties between to the two countries to another level. His trip to Frankfurt connected Kennedy to early German liberalism in 1848; allusions to Goethe's international outlook and the founding father's ideals helped reinforce similar values that bonded the two nation's history together.

Kennedy uses a historical argument to discredit the communist ideology, which is based on a specific idea of history and the progression of history toward a worldwide communist revolution where all nations would become communist. From Marx to Khrushchev, communist leaders always believed that history was on their side and always pointed that out in addresses and attacks on capitalism. Earlier I noted that Kennedy's description of freedom movements reinforced the ideal of liberty. Such an example does double-duty because it also can serve as a contemporary historical argument to attack communist predictions of eventual triumph. Recall that Kennedy employed examples of historical events to argue against the communist view of the march of history. He notes: "Negro citizens of my own country have strengthened their demand for equality and opportunity…The pace of decolonization has quickened in Africa…The people of Eastern Europe, even after 18 years of oppression, are not immune to change" (Kennedy, 1963b). Even "the people of the Soviet Union…feel the forces of historical evolution" (Kennedy, 1963b). These examples serve JFK well in demonstrating freedom's march across the globe. The pace of history is slow and is part of Kennedy's pragmatic approach, but his examples demonstrate a progressive evolution of thought around the globe—one that is contrary to Communism's belief because "history, itself, runs against the Marxist dogma, not toward it" (Kennedy, 1963b). This is a more subtle attack on the communist ideology, at least one that is not as fierce or

blatant as his attacks hours earlier, but perhaps more damning because historical fact is represented as undermining the foundation of communist ideology.

Kennedy declared that “these dogmatic police states are an anachronism. Like the division of Germany and of Europe, it is against the tide of history” and the West will have to take action to help bring about the change—the steps already outlined above (Kennedy, 1963b). Kennedy asserts “The new Europe of the West—dynamic, diverse, and democratic—must exert an ever-increasing attraction to the people of the East” (Kennedy, 1963b). His call for action follows his action-oriented leadership style, the principles of the New Frontier and the strength of the Western system. Instead of merely containing or waging a military war against communism, Kennedy proposes to fight communism in the market place of ideas, not the battlefield. This change in emphasis, from a military strategy to defeat communism to a détente strategy, represents a change in Kennedy’s discourse and outlook.

Kennedy was able to ground his argument in history by examining communism’s failure over the past eighteen years. Communism’s ruthless history stretched back to the closing days of World War II, with Soviet atrocities perpetrated against the German populace on a massive scale. Communism’s aggressive action against the West in Berlin, Korea and Vietnam were three examples Kennedy could have cited as aggression against Western values. Interestingly, Communism’s attack against the West was minimal compared to the historical failures and destruction waged against its own people. The Soviet gulag system and the crushing of the East German uprising and the Polish and Hungarian uprisings were small compared to the destructive Cultural Revolution of Mao in China; each of which were examples of communism abusing its people either in the

name of control or cultural progress. As Kennedy believed personally and as was reiterated to Khrushchev at Vienna, he was not overly concerned with Soviet and Chinese doctrines and political beliefs, but rather, what they actually did in the world. It was their aggressive actions that caused Kennedy concern and drove him to action.

The most evident symbol of failure was the Berlin Wall and its scarring physical presence across the Cold War landscape. The Wall symbolized the detainment of people against their will to serve communism's historical agenda. The Wall served to keep out the liberalizing effects of the West, which is why Kennedy proposed to use a new strategy to transcend the Wall and change communism, détente.

Détente: The Path Forward

At the Free University, Kennedy was reasserting the principles developed in his American University address. In speaking to the Germans, in their homeland, Kennedy asked them to subscribe to the principles of détente. Kennedy's call to the next generation of Germans highlighted his differences with Adenauer who always feared détente and negotiations with the Soviets and GDR. Now Kennedy was speaking to a new generation about détente.

Kennedy again recognized that convincing his audience on either side of the Iron curtain was not an easy task, "There will be wounds to heal and suspicions to be eased on both sides" and to help future integration of the East into the West "The difference[s] in living standards will have to be reduced by leveling up, not down" (Kennedy, 1963b). Kennedy warns "I do believe in the necessity of great powers working together to preserve the human race, or otherwise we can be destroyed" (Kennedy, 1963b). The failure of détente and communication leads to misunderstanding and even worse, war.

The dark hours of the Berlin Crisis in 1961 and Cuba in 1962 taught Kennedy that communication above all was important. Détente maintains the lines of communication and works to open societies to each other for the free exchange of ideas. It was a strategy Adenauer feared and older generations in both America and Germany had shied away from, but Kennedy articulated his belief that a new age was dawning and his generation and the next had to be ready to meet the challenge. Buttressing Kennedy's belief in negotiations and the future was his conviction of Western superiority. He felt the dynamics of capitalism and democracy would be appealing to those living in the downtrodden East.

Community Building: A Dual Audience

Kennedy's remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz, only a few hours before his Free University address, were intended for Germans, but there was one line that expanded the scene to the global Cold War landscape: "When all are free, then we can look forward to that day when this city will be joined as one and this country and this great Continent of Europe in a peaceful and hopeful globe" (Kennedy, 1963a). Kennedy continued the themes of reunification, but expanded them to the larger Cold War landscape at the Free University. Kennedy references to Asia, Africa and Latin America are few in number, but he bestows the title "citizens of the world" on those attending the Free University; including the 800 students in attendance from foreign countries and they too are encouraged to play a critical role in the advance of freedom globally. What Kennedy began at Rudolph Wild Platz, he would continue at the Free University by stressing to these "citizens of the world" the need to educate for and embody the ideal of freedom.

After initial remarks, Kennedy addresses his audience directly, “I am talking to the future rulers of this country, and also of other free countries, stretching around the world, who have sent their sons and daughters to this center of freedom in order to understand what the world struggle is all about” (Kennedy, 1963b). This expansion of the audience is crucial for Kennedy because he hoped to gain global acceptance for his new détente policy, which was originally announced at the American University. Kennedy now had a global audience he could address on détente’s importance. At American University, he was addressing a U.S. audience and the Soviet leadership. At Free University, Kennedy seized the opportunity to expand détente to a global policy by influencing the next generation. The “citizen of the world” attempts to “comprehend the difficult, sensitive tasks that lie before us as free men and women, and… [is] willing to commit [his or her] energies to the advancement of a free society” (Kennedy, 1963b). A “citizen of the world” is a man or woman dedicated to the advancement of freedom. Note that Kennedy did not use the term “democracy”, but relied upon the freedom of popular will signifying a rejection of bi-polar world and the realization that multiple forms of government are acceptable, as long as they are chosen by the people and do not infringe on others’ basic rights.

Kennedy’s first two speeches typified his personal responsibility and action-oriented leadership style in conducting America’s world affairs. At the Free University, however, Kennedy spoke to the next generation and outlined his vision of the task at hand and how young people can make an impact in the world. Kennedy shifts the onus of tomorrow’s politics and geopolitical world onto the future generation and he argues that their success is dependent on their education. Kennedy saw the hardening of Cold War

tensions in his generation: the Berlin Blockade, the repression of freedom movements in the 1950s, the 1961 Berlin Crisis and the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. He understood that détente would be difficult and demanding and while he could begin to thaw relations between the superpowers, further progress would be at a slow pace. The success of détente would hinge on the upcoming generation, which is why Kennedy spoke to the students on the necessity of pursuing his policy.

Kennedy's spoke of three ideals: truth, justice and liberty. The ideal of liberty helps Kennedy expand his speech to the global landscape, where freedom's call is reverberating on a worldwide scale. Liberty is tied to the freedom movements around the globe. Kennedy noted that the freedom movements of the "Negro citizens of my own country have strengthened their demand for equality and opportunity…The quick pace of decolonization has quickened in Africa…The people of Eastern Europe, even after 18 years of oppression, are not immune to change. The truth doesn't die" (Kennedy, 1963b). Using these examples of the global liberty movement, Kennedy demonstrated that liberty is a goal that transcends race, class and politics. Liberty becomes one pillar of the shared vision Kennedy created for his audience.

While the global citizen references worked toward creating a global vision, Kennedy needed to reach a more important audience, the Germans. Kennedy and his administration firmly believed that for a successful détente between the U.S. and Russia, the Germans needed to work together. Kennedy was not calling for full recognition of the GDR by the FRG, but coexistence was needed. For détente to work in Europe, inter-German problems would need to be solved between the two German states.

The expression of justice required the two Germanys to work with one another on basic tasks. Kennedy firmly believed and reassured his West German audience that West Germany's strengths would win over the GDR every day; an indicator in Kennedy's firm belief in Western superiority economically, politically and culturally over its Eastern competitors. This strengthened his call for candor between the two states, as the FRG had nothing to fear because it had "demonstrated [a firm] commitment to the liberty of the human mind, the welfare of the community, and to peace among nations" (Kennedy, 1963b). The GDR's historic failure to establish legitimacy in the eyes of the world was evident: the 1953 uprising, the emigration of two million refugees and the failure at Checkpoint Charlie. A de facto recognition of the GDR would help ease tensions, improve the lives of Germans on the other side of the Wall and ease eventual reunification. Further positive action by the FRG could only enhance its prestige and improve relations in the Cold War, especially by helping their neighbors across the border.

West Germany and West Berlin were said to possess the qualities that are consistent with other Western nations and should be welcomed with open arms into the Western Alliance as equals. This call, along with Kennedy's discourse at Rudolph Wilde Platz, marked a change in his thinking. West Germany was no longer an allied nation in the Cold War, but a major allied nation whose concerns should be accounted for in the U.S. Like the Western Alliance in 1961, Kennedy now had to take into account West German policies when speaking about or conducting U.S. foreign policy. In communicating this sentiment, Kennedy had spoken forcefully to Germans in Germany, which served as a significant statement of Germany's importance to the West. Similar to

de Gaulle's statement about the Germans being a great people, Kennedy's remarks about Germany's place among nations projected a Germany that had been able to transcend the ravages of its dark Nazi past. Kennedy's stop in Frankfurt, which was the historical symbol of liberty in Germany from the 1848 revolutions, and his motorcade through Berlin, highlighted the American and Western influence on the city, and reinforced Kennedy's remarks. The U.S. president's call outweighed de Gaulle's statement because Kennedy was the leader of the free world who signaled Germany's re-ascension into the community of peaceful nations.

Through the common struggle of the first Berlin Crisis in 1961 and with his attention diverted by the Cuban Missile Crisis, Kennedy had been unable to forge a strong emotional and physical bond with West Germans. Though the image of the vengeful Nazi Stormtrooper had faded, a new vision of Germany had escaped Kennedy's grasp until 1963. Only then did Kennedy fully realize the German desire for reunification as he personally experienced the warmth of the German people and their resolve to participate in and shape a common destiny. The president's perception of Germany had changed, along with his emotional attachment to the city of Berlin. He was a new man (Kempe, 2011). Kennedy's acceptance of Germany into the community of nations and powerful discourse to the Germans in Germany solidified the acceptance of a common vision for the future, a vision rooted in the principles of truth, justice and liberty, and one that defined a common policy of détente that would work for the long term reunification of Germany. The success of Kennedy's speech and the buy-in from the Germans was evident in the actions of Willy Brandt and Egon Bahr and the success of their Ostpolitik policy.

The Rise of Brandt and the Dawn of Ostpolitik

The American response came mainly from JFK's advisers, Sorensen and Bundy. Kennedy inserted a line by Bundy that was intended to help repair the damage done in his first address. Bundy inserted the line "As I said this morning, I am not impressed by the opportunities open to popular fronts throughout the world" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 84). This line and the overall tone of the speech helped to repair the political damage in the eyes of Sorensen and Bundy (Hofmann, 2007). Kennedy's speech at the Free University helped him annunciate his détente policy in a way that made the biggest impact in the German psyche and ensured the largest buy-in from the population.

The Soviets and Khrushchev paid little attention to Kennedy's remarks at the Free University. Though the openings Kennedy initially presented in his American University speech were reiterated at the Free University, they were soon echoed by Khrushchev. In a matter of a week, in his own address in East Berlin, Khrushchev would be openly discussing the idea of a nuclear test ban treaty, a treaty that Kennedy had been working for since being elected in 1960.

The audience that Kennedy most wanted to reach was the Germans. The tone and aim of the speech was aimed at Germans and Berliners. Kennedy's Free University speech had summoned the magic words that attracted both East and West Germans, the prospect of German unification (Smyser, 2009). The Germans themselves basked in Kennedy's trip and its aftermath. George McGhee, the American ambassador in Bonn, stated "it simply dominated the mass media, and the Germans were speaking of little else" (Daum, 2008, p. 169). Brandt would become the biggest beneficiary of the trip, especially because of Kennedy's speech at the Free University.

In the days' following Kennedy's visit to Berlin, U.S. diplomats across Europe tried to shift the focus from Kennedy's speech at Rudolph Wilde Platz to the Free University speech. Many supporters of détente in the U.S. and Berlin were confused as to how détente could work after Kennedy declared that cooperation with the communists was impossible at Schöneberg Hall (Daum, 2008). Leading the shift in focus to the Free University speech was Willy Brandt who championed Kennedy's more conciliatory tone. Brandt saw Kennedy's speech as a point-by- point reiteration of his positions on Berlin, Germany and détente. The speech at the Free University was a critique of Bonn's foreign policy, an endorsement of Brandt's own evolving policy of small steps and added encouragement to continue this policy further with the blessing of America (Hofmann, 2007). Brandt and Bahr now went on the offensive campaigning hard for their Ostpolitik policy in the weeks after Kennedy's visit. They had 350,000 color pamphlets made up and distributed to every family in Berlin with a full text of Kennedy's speeches, a preface by Brandt, and no less than eight pictures of Brandt and Kennedy together. Over the next few months and years, Brandt rarely missed an opportunity to quote Kennedy, especially the Free University speech, which provided him with an arsenal of suitable, authoritative maxims (Hofmann, 2007).

One of the lines that found favor in Brandt's political movement toward Ostpolitik was Kennedy's remark regarding the importance of East-West engagement: "It is important that the people on the quiet streets in the East be kept in touch with Western society. Through all the contacts and communication that can be established, through all the trade that Western security permits" (Kennedy, 1963b). In the five meetings with Rusk, Brandt was encouraged to create more contacts between East and West. Kennedy's

discourse helped Brandt advance his policy (Hofmann, 2007). Bahr began to lay out the Ostpolitik policy specifics at the Evangelical Academy in Tutzing.

In mid July, Bahr gave an address that would outline the Ostpolitik policy both he and Brandt would implement over the next ten years. In a speech that had Brandt's blessing, Bahr coined the phrases "change through rapprochement" and "overcoming the status quo by not changing the status quo at first" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 85). Bahr applied these principles to inter-German relations arguing that by working with the East German regime, could the West hope to promote peaceful change and transform the regime. Bahr's speech was logical and precise following Kennedy's tenets and applying them to the specific question of inter-German relations (Hofmann, 2007). The most explosive portion of Bahr's speech was his call for de facto recognition in all but name of the regime in the East. Bahr did not call for de jure recognition of the GDR as a legitimate regime, but he recognized that the changes that needed to take place called for some sort of recognition of the present situation. As Kennedy stated at the Free University, "It requires us to face the facts as they are, not to involve ourselves in self-deception" (Kennedy, 1963b). Bahr was prodding the West Germans and Berliners to recognize the division of Germany and to work with their brethren in the East.

Brandt recognized Bahr's address may have breached the public taboo on East German relations and that smaller steps would be needed to initiate détente with the GDR. Brandt planned to begin with humanitarian aid, but he cautioned that this was only the first step. In concert with Kennedy's Free University address, self-determination was the long-term objective (Hofmann, 2007). Later in his career, Brandt recognized that the small steps were not necessarily an "automatic path to reunification, but [served] as a

value in themselves in so far as one helped the people in the Zone" (Hofmann, 2007). Brandt finally grasped the message that Kennedy presented at the Free University; reunification would not come in a sweeping movement, but in a series of practical steps. Patience and faith were needed to maintain contact with the occasionally hostile regime in the East.

Bahr's speech created backlash in Berlin and West Germany. Both the CDU and SPD political parties criticized Bahr. The backlash taught Brandt and Bahr a valuable lesson, the power of public taboo in recognizing the GDR. Though, they also realized what they could say in public, as they discovered, "the CDU cannot fight through to the ultimate conclusion if that forces it to admit that it, or important parts of this party, basically dislikes the entire direction of the American administration" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 86). Opposition to Ostpolitik could only criticize Brandt and Bahr so much because their thoughts and ideas were linked to American policy. As time passed, the ire over Bahr's speech at Tutzing faded and Brandt used his speech as a reference point for the beginning of Ostpolitik (Hofmann, 2007).

Brandt and Bahr's acceptance and embrace of Kennedy's Free University speech equated to a whole-sale buy-in on Kennedy's détente policy. The power to persuade and to induce acceptance of a policy are two critical factors when determining the success of a rhetor (Zarefsky, 2008 & Tatalovich and Dynes, 1979). Ostpolitik, touted by Brandt and Bahr, became the foreign policy of West Germany from the late 1960s till the end of the Cold War, historically indicating the success of Kennedy's Free University speech.

Why Free University Matters

The Free University speech can be seen as an extension of Kennedy's American University address. As an extension of his peace policy, Kennedy now specifically included the Germans with his calls for inter-German relations. Wander (1984) stated that a president should be the embodiment of foreign policy. With his pleas of coexistence toward the Russians, Kennedy became a true proponent of détente. By examining Kennedy's three German speeches beginning with his July 1961 speech, I traced the evolution of Kennedy's thought process and policy on Berlin and Germany. Kennedy's 1961 speech created a vision and policy of military defense with flexible response. His speech at Rudolph Wilde Platz countered his calls for coexistence, but it was a strategy to garner the support of the Germans and to build a communal bond with them. At Free University, Kennedy shifted gears from a military policy for Germany to a peace policy grounded in détente. Kennedy would not shrink away from confrontation, but he was more focused on reaching agreements with the Soviet Union over the issues of Berlin, a test ban treaty, and other major issues that called for attention.

The military buildup and the adversarial nature of the Cold War coaxed Kennedy into a military strategy in 1961, even though he personally favored negotiation. His personal failures at Laos, the Bay of Pigs and Vienna also influenced his decision because he needed to regain the position of strength that he had lost. This militaristic rhetoric and outlook took the world to the brink of nuclear war in October 1962, at which point Kennedy realized the dangers of this strategy and returned to his favored position of negotiations. This evolutionary outlook assisted the president in regaining the negotiating position of strength that helped him in 1963.

Kennedy's outburst of emotion and accusatorial speech at Rudolph Wilde Platz represented his visceral reaction to the conditions in East Berlin and the horror of the Berlin Wall. His failure to act and his lack of interventional rhetoric over its erection factored into his emotional outburst. His basis for attacking communism was well founded in the Soviet failures and atrocities from 1945 to 1963. Each failure gave credence to his attacks. His emotion and sympathy with West Berlin aims helped create the communal bond between the two that had been missing.

The Free University address is the culmination of Kennedy's work in Germany. He provided a roadmap for success in inter-German relations, while at the same time eliciting the buy-in of the Germans for his détente policy. This speech was a counter to Rudolph Wilde Platz as it is more pragmatic and less accusatorial in tone and topic. Free University marked the transition from a military strategy that began in 1961 to a peace strategy that was slowly taking shape prior to the address, but was fully initiated afterward. Kennedy expanded the audience from Germany to the world, creating a global vision and policy that could be usefully adapted in a variety of contexts and countries. Unlike his first strategy, which was premised on militarism, this new strategy revolved around negotiation and worked towards peaceful coexistence. This policy was highly attractive to many Third World and neutral countries that feared nuclear annihilation between the two superpowers. By framing the Cold War debate in terms of negotiation and peace, with the U.S. taking the initiative and offering the olive branches to the Soviet Union, Kennedy was able to set the terms for the debate. If the Soviets rejected Kennedy's call for peace, any aggressive action on their part would be more readily condemned. Kennedy's articulation of the evolution of his policy was a masterstroke

rhetorically, always setting the terms of the debate in the U.S.'s favor. Kennedy was able to frame the terms for debate and denounce communism's aggression because the historical fact supported his case. Communism's failures were evident throughout the past eighteen years and he was able to amplify those failures to gain the rhetorical edge.

Chapter IV. Conclusions and Implications

Epilogue: Kennedy's Legacy in Germany to Ostpolitik in the 1970s

As Kennedy flew to Ireland from Berlin, he was still glowing from the day's events. Kennedy later commented that his visit gave him a far deeper understanding of the necessity of ultimate reunification (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy had also finally realized that West Berlin could be an asset rather than a hindrance in his global Cold War strategy. His speech at Rudolph Wilde Platz marked his final reconciliation with the paradox of Berlin, a militarily indefensible city that was politically indispensible (Stern, 2006). It was a final declaration of independence from any threat made by the Soviets carrying his message from Cuba one step further. Kennedy's Rudolph Wilde Platz address became part of his lore and myth as no other Kennedy address is cited as often or as proudly (Smyser, 2009). Berlin receded as a flashpoint in the Cold War. The occasional harassment by the Soviets over Berlin remained, but nothing teetering on the brink of nuclear war. Brandt believed that Kennedy's personal guarantee made it too risky for the Soviets to move on Berlin. Khrushchev recognized the dangers of re-escalating tensions in Berlin and he told Ulbricht to back off to lessen the threat of misunderstanding between the two sides.

After Kennedy's visit, Berlin and America became irrevocably linked. No American president could back away from the commitments Kennedy words had sealed

(Smyser, 2009). Kennedy glowed with the pride of keeping the city free despite all the detractors that told him it was too risky. The adulation he received in Germany made him feel that the sacrifices made by Americans were recognized and appreciated by Berliners and Germans. Kennedy sat there weary, but happy, he told Sorensen, “We’ll never have another day like this one as long as we live” (Sorensen, 1965). Kennedy revitalized German hopes for reunification and committed Germany to détente.

Part of Kennedy’s contentment came from the knowledge that he had bested de Gaulle in winning the hearts of the German people. In a radio address to the American people on July 5, 1963, Kennedy declared the trip as a success and a “moving experience” (Daum, 2008, p. 170). The crowd that saw his motorcade was estimated between 1.1 and 1.4 million people or approximately 58 percent of adults and young people (Daum, 2008). About 90 percent of the people who saw his motorcade returned home to follow the rest of his visit on television. Between 7.5 and 8 million homes in the FRG and West Berlin had a television, 60 percent of those tuned into the news on the days of Kennedy’s visit (Daum, 2008). Television allowed the Germans to experience an American presidential visit as tangible event and “to experience everything so directly,” strengthening the communal experience between Kennedy and the Germans (Daum, 2008, p. 171).

Opinion polls indicated that the average German was overwhelmingly positive in assessing Kennedy’s trip and his rhetorical messages, describing them as “exceptional,” “spectacular,” “breathtaking,” and “moving” (Daum, 2008, p. 170). Kennedy’s trip had in fact exceeded the expectation of all observers who marveled at the “jubilant enthusiasm and heartfelt response on the part of West Berliners” (Daum, 2008, p. 169). The press in

Germany also lauded the trip and publicized the warmth and enthusiasm shown by the Germans along Kennedy's stops. The *Frankfurter Rundschau* reported the West Germans had an "exceptional, personal liking for Kennedy" and the *Bonner General-Anzeiger* went further claiming "[the] West Germans' response to Kennedy indicated their preference—should they have to choose—for American Atlanticism over the Gaullist vision of a more independent and self-confident Europe" (Daum, 2008, p. 171). The U.S. Information Service in Bonn characterized Kennedy's Berlin trip as having a "record after-effect and the largest spontaneous public response to a foreign visitor in German history" (Daum, 2008, p. 169).

After experiencing the burden of crisis during his first few years as president, Kennedy reaped the benefits of a favorable turn in U.S.-German relations. The problems between Bonn and Washington still existed, but an increase in loyalty and trust between the two capitals fostered improved relations. Kennedy's decision to bring Adenauer to Berlin with him further eased tensions between the two improving relations; "an undertone of cordiality never before registered so clearly," now bonded the two leaders (Daum, 2008, p. 175).

Kennedy received mixed reviews from the American press. The *New York Times* and newsman Walter Lippmann found little to complain about after the trip, but were initially against the venture. Some members of the Republican Party did not approve of Kennedy's trip, warning against misinterpreting his performance. The *Chicago Tribune* and *The Wall Street Journal* denounced Kennedy's "ventures in personal diplomacy" (Daum, 2008, p. 172). Other press outlets and politicians were relieved by Kennedy's

conciliatory tone at the Free University. Despite the few criticisms, overall, Kennedy's actions were well received at home.

Kennedy received predictable responses from Rome to Paris. Most leaders were relieved that Kennedy downgraded German reunification from an immediate to a long term goal. France was mildly upset that Kennedy's trip stole de Gaulle's thunder, but they praised America's commitment to Europe. However, the question of America's long-term reliability on the continent remained. Britain praised the Federal Republic as a true friend to America, but the *Daily Express* believed the FRG would only support the transatlantic alliance until it acquired nuclear weapons, then the alliance would disintegrate (Daum, 2008). French and British criticism seemed to largely stem from political ambitions and insecurities. France wanted to create a strong European bloc, led by France, to counter America's influence on the continent. The British Empire, being in the throes of decline, grasped harder at the "special relationship" it held with America. General impressions across the rest of the West were positive. Kennedy improved relations in Germany and further guaranteed American support on the continent.

The Soviets and East Germans criticized Kennedy's trip as conceding to West German revanchism, which benefited the Western capitalist system. They focused on Kennedy's remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz where they believed Kennedy backtracked from his peaceful coexistence stance with "vile anticommunist attacks" (Daum, 2008, p. 172). GDR officials pointed to the contradictions between Kennedy's American University address and his remarks at Rudolph Wilde Platz. However, none of the criticism mentioned the phrase "Ich bin ein Berliner," fearing that East Germans would identify with the president. One discrepancy between Eastern and Western reports was

Kennedy's visit to the Brandenburg Gate. *Neues Deutschland* reported that the visit was cut short, only five minutes long, because of the "red flags of the working class, the national emblem of the GDR, the protective wall," and the slogans that disturbed the "otherwise so self-assured" president (Daum, 2008, p. 172-173).

Neues Deutschland's report contradicted the numerous West German reports from *Tagesspiegel*, *Suddeutsche Zeitung* and *Die Welt*. These German papers reported Kennedy's cool and calm character became more expressive and human as the visit progressed. Kennedy delivered the line 'Ich bin ein Berliner" humbly and modestly. However, the crowd, their enthusiasm, and the emotion from the Wall, caused the president to break form and lose control of his emotions. A new Kennedy emerged. As the *Berliner Morgenpost* wrote, West Berliners were said to be most responsible for this as their warmth blazed a trail through the "cool and rational view of the world held by this man from Boston" (Daum, 2008, p. 176).

Two days after Kennedy's visit, Khrushchev visited East Berlin. Ulbricht and Khrushchev tried to recreate a Kennedyesque scene, Soviet style. They rode in an open car to the adoration of 600,000 East Berliners chanting "Nikita! Nikita!" but the effect was hardly the same. The Eastern celebration lacked the spontaneity and genuine affection of West Berlin's celebration. Khrushchev tried the phrase "Ich liebe die Mauer" or "I love the Wall," but that poorly chosen phrase simply inspired dread and sadness, as East Berliners saw the Wall as a prison more than anything else (Smyser, 2009). Khrushchev discussed reunification, but only under the socialist system. He did believe that the best option for the superpowers was coexistence using a détente policy (Daum, 2008). The real purpose of Khrushchev's trip was to reemphasize to Ulbricht that "An

important reason for not pressing ahead with Berlin…is the outcome of the Cuban crisis" (Smyser, 2009, p. 233). A CIA report indicated that the Soviets "do not intend to reactivate the Berlin issue for a long period" (Smyser, 2009, p. 233). With the removal of the Jupiter missiles in late March from Turkey followed by Kennedy's American University speech, Khrushchev decided 1963 was the best time to invest in détente (Fursenko & Naftali, 2007). Khrushchev's decision allowed him to make a bold move in early July that accomplished one of Kennedy's major goals.

On July 2, 1963, Khrushchev delivered a speech in East Berlin. He praised the "sober appraisal" of Kennedy's American University speech (Beschloss, 1991). Khrushchev announced that he was prepared to accept a partial test ban treaty (Fursenko & Naftali, 2007). The limited ban treaty would cover the atmosphere, outer space and under water. Combined with signing a nonaggression pact between East and West, the treaty would create a "fresh international climate," stated Khrushchev (Beschloss, 1991, p. 618). The West quickly sent negotiators to Moscow to work on the treaty. Kennedy told his negotiator, Averell Harriman, to work on keeping China from going nuclear. Kennedy had warned that China would be a "great menace in the future to humanity, the Free World, and freedom on earth" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 619). The limited test ban treaty marked the beginning of détente in the Cold War. The move toward détente helped Khrushchev work towards a better climate for the two superpowers to compete, where the weapons were ideas, not guns, and the major benefit would be the decline in military budgets (Fursenko & Naftali, 2007).

Relations between the superpowers steadily improved. By October, they agreed on a deal over excess American grain. To gain passage of selling American grain to

Russia, Kennedy included the proviso that it must be shipped on American vessels, which had one of the highest shipping rates in the world. The Soviets agreed upon what was deemed some “damned expensive” wheat (Beschloss, 1991, p. 645). Americans favored the agreement by a 60 to 31 percent margin (Beschloss, 1991). The deal almost got derailed by Berlin when Rusk and Gromyko met. Rusk told Gromyko that Berlin was still the main point of contention between the two superpowers. Gromyko complained of Bonn’s obstruction to a peace treaty. Rusk reminded him that the “fever of the situation” in Berlin was gone, as the East was no longer bleeding emigrants and GDR trade with the FRG was about $5 billion (Beschloss, 1991, p. 645). Rusk also reminded him that Khrushchev had said that trade meant peace, and that the U.S. was “no monkey on a stick, manipulated by West Germany” (Beschloss, 1991, p. 645). A few days later on October 10, Kennedy revealed to Gromyko that he intended to flatten his defense budget, unless a crisis developed. Kennedy hoped Khrushchev would do the same. Kennedy also hinted at decreasing the number of American soldiers in Europe, hoping the Russians would follow suit (Beschloss, 1991). Slow, but substantial progress was being made with the Soviets in thawing the Cold War.

Unfortunately, Kennedy was assassinated on November 22, 1963, before he could make further progress. Mourning over Kennedy threatened to take on a surreal aspect in Germany. Memorial services in the streets sprang up sporadically. Ceremonies often adopted the modern tradition of political commemoration (Daum, 2008). Fritz Stern (2006) described the scene in Germany after Kennedy’s death:

> People began to cry, others were hushed in horror, and my own feeling was one of stunned, disbelieving grief—and fear. What did it mean? I had been beguiled by Kennedy’s style and wit, by his team at the New Frontier, awed by his (and his brother’s) handling of the Cuban missile

> crisis, and above all I had cheered his American University speech the previous April, when avoiding all American triumphalism he called for improved relations with the Soviet Union. I felt this loss incalculable. The world was mourning. The murder of Kennedy evoked a universal identification with America—especially among Germans, most fervently among Berliners (p. 234).

Kennedy now became a mythological fallen hero. The memorial services personified and glorified his political achievements, depicting him as a model of virtue for the present. Kennedy's charisma had touched the transatlantic experience by enabling his audience to experience first-hand this "extra-ordinary other" (Daum, 2008, p. 188). As the mass media reported on Kennedy's death, and citizens all across Germany tuned in again, as they had six months earlier, but this time with grief in their hearts. JFK's death rivaled two other moments of spontaneous occurrences of communal mourning in German history, the deaths of Emperor Wilhelm I in 1888 and President Friedrich Ebert in 1925. Germans had mourned, but never before for a foreign leader. Candles were placed in the windows. Since the end of World War II, candles were used for public mourning and collective expectation for political salvation (Daum, 2008). Candles were even seen in East Berlin and the GDR. Kennedy brought America and West Germany together one last time to share in yet one last communal experience.

With his death, the Kennedy myth in Germany and Europe grew. The Kennedy myth began with the president of far-off America transforming West Berliners into Roman citizens, with Cicero's help, which brought Germany back into the community of nations. The myth stretched back to the Greeks who celebrated with "religious veneration in their tragedies" the death of the hero (Daum, 2008, p. 192). Kennedy had become the American Prometheus, a titan who moved between the realm of gods and the mortal world. He had brought an unusual fire to Europe that had warmed a world gone cold. He

was also referred to as a modern day Scipione del Ferro, a Renaissance man who could do anything. Kennedy was lauded as a true Republican, in the style of an ancient Roman ideal of reaching for the stars. The myth of Camelot also began to arise around this time (Daum, 2008). Most non-German Europeans viewed Kennedy as Prometheus or an ancient Roman. This perspective surfaced in many Europeans' conceptions of transatlantic politics. The Old World, Europe, transferred its ideals to the New World, America. Kennedy rejuvenated America, the myth went, because he had a European soul (Daum, 2008). Fritz Stern (2006) received a letter from a young archivist working in Merseburg in January 1964, which commented, "The shock here was particularly great and persistent because for us America is the symbol of freedom and tolerance" (p. 333). Kennedy embodied American ideals that reached both young and old in Germany and Europe.

A memorial service was held in front of Schöneberg City Hall the day Kennedy was laid to rest. The service was replete with political, military and religious symbols that interwove the two countries (Daum, 2008). On that day, as it was in June, the life of Berlin was suspended. Heinrich Albertz, a member of the municipal executive, closed the ceremony by proclaiming Kennedy "was a Berliner" (Daum, 2008, p. 196). With Kennedy's death, one of the high points in relations between Berlin and America ended. The final tragic act of Kennedy and Berlin was over.

Brandt wanted to keep the Kennedy legacy alive after his death. He hurriedly wrote *Encounters With Kennedy* offering numerous Kennedy quotes. An unfavorable review of the book criticized Brandt for being more about politicking for himself than about Kennedy. Brandt tried to counter this impression. He felt he needed to rekindle the

flame of hope that was snuffed out after Kennedy's untimely death (Hofmann, 2007). Brandt was trying to cast himself as Kennedy's executor in Germany. He received a favorable endorsement from Kennedy's widow, who wrote him that she hoped "that you will someday…lead your country as he led his" (Hofmann, 2007, p. 97).

Brandt began with a small step after Kennedy's death. He received an offer from GDR Council of Ministers, Alexander Abusch, to negotiate Christmas passes for West Berliners. They could travel to East Berlin to visit their relatives over the holidays. The first pass was signed on December 17, 1963 (Hofmann, 2007).

The foundation of Ostpolitik started in Berlin and became West Germany's policy when Brandt became Chancellor. The three foundations of Ostpolitik were: Reunification is a foreign policy problem that can be solved only with the Soviet Union, not without and not against it. The despicable regime in East Germany cannot be destroyed; one must work with it. While these thoughts were uncomfortable for many Germans and went against their deepest feelings, they seemed unavoidable to Brandt (Smyser, 2009). Brandt reversed Adenauer's policy, which was to put reunification before any deals with the East. Brandt believed reunification would come, but that a number of other issues needed to be solved between the two Germanys first (Smyser, 2009). Brandt's initial détente policy attempts from 1963-66 were a start, but did not track what Kennedy had proposed. Brandt's activities from 1970-1973 actually patterned themselves after those Kennedy had advanced in his 1963 speeches. In those three years, Brandt accomplished a package deal that maintained the status quo that secured Berlin. In this package deal, there was no give in the Western position. Kennedy wanted Brandt to find a modus vivendi in Berlin or a secure a long range settlement which would allow other issues to be solved. These

included: German frontiers, sovereignty of the GDR, prohibition of nuclear weapons for both Germanys and a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw powers (Hofmann, 2007). A non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw powers was originally a Soviet idea, but Kennedy pushed the concept in the West and offered it as a way to recognize the status quo in Europe (Hofmann, 2007). Brandt successfully negotiated a treaty recognizing the borders of Poland and Czechoslovakia, secured Berlin, signed the 1970 Moscow Treaty which gave de facto recognition to the GDR and the Oder-Neisse line, and improved relations with the GDR, the Soviet Union and other Eastern Bloc countries (Smyser, 2009 & Hofmann, 2007)

The Kennedy legacy in terms of German relations is complicated. No president had treated the Germans so ruthlessly, yet became so popular with them. Kennedy's policy was in direct contradiction to West Germany's policy, he accepted the Berlin Wall, he wanted the West to recognize the GDR and work with them and he stated clearly that it was up to Germans to find solutions to inter-German problems (Hofmann, 2007). Previous American heroes in the German pantheon included Roosevelt for his commitment to free Europe from the evils of Nazism, Secretary of State George Marshall for fashioning an economic policy to rebuild Germany and President Truman whose determination helped end the Berlin Blockade. None of the three have their names on bridges or streets in Germany's largest cities: Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, Cologne and Bonn. Kennedy, did less than his predecessors for German reunification, has a street or bridge named after him in all those cities and remains beloved figure to most Germans (Mathiopoulos, 1985).

Kennedy initiated détente in U.S.-Soviet relations. Kennedy preferred adding options and remaining flexible in situations compared to creating one hard and fast policy, even if this meant promoting contradictory courses simultaneously, as he did in July 1961 espousing both a military buildup and negotiations (Freedman, 2000). Kennedy wanted to reexamine U.S. policy and decision making at every step of a situation or crisis before acting. Though this policy may seem infuriating and complicated, Kennedy had great fortune of implementing this policy in Berlin. Remnants of Kennedy's influence in policy can be seen long after his death, in both NATO and subsequent U.S. presidential decision making (Freedman, 2000).

Kennedy's policy of increasing the military budget and erasing the doubts of the missile gap, at least in favor the Soviets, caused the Soviets to damn the consumer and throw their economy into overdrive. This caused the arms race that lasted into the mid 1980s. By the 1970s, the Soviet Union had reached an approximate parity with the U.S. in nuclear arms. Khrushchev claimed that the Soviet economy would be the strongest in the world by 1980 and the Soviet sports and national defense would be conducted by spontaneous initiatives of the masses (Beschloss, 1991). By 1971, the Soviet power was so strong in Europe they did not have to threaten war over Berlin to move on other Cold War issues. However, 1980 found the Soviet economy in stagnation and rapidly crumbling. Kennedy did succeed in diffusing the Berlin flashpoint. Under Brandt's leadership, Ostpolitik had achieved diplomatic success in getting the quadripartite powers to proclaim "the frontiers of all states in Europe inviolable" (Beschloss, 1991, p. 702) In exchange for this agreement, the Soviet's promised not to interfere with Western access rights in Berlin (Beschloss, 1991).

The outcome of the Berlin Crisis showed that the two superpowers had more in common, than they originally thought. If the Soviets did not raise the issue of Allied rights in Berlin, the Western Allies would accept the reality of two separate Germanys. The real benefit to the two superpowers was that they were now free to stop responding to every whim of their associated German state. The superpowers were no longer black mailed into believing they had to hang tough in Germany, with the fear of losing credibility in their German state (Judt, 2005). With the two superpowers free to act, it was up to the two German states to work out any remaining inter-German problems.

Implications and Conclusions

Studying Kennedy's three German speeches from 1961 to 1963 exemplifies the evolution of a cold war president. Kennedy's public address on Germany and Berlin had the weight of history bearing down on him, as he had to maintain U.S. commitments made from the end of World War II to his presidency. The historical events from 1945-1960 influenced the way the Soviets and the Germans would respond to Kennedy's rhetoric and actions concerning Berlin. The 1961 Kennedy was reeling from consecutive foreign policy defeats and a perceived thrashing at the hands of Khrushchev. He was determined to show his mettle. To prove his strength and that of the U.S., Kennedy's July 25, 1961, address examined the situation in Berlin from a legal and military perspective. Kennedy's legal grounding had roots in the Yalta and Potsdam Accords. Kennedy defended American rights based in international law and responded to Khrushchev's threats with a military buildup and new military strategy. German and Berlin unification was far from his thought process, what was most important was the Cold War and American prestige. When the East Germans erected the Berlin Wall, Kennedy stood by

silently. He accepted the basic rationale for the Wall and concluded that a Wall would not interfere with Western legal rights.

By 1963, Kennedy was a changed man. Seasoned by his early foreign policy gaffes, his experiences with Berlin in 1961, and the harrowing confrontation with the Soviets over the missiles that had been ominously placed in Cuba, Kennedy was determined to search for a middle ground where he would not be forced into brinkmanship. His success in confronting Khrushchev over the Cuban Missile Crisis helped solidify his credentials as an effective, courageous and prudent world leader.

When Kennedy arrived in West Germany in mid 1963, West Germans were waiting to cheer the hero that protected them in the dark days of 1962. Though the issues between the nations were far from solved, Kennedy was deeply moved by the West Germans' warm welcome and marveled at the elation his visit had stirred. His speeches in Berlin on June 26, 1963, marked a turning point in the U.S.-German relationship. The need for a new military strategy was over, what remained and what Kennedy recognized was the need for a peace strategy. His Rudolph Wilde Platz Address attacked the horrors of communism. What Khrushchev called Cold War bluster was real emotion shown by the president at the horrors of the Wall and his own inaction in August 1961. His trip to Berlin brought home the deep seeded German desire for reunification. Keeping with his general rhetorical strategy present in all three speeches, balancing pragmatism and idealism, Kennedy addressed the graduating class at the Free University in Berlin. There Kennedy outlined practical steps that could be implemented to achieve a breakthrough in inter-German affairs. The two June 26 Berlin speeches demonstrate Kennedy's rhetorical duality as both a pragmatist and an idealist; in one speech he attacks communism on

idealistic grounds and in the other he calls for East-West cooperation through pragmatic action. Kennedy evolved from thinking of the Cold War as a military problem needing a military strategy to a peace president focusing on fostering cooperation to lessen the Cold War tensions.

This study has traced the evolution of Kennedy's Cold War policy concerning Germany and Berlin. The use of historical-critical rhetorical methodology has allowed for a close description of historical events impacting the U.S.-German relationship, an analysis of Kennedy's presidential rhetoric demonstrating the evolution of his German policy, and provided a case study in the expansion of presidential ethos in a rhetorically defined presidency. Kennedy used his addresses to fashion words that helped him gain support for his policies of flexible response and détente. A longitudinal study of presidential rhetoric over a time period can examine a particular president or issue showing the evolution or maintenance of a president or policy.

Kennedy's rhetoric on Germany reveals the rehabilitation of the German state in the world community. As previously noted, France and Britain were not against keeping West Germany weaker and this notion was highly supported by Soviet fears of revanchism. While the historical record supports West Germany's importance in the Western Alliance, this was not always supported in the West, as evident in Kennedy's July 1961 speech. German goals and aspirations were secondary to other Western Alliance members, especially those concerning reunification. From the end of World War II on, Germany continued to be shadowed by the specter of Nazism. Kennedy could not fully remove this specter, only a deep introspection on the part of Germans could do that, but Kennedy could welcome the Germans into the community of nations. Kennedy's

(1963b) statement at the Free University serves as a compelling example: "The Federal Republic of Germany…has created a free and dynamic economy from the disasters of defeat, and a bulwark of freedom from the ruins of tyranny. West Berlin and West Germany have dedicated and demonstrated their commitment to the liberty of the human mind, the welfare of the community, and to peace among nations." With these few short lines Kennedy further distanced West Germany from its Nazi past and associated it with the democratic freedoms of the West. Included in this revitalization and makeover of West Germany were the *Amerika zu Hause,* the Free University and other architectural and cultural imports from the West. Kennedy's stop in Frankfurt connected early German democracy to the postwar government. Kennedy's entire tour of Berlin and his two addresses in 1963 linked Germany with democracy, capitalism and Western ideals. Separating West Germany from its Nazi past helped legitimize West Germany's standing among nations and improved the psyche of its population. The burden of collective guilt that began in 1945 was lifted throughout the 1960s.

One of Kennedy's rhetorical tactics reflected his personal belief that America and democracies respond best to challenges (Gaddis, 2005b). Kennedy presented his German audiences with a challenge or a task to undertake fostering improvements in the world. He was not merely a president who reported on events, blamed others, or waited to see how a crisis turned out. He actively sought to meet the challenges America and freedom faced. He bore the responsibility for his policies and actions being the first citizen of democracy. Through his rhetoric he was to unite an audience towards a common goal moving them to action. The aura and myth of Kennedy derived from his vision of a better future, which is evident in all three German speeches. This brighter tomorrow required

him to ask his audience to overcome and persevere through dangerous times, but his charismatic personality and personal acceptance of this same burden lessened the negative impact of his call for sacrifice. His success can be measured in part by the outpouring of love in America and Germany that was displayed after his assassination. The ability for a president to set a goal and to meet that goal affords the president credibility and bestows a credible image of leadership we often label "being presidential." Such an image also boosted Kennedy's standing among other leaders aiding him in international negotiations. Kennedy's tough stance with Khrushchev helped him gain the nuclear test ban treaty and peace in Berlin. Kennedy stumbled early in his term, but he emerged as a confident presidential leader through his inspiring rhetoric and steely action in the hostile Cold War landscape. Words became deeds.

Two other common Kennedy rhetorical tactics that deserve mention are his global appeal and his sense of history. Kennedy's three speeches were intended to reach a particular audience. The July 1961 address was intended first and foremost for his domestic American audience; his Berlin speeches privileged the German audience. However, Kennedy included global themes that spoke to all nations and peoples. He used idealistic rhetoric to transcend place and time as he pressed the theme of freedom on the global agenda. His charisma allowed those listening to freely join him. Flexible response was a global policy protecting people from Southeast Asia to Berlin to America. In Berlin, he calls upon all free people to travel to Berlin and speaks to "citizens of the world" about universal principles of truth, justice and liberty. In contrast to his idealistic principles, Kennedy wanted to implement these high ideals using pragmatic steps. Kennedy commanded the historical metaphor to both inspire and to propose caution

against extremes. His awareness of the global landscape and history prevented him from overreaching on his idealistic goals. Instead, Kennedy proposed basic and attainable steps that helped assure that meeting his goals would proceed gradually, but at a steady pace. He knew history could not be rushed, nor does it provide much evidence for people intent on recording daily change. For Kennedy, prudence would suggest that history is a slow process that evolves over time. Flexible response was an intermediary choice between holocaust and humiliation. The president refrained from asking Berliners to tear down the wall at Rudolph Wilde Platz, and at the Free University Kennedy spoke of the small actions needed to bring about rapprochement and unification between the two Germanys.

Examining Kennedy's rhetoric on Germany from a historical rhetorical perspective provides one last lesson: the importance of clear and open communication channels during the Cold War. After Kennedy's July 25, 1961, speech, Senator Fulbright made a comment regarding the possible border closure in Berlin. Kennedy failed to clarify or comment on Fulbright's assessment. A few weeks later, the GDR erected the Berlin Wall, partially because of Kennedy's July 25 speech. However, Fulbright's comments did help confirm their feelings about how Kennedy would react. Kennedy's failure to condemn the Wall boosted Khrushchev's bravado in other areas of the world. When Fulbright again made a comment about missiles being in Cuba and that the U.S. was in no worse position, Khrushchev was emboldened again believing that Fulbright spoke for Kennedy. Khrushchev placed missiles in Cuba believing Kennedy would not react considering he remained relatively quiet over the Wall, but this time Khrushchev misread Kennedy's intent and the premier's high stakes gambit would backfire. Kennedy was irate and the world was brought to the brink of nuclear war. By 1963, Kennedy's

blustery rhetoric at Rudolph Wilde Platz was overlooked by Khrushchev because of Kennedy's tough action in the past and his clear commitment to Berlin's defense help establish acceptable boundaries on Soviet action in the city. To escalate Berlin once again made little sense because the two superpowers had come to a clearer understanding of each other. Kennedy was forthright with his rhetoric after Cuba, sending clear signals that Khrushchev could read. He stated his position on Berlin so that there would be no future misunderstanding between the two. The approach this study has employed makes it clear that the Cuban Missile Crisis and the erection of the Berlin Wall were in large part direct outcomes of Kennedy's wavering and failure to communicate clearly about major U.S. priorities. Once he committed publically and clearly through his speeches in Berlin and through back channels to Khrushchev, an era of détente was ushered in and tensions were quickly diffused.

Kennedy's rhetoric also shows the limitations placed on a president when he is part of an alliance. Kennedy could not publically criticize his ally's views, even when the alliance was threatened, as when de Gaulle threatened to change the Western Alliance in 1963. In 1961, Kennedy refrained from blatantly stating America would not interfere in East Berlin because of his alliance with West Germany. Instead, he insinuated the Soviets and GDR could act as they saw fit in East Berlin. In 1963, Kennedy went to Germany to support the Atlanticists and refute de Gaulle's claims questioning American commitment to Europe. The trip symbolized American commitment and Kennedy refrained from attacking France for undercutting the U.S. commitment to West Germany. Kennedy referred to leading the alliance and to working with Congress, both were necessary, but it would be easier to act without taking into account their disparate interests.

Future scholarly work in this area might profitably focus on the continued evolution of the American-German relationship after the erection of the Wall. The Berlin Wall created a new political atmosphere in Germany and West Berlin, and many political changes took place inside Germany with the rise of Berlin Mayor Willy Brandt. Brandt gained national notoriety for his public speech against Kennedy and the West's lack of action when the Wall was erected. Future studies could focus on Western reaction and rhetoric concerning the Wall's presence in Berlin. Continued research can be conducted to investigate how the speeches by Kennedy or German leaders during the Kennedy era or other presidential administrations shaped the geo-political situation in Central Europe, the Soviet-American relationship over Berlin, and the German-American relationship.

Another area of possible scholarly inquiry is Truman and Kennedy. The Truman Doctrine was originally intended to be a flexible policy, much like flexible response, but it soon became a blanket policy cited by Cold War politicians as a reason to intervene in a foreign country. A comparison between the two speeches and policies is needed. Truman and Kennedy also present two ideal candidates to compare and contrast rhetorically by analyzing their policies and relationship toward Germany. Both were democratic presidents in office during the Cold War and both had major German crises to handle. Their rhetoric concerning the U.S.-German relationship could prove fruitful to both rhetorical and historical scholars.

Kennedy took an accusatorial and strong stance toward communism, while at the same time promoting a strategy of détente and negotiations. Other scholarly work could focus on presidents using a similar strategy of promoting two contradictory paths or examine how presidents' discussed an adversary. What terms were used to describe the

adversary and what policies were implemented to deal with these adversaries? Such rhetoric could include other Cold War presidents' rhetoric on the Soviet Union including, but not limited to, Reagan's rhetoric toward the crumbling Soviet empire. Reagan's strong stance against the communist ideology and his proposed "Star Wars" defense system is contradictory to his proposals at Reykjavik and other summits where he wanted to limit or decrease nuclear arsenals. Another area of exploration could be rhetoric concerning different offshoots of communism including "Maoism" and "Titoism." Areas of study here could include Nixon's rhetoric concerning China and normalizing relations. What strategies did Nixon explore and use when he planned and announced his Chinese trip and how do they compare to his rhetoric toward the Soviet Union? In each of these cases, the historical influence is important to understand and examine. Could Reagan's initiatives due to the weakness of the Soviet economy? Was Nixon's trip and normalizing of relations influenced by China's failed Cultural Revolution? Rhetorical analysis with historical support could lead to insights to such questions.

Finally, Kennedy's rhetoric on Germany in the 1960s provides some insight into how presidents lead an alliance or coalition. Future studies could examine other Cold War presidents' handling of the Western Alliance. Other scholars might take up such topics as the coalition-building required for George H.W. Bush's preparations for the Gulf War, or perhaps mount an examination of George W. Bush's rhetorical leadership in his attempt to promote and build a coalition of the "willing" post-9/11. Regardless of the potential new research projects implicated by the work undertaken here, it is my hope that this study has demonstrated the importance of linking rhetoric to history and history to rhetoric. Texts and contexts remain inseparable. I trust that future scholars will

continue to pursue the mystery of how the past becomes a prologue and how presidential words spoken today cannot help but shape our common tomorrows.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Act of Military Surrender (Berlin, 8 May 1945). From European Navigator. http://www.ena.lu/act_military_surrender_berlin_1945-020002602.html (accessed November 29, 2009).

Ball, M.A.. (1998). Theoretical implications of doing rhetorical history: Groupthink, foreign policy making, and Vietnam. In K. Turner (Ed.), *Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases* (pp. 61-71). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Beschloss, M. (1991). *The crisis years: Kennedy and Khrushchev 1960-1963.* New York, NY: Edward Burlingame Brooks an Imprint of Harper Collins Publishers.

Bessel, R. (2009). *Germany 1945: From war to peace*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Boehling, R. (1999). The role of culture in American relations with Europe: The case of the United State's occupation of Germany. *Diplomatic History, 23,* 57-69.

Bostdorff, D. (1994). *The presidency and the rhetoric of foreign crisis.* Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press.

Bostdorff, D. (2008). *Proclaiming the Truman Doctrine: The Cold War call to arms.* College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.

Bostdorff, D., Carcasson, M., Farrell, J., Ivie, R.L., Kiewe, A., & Smith, K. (2008). Report of the national task force on presidential rhetoric in times of crisis. In J.A. Aune & M.J. Medhurst (Eds.), *The Prospect of Presidential Rhetoric* (pp. 355-378). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Bostdorff, D. & Goldzwig, S. (1994). Idealism and pragmatism in American foreign policy rhetoric: The case of John F. Kennedy and Vietnam. *Presidential Studies, 24*(3), 515

Bruner, M. S. (1989). Symbolic uses of the Berlin Wall. *Communication Quarterly, 37,* 319-328.

Castillo, G. (2005). Domesticating the Cold War: Household consumption as propaganda in Marshall Plan Germany. *Journal of Comparative History, 40,* 261-288.

Cecil, R. (1970). Potsdam and its legends. *International Affairs, 46*(*3*), 455-465.

Clark, E.C., & McKerrow, R.E. (1998). The rhetorical construction of history. In K. Turner (Ed.), *Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases* (pp. 33-46). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Clay, L.D. (1962). Berlin. *Foreign Affairs, 41*(1), 47-58.

Dallas, G. (2005). *1945: The war that never ended.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Daum, A. W. (2008). *Kennedy in Berlin.* Washington D.C.: Cambridge University Press.

Dean, K.W. (1991). 'We seek peace, but we shall not surrender' JFK's use of juxtaposition for rhetorical success in the Berlin Crisis. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 21*(3), 531-544.

Directive to the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Occupation Forces (JCS 1067) (April 1945). From German History in Documents and Images: Volume 8. Occupation and the Emergence of Two States 1945-1961. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=2297 (accessed November 29, 2009).

Dulles, A. W. (2003). That was then: Allen w. Dulles on the occupation of Germany. *Foreign Affairs, 82,* 2-8.

Edwards, L. (1989) Congress and the origins of the Cold War: The Truman doctrine. *World Affairs, 151,* 131-141.

Freedman, L. (2000). *Kennedy's wars: Berlin, Cuba, Laos, and Vietnam*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Freedman, L. (2002). Berlin and the Cold War. In J. Gearson & K. Schake (Eds.), *The Berlin Wall Crisis* (pp. 1-9). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fursenko, A. & Naftali, T. (2006). *Khrushchev's Cold War: The inside story of an American adversary.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Gaddis, J.L. (1974). Was the Truman Doctrine a real turning point? *Foreign Affairs, 52*(2), 386-402.

Gaddis, J.L. (2005a). *The Cold War: A new history.* New York: Penguin Books.

Gaddis, J.L. (2005b). *Strategies of containment: A critical appraisal of American national security policy during the Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gelb, N. (1986). *The Berlin wall: Kennedy, Khrushchev and a showdown in the heart of Europe.* New York: Times Books.

Goedde, P. (1999). From villains to victims: fraternization and the feminization of Germany, 1945-1947. *Diplomatic History, 23*, 1-20.

Goldzwig, S., & Dionisopoulos, G.N. (1995a). *"In a perilous hour": the public address of John F. Kennedy.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Goldzwig, S., & Dionisopoulos, G.N. (1995b). Legitimating liberal credentials for the presidency: John F. Kennedy and The Strategy of Peace. *The Southern Communication Journal, 60(4)*, 312-332.

Hansen, R. (1995). Germany's unconditional surrender. *History Today, 45*, 34-39.

Hartley, A. (1971). John Kennedy's foreign policy. *Foreign Policy, 4*, 77-87.

Hatzivassiliou, E. (2009). NATO assessments of the Soviet Union, 1953-1964. *Journal of Cold War Studies, 11*(*2*), 89-116.

Hermens, F. (1947). Evaluating the Potsdam plan. *American Journal of Economic and Sociology, 6*(*2*), 181-194.

Henry, D., Abbott, P., Houck, D., Laracey, M., Lucas, S., & Parry-Giles, S. (2008). Report of the national task force on the theory and practice of the rhetorical presidency. In J.A. Aune & M.J. Medhurst (Eds.), *The Prospect of Presidential Rhetoric* (pp. 340-354). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Herring, G. C. (2008). *From colony to superpower: U.S. Foreign relations since 1976.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hofmann, A. (2007). *The emergence of détente in Europe: Brandt, Kennedy and the formation of Ostpolitik.* New York: Routledge.

Hofmann, W. (1969). West Berlin—The isolated city in the Twentieth century. *Journal of Contemporary History, 4*(3), 77-93.

Ickstadt, H. (2004). Uniting a divided nation: Americanism and anti-Americanism in post-war Germany. *European Journal of American Culture, 23*, 157-170.

Jarausch, K. H. (2006). *After Hitler: Recivilizing Germans, 1945-1995*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Judt, T. (2005). *Postwar: A history of Europe since 1945.* New York: Penguin Books.

Kastner, J. (2002). The Berlin Crisis and the FRG, 1958-1962. In J. Gearson & K. Schake (Eds.), *The Berlin Wall Crisis* (pp. 125-146). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kempe, F. (2011). *Berlin 1961: Kennedy, Khrushchev, and the most dangerous place on earth.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Son.

Kennedy, J.F. (July 25, 1961). "Radio and Television Report to the American People on the Berlin Crisis." From The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=8259&st=&st1=(accessed July 7, 2010).

Kennedy, J.F. (June 26, 1963a). "Remarks in the Rudolph Wilde Platz, Berlin." From the American Presidency Project http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=9307&st=&st1= (accessed July 7, 2010).

Kennedy, J.F. (June 26, 1963b). "Address at the Free University of Berlin." From The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=9310&st=&st1= (accessed July 7, 2010).

Kiewe, A. (1994). Introduction. In Amos Kiewe, *The modern presidency and crisis rhetoric* (pp. xv-xxxvii). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Lang, D. G. (1995). International commitments and democracy: The United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. *The Review of Politics, 57,* 309-335.

Lunak, P. (2003). Khrushchev and the Berlin Crisis: Soviet brinkmanship seen from the inside. *Cold War History, 3(2),* 53-82.

MacDonogh, G. (2007). *After the Reich: The brutal history of the Allied occupation.* New York: Basic Books.

Marshall, George C. "The Marshall Plan." In *Our Nation's Archives: The History of the United States in Documents,* edited by Erik Bruun & Jay Crosby. New York: Tess Press, 1999: 671-672.

Mathiopoulos, M. (1985). The American president seen through German eyes: Continuity and change from the Adenauer to the Kohl era. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 15*(4), 673-706.

May, E.R. (1998). America's Berlin: Heart of the Cold War. *Foreign Affairs, 77*(4), 148-160.

Mayer, F. A. (1994). Adenauer and Kennedy: An era of distrust in German-American relations? *German Studies Review, 17,* 83-104.

Mayer, F.A. (1996). *Adenauer and Kennedy: A study in German-American relations, 1961-1963*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Meagher, M. E. (2006). John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan: The challenge of freedom. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, 18,* 1-24.

Meagher, M.E. (1997). "In an atmosphere of national peril": The development of John F. Kennedy's world view. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 27*(3), 467-479.

Medhurst, M. (1990). Rhetoric and Cold War: A strategic approach. In M.J. Medhurst (Ed.), *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology* (pp.1-15). New York: Greenwood Press.

Medhurst, M. (2008). From Retrospective to Prospect: The Study of Presidential Rhetoric. In J.A. Aune & M.J. Medhurst (Eds.), *The Prospect of Presidential Rhetoric* (pp. 3-27). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Nieburg, H.L., & Nieburg, H. (1991). Paradigms of presidential power. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 21*(2), 287-300.

Passey, J. (1973). Willy Brandt's speech 'For all Germany.' *Communication, 2,* 117-129.

Plokhy, S.M. (2010). *Yalta: The price of peace.* New York: Viking.

Pratt, J. W. (1970). An analysis of three crisis speeches'. *Western Journal of Communication, 34*(3), 194-203.

Pucci Jr., E. (1994). Crisis as pretext: John F. Kennedy and the rhetorical construction of the Berlin Crisis. In Amos Kiewe, *The modern presidency and crisis rhetoric* (pp. 47-71). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Report of Yalta (Crimea) Conference (February 4-11, 1945). From German History in Documents and Images: Volume 8. Occupation and the Emergence of Two States 1945-1961. http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/sub_document.cfm?document_id=2295 (accessed November 29, 2009).

Roberts, S. (2008). Times past: 1948 the Berlin Airlift. *New York Times Upfront, 141,* 24-28.

Rolleston, J. (1999). After zero hour: The visual texts of post-war Germany. *South Atlantic Review, 64,* 1-19.

Ross, C. (2004). East Germans and the Berlin Wall: Popular opinion and social change before and after the border closure of August 1961. *Journal of Contemporary History, 39,* 25-43.

Schake, K. (2002). A broader range of choice? US policy in the 1958 and 1961 Berlin Crises. In J. Gearson & K. Schake (Eds.), *The Berlin Wall Crisis* (pp. 22-42). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Schraut, S. (2000). 'Make the Germans do it': The refugee problem in the American zone of post-war Germany. *Journal of Communist Studies & Transition Politics, 16*(1/2), 115-124.

Scott, R. (1990). Cold War and rhetoric: Conceptually and critically. In M.J. Medhurst (Ed.), *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology* (pp.1-15). New York: Greenwood Press.

Silvestri, V.N. (2000). *Becoming JFK: A profile in communication*. Westport CT: Praeger.

Simpson, J.L. (1957). Berlin: Allied rights and responsibilities in the divided city. *The International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 6,* 83-102.

Smyser, W.R. (2009). *Kennedy and the Berlin Wall: A hell of a lot better than a war*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Snow, N. (2008). International exchanges and the U.S. image. *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science, 616,* 198-222.

Sorensen, T. (1965). *Kennedy: The classic biography*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Stern, F. (2006). *The Five Germanys I have known.* New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Stone, N. (2010). *The Atlantic and its enemies: A history of the Cold War*. New York: Basic Books.

Tatalovich, R. & Daynes, B.W. (1979). Paradigm to explain presidential power. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 9*(4), 428-441.

Taylor, F. (2007). The Berlin Wall: A secret history. *History Today, 57,* 43-49.

Taylor, F. (2008). *The Berlin Wall: A world divided, 1961-1989.* New York: Harper Perennial.

Terrill. R.E. (2003). Ways of rhetorical history. *The Review of Communication, 3*(3), 297-300.

Trachtenberg, M. (2001). New light on the Cold War? *Diplomacy & Statecraft, 12,* 10-17.

Trauschweizer, I.W. (2006). Tanks at checkpoint Charlie: Lucius Clay and the Berlin Crisis, 1961-1962. *Cold War History, 6,* 205-228.

Truman, Harry S. (1947). *The Truman Doctrine.* U.S. Congress, Washington D.C., 12 March 1947. http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/harrystrumantrumandoctrine.html (accessed November 24, 2009).

Turner, K. (1998). Introduction: Rhetorical history as social construction. In K. Turner (Ed.), *Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases* (pp. 1-15). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Wander, P. (1984). The rhetoric of American foreign policy. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 70*(4), 339-361.

Wells, R.H. (1949). The German problem in 1948. *The Western Political Quarterly, 2*(2), 208-216.

Windt Jr., T.O. (1986). Presidential rhetoric: Definition of a field of study. *Presidential Studies Quarterly, 16*(1), 102-116.

Windt Jr., T.O. (2003). *Presidential speechwriting: From the New Deal to the Reagan Revolution and beyond*. K. Ritter & M.J. Medhurst (Eds.), (pp. 92-107). College Station: Texas A&M University Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1998). Four sense of rhetorical history. In K. Turner (Ed.), *Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases* (pp. 19-32). Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Zarefsky, D. (2008). Knowledge claims in rhetorical criticism. *Journal of Communication, 58,* 629-640.