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I. POST-WAR DISCOURSE AND REALITY

The central argument of this thesis is that in the United States, the rhetoric created and used by influential leaders assisted in shifting the national discourse, outweighing the overwhelming desire for democracy and creating a misperception of Soviet intent both among the public and within the government. This shift in discourse resulted in the creation of the national security state, a contentious development that risked subverting crucial aspects of U.S. democracy, many of which had been central to U.S. ideology and discourse before World War II. It was in large part the powerful public rhetoric that eventually made such a shift possible.

The trial of Nikolay Grigoryevich Redin demonstrates the predominant feeling in the United States in the aftermath of World War II: That the Soviet Union and Communists might still be considered allies. This trial occurred on the heels of former prime minister Winston Churchill’s “Iron Curtain Speech” on 5 March 1946 before his rhetoric seeped into the American people’s lexicon.\(^1\) While the anti-Communist spirit of the Cold War had not yet taken hold in the United States, some attempted to exploit a fear of the Soviet Union and Communism; yet such efforts remained unsuccessful because the anti-Communist rhetoric lacked believability for people who viewed the Soviets as allies. Accused of espionage, Soviet Navy lieutenant Nikolay Redin had been assigned to the West Coast division of the Soviet Purchasing Commission, a component of the Lend-

---

\(^{1}\) As a disclaimer this thesis will use the term American or Americans to refer specifically to the United States of America. While this term can convey an extremely anglo-centric connotation in certain contexts, I do recognize that other inhabitants of North and South America are also Americans.
Lease agreement between the United States and Soviet Union. His trial exemplifies the attempted exploitation of fear.\(^2\) Redin’s arrest and trial was not the beginning of the Cold War but it did mark an increased tension between former wartime allies. The event also shows U.S. public perception of the Soviet Union and its agents in the aftermath of World War II, highlighting the still friendly relationship before the effects of rhetoric altered the perception of the Soviets and Communism.\(^3\)

On 27 March 1946 Elbridge Durbrow, State Department chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs, filed a memorandum of a conversation with Soviet diplomat Fedor Alekseevich Garanin. The subject of their conversation was the arrest and detention of Soviet naval officer Lieutenant Nikolay Grigoryevich Redin. Garanin inquired as to the motives and reason for Redin’s arrest the previous day by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Durbrow’s notes on the conversation included his belief that it was “pertinent to point out that while the Soviet Government has not lived up to the commitment” agreed upon regarding the notification of the arrest of a foreign national, he would attempt to obtain information regarding the arrest.\(^4\) This level of

\(^3\) Leab, “The Red Menace and Justice in the Pacific Northwest,” 82. Leab and I share the sentiment that this is a transitional event in the relationship between the U.S.S.R. and United States. However, I am analyzing this event in a different way than Leab. Leab contends that Churchill’s speech was not well received, and that the revelation of Soviet attempts to gain nuclear secrets actually changed public opinion. I disagree with Leab and contend that Churchill’s rhetoric started a movement that had yet to take hold, as seen in the verdict of Redin’s trial. If the public or government had been as affected by the nuclear revelations, then Redin would likely have been found guilty as a Soviet spy.
cooperation between Durbrow and Garanin indicated that good relations still existed. Durbrow’s request was fulfilled by Secretary of State James Byrnes the next day. The next day Secretary Byrnes sent a message to the Chargé of the Soviet Union, Nikolai Vasilevich Novikov informing him that the United States accused Redin of espionage.\(^5\)

If the Soviet embassy did not receive word of their naval officer Lieutenant Redin from the State Department, then they would have received more detailed information about him on the front page of every major newspaper in the United States on 27 March. From the *New York Times*, *Chicago Daily Tribune*, and even the *Austin American Statesman*, the story of the spy Nikolay Grigorievitch Redin spread across the country.

Within twelve days the State Department sent an aide memoire to the Soviet embassy to update its staff on the case of Lieutenant Redin. In this message members of the State Department communicated their inability under U.S. federal law to intervene in legal matters that fell under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice. Most importantly this message detailed Redin’s charge of espionage. According to the State Department message, Redin was “charged with having obtained information of restricted and confidential nature relating to the construction, equipment and performance of a United States Naval Destroyer Tender, the USS *Yellowstone*.” Included in the charges against Lieutenant Redin was “having attempted to induce another individual to obtain…additional information of a confidential nature…and to have conspired with persons unknown to furnish classified information relative to the national defense to the

---

Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics.” The charges against Redin were, according to the State Department, “sufficiently strong for prosecution.”

The summation provided in the 9 April message was found to be correct. The Federal Grand Jury hearing for Nikolay Redin resulted in his indictment on five counts of conspiracy against the United States in his attempts to gain information about the USS *Yellowstone*. Redin’s charge of conspiracy to violate the Espionage Act alleged that he had “beginning on or about the first day of April, 1944, and continuing until the twenty-sixth day of March, 1946, with intent and reason to believe that the information was to be used to the injury of the United States and to the advantage of the USSR” collected intelligence on U.S. soil. While the trial still had not occurred, the charges against Redin seemed to be as strong as Secretary Byrnes had alluded to in the 9 April message. However strong those charges were, no one could know how the trial would go or what the jury might rule; yet it was certain was that Redin would receive a fair trial.

Widespread media coverage of Redin’s arrest largely echoed the message of government officials. Reports filed by the Associated Press filtered through to large and small newspapers. This gave all Americans, no matter where they lived, front page information about Redin. The media’s coverage of the case centered around the charges of espionage that justified the arrest of the Soviet national but also the motives for Redin’s spying. Inaccurate reporting by the Associated Press alleged that Redin had

---


attempted to gain information about the USS Yellowstone because it held atomic secrets. News reports informed readers that the ship was associated with the atomic testing at Bikini Atoll and this was why Redin targeted the Yellowstone. According to historian Daniel J. Leab, the reports of Redin’s espionage being related to atomic testing at Bikini were completely false. Although the reporting was incorrect, the story pushed to the American public and reflected in the prosecution’s case should have resulted in “an airtight case,” as FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover proclaimed. Additionally, the news reports added fuel to the assumption of guilt surrounding Redin. Each news report contains a mention of the House of Representatives committee investigating un-American activities (HUAC). While this organization did not yet have the gravitas that it would hold in the 1950s, Redin’s investigation by the committee implied a certain amount of assumed guilt. Despite the news reports that proclaimed the Soviet officer’s guilt, the wheels of American justice still had to determine his innocence or guilt. Most notably, the news reports all contain an anti-Communist bias similar to the bias that Winston Churchill exhibited in his “Iron Curtain Speech” earlier in the same month.

In a trial that lasted for just over three weeks, the government’s prosecuting attorneys failed to present a successful case despite their best efforts and what seemed sufficient

---

evidence. The trial began on 24 June in front of a jury of seven men and five women. The case built by Hoover’s FBI and argued by U.S. attorney’s Victor Anderson and Allan Pomeroy argued Redin’s guilt based on a sentiment of anti-Communism that was accepted during the Cold War, but at this point had not permeated American society. While Hoover and many other Americans believed Communism to be a threat since its inception, the overwhelming fear and hatred present during the Cold War had yet to develop. Despite evidence gathered by the FBI that indicated Redin employed spy tradecraft such as surveillance detection routes, what would become a customary practice for spies in the Cold War, the jury considered this evidence too circumstantial to prove guilt. Additionally, the jury failed to convict Redin for enticing Herbert Kennedy, an American shipyard engineer, into providing him with blueprints and details of the USS Yellowstone. Although similar evidence only years later would prove Redin guilty of conspiracy at a minimum, the tone of the Cold War had yet to develop to the point of declaring the immediate guilt of a potential spy based on tradecraft alone.\textsuperscript{11}

Despite living in a world on the verge of change, the prosecution’s attempt to play on Communist fear failed. In their final statements, Anderson and Pomeroy tried to use Redin’s Soviet citizenship against him. According to historian Daniel Leab, Anderson “denounced the Soviet Union, charged that Redin acted on the orders of the Kremlin,” and lauded the FBI as “the trusted guardians of internal security of this Christian land.” Not only did Anderson level unsubstantiated accusations but his language also portrayed the FBI as the savior of the American people imparting a divine infallibility on them. Although Anderson’s plea to the jury during closing remarks fell on deaf ears, it

represented the kind of arguments used during the Cold War against spies in similar situations. On 17 July, after fewer than nine hours of deliberation, the jury returned not guilty verdicts on all charges. The jury was apparently not swayed by the claims of the prosecution; the verdict in this case is one example of how much Americans valued democratic ideals rather than punishment of a potential Communist spy. A fair trial and judgment free of bias or influence from international affairs were valued over the scare tactics of the prosecution. The outcome of the trial demonstrates that Churchill’s anti-Communist rhetoric had yet to take hold in the U.S. public and Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram’ had yet to make its way outside of government circles. While there were some tensions between the United States and U.S.S.R., the real conflict and tools needed to fight it had not yet developed.

The story of Redin and his actions while in the United States reads like the plot of a spy drama. Complete with intrigue, deception, and trade craft worthy of James Bond or George Smiley, Redin’s actions were dismissed by an American jury that did not view his actions as suspicious; but had the same events occurred between 1950 and 1990, Nikolay Redin would most likely been found guilty and added to the list of spies caught during the Cold War. Redin’s acquittal demonstrates that the extent of later Cold War anti-Communist feeling in society.

In order to demonstrate the influence that rhetoric had on the national discourse from 1946 through 1950, I examine speeches, addresses, and letters of the key figures in the post-war world. An analysis of the rhetoric used by the influential figures of the time provides a greater understanding of their views on the Soviet Union and Communism.

Understanding the rhetoric and potential misperceptions that resulted assists in explaining the dramatic shift in the discourse regarding the alliance between the United States and U.S.S.R. following World War II. This thesis examines that shift in the discourse, expansion of the military, and creation of a civilian peacetime intelligence service by reviewing the founding documents, memos, and recollections of the people and organizations involved.

I. Historiography

Early in the Cold War, historians began examining the economic and political relationships between the United States and the rest of the world. In *The Contours of American History*, William Appleman Williams wrote about “the way we Americans have lived our individual and collective lives, about the consequences of thinking and acting as we have, and about how we can use that knowledge to extend and deepen our humanity in the present and future.”¹³ Williams sought to explain the consequences of political and economic policy created at the highest levels of government. To understand U.S. policies throughout history and during the Cold War particularly, Williams contended that the United States viewed overseas expansion as the key to long-term success. Therefore U.S. policy was shaped by the need for expansion, which was hindered by the Soviet Union. This competition for territory and the accompanying political and economic success are what motivated the United States and U.S.S.R. to become aggressive, triggering the Cold War. Ultimately, the book represents an effort to understand interactions of the United States and the significance of those relationships.

---

This examination produced a greater understanding of the perceptions American society held of itself and other countries at specific periods in history. Williams’ examination also revealed how American society defined and justified the economic and political decisions made throughout history. Finally, Williams sought to analyze how U.S. perceptions of reality influenced world events and then how the resulting reality changed or altered the initial perception.\footnote{Williams, \textit{The Contours of American History}, 20.}

Williams’ analysis of the period after World War II relied on an unexplored frontier to explain American motivations and actions. At this time in history, frontier as it had been known no longer existed. For Williams, the American policy in the post-World War II era focused on overseas expansion to substitute for the frontier as a source of wealth.\footnote{Williams, \textit{The Contours of American History}, 473-474.} This reliance on overseas expansion of economic markets required the policy of containment to develop and protect the expansion of markets. Williams argued that containment policy bolstered American interests with the presence of the atomic bomb; however, nuclear parity required a large expansion of conventional military to protect further economic expansion. Additionally, Williams argued that the discourse in the United States, or the views and opinions of cultures in the United States that form the way in which a society views the world, blamed the Soviet Union for potential tribulation in American society. This reactionary movement resulted in fervent anti-Communism that became institutionalized within society and government.\footnote{Williams, \textit{The Contours of American History}, 474-5.}

While Williams focused on policies such as containment and its effect on society, his analysis was limited; because enough time had not elapsed, Williams could not know
the validity of his argument. This thesis does not argue that the frontier or economic
development were the cause of the Cold War or the expansion of the national security
state. However, I do agree with Williams’ assertion regarding the policy of containment
and the expansion of the military and intelligence services to enact that policy. This thesis
complements Williams’ argument by examining the discourse of anti-Communism in the
United States and the ways it helped to solidify the expansion of the national security
state.

Providing a chronicle of anti-Communism in American society is the goal of
Anticommunism*. Powers expertly navigates the history of Anticommunist ideology in the
U.S. government from the time the Communists took power and created the U.S.S.R. in
the midst of World War I. In chronicling the creation of the Soviet government and
Communist party, Powers also takes note of the American contribution of a
counterbalance to the creation of the Communist political ideology. The author notes
contributions from all segments of American society, emphasizing the ability of
Communism to provide an adversary against which Americans rallied. Powers also takes
care to note the ebbs and tides of U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations. The analysis provided by
Powers allows readers to understand the dynamic nature of American and Soviet relations
throughout the twentieth century. Specifically, Powers focuses on the role of American
society and how the contribution of groups like labor unions helped to shape opinion of
the America public in the early stages of the Cold War.17

---

To understand the currents of anti-Communism in the United States during the Cold War, author John Lewis Gaddis explores the origins of the conflict from 1941 until 1947 in his book, *The United States and the Origins of the Cold War, 1941-1947*. Gaddis points to a convergence of factors such as domestic issues, the complicated U.S. bureaucracy, large personalities, and faulty perceptions, all of which helped to usher in the Cold War. While Gaddis does not fully explain the origins of the conflict, his analysis provides insight into the landscape in which American policy makers were forced to make decisions in the post-World War II era. Gaddis’ focus on the alliance beginning in 1941 allows for an intense examination of the U.S.-U.S.S.R. relationship without losing focus because of American preconceived notions that extended from Russian, or Soviet, withdraw from World War I and the resulting anti-Communist feeling in American society beginning in 1919. The result of Gaddis’ work is a more complete understanding of the politics of American society in the post-war period.\(^\text{18}\)

Politics in the United States during the post-World War II era was the focus of Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas’ *The Wise Men*. Their examination follows the lives, careers, and interactions of six men in the U.S. government to demonstrate how a small cadre of government officials could influence policy and therefore the lives of millions of people. The authors focused on a time before the advent of the enormous U.S. government bureaucracy during the late stages of the Cold War, when the formation of policy occurred over lunch or dinner parties. The ability of these six men to transition between government service and private industry allowed them a great amount of

independence in giving advice to the president or to policy makers. The independence and confidence held by this group helped change American society in the post-war era.

The authors had “no ideological ax to grind” and “no thesis to prove,” but sought out the motivations of the six subjects throughout their lives and careers. Unlike William Appleman Williams, Isaacson and Thomas did not seek to use the subjects’ motivations to examine the effects of their actions; rather, they sought the causes of the men’s actions. The authors suggest that the six government workers were more concerned with the long-term well-being of Europeans. They also argue that their subjects’ major motivation was the desire to protect democracy for societies in which people wished to be free. Gaining support for these societies required the use of rhetoric that at times exaggerated the threats, leading Americans to come to believe the anti-Communist rhetoric. Although plagued by unintended consequences and policies that exacerbated strained relations with the Soviet Union, the six men responded to the threats of the post-war world as they perceived them. Isaacson and Thomas sought to understand and explain how and why the six government workers created history.

The importance of *The Wise Men* to the subject of the post-World War II period cannot be ignored. The influence of Kennan, Bohlen, or Harriman to the larger subject of the formation of the Cold War or to the deteriorating relationship with the Soviet Union in this period is enriched by an examination of the rhetoric used within this small group of men.

---

While the examination of the formation of the intelligence services provides an insight into the inner workings of the early Cold War, an examination of the influential actors in the nascent stages of the formation of the Cold War also brings clarity to a time period of great change. John Lewis Gaddis’ seminal biography *George F. Kennan: An American Life*, seeks to examine the life of the diplomat, author, and teacher to highlight the role Kennan played at a crucial time in American history. Known as the ‘father of containment,’ because of his expertise and credibility gained from advising U.S. government leaders during the early stages of the Cold War, Kennan was also a tragic figure. Kennan’s loneliness and tendency towards melancholic periods of time, according to Gaddis, helped to shape his worldview as well as his advice to Americans about the Communist leadership in the Soviet Union. To explain the policies that Kennan advocated for while in government service, Gaddis examines Kennan’s rationale provided from diary entries and advice provided in memos and telegrams. To accomplish this Gaddis explores Kennan’s past for context as well as his personal thoughts during the early stages of the formation of containment policy for this explanation.21

While the explanation of Kennan’s role in the formation of the Cold War is enriched by biographical works that explain the formation of his worldview, other historians have focused on the origins of the rhetoric that he used. This is the focus of Frank Constigliola’s article, “‘Unceasing Pressure for Penetration:’ Gender, Pathology, and Emotion in George Kennan’s Formation of the Cold War.” Constigliola, similarly to Gaddis, seeks to examine the analysis and advice that Kennan provided to the leadership

of the U.S. government during the early stages of the Cold War. Constigliola argues that Kennan’s use of language, particularly the use of gendered language created a fear of the Soviet Union that would later be used as the justification for the creation of the national security state. This analysis of Kennan’s language illuminates the results of Kennan’s signature ‘Long Telegram’ which delegitimized cooperation with the Soviet Union. The adoption of Kennan’s telegram was made possible because Truman and his administration desperately sought clarification on Soviet intentions. The telegram also became official policy because according to Constigliola, Kennan was able to veil his deep seeded emotional feelings on the Soviet Union with rational arguments that Truman could understand and implement as Cold War policy. While recognizing and accounting for Kennan’s personal feelings about the leadership of the Soviet Union, this thesis focuses on the anti-Communist rhetoric present in the ‘Long Telegram’ and not on the gendered aspects of Kennan’s prose. I argue that the anti-Communist aspects of Kennan’s rhetoric were more familiar and therefore easier spread throughout the U.S. government and public.

Another individual who held a great amount of influence during the early Cold War was George C. Marshall. An examination of Marshall is provided in Mark Stoler’s book, *George C. Marshall: Soldier-Statesman of the American Century*. The author seeks to parallel the emergence of the United States as a major world power with the ascendency of Marshall to the highest appointed positions in the American government to highlight the vital role to American history that Marshall played. According to the author

---

the focus on different kinds of power such as military, economic, and political became a main focus for Marshall. The intersection of these branches of power are valuable to the author’s explanation of Marshall’s namesake economic plan for the reconstruction of Europe after World War II and to forming Marshall’s view of the world. Stoler’s explanation of the Marshall Plan in parallel to Marshall’s career represents the introduction of the United States as the pre-eminent global political, economic, and military leader.23

Understanding the connection between the leadership of the U.S. government, the bureaucracies that the leadership creates, and how they both interact with the rest of the world can be a complicated and confusing process. These are just a few of the many issues which David McCullough addresses in his book, *Truman*. By focusing on President Harry S. Truman, the author illuminates a crucial period of American history by examining the motivations and actions of Truman’s presidency. Writing about Truman’s childhood and early years provides an important glimpse into the formation of Truman’s view of the world and assists in understanding the possible underlying motivations in the president’s decision-making process and how he conducted foreign policy.24

The creation of the national security state is the focus of Michael Hogan’s book, *A Cross of Iron: Harry S. Truman and the Origins of the National Security State, 1945-1954*. Hogan examines the competing factions within the U.S. government that debated the formation of the national security state. The author identifies the factions as those

---

who favored the “national security” state and those opposed, who feared the creation of a “garrison state.” This debate largely fell along conservative and liberal factions of American politics. The conservatives in the government and media feared the creation of a gestapo in the United States, while liberals with international concerns favored the creation of the national security state to fully engage in the Cold War. Hogan also notes that liberals in American society were concerned with the prospects of a gestapo or ‘garrison state’ but employed rhetoric and democratic ideas to convince society of the need for national security. In addition to these groups is a third group mainly within the government that called for the creation of the national security state irrespective of fears of the creation of a ‘garrison state.’ By examining the competing segments of American society and their ideas of what American values consisted of, readers can understand how arguments against Communism took on rhetoric that emphasized the un-Americanness of the Communism. This separation created by the rhetoric assisted in the formation of the national security state by creating a potential enemy that inspired more fear than the prospect of a ‘garrison state.’

Examining the problematic relationship between intelligence and American society is the focus of Charles Ameringer’s book, *U.S. Foreign Intelligence: The Secret Side of American History*. Ameringer attempts to shed light on the role of intelligence in relation to the formation of the national security apparatus and its goal to protect the interests of the U.S. government. While acknowledging the successes of American intelligence, the author also acknowledges the contradiction of a democratic society that

---

employs covert practices to undermine the sovereignty of other nations. Ultimately, he seeks to determine the significance of intelligence to the greater narrative of American history. Ameringer’s work focuses on the decisions made at the highest levels of public office as they determined the functions of the national security state and the use of intelligence. While this is helpful to gain a broad understanding of the formation of the intelligence apparatus, the way that U.S.-Soviet relations became so strained as to make the national security state seem a necessity remains un-an answered in Ameringer’s work.26

The author solely focuses on the formation of the intelligence community, not addressing the influence of the second tier of government officials who were influential in the formation of the intelligence community and the national security apparatus. This thesis will expand on that examination to include the discourse present in society, either in public through the examination of newspapers or from examination of congressional documents to determine the tone of the U.S. Congress during the formation of these agencies and organizations.

Ever present within the conversation and uses of intelligence looms the issue of covert action. Sallie Pisani’s The CIA and the Marshall Plan seeks to explain why the United States began the use of covert operations during peacetime. To examine this development, Pisani investigates the government actors responsible for the formation of covert operations and intelligence. Pisani attempts to determine how the two elements of the intelligence community developed in the early Cold War and influenced American society to form specific ideas regarding the Soviet Union. Ultimately, the author

examines how networks of elite policy makers in the U.S. government worked together to form an opposition to Communism, culminating with the Marshall Plan. This plan resulted in the merging of public and private networks of individuals utilized by the intelligence community to globally combat Communism. Pisani’s argument emphasizes the use of covert operations as a vital component to U.S. foreign economic policy during the Marshall Plan era. In the global context of the use of intelligence during the Cold War, Pisani examines the influences of both state and non-state actors to analyze the effects of American intervention on other cultures; in so doing, he creates a narrative of American history that is more inclusive of the global resistance to Communism, via the Marshall Plan, during the Cold War.27

While Pisani includes the Office of Policy Coordination (OPC) a subsidiary of CIA’s Office of Special Operations (OSO) within the analysis of the Marshall Plan, there are opportunities for expanded study in the historiography. Description of the OPC does not address the discourse present in the government and in society to allow the formation of a peacetime intelligence organization. Analysis of the anti-Communist rhetoric in the post-war period develops a greater understanding of the ways that intelligence affected American society and society’s influence on intelligence collection.

Departing from the examination of the effect of intelligence on a global scale, author Wilson D. Miscamble inspected the effect that George F. Kennan had on U.S. foreign policy. *George F. Kennan and the Making of American Foreign Policy, 1947-1950*, is not a biography, but an examination of Kennan’s role in the formation of policy

making. Miscamble highlights how one mid diplomat contributed to the discourse of paradigm-shifting foreign policy during the post-war period. Kennan’s role within the State Department as head of the Policy Planning Staff allowed his influence to be felt in the discussion of foreign policy during this period because of the department’s relationship with Truman. According to Miscamble, Kennan’s position and President Truman’s willingness to allow the State Department to create and enact foreign policy makes the study of Kennan and his staff valuable to a greater understanding of the post-World War II era, and Miscamble’s work provides an intimate view into the disputes and views of the key participants. The author clarifies much of the evolution of containment policy and the Truman doctrine and their symbiotic existence.28

While Miscamble explored the role of the mid-tier civil servant, his examination also does not address the connections of Kennan’s role to the wider U.S. public, and he does not mention the effect of the rhetoric used by those government workers on the U.S. public. Miscamble’s almost myopic examination focuses solely on a relatively small group of government workers; this thesis will enrich Miscamble’s analysis by considering the role of the American people in their acquiescence to a continued struggle with a foreign adversary. Miscamble mentions the ‘Mr. X’ article that I will address in this thesis, but his work does not explain what significance the article had on the public in terms of rallying support, or lack of support, for the anti-Communist cause. This thesis will address these elements to provide greater understanding of how the formation of foreign policy influenced or was influenced by the people of the United States.29

29 Miscamble, George F. Kennan, 3-10.
David Rudgers’ book, *Creating the Secret State*, contributes to the early Cold War historiography by demonstrating that the postwar intelligence community developed institutionally amongst high-level policy makers in the U.S. government. These makers of high policy advocated and allowed the formation of intelligence in response to a perceived threat from Communism and its spread around the world. *Creating the Secret State* focuses on the origins of the Cold War by examining the conflict solely from an American perspective. Using government documents and personal papers of government officials, Rudgers created a diplomatic history highlighting the U.S. government’s responsibility for countering Communism. While the author expertly navigates an extensive collection of primary sources to create a powerful narrative of OPC, Rudgers does not explain why OPC became a primary tool against Communism during the Cold War.  

In order to better understand the evolution of an event like the formation of the national security state during the Cold War, a first-hand account provides much needed insight. *A Look Over My Shoulder: A Life in the Central Intelligence Agency* provides such an account from former director of Central Intelligence Agency Richard Helms and former CIA officer William Hood. Influenced by the conclusion of the Cold War and normalization of relations with Russia, Helms sought to record his experiences in government service to help explain the role of intelligence and the events during his

---

service. Importantly, Helms stressed the crucial nature of secret intelligence for the protection of the United States.\(^\text{31}\)

In addition to recounting his time as a government worker, Helms outlined his experience with the formation of the national security state. In many ways Helms’ career in government service followed the formation of the national security state and the bureaucratic structures that went along with it. Unlike Kennan, Helms did not have a hand in the formation of U.S. foreign policy, but he did play a prominent role in the establishment of the national security state. From his position as an intelligence officer, Helms was involved in many of the intelligence operations against the Soviet Union, many of which subverted the democratic processes of the target countries. While in many cases these were unintended consequences, the actions were carried out prioritizing the interests of U.S. national interests or security.

U.S. foreign policy enacted during the Cold War resulted in the subversion of democracy around the globe. The insights and evidence from that subversion of democracy are vital to this thesis. While Helms does not address the rhetoric used to build the national security state, he does outline the results of that rhetoric and the effects on society.

Another monograph that represents a return to the post-World War II and early Cold War histories focusing on high diplomacy is David Barrett’s *The CIA and Congress: The Untold Story from Truman to Kennedy*. As indicated in the title, the book deals directly with the relationship between CIA, the U.S. Congress, and the President of

the United States. Barrett focuses on the role of Congress and its responsibility to provide oversight of intelligence activities. The author seeks to highlight the balance of presidential executive power and the constitutional right of congressional oversight of the chartering, direction, and funding of executive level agencies. Ultimately, Barrett determines that the creation of the national security state as well as agencies such as CIA and OPC came about because of presidential support.\textsuperscript{32}

\textit{The CIA and Congress} represents the tradition of diplomatic history by focusing solely on the Soviet Union and threat of Communism’s spread to explain the use of intelligence in the Cold War. Barrett utilizes memos, notes, and other government documents to examine the language government leaders used with one another. Focusing on these sources, the author completes a narrative heavily focused on government rhetoric during the Cold War. Most importantly for the historiography of intelligence and its use in the formation of the Cold War, Barrett does include government rhetoric and government officials’ opinions of intelligence.

In a departure from most books examining the role of intelligence in the Cold War written at the turn of the twenty-first century, Hugh Wilford’s \textit{The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America}, marked a return to social-based history focusing on global effects. Wilford provides a detailed account of the first twenty years of CIA global covert activity. Overall, the author examines the effect of covert activities, undertaken to combat Communism by CIA and OPC. Ultimately, the author’s goal is to determine the lasting effects on the societies in which covert activities occurred to understand the extent of

\textsuperscript{32} David M. Barrett, \textit{The CIA and Congress: The Untold Story from Truman to Kennedy}, (Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas: 2005).
intelligence’s influence on global communities. Additionally, Wilford’s analysis sheds light on American society and culture during the Cold War.³³

Focusing on global actors, both non-state and policy leaders, Wilford’s work demonstrates some effects of globalization on history. The social history perspective allowed the author to place American intelligence history within a global historical context to gain a better understanding of the Cold War. His analysis of Cold War motivations and U.S. government strategy also contains elements of diplomatic history, providing a rounded and complete analysis of intelligence and its uses. The Mighty Wurlitzer provides an account of the formation of the intelligence community, specifically OPC; however, Wilford’s focus centers on OPC’s influence globally. While this examination provides valuable explanation of some elements of the Cold War, it does not provide insight into American society’s role in the creation of the intelligence community or potential ramifications of the intelligence community’s creation.

Masuda Hajimu, borrowing a theoretical framework from John A. Lynn that analyzes the popular discourses in a society and how they create the reality in which that society lives, identified a long and deep-seeded origin for the discourse of conflict with the Russian people that preceded the Bolshevik Revolution. According to Masuda, these examples were indicative of the discourse of competition. The development of anti-Communist discourse resulted in a reality of conflict known as the Cold War with the Soviet Union. The discourse of the Cold War, according to Masuda, “was engaged in by policymakers and intellectuals in terms of opinions, often seen as provocative and

perceptive,” which further influenced popular opinion in the United States toward inevitable conflict between the superpowers. The reality of the Cold War depended on the discourse. Masuda suggests that “for something to be considered an irrefutable reality…there should be…social acceptance and participation.” To be effective, “a majority of the population had to believe in and propagate the discourse of the Cold War as a reality of the world.” Once policymakers adopted a discourse of conflict with Communism, they created the irrefutable reality of the Cold War by presenting the Soviet Union as the enemy of democracy.34

As Masuda’s work helps to demonstrate, the discourse and resulting reality created a necessity for covert intelligence operations. Challenging the Soviet Union in the United Nations became a hallmark of the Cold War, but the discourse which called for the political gamesmanship in the UN extended into the developing world, making covert action to fight the Soviet Union an acceptable reality. This thesis agrees with Masuda’s use of Lynn’s model of discourse and reality. Additionally, I demonstrate that the formation of the national security state, well before the Korean War, played a large role in the initiation of the Cold War. This study uses the same model of discourse versus reality to better understand the climate of the United States that led to the creation of the national security state.

II. Methodology

Within the scholarship of armed conflict or war, the cultural approach has benefited historians immensely. This method of viewing the history of war and conflict is

---

the primary tool for analysis in John A. Lynn’s, *Battle: A History of Combat and Culture From Ancient Greece to Modern America*. According to Lynn, the cultural approach “is most likely to grant individuals and peoples their full personal, social, and cultural character.” Interpretation of this level gives a multi-layered voice to the individual as well as high policy makers. This analysis provides a greater understanding of war and conflict in general as well as the societies that engage in battle.

In order to analyze societies and how they engage in conflict, Lynn provides a framework to understand the influencing factors. One of the frameworks that Lynn proposes is the relationship between the discourse and reality of conflict or war. The purpose of this analytical framework is to highlight the difference between the conceptual discourse and the concrete reality. The framework demonstrates that an essential feedback loop is present between the discourse and reality of conflict. The essential feedback loop serves to confirm the discourse as reality or augments either element, or both, to understand conflict. These two factors, discourse and reality, act as counterbalances to justify or condemn conflict in a society.

The conceptual elements of Lynn’s framework are the “values, beliefs, assumptions, expectations, and preconceptions” that a society embraces. In short, Lynn’s framework relies on understanding the cultures that form the discourse in a society. Because a society contains many cultures, Lynn identifies those that are most

---

36 Lynn’s analysis focuses on armed combat and war of both regular and irregular nature. Because the post-World War II years leading up to the outbreak of hostilities on the Korean Peninsula do not fall into the common definitions of warfare, I have chosen to use the term conflict rather than war.
prominent in forming the discourse on conflict: societal, military, and strategic cultures. John Keegan’s definition of military culture included the ways in which the military does things irrespective of factors dictated by reality. Lynn expands Keegan’s definition to include how the military views war and combat. Societal culture in the context of strategic culture includes aspects of a society such as religion or masculinity, according to Lynn. Strategic culture is an invaluable source for studying how the government and the military interpret and react to conflict. The value of this type of culture is derived from the interaction of societal and military cultures. The components of strategic culture include the “civil values and practices as well as military conceptions and capabilities.”

The intersection of “civil values” and “military conceptions” provides an invaluable view into the motivations of a society and how that society rationalizes conflict both in public and in the government. Therefore, to comprehend strategic culture requires an examination of the presidency, the legislative branch, and popular attitudes in society and the military.

Although not all conceptual elements in a society form the discourse regarding conflict, the conceptual elements are helpful when considering the discourse on conflict in a particular society. Lynn notes that the term discourse “signifies the complex of assumptions, perceptions, expectations, and values on a particular subject,” but adds that “a single society can harbor several discourses.” Because societies are diverse and contain different races, genders, and socioeconomic backgrounds, the discourse on conflict reflects the differences in society. Because the discourse is dynamic it can undergo change due to cultural changes as well as shifts in the reality of conflict as a

---

38 Lynn, *Battle*, xx.
society experiences that conflict. While beneficial, this level of analysis can be problematic. Because there are multiple discourses in a society, each motivated by various factors (race, gender, ethnicity, religious background, class, etc.), the voices in the minority are often stifled, especially in a segregated society such as the United States in the post-war era. Additionally, some elements of society are limited in their ability to effect change in the discourse on conflict and therefore navigate the reality of conflict with limited input because of societal inequality.

Adjustments to the discourse on conflict can, according to Lynn, result in an idealized or perfected reality. Examples of this idealized reality include ceremonial shows of force or participation in competitive sports at the international level. This twist of reality creates a perception in society that the discourse is satisfied by the alternate form of competition rather than engagement in actual armed conflict. However, if the idealized or perfected reality of conflict does not align with society’s broader discourse, a modification of the discourse occurs as a counterbalance to match the perfected reality of the conflict. This unexpected change in reality can motivate “a society…to force warfare into accepted patterns that society may replace real war with a Perfected Reality that more completely conforms to the relevant Discourse on War.” Perfected reality serves to balance the shifting discourse, if it does not do so then the perfected reality can be discarded as being too extreme. If the perfected reality is too extreme then it can be deemed too far outside the discourse to be legitimately considered part of the discourse.

---

41 Examples might include the Olympics or other international-level competition.
42 Lynn, *Battle*, xvi.
43 Lynn, *Battle*, xvi.
An example of an extreme perfected reality might be something such as justifying the suspension of liberty or the denial of due process to protect the national interests of a country. The extreme nature of the suspension of liberty or due process would be considered a violation of democracy; however, if the discourse in a society has shifted enough then society accepts the extreme. Although these are examples of an extreme shift in the discourse, the examples also represent a large shift in the reality of conflict. The very nature of societal conflict is unpredictable and generally causes confusion for all participants. Engagement in conflict against a group that fights with a different discourse on conflict results in an unexpected reality of conflict for all involved. An example of this conflict of discourse and expectation was demonstrated in the way the U.S. government valued the democratic process in the post-war world versus the Soviet model of spheres of influence to protect the U.S.S.R.. While both countries felt their ideologies presented the best chance for peace throughout the world, the potential for combat to prove the dominance of democracy or Communism was nonexistent. Nuclear weapons limited the possibility for direct combat between the two superpowers of the post-World War II era. This forced a modification of combat that resulted in the covert and clandestine combat that became a hallmark of the Cold War. However, when modification of conflict is not possible, and reality cannot be balanced by the discourse, then an idealized or artificial form of competition is necessary for psychological balance in the society undergoing change.

Lynn’s model provides a societal examination that focuses both on government leadership and on the American people. Although many people may argue that leaders in the government were above, or not influenced by the public, I contend and Lynn’s model
supports the assertion that because the government derives its power from the public then the government could not be separated from the governed. Even though influential members of the government enjoyed appointed positions many of the developments which they contributed to were made possible because of congressional funding or support. American society exercised, or had the opportunity to exercise control during the Cold War through the electoral process showing approval or disapproval for the actions of their elected officials. This unique feature of American democracy prevented government leadership from prosecuting the Cold War from within a self-perpetuating feedback loop that reaffirmed the anti-Communist rhetoric created within. Balancing the rhetoric created by the State Department, President Truman, and the intelligence apparatus the American people’s ability to express their approval through voting demonstrates their influence on American leadership.

Application of the discourse and reality framework to the period between World War II and the Cold War provides valuable insight into American society at a pivotal point for the entire world. I apply Lynn’s model in this thesis to demonstrate the influence of the rhetoric used by high policy makers like Truman by examining his executive orders, addresses to Congress, and correspondence. I also apply Lynn’s model to speeches delivered by foreign dignitaries such as Winston Churchill and U.S. government officials such as Secretary of State George C. Marshall. Churchill’s speech in March 1946, held significance because of his reputation as a statesman during the war; therefore, Churchill had a distinct influence on public opinion in the post-war United States. This thesis also examines the rhetoric and influence of the U.S. Congress through news reports featuring congressmen and the daily Congressional Record. Additionally, I
analyze the memoranda and correspondence of mid-level bureaucrats like George Kennan, Elbridge Durbrow, and Charles E. ‘Chip’ Bohlen from the U.S. State Department. Analytical study of this caliber also includes the role of American society as found in editorials, letters to the editor, and newspaper reports. I argue that the discourse created by these elements created a setting in which the reality of the post-war conflict required a broad shift from the wartime discourse; the rhetoric and the feedback loop in the discourse allowed the U.S.S.R. to shift from friend to dangerous foe.

The post-war shift in discourse resulted in simultaneous shifts in the reality that became the Cold War, one of which came about as a result of the intense anti-Communist rhetoric. This shift allowed for the subversion of the democratic practices of other nations with the goal of preventing the spread of Communism to protect U.S. national security interests. This can be seen as an example of Lynn’s ‘extreme reality’ or a knee-jerk reaction to a violent or quickly shifting discourse, similar to the HUAC investigations and McCarthy hearings of the 1950’s. Additional examples can be seen in the U.S. interventions in Afghanistan from 1979-1989. These are reactions that result in violations of democratic ideas or norms that U.S. society traditionally holds in high value. An ‘extreme reality’ following World War II also resulted in the formation of the national security state and intelligence apparatus covered in the analysis of the National Security Act and National Security Council documents in chapter three of this thesis.

---

44 While this thesis does not directly address this particular issue if more information is desired please see Landon R. Y. Storrs, The Second Red Scare and the Unmaking of the New Deal Left, (Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 2013).
45 Lynn, Battle, 360-361.
Another result in the post-World War II shift of U.S. discourse and leading into the early Cold War was the formation of a ‘perfected reality.’ This reality of the Cold War period resulted from a general U.S. fear of another world war. This ‘perfected’ or alternate reality, shaped by the advent of nuclear technology and development of mutually assured destruction (MAD), rejected discourses of traditional warfare. While the discourse of U.S. society called for conflict with Communism, the reality of MAD restrained the outbreak of conventional conflict between the United States and Soviet Union. The resulting reality of the Cold War saw a premium placed on ritualized competition in the form of Olympics or other international sporting competitions. Military parades or military shows of force in the form of joint military exercises or wargames are examples of ritualized competition seen during the Cold War. This is important to understanding the motivations of actors in this period. Because the perfected reality negated the possibility of open conflict with the Soviet Union, covert actions or warfare became the standard because it conformed to the popular discourse of this early Cold War period.

This thesis examines the formation of the discourse that resulted in the formation of both realities of the Cold War. Because I focus on rhetoric in the formation of the national security state, I address both the ‘perfected’ and ‘extreme.’ Chapter two examines in depth some of the most notable and popular speeches and addresses of the post-war era, as well as the reactions to that rhetoric from members of the U.S. Congress and from society through analysis of newspaper accounts. When possible, I analyze government documents such as the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) reports. These reports are important because they provide a valuable insight into the type
of information that was circulated within the government by the intelligence apparatus. Because they were created by the CIG and later CIA, as I will show, the reports served as a positive feedback loop that justified the expansion of the intelligence apparatus.

With the post-war discourse firmly established by early 1947, chapter three turns to U.S. government developments relating to the formation of a national security state, as made possible by the anti-Communist rhetoric. This thesis acknowledges the importance of the formation of the national security state because of its importance to the professionalization and expansion of the military. However, I also argue that the formation of the intelligence apparatus as a component of the national security state pushed the creation of both the ‘perfected’ and ‘extreme’ reality of the Cold War.
II. SHIFTING DISCOURSE

This chapter focuses on the discourse present in the U.S. government and within the civilian population. I argue that the rhetoric employed by influential leaders resulted in a gradual shift in the national discourse of the United States. The discourse employed by these leaders also created a misperception of the Soviet Union. As a result of this misperception, Americans’ traditional preoccupation with the protection of democracy largely disappeared. This chapter supports the larger thesis by examining that shift in discourse.

According to John Lynn’s model outlining the effects of discourse on the reality in which a society lives, societies generally have many cultural components that make up a discourse. Here the main focus is on the strategic culture of the United States. This focused examination of the rhetoric results in an in-depth inspection of speeches, memos, and documents created by people in the government. These documents, and reactions to them, demonstrate that public opinion on democratic ideas and norms changed as a result of persuasive government rhetoric.

Before the war’s end, State Department officials in Europe began to report complications in the relationship between the Soviet Union and western allies. Taken by themselves these occurrences meant little; however, combined with other events, they led many prominent figures such as George Kennan to suggest that the Soviets were a potential rival or outright enemy. While Kennan’s voice proved to be one of the loudest in hindsight, his was not alone and many of his contemporaries shared similar sentiments regarding the Soviet Union. This negative sentiment regarding the intentions or trustworthiness of the Soviet Union created a shift within the U.S. government and later
within the larger public discourse. These shifts in discourse occurred because of an overwhelming desire to protect democracy around the world, but the anti-Communist rhetoric resulted in the creation of the national security state, which often subverted democratic ideals.

Despite fruitful agreements at the Tehran Conference and U.S. aid shared via wartime Lend-Lease aid, the Soviet Union began to violate the terms of the inter-war agreements before the war had concluded, according to the State Department. In a memorandum to Secretary of State Edward Stettinius, the State Department’s liaison to the White House Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen outlined each of the violations in detail as a preparation for a meeting with Soviet Minster of Foreign Affairs Yvacheslav Molotov. A list of grievances, the memo demonstrates the sentiment of State Department officials as early as April 1945. The nine items on the list included violations of the election system agreed to at Yalta, failures to allow humanitarian aid into countries, and failure to fulfill Lend-Lease requirements. The memo documented the behavior of the Soviet government and what officials in the State Department believed were efforts to install Communist governments in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Poland. In Romania, the Soviet military, bolstered by Soviet radio and press, disseminated pro-Soviet propaganda and forced the dismissal of Premier Nicolae Radescu on 6 March 1945. This, in effect, was a violation of prior agreements made at the Yalta Conference. According to Bohlen the Soviet government’s violation of the Yalta agreements indicated that the diplomatic process had begun to fail.¹

¹ Charles E. Bohlen, “Assistant to the Secretary of State for White House Liaison, to the Secretary of State,” Memorandum, April 19, 1945, Diplomatic Papers, 1945, Europe,
The Soviets were also uncooperative in terms of assistance to international aid organizations such as the Red Cross. The Soviet government blocked the Red Cross from entering Poland and the Balkans to provide aid to those affected by the war. Compounding the issues of humanitarian aid, the Soviet government failed to forward Lend-Lease materials and supplies to meet obligations previously agreed to. While the violations would seem trivial or inconsequential taken separately, when considered together they hardly seemed like the behavior of an ally. Such extensive subversion of agreed-upon obligations led to an atmosphere in the American government in which Bohlen and George Kennan could provide hardline opposition to Soviet actions. In each point of his memo, Bohlen advocated that Secretary Stettinius should stress U.S. policy vehemently. Although this memo was but one of many being circulated at the time, it is significant because it demonstrates the government rhetoric that affected U.S. foreign policy. Additionally, Soviet elections and continued reporting of negative interaction with the Soviets created an opportunity for anti-Communists in the U.S. government to express their opinions regarding Soviet intentions.

With victory in Europe, the Allies began the process of European rebuilding, but analysis of State Department memos demonstrates that within two months after victory U.S.-Soviet relations continued to decline. In a memorandum sent on the first day of the Potsdam Conference, George Kennan related the latest negative interactions from Moscow to Secretary of State James Byrnes. He outlined three incidents in which the Soviets behaved in an increasingly contemptuous or hostile manner with U.S. Navy or


Bohlen, “Assistant to the Secretary of State,” Memorandum, April 19, 1945, p 833-838.
State Department officials. The first accusation centered on alleged errant firing by U.S. naval vessels on Soviet balloons. In this instance the Soviets were uncooperative with efforts to investigate. Second, Kennan outlined the case of an American sailor’s alleged assault on a dockworker. In this case, Soviet government officials violated the diplomatic rights of the American naval personnel. Despite the cessation of hostilities and a U.S.-U.S.S.R. alliance, Soviet officials insisted on their right to arrest and try the sailor in a military tribunal. Adding to what Americans would consider a violation of democracy, the Soviet officials sought to deny the sailor access to defense or diplomatic counsel. The final instance was the detention of an American naval vessel, Daniel Willard: an American sentry drew his weapon on Soviet dockworkers who were in the process of stealing cargo from a broken case. Local officials demanded the arrest of the American sentry; however, the Assistant Naval Attaché only offered to produce the sentry for questioning. Local Soviet officials blocked the ship from leaving port for four days before finally allowing it to depart. While not outwardly hostile actions, the sum of their parts led to an assumption that despite being wartime allies, the two countries were quickly becoming belligerent.³

Although relations between the U.S. Navy and Soviet dockworkers showed signs of strain, the tone of President Truman’s letters during the post-war meeting showed a glowing friendship. This is relevant because it demonstrates the differing perceptions of the Soviet Union held by the president and by staff in the State Department. In letters to his wife and daughter, Truman detailed his evenings during the post-war Potsdam

Conference (17 July – 2 August 1945) and the Allies’ celebrations of the war. Truman’s language indicates that he seemed unaware of diplomatic problems described by State Department officials. In a 22 July letter to his daughter, he described the extravagant dinner party thrown by Josef Stalin and the Soviets the previous evening as a part of the Conference’s festivities. What is informative about this letter is not the description of the menu, but the general tone of lightheartedness with which the President writes. The tone is indicative of recalling a meeting with an old friend or trusted acquaintance. Truman described extensive celebratory rounds of toasts dedicated to “somebody or something – to the United States…and the same procedure to the British & the Russians.” An analysis of this letter significantly shows that the relationship between the three major allies was still present and strong, or at least that Truman perceived that to be so. In another letter on that date, to his wife, Truman’s words bolster that impression as he mentions that at the dinner he and Stalin spoke privately. His description of the private meeting hinted at potential disagreements between the two leaders, as he wrote that he believed “things will be alright in most instances…Some things we won’t and can’t agree on.” This is important because it foreshadows the disagreements to come between the Soviet Union and the United States, even while Truman believed that they were still allies.

In the midst of the Yalta Conference, the United Kingdom sought to accentuate the bonds of friendship shared between themselves and the United States in an attempt to

---

highlight their shared differences with the Soviet Union. During this period of celebration, the British also organized dinners while the delegations were meeting in Berlin. One of these dinners, held on 23 July 1945, highlighted the Anglo-American alliance and the beginning of the ‘special relationship’ between the United States and the United Kingdom. Prime Minister Churchill requested that President Truman arrive later than scheduled to emphasize his importance as the guest of honor to all those in attendance, especially Stalin.\(^6\) Despite this political maneuvering, the attitude and climate of these meetings appear to maintain the celebratory feelings of allies reveling in their victory while also foreshadowing Churchill’s stance on an Anglo-American alliance, potentially against the Soviet Union.

In addition, Truman revealed to his wife in a 29 July letter his personal feelings towards Stalin: “I like Stalin,” he wrote, “He is straightforward. Knows what he wants and will compromise when he can’t get it.” Despite any respect he might have held for Stalin’s ability to compromise, Truman was not willing to compromise away too much during negotiations. Truman perceived Stalin to be unhappy about the British elections, which Stalin believed could be detrimental to reparations owed to the Soviet Union. In this instance, the first disagreements between the major powers come to light, at least in letters to his family. For the most part, these letters from Berlin depict the relationship between Truman and Stalin in the aftermath of conflict in the European theater. They show Truman’s innermost thoughts regarding the American position in negotiations. At this time, Truman clearly did not see the Soviets as a major threat, but believed he held

the upper hand over Stalin. Because of this, Truman remained confident that the U.S. and U.S.S.R. were still allies despite some State Department officials’ perception of belligerent activities.7

By the Fall of 1945, U.S.-Soviet diplomatic relations became increasingly complicated. State Department officials reported that Soviet officials had behaved contemptuously or provocatively in their recent interactions. These reports gradually built a consensus and helped shift the discourse within the government. On 1 October 1945, Kennan sent a Telegram to Secretary of State Byrnes informing him of forty-seven sealed diplomatic pouches detained by Soviet Embassy officials in Leningrad and Moscow. In an odd compromise, Moscow officials proposed to release the pouches if they might first inspect the contents. Kennan denied the proposal because it violated diplomatic custom, but the interaction serves as a prime example of the recalcitrant behavior of Soviet diplomatic officials.8

The new year brought with it more examples of deteriorating relations between American and Soviet governments. The deterioration came both as a result of State Department officials’ rhetoric about Soviet intentions, and because of rhetoric spread more widely throughout the government. At the request of State Department officials, who sought clarification regarding Communist Party leaders’ propaganda in advance of Soviet elections on 10 February, Kennan’s 2 February telegram responded to the concerns. Kennan outlined the Communist rhetoric that lauded martial gains. According

---

to Kennan’s analysis of the Soviets, the leadership thought martial gain was only possible because of the superiority of the Communist system. Most compelling in Kennan’s message are the quotes that Kennan chose to highlight. Kennan centered on passages that spoke of “reactionary forces who are striving to sow discord and hostility among peoples,” and the necessity to “defend interests of Soviet Union,” and “for eradication of all roots of Fascism for averting of all aggression in future.”9 Additionally his telegram represented an effort to present the Soviets as having militaristic intentions and an end goal of maintaining or increasing global influence. Kennan also believed that Soviet officials referred to the United States as a ‘reactionary force’ that patriotic Soviets would strive to defeat. Although Kennan added that this was the same rhetoric used in the 1937 elections, his analysis indicated that the war did not build an American-Soviet friendship. Less than a week later Kennan sent another telegram to Secretary Byrnes. This telegram highlighted Molotov’s election speech. This telegram was significant because yet again Kennan had an opportunity to continue his exposition on the intentions of Soviet leadership. Conversely, it also showed potential biases that Kennan might have harbored against the Communist government.

Within the first two paragraphs of the telegram Kennan summarized Molotov’s belief that other nations did not want the Communist Party to be in power. Kennan’s analysis indicated that Molotov believed other countries feared the spread of Communism, which would make the U.S.S.R. a major world power. Kennan seemed focused on these points of Molotov’s speech to establish a narrative of Soviet superiority

over other nations and systems of government and also an ever-present suspicion in the
Soviet leadership of western governments. Kennan included Molotov’s statement that the
Soviet people and government should endeavor for peace and security to ensure
economic success. Economic success depended on international security, therefore
according to Molotov, situations in Italy and Austria presented potential barriers to the
economic security of the U.S.S.R.. Also, Kennan related Molotov’s views on Soviet
membership in the newly forming United Nations (UN). Molotov stated that the Soviet
role in this organization would serve toward “averting new wars and bridling any and all
imperialist aggressors.”

Molotov further stated that, “there are no militarist groups in
the U.S.S.R. as among dominating classes in certain other countries where dangerous talk
of ‘third world war’ is being encouraged by foul imperialists.”

Molotov’s statement contained an assurance that the Red Army could surely counter any imperialist aggressor. Molotov’s statement was significant to the developing post-war narrative because the
Soviet Union and United States had moved from allies to potential enemies in a quest for
economic prosperity. This shift in relationship between the two countries was based on
their preconceived notions related to the intentions of their counterparts.

Kennan’s continued analysis of the Soviet elections focused on the rhetoric of the
Communist leadership, this preoccupation with rhetoric would help to shift the U.S.
national discourse because of the perceptions Kennan had of the Soviet leadership. On 12
February 1946, Kennan continued his reporting of Soviet actions to Secretary Byrnes;
this report contained a five-point summarization of Stalin’s election speech and Kennan’s

analysis for U.S. foreign policy. Here Kennan highlighted Stalin’s stance that capitalism was to blame for both world wars, that war proved the superiority of the Soviet system, and Stalin’s five-year economic plan for the Soviet Union.\(^\text{13}\) In this telegram, Kennan provided much more analysis of the 10 February 1946 election speeches. He concluded that all party speeches contained passages about the necessity of maintaining a military to combat “forces of ‘fascism and reaction’ in ‘bourgeois democracies’ and elsewhere.”\(^\text{14}\) Kennan’s use of these passages, relating the multiple occurrences of militaristic or antagonistic nature between Communist and capitalist systems, seemingly sought to position U.S. diplomatic efforts in opposition to the aggressive Soviet position against capitalism. This highlighted the overall narrative that Kennan developed leading up to his ‘Long Telegram’ communicated later in the month.

The rhetoric of Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram’ held an incalculable amount of influence over government leaders, the origin of the Cold War, and therefore the creation of the national security state. Kennan’s telegram served as a response to a 3 February telegram from the State Department requesting analysis of the Soviet leaders’ election speeches that same month.\(^\text{15}\) In response, Kennan composed a five-part, seventeen-page report detailing the outlook of the Soviet Union, how the Soviets might try officially and unofficially to apply their outlook globally, and consequences for U.S. foreign policy. Despite his simply being a diplomat assigned to the American embassy in Moscow,


\(^{14}\) Kennan, “The Chargé to the Secretary of State,” Telegram, February 12, 1946, p 696.

Kennan’s opinion on the Soviet Union was highly valued by some; this would cement his position as a Soviet specialist.\textsuperscript{16} The 22 February telegram also outlined Kennan’s foreign policy recommendations, which contributed to the shifting U.S. discourses, first in the government and later in broad public opinion, enabling the groundwork of the Cold War and its national security state to be laid.

Kennan begins his thesis by explaining the elements of the official Soviet propaganda of the Post-World War II era. The backbone of Soviet propaganda, according to Kennan, was that Soviet leaders perceived there to be an antagonistic relationship between themselves and capitalist societies. Quoting Stalin, Kennan wrote that, “in the long run there can be no peaceful coexistence.” This statement implied an inherent conflict between the Soviets and capitalists, according to Kennan’s analysis of Stalin. Kennan’s use of the quote set the tone of anti-Soviet discourse by presenting Stalin as the origin of opposition to peace because of Soviet distrust of capitalism. Excerpted from a 1927 speech and potentially taken out of context, it did provide an early view into the way that Stalin viewed global competition for economic influence, but also potentially misinterpreted long-term Soviet intent. According to Kennan, Stalin supported his belief in a conflict between Communism and capitalism by depicting capitalism as a system “beset with internal conflicts,” “insoluble by means of peaceful compromise.”\textsuperscript{17}

Essentially, Kennan posited that Stalin and Soviet leadership believed capitalist societies were unable to avoid conflict with others and predicted wars of intervention.

\textsuperscript{16} Miscamble, \textit{George F. Kennan}, 26.
waged by capitalist states. These conflicts could be disastrous for the Soviet Union, but they could also result in growth and expansion of the socialist ideology across the globe. Both Stalin, and Lenin before him, were mindful of the expansion of socialism within capitalist societies and the possibility of what Lenin had referred to as “false friends of the people, namely moderate-socialist or social-democratic leaders.”\textsuperscript{18} Kennan related Lenin’s and Stalin’s fear of socialist cooption by capitalism, and began building his argument showing the Soviet government as inherently hostile or suspicious of any form of capitalism. From this first section of his telegram, Kennan posited four conclusions regarding Soviet policy. The first was that the Soviet Union’s main goal was to increase its power and influence over capitalist societies. The Soviets and their allies would accentuate the differences between Communist and capitalist, according to Kennan, taking note to highlight the weaknesses of imperialist goals which resulted in conflict and revolutionary upheavals. Also, Kennan wrote that the Soviet government would attempt to use “democratic-progressive” elements around the globe to work in favor of Soviet interests in capitalist societies. Conversely, Kennan posited that the Soviets would be engaged in conflict against those “false friends of the people,” the social-democratic leaders around the world.\textsuperscript{19} In effect, Kennan’s first section attempted to plant his own misperceptions about the Soviet Union into the minds of others in the U.S. government.

The second part of Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram’ explored aspects of the Soviet government and people, accounts that often conflicted with the assertions of Soviet

\textsuperscript{18} Kennan “The Chargé to the Secretary of State,” Telegram, February 22, 1946, p 696-709.
\textsuperscript{19} Kennan “The Chargé to the Secretary of State,” Telegram, February 22, 1946, p 696-709.
leadership. Kennan began by explaining the outlook of the Russian people as he perceived it. According to Kennan, the Russian people were, “by and large, friendly to (the) outside world, eager for the experience of it.”\(^{20}\) The Russian people were not as insular as the Soviet government portrayed, or wanted, them to be. Kennan explained that the thoughts of the Soviet people were subverted by the information forwarded by the “official propaganda machine.” This propaganda machine, according to Kennan, created the official party line of the Soviet Union. The ‘party line’ regarding the inherently conflict-ridden nature of capitalism believed there was an inability of capitalist and Communist states to exist in peace. Additionally, the ‘party line’ held concerns regarding moderate socialist leaders in capitalist countries as a potential danger to the Soviet Union. According to Kennan these were false axioms forwarded by the Soviet government to create conflict for its own benefit. This conflict would help to solidify the Soviet government’s hold over its own people by creating a security concern for the leadership to address, taking actions to “protect” its society. Moreover, Kennan attempted to explain his view that the “Kremlin’s neurotic view of world affairs is traditional and instinctive,” due to a “Russian sense of insecurity.”\(^{21}\) He emphasized that the origin of Russian insecurity stemmed from exposure to foreign societies, taking care to note that it was not the insecurity of the populace, but of the rulers of the people. This was because exposure to foreign societies could have resulted in diminishment of the relative power of the monarchy, and later of the Soviet government.


This recurrent fear of outside influence, Kennan argued, justified to the Russian people the increase of military and police power. Through increased state security, the government could effectively isolate the populace from influence abroad, or within. It was natural, Kennan explained, for the Soviet government to take these actions because it was historically in line with decisions of previous leaders to advance Russian nationalism. Kennan attempted to warn all who might be influenced by the Soviet government and Marxist ideology, writing that it was a mystery who in the Soviet government received unbiased information regarding the outside world, which left many leaders with an incomplete world view. He believed that the government could not be dealt with because communication with its leaders was filtered due to “secretiveness and conspiracy” within the Soviet system. Kennan warned that a Soviet fear of ulterior motives, as well as the insular nature of Soviet leadership, would prevent diplomats from interaction with the policy-making elite of the U.S.S.R.\textsuperscript{22} Kennan warned that any interactions with the Soviet government must keep this in the forefront of discussion or negotiations. In reflection, Kennan also created doubt regarding the effectiveness of diplomacy with the Soviet Union by presenting a scenario in which U.S. diplomats or workers might be needlessly suspicious of their counterparts’ intentions, thus weakening relations and trust between the two countries.

Kennan began part three of his telegram by describing the methods by which the Soviet government would assert its influence throughout the world, language that further shifted American discourse on Soviet Communism. Delivered on two separate planes,

\textsuperscript{22} Kennan “The Chargé to the Secretary of State,” Telegram, February 22, 1946, p 696-709.
Soviet policy would either be official or subterranean. On the official plane were things that the Soviet government would publicly acknowledge as actions undertaken by the government. The other plane was “subterranean,” or Soviet government actions not officially acknowledged. According to Kennan, examples of the first plane included efforts to strengthen the military, or the strength and prestige of the Soviet Union. Also, he posited that the Soviet government would attempt to increase its relative power globally whenever advantageous. Kennan specifically mentioned Iran, Turkey, and Persian countries as potential targets of the Soviets. As a part of an attempt to increase its relative power, Kennan predicted, the Soviets would participate in international organizations such as the UN, motivated not by international cooperation, but as an opportunity to extend Soviet power or dilute the power of other nations. Kennan’s view of the Soviet government maintained that the Soviets would also attempt to weaken the influence of western nations in the developing, post-colonial world. This area, then known as the Third World, would both officially and unofficially be an area of contention. Devoted to diminishing the influence of western nations in the third world, Soviet policy would attempt to create countries dependent on the Soviet system. Soviet trusteeship of countries would also aid in the effort to separate developing counties from the western world by linking each trustee country politically and economically to Moscow. Another arena in which Kennan predicted that the Soviet Union would attempt to gain allies was through exploiting potential enemies of the west. Within this section the foundations of the global Cold War originated in part from Kennan’s rhetoric of anti-Communism. The fear of Soviet expansion globally and the western response to stop the
spread of Communism gained momentum with Kennan’s pronouncement of Soviet intentions.

In part four of the telegram, Kennan explained the covert or unofficial efforts of the Soviet government. The first instance that Kennan mentioned was a network or central core of Communists in other countries. Through these loyal Communists, Moscow could control other countries without the western world knowing. In hindsight we know this to be false; not all Communists were willing to toe the party line for Moscow. This incorrect analysis of global Communism would set back negotiations with Communist countries such as China, and stymy U.S. foreign relations because of a lack of nuanced understanding of Communism. Kennan also believed that the Soviets would attempt to penetrate national associations or large groups. These included “labor unions, youth leagues, women’s organizations, racial societies, religious societies, social organizations, cultural groups, liberal magazines, publishing houses, etc.” According to Kennan it would be from these groups, particularly labor, youth, and women’s organizations that Communism and its sympathizers would attempt to diminish western influence in the world. By focusing the fear on institutions already present in American society Kennan rooted his rhetoric in something tangible that people could see or were members of. Linking his rhetoric to tangible organizations he was able to create a discourse within the government that contributed to the shifting national discourse and resulting formation of the national security state. Again, this seems like an assertion that backfired in the long run. This discourse of suspicion surrounding Communism,

particularly its dissemination by labor unions and racial societies, later led to Wisconsin Senator Joe McCarthy’s witch hunt for Communists within American society from February 1950 until December 1954.

Kennan asserted that the Soviet Union would also attempt to undermine western powers with unrest and violence. The use of democratic processes to seek redress for grievances from the government would be used to generate rebellion to the system of government and eventual destruction of society. He predicted violent efforts carried out in the unofficial or subterranean side of Soviet planning. Kennan predicted that in the Third World, missteps and errors in colonial administration would result in exploitation of the populace to the benefit of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, where these areas of exploitation occurred, the Soviet apparatus would try to install Communist political machinery. Kennan noted that a major Communist goal was to “work toward the destruction of all forms of personal independence, economic, political or moral…(the) system can handle only…and complete dependence on higher power.”24 What Kennan seemed to be warning of was an attack on free societies and democratic processes, a conclusion that would likely be reached by readers of his telegram in the State Department and other branches of government. Kennan concluded his discourse on Soviet unofficial policy by remarking that, “all soviet efforts on unofficial international plane will be negative and destructive in character, designed to tear down sources of strength beyond reach of Soviet control.”25 Kennan’s use of the phrase “tear down

---

sources of strength” when addressing the “unofficial international plane” seems to suggest that the Soviet Union would resort to devious tactics to destroy American democratic institutions. This claim resulted in American suspicions of Soviet involvement in international organizations as inherently destructive, and portrayed the Soviets as needlessly aggressive and paranoid. Therefore, Kennan added to the potential for U.S. government misinterpretation of Soviet intention.

In summation, Kennan posited that the Soviet system must be dealt with, but it should be handled carefully. He wrote that educating the American people about the issues surrounding Communism should be a priority—one handled not only by the press, but also by the government. This way the government could control how the U.S. public viewed the Soviet Union. Also, Kennan thought that domestic political improvements and advancements in American society would help to diminish Moscow’s ability to generate rebellion. He also argued that the U.S. government should sell a positive image of the American people to the rest of the world to counter the Russian narrative portraying western countries as negative or backward. What Kennan suggested was an image of the United States that had been propagandized during the war as being the champion of democracy and example of freedom. The discourse that he proposed be sold to the rest of the world was one of American superiority as the protector of democracy. He concluded by saying that it is American virtue to which the United States should adhere in order to avoid becoming like the Soviet Union. However, as a result of the rhetoric used in his telegram, the discourse in the U.S. government began to change.  

Less than two weeks separated Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram’ and Churchill’s ‘Iron Curtain’ Speech. The rhetoric that Kennan and Churchill employed both served to shift the national discourse in different, yet equally important ways. Kennan’s telegram swayed the discourse within the government, but Churchill’s address reached a much broader audience and therefore had a greater impact on the post-war discourse.

Perhaps the most important speech delivered in the post-war world occurred in a small mid-western town. With the national discourse shifting within the government the American public found the public national discourse shifting with former Prime Minister Winston Churchill’s visit to the United States. Despite the size of the town, the speech held immense significance because it helped to begin the shift of the discourse within the American public regarding Communism. At a commencement address at Westminster College in Westminster, Missouri, President Truman accompanied former Prime Minister Churchill to the ceremony. As the keynote speaker for the commencement ceremonies, Churchill was aware of the press coverage of his visit and the added credibility of presidential accompaniment. He also had a captive American audience eager to hear his sage advice about how the United States should behave in the future as an international power.

Churchill’s 5 March 1945 address would, for many Americans, reawaken their fear of Communism; however, for others, Churchill’s rhetoric created a new kind of Communist menace. The discourse that he started with this speech aided U.S. government leaders in continuing a discourse of anti-Communist policies. These policies resulted in the acquiescence of the American people to fighting Communism at all costs. Churchill began by remarking on what great honor it was to be introduced by President
Truman, and how much he would like to address, not just those in attendance, but also his
countrymen and people around the world. This type of language indicated that this
message was not just intended for those at the commencement, but for a global audience.
The goal of addressing a wider audience was to highlight the issues that he wanted the
world to know were important. The language that Churchill used assisted in the formation
of American discourse in the post-war world. Churchill added that he and Truman both
hoped that this speech would provide an opportunity to give his “true and faithful counsel
in these anxious and baffling times.”\(^{27}\) Even if people did not think that the times were
baffling, Churchill began by creating an uncertainty to which only he had the answer,
which he would provide in his address. He added that he had no compunction against
telling the truth as he saw it. Because Churchill was no longer the Prime Minister of the
United Kingdom he could give his opinion and guidance on the world in the post-World
War II era. Additionally, he felt that he was free of possible political retribution, having
already reached the pinnacle of his professional career; he felt the freedom of being
unencumbered by feelings of ambition.

Because of this, Churchill presented himself as simply being there to help and to
give advice, not as a politician, but as a friend of the American people. As a trusted ally,
Churchill stated the he would outline the greatest problems that the United States and
United Kingdom faced in the aftermath of their victories in World War II. The language
that Churchill used imparted an urgency to his address. Churchill presented his goals as
altruistic and vowed to protect “with what strength I have that what has been gained with

\(^{27}\) “Mr. Churchill’s Address Calling for United Effort for World Peace: Truman and
Churchill In Missouri,” *New York Times* (New York, NY), March 6, 1946, accessed 4
so much sacrifice and suffering shall be preserved for the future glory and safety of mankind.”28 Invoking the great sacrifice undertaken during WWII by the U.S. and U.K., Churchill declared the necessity to protect democracy in the post-war era. The former prime minister referred to a menacing force in the world that presented a challenge to democratic ideas. Fighting this menace, according to Churchill, required the United States to take on a global responsibility. Additionally, Churchill mentioned the reproach that the United States could suffer for shirking this duty to the world and to Americans who died during World War II.

Churchill maintained the militaristic theme of his speech when he introduced the term “over-all strategic concept.” This term, according to Churchill, was applied to problems or serious situations by officers during the war. He mentioned the term to outline his “over-all strategic concept” for one of the greatest problems in the post-war era: the “safety and welfare, the freedom and progress, of all homes and families of all the men and women in all the lands,” adding that he spoke of “cottage or apartment homes where the wage-earner strives…to guard his wife and children from privation and bring the family up in the fear of the Lord.”29 His over-all strategic concept, as he stated it, was to protect all people from privation, but he specifically mentions the middle class of each country, those who strive to raise a god-fearing family, and are seeking a better life. The use of the terminology borrowed from wartime vernacular became clearer as he outlined the largest threats to the strategic plan. According to Churchill, “war and tyranny” were the two greatest threats to the progress of the world. Although Churchill

29 “Mr. Churchill’s Address,” New York Times, March 6, 1946.
did not indicate who would be responsible for the war or tyranny, he included that “When the designs of wicked men or the aggressive urge of mighty States dissolve over large areas…civilized society…cannot cope.”\textsuperscript{30} While Churchill was not explicit, it appeared that he was referencing Stalin and the quick spread of Communism throughout Eastern Europe in the days after V-E Day. Most importantly for Churchill, the ultimate goal was to prevent another global conflict similar to the world wars in which he had participated.

Continuing the military theme of his address to the American public, Churchill continued to the next step in American military planning and strategy, identifying his suggested method. For Churchill the UN should be “a true temple of peace,” but he also added that “before we cast away the solid assurances of national armaments for self-preservation we must be certain that our temple is built, not upon shifting sands or quagmires, but upon the rock.”\textsuperscript{31} In this passage Churchill not only addressed the military necessities for this international organization, but he imbued the organization with a sacred or holy feeling by referring to it as a temple built upon the rock, a common religious symbol of steadfastness and justice. This use of language is not a coincidence; it is reasonable to assume that the skilled orator played heavily to the god-fearing audience used religious imagery to build support for the UN. Additionally, this imagery would set the Western world apart from the state atheism of the Soviet Union, subtly highlighting another difference between the cultures and countries. What Churchill sought to accomplish was to cement diplomatic and martial bonds between America and the United Kingdom. Churchill seemed to seek a militarization of the UN, but also a commitment

\textsuperscript{30} “Mr. Churchill’s Address,” \textit{New York Times}, March 6, 1946.
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from the U.S. military, as a matter of necessity. Churchill transitioned into a discourse on tyranny and the societal imperative to prevent it. Although not naming the Soviet Union, Churchill began a comparison of free societies to “all-embracing police governments,” in which “control is enforced upon the common people.” Despite not naming the Soviet Union, his description is of a dictatorship undeniably similar to that of Stalin’s Soviet Union. He continued by extolling the virtues of democratic government and the notion that it is the “right” of humanity to live and participate in its own governance. The former Prime Minister added that it was the duty of all living in a democracy, Americans and British especially, not only to protect this ability, but to spread democracy to all mankind. Spreading democracy would eliminate the threat of tyranny and the threat of Communism and the Soviet system of government.  

Spreading democracy would bring about future advancements. He predicted the rise of consumer culture and a rise in the overall standard of living in the developed world. Most important for Churchill was the relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom. For him the alliance between the two countries would add to the potential success of any international organizations. He argued that the bonds between the U.S. and UK could lead to an unprecedented period of peace and ensure that World War III would be avoided. It is important to note that by invoking the memory of World War II and the potential for nuclear annihilation because of new weapons, Churchill’s rhetoric was particularly effective. This alliance would serve as a preventative measure to would provide global stability and prosperity for all, if all involved participated in democratic-styled governments.

---
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Churchill then shifted the subject of his speech by explicitly naming the Soviet Union and its Communist-based government as the principal threat to the goals of an Anglo-American ‘special relationship’ and most importantly to global peace. He began by questioning the intent and reach of Communist ideology and the “limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing tendencies.”

Churchill called for an understanding of the Soviet need for protection from German hostility, welcoming the Soviets to the international stage, and welcoming increased contact between Soviets and the Anglo-American people. However, in the next paragraph he warned of the present situation in Europe, in which the Soviet sphere created, “an iron curtain…across the Continent.”

This curtain created the dividing line between democracy and Communism, east versus west, and for the sake of propaganda bad versus good. This distinction reinforced the suspicions of some Americans towards Communism, for others Churchill introduced the concept that the Soviet Union was the new enemy of democracy and freedom. To support his claim, the statesman listed several eastern European cities on the other side of the ‘curtain’ or increasing forms of control from Moscow. Highlighting the need of American, British, and French supervision to conduct free and fair elections in Greece, Churchill compared Greece to Poland. The Polish, according to Churchill, received encouragement from the Soviets to “make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany.”

This behavior towards Germany was, according to Churchill, indicative of the Soviet effort to gain totalitarian control of Soviet satellite states. Most importantly,

---
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Churchill provided the American people cause to be suspicious of the Soviets. Churchill, a trusted and personal guest of the U.S. President, sparked the conversation within the American public that helped shift the discourse to accept the necessity of the national security state.

Before ending his address, Churchill attempted to temper the threat about which he warned. He believed that another war was neither inevitable nor imminent and that the Soviet Union did not desire conflict. However, Churchill warned that the Soviets would seek the spoils of war, the expansion of their ideology and the establishment of spheres of influence globally. Churchill then argued that the Anglo-American coalition should consider the “permanent prevention of war and the establishment of conditions of freedom and democracy as rapidly as possible in all countries.”

In this one passage, Churchill cemented a policy for dealing with the Soviet Union or countries in its spheres of influence during the Cold War. The ideology of constant opposition to the spread of Communism around the world, later posited by George Kennan as ‘containment,’ would attempt to accomplish Churchill’s premise of preventing war. Unfortunately, the policy that Churchill prescribed would bring the Anglo-American alliance into conflict with the Soviets time and time again during the Cold War. This inevitability was increased by Churchill’s insistence that “there is nothing they admire so much as strength, and there is nothing for which they have less respect than for weakness, especially military weakness.”

In this passage, Churchill advocated the use of military might against the Soviets as a way to gain respect. Advocating the use or threat of military force against a
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former ally in an ideological struggle to ensure world peace seems problematic at best. In reality the implementation of the policy he suggested resulted in several wars and clandestine proxy warfare around the world. Churchill’s idea of countering Soviet ideology by showing military might, when implemented by American and British policy makers, created a precarious international scenario in which the democratic West and Eastern Bloc countries could not avoid conflict. The additional comparisons that Churchill made to 1930s Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union make it clear that his title for the speech, “The Sinews of Peace” was not so much a call for peace as it was a call for opposition to the Soviet Union, and that it designated military action as the most effective means of communication with the Soviets. Churchill also hoped that the UN would be the main check to Communist expansion.

Responses to Churchill’s speech reached around the world and received headline coverage in news outlets of all size and persuasion. The coverage of Churchill’s speech is important to understand how well disseminated the speech was, but also to provide the opinions of the American people. By understanding how the American people viewed Churchill’s address a greater understanding of the speech’s effect on the national discourse can be attained.

Harold Hinton’s front-page article in the *New York Times* reported on Churchill’s speech at Westminster College. Hinton’s summarization of Churchill’s speech began with a call for an Anglo-American alliance to facilitate international cooperation. Hinton then turned to Churchill’s “dark picture of post-war Europe,” to the “iron curtain” that covered the eastern portion of the Europe. The picture that Hinton presented is one of ominous possibilities for the future, much like the tone of Churchill’s address at
Westminster College. From Churchill’s speech, Hinton emphasized the need for a collaborative effort to counter the Soviet Union and specifically wrote about Churchill’s comparison of the potential Soviet threat to the threat that Nazi Germany presented to the world in 1935. Hinton wrote that Churchill made concessions for the Soviet desire to secure its borders against possible incursion from hostile enemies; he also advocated countering Soviet aggression with a unified effort through the proposed UN. According to Hinton’s article, Churchill proposed that the UN would be the principal organization to negotiate and settle differences between the Soviet Union and the western world. Also, Hinton took great care to mention Churchill’s declaration to those in attendance that, “it was ‘your moral duty and mine to see that the Charter of the UN is implemented as the law of the land and the law of the world.’”\(^\text{39}\) According to Churchill, this would counter the largest threats to the advancement of the world: war and tyranny. Received warmly by the crowd, Churchill’s speech seemed to reinvigorate the bonds between English-speaking allies. Hinton reported that the speech “was received with marked applause…where it dealt with the responsibility…to see that another World War was avoided, but the proposal for ‘fraternal association’ brought only moderate handclapping.”\(^\text{40}\) While the pre-war discourse still present in society might have caused the lack of crowd enthusiasm for an Anglo-American alliance to counter the Soviet threat, the enthusiasm shown for embracing a moral responsibility indicated approval from some Americans in the Midwest to Churchill’s charge to fight the Soviet menace at


all costs.\textsuperscript{41} It is clear that the response to Churchill’s speech also derives from the fact that most Americans were weary of war and desired the peace that should have accompanied the cost paid in World War II.

Chesly Manly of the \textit{Chicago Daily Tribune} also reported on Churchill’s address, and he too recognized the ominous tone of the former Prime Minister’s speech. Recognizing the significance of Truman accompanying Churchill to Westminster College, Manly reminded his readers of Churchill’s continued influence with Truman, even as a private citizen. Churchill, according to Manly, called for an alliance to save the UK and the rest of Europe from the ‘Red Peril’ that the Soviet Union presented. Manly presented the address as offering the world Truman’s options for the future in “dark and fearsome tones, imperiled by war and tyranny.”\textsuperscript{42} The ominous tone of Churchill’s speech, combined with Manly’s analysis of that tone, worked its way into the public opinion with that day’s publication. If the readership of the \textit{Tribune} had not interpreted Churchill’s speech as foreboding, the reporting of the speech disseminated the gloomy tone for them. Similar to other reports of the speech, Manly focused on Churchill’s call for an Anglo-American alliance, and also reported on Churchill’s intention to arm the UN with a combined military presence from each country. This combined presence included joint training and use of military facilities to protect against the possible spread of Communism.


Similar reporting came from William H. Stringer of the *Christian Science Monitor*. Stringer’s reporting included the same quotes in which Churchill calls for a U.S.-U.K. military alliance to counter possible Soviet expansion into Europe, as reported by other journalists. Stringer included that Churchill’s speech was the kind of “forthright speech that some Americans have wished to hear from their own officials.” Stringer’s reporting of the speech interprets Churchill’s call for an Anglo-American alliance to act as a “super guardian of the peace.” Stringer also focused on Churchill’s call against appeasement to prevent future conflict. Highlighting Churchill’s use of the term appeasement could have been an effort on the part of the Stringer to remind readers of British Prime Minster Neville Chamberlin’s failed appeasement efforts to ameliorate relations with Nazi Germany before World War II. Instead Stringer focuses on Churchill’s proposals which are centered on the military alliance as the primary method to counter expected Soviet expansion. Stringer uses the memory of Chamberlin’s failed appeasement to provide favorable context to Churchill’s proposals, which would not have been as well received without the memory of the failed appeasement effort with the Nazi’s. Advocating the militarization of the UN, Stringer reported Churchill’s assertion that the militarization of the UN should copy the command structures established by the Allied Powers during the war. Stringer concluded his article by highlighting the most menacing portion of the speech, in which Churchill cast doubt on Soviet intentions but reminded the reader of the unknown, “limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytizing

---

tendencies.” This article provides another instance of the negative reporting of Soviet intentions taken from Churchill’s speech being magnified by the newspapers and disseminated to the American public. This type of reporting helped to create the anti-Communist rhetoric that shifted the American public to viewing the Soviet Union as an enemy. Concurrently, as Churchill advocated, it helped government officials justify creating organizations devoted to fighting global Communist expansion.

Coverage from the Los Angeles Times followed similar themes of potential conflict with the Soviet Union. Times staff highlighted quotes from Churchill’s speech, addressing the American people’s accountability to ensure peace, warned the listeners of the Soviet desire for expansion, and promoted the armament of the UN to ensure peace.\textsuperscript{45} The selectiveness of the quotes suggests that the staff attempted to highlight the call to arms against the Soviets as the principal point of Churchill’s address. Of the twelve quotes selected, six contained a call to counter the Soviet Union, or presented the Soviets as being in opposition to the world-wide desire for peace. Additionally, five of the quotes emphasized U.S. responsibility to participate in the UN to achieve peace, and also to provide a military presence within the new organization. Senators from both sides of the aisle as well as some in attendance rejected Churchill’s ideas on the grounds that the United States was an independent nation, and therefore could not be tied that closely to the foreign policy of the United Kingdom in an attempt to maintain British imperialism while compromising the safety of the American people. Other Senators, in a bipartisan criticism, were wary of any binding alliances with any country in a united effort to make
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the UN work effectively. Although there were many detractors to Churchill’s address, several senators agreed with portions of his speech. Specifically, Senator Tom Connally of Texas agreed that nuclear secrets were best kept away from UN allies and Senator Edward V. Robertson called for close cooperation with the British to ensure success for the UN.46

National news coverage of Churchill’s Fulton, Missouri address at Westminster College was largely positive. The reporting of agreement with the former Prime Minister by both government leaders and private citizens lent credibility to Churchill’s words and in the coming days many articles would be published espousing similar ideas. The influence of Churchill’s speech cannot be denied in terms of how its anti-Communist rhetoric assisted in the reemergence of explicit anti-Communist discourse in the United States. The rhetoric within the State Department had already allowed for misperceptions of Soviet intent and dissemination of Churchill’s speech provided similar context for the American public to distrust Soviet actions.

Responses from members of the U.S. House of Representatives also varied in approval, or degrees thereof, with Churchill’s speech in Missouri. Congressman William Colmer (D) of Mississippi agreed wholeheartedly with Churchill’s position on the post-war political atmosphere, and noted that Churchill “deemed it wise and necessary to take the people of the world into his confidence.”47 Also, any action would require the American people to acquiesce to funding the rebuilding of Europe and blocking Soviet
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expansion into areas deemed vital to the United States, United Kingdom, or U.N. Colmer supported his claim by recounting his mission to Europe as a part of the House Subcommittee of the Postwar Economic Policy Committee. On this trip through Europe, which Colmer described as dismal, he witnessed what he characterized as a disregard for the UN charter, as well as “leaders of many of the small countries visited verily shaking in their boots” at the prospect of being devoured.⁴⁸ Congressman Colmer concluded his statement by agreeing with Secretary of State James Byrnes and Churchill’s view that the Soviet Union had to be countered by the UN to ensure peace in the post-war era.

Although there were differing opinions of the alliance with the United Kingdom, most Congressmen agreed with U.N. principles, but not of the need for an Anglo-American alliance. However, throughout the Cold War and into present day the special relationship between the United States and United Kingdom featured heavily in actions on the world stage. While some Congressmen likely agreed with Representative Colmer, some deviated on the subject of Churchillian plans for the future. Congressmen Ellis Patterson (D) of California, Jerry Voorhis (D) of California, Frederick C. Smith (R) of Ohio, and Charles R. Savage (D) of Washington all agreed with Churchill and Colmer for the need of the UN to ensure peace for the future. However, these Congressmen disagreed with Churchill because they denied the need for an Anglo-American alliance to police the world for the protection of democracy. Alternatively, the Congressmen argued that the Anglo-American alliance would likely result in increased hostilities between the West and the Soviet Union. The rationale behind this was that a return of power politics on the global stage would validate Soviet fears of alliances formed to diminish the Soviet
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influence around the world. Congressman Smith added a prophetic warning that a potential alliance with the United Kingdom would likely result in the people of the United States shouldering the burden of any future conflicts, with the Soviet Union or otherwise. Others, such as Congressman Andrew J. May (D) from Rhode Island agreed with the idea of UN action being the first option but added that an alliance with the United Kingdom would be necessary if the UN failed. The alliance with the United Kingdom was questionable for several reasons, but Congressman Hubert S. Ellis (R) from West Virginia and Robert F. Rich (R) from Pennsylvania both questioned the legitimacy of Churchill’s plea. Both Congressmen reminded their fellow legislators of the application for $4.5 billion loan from the United Kingdom and its connection to Churchill’s plea.

While support for the institutions like the UN and Marshall Plan would become commonplace during the Cold War, their mere existence was called into question during congressional remarks in the wake of Churchill’s address. The rhetoric in the government and in some parts society had not yet reached some members of the U.S. Congress. While the discourse in the State Department had for the most part shifted to view the Soviet Union as a threat other government discourse had not. Representative Ellis remarked that the presence of a domineering Stalin was no great news and that Churchill’s effort to stir the American public was an effort to ensure passage of the British loan. Congressman Rich echoed similar sentiments. Rich voiced worries about the burden the American people would feel as a result of non-payment, which according to Rich became a common occurrence.49 Other Congressmen like Representative Savage were against an

49 United States House of Representatives, “Congressional Record 03/06/1946.”
alliance with Britain but favored the UN. Also, Savage dismissed Soviet expansion as
the same type of activities that the United States engaged in around islands in the Pacific
Ocean.\textsuperscript{50} Congressman Savage’s outlook demonstrates that Churchill’s rhetoric was
largely ineffective in swaying his outlook that saw American expansion in the Pacific
Ocean as being the same as the creation of Soviet spheres of influence in eastern Europe
after World War II. In a similar sentiment, Congressman Dirksen of Illinois read a list of
headlines from the news over the last seven months. The list included a dozen instances
of anti-British riots, Soviet aggression or espionage, and terrorism happening around the
world. He mentioned these news headlines to critique Churchill’s push for the UN to
protect a future peace when in fact, peace had not been obtained to begin with. He
concluded his remarks by saying, “As I read Churchill’s speech, I could only think:
Peace, it’s wonderful.”\textsuperscript{51} Within these several Congressmen’s remarks the sentiment of
anti-Communism is present; however, there was still some reluctance to see the Soviet
desire for spheres of influence as a threat to the United States.

U.S. public response to Winston Churchill’s speech in Fulton, Missouri was
mixed in many ways. This is because the discourse in American society did not yet
reflect the rhetoric that Churchill employed in his speech. Letters to the editor and other
submissions from the American public demonstrate the discourse that was present at the
time of the speech and how the public reacted to Churchill’s words. This insight helps to
highlight that shift. From across the United States, people weighed in with their opinion
of Churchill’s call to action. These responses show some examples of the U.S. public’s
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perception of Churchill’s historic speech. While not indicative of all Americans, these responses help to illuminate the national discourse in the infancy of the Cold War.

In the “Letters to the Editor” section of The Washington Post on 8 March 1946, John Eddy penned a critical response to Churchill’s address. In his piece, Eddy congratulated the veracity of Senator Claude D. Pepper’s (D) response to the speech. The Washington Post author also questioned the legitimacy of Churchill’s opinion, given Churchill’s loss of political office. Eddy declared Churchill a warmonger and suggested that Americans should declare independence from British rule for a second time. Eddy’s submission is not only vehemently against Churchill, but is critical of Truman for his support of the former Prime Minister, rhetorically asking who was actually the President of the United States. Additionally, Eddy’s interpretation is that a militaristic response to the Soviet Union should not be the American policy. Eddy identified the similar feelings of other Americans that were weary of any potential conflicts not directly related to the United States.

In the 8 March 1946 issue of the New York Times, Richard S. Williams and Alfred Losch also penned letters to the editor in response. Williams’ letter calls into question the 6 March editorial, which according to Williams placed too much emphasis on an Anglo-American alliance and not enough on Churchill’s suspicion of the Russians. Williams wrote that, “if our foreign policy and the tenor of public opinion…are to be governed by such a suspicion of Russia, then the future is indeed black.”

---

interaction with the Soviet Union is warranted given that “some of Russia’s recent action
do appear unwarrantedly expansionist and aggressive,” but he reminded readers that there
had always been suspicions of Communist countries. Williams advocated for Americans
to “not blindly follow our nation’s judgment on what regimes and parties are in the right
without ascertaining the facts as carefully as possible and then making our decision on
the basis of what regime affords the greatest degree of democracy.”

Williams called on the American people to judge Soviet actions independently of history or current events. Essentially what Williams called for was Americans to consider the Soviet Union in the context of the discourse society had provided. Because the discourse was formed by the motives and rhetoric of the influential leaders, Williams wanted to discard this and judge the actions of the Soviet Union based on the perception of Americans in the present.

Williams essentially proposed the creation of an alternate reality based on a limited
national discourse. Referring to Churchill’s address as an unfortunate incident, Williams charged Churchill with threatening the relationship built between the United States and the Soviet Union at a time when peace could be attainable. Conversely, Alfred Losch of New York responded to Churchill’s speech with glowing remarks. Losch declared Churchill’s words worthy of requirement for all school-age children, giving it similar status to America’s founding documents. In his letter to the editor, Losch gave Churchill near omnipotent status in terms of international politics and advocated for an Anglo-American alliance before it became too late. Additionally, Losch called for greater

---

cooperation to increase American influence globally, not just for our benefit, but for all of mankind.\textsuperscript{55}

Demonstrating Churchill’s lack of attachment to the consensus feeling in America after the war, letters sent to the editors of major newspapers demonstrate the American discourse regarding Churchill’s plea for international cooperation between the United States and United Kingdom. Another criticism of Churchill’s speech is found in Larry Frommer’s 8 March letter to the editor of \textit{The Washington Post}. In the 11 March issue, Frommer compared Churchill to Greek sophists, “who were more adroit than truthful in their reasoning.”\textsuperscript{56} Frommer continued by pointing out potential problems created by Churchill’s insistence that the Soviet Union was a menace to peace. Also, the author questioned whether Churchill’s motive was concerned with the global spread of Communism or actually the threat of Soviet incursion into the United Kingdom. Frommer argued that the use of alliances against the Soviet Union would only “hasten her building of spheres of influence,” that the United States should instead “show Russia we are willing to cooperate despite varying political philosophies.”\textsuperscript{57} Some Americans called for cooperation with the Soviet Union rather than alliance with the United Kingdom to counter Communist aggression; however, other Americans also penned letters alleging desperation on the part of Truman and Churchill.

A contributor only known as C.D.E. wrote to \textit{The Washington Post} on 7 March to air his or her displeasure with Churchill’s address. The author regretted that Truman

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
would sponsor the former prime minister’s address to the crowd at Westminster College, remarking that “if he (Truman) wants to test his anti-Soviet views on the public, Truman might more honestly present them through Admiral Leahy.”58 The anonymous author seems to take issue with the anti-Soviet nature of the address, but also the use of Churchill to initiate the discussion. The dislike of Churchill and his rhetoric was not limited to the United States. Reports of Churchill’s rhetoric were criticized equally by the very people he sought to demonize.

Opinions of Churchill’s speech were reported from all across the globe. The response from the leaders in the Soviet Union was particularly informative reaction in the Communist world to Churchill’s rhetoric.59 However, it is important to note that the Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) reports were filed by the CIG and later CIA. Because of this, the analysis of Soviet sources is prejudiced by biases that the intelligence organizations held against the Soviet Union. This Amero-centric analysis potentially acted as confirmation bias of their own preconceived notions of Soviet intent or ways of thinking. Despite the potential issues with the translations and intent of Soviet media, the reports provided the American government with some sense of the rhetoric that the Soviet people received from their government. PRAVDA’s response to the Churchill speech characterized the former Prime Minister’s words as saber rattling,

59 I am aware of some of the limitations of this thesis. This work exclusively examines the United States and the exploration of rhetoric in the post-war period is limited to the American discourses. While the U.S.S.R. was a major component of the Cold War it is not the focus of this study. The focus of this thesis is to examine the effect of rhetoric on the discourses in the United States and the resulting creation of the national security state to address the discourse of anti-Communism in the post-war era.
according to the Foreign Broadcast Information Service’s (FBIS) daily reports of foreign news from Moscow, for 11 March 1946. FBIS, a holdover component of OSS, provided the Central Intelligence Group and President Truman with foreign news reports. Because PRAVDA was the official newspaper of the Communist party that reported on foreign policy issues, this report provided Truman some idea of the possible discourses in Soviet society and within the government. PRAVDA characterized Churchill’s speech as being unsuccessful in the United States and in Churchill’s United Kingdom, alleging that the statesman had “overreached himself” in his attempts to rally for an Anglo-American alliance. Moreover, PRAVDA’s editorial called Churchill “the pioneer of the anti-Soviet campaigns and chief organizer of the armed intervention against the Soviet Union,” yet added that during World War II, Churchill “posed as a friend of the soviet people and (expressed confidence) in the Soviet-British friendship.” Presenting Churchill not as a former ally, but as the primary belligerent world leader against Communism, the PRAVDA editorial presented Churchill’s call for an Anglo-American alliance with the United States as a threat to the Soviet people. The PRAVDA editorial highlighted the threatening points of Churchill’s address in Fulton, alleging that he was “experienced enough to cover these intentions and plans with loud phrases of democracy, peace, and the brotherhood of Nations, but one need only read his speech to see how false and hypocritical are these phrases— ‘expansionist tendencies of the Soviet Union,’ ‘iron
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curtain,’… ‘the shadow from the East’—words poisoned with hatred against true democracy.”

The editorial attempted to reveal Churchill’s objective as being corrective to Soviet eastern European influence following the war. *PRAVDA* vehemently denied Churchill’s allegation of Soviet influence against European states and subversion of democracy by the Soviet Union. The editorial alleged that “Churchill does not say what he means, what he actually tries to do is to suggest the idea of the inevitability of a new war...he is instigating that war...a war against the Soviet Union.” Despite possible interpretations to the contrary, the editorial staff at *PRAVDA* believed that Churchill called for conflict between Western democracies and the Soviet Union. Additionally, the editorial argued that the main premise of Churchill’s speech was to create an Anglo-American alliance that would be an alliance formed with the sole objective of countering the Soviet Union and what Churchill called its desire for “the fruits of victory and indefinite expansion of its power and doctrines.” Always the consummate statesman, Churchill’s choice of language for this speech provided evidence for Soviet fear of the outside world. Churchill’s rhetoric not only fed Soviet fears, but it also bolstered American calls from both the government and the public to counter the possible threat of Soviet expansion. The reporting from *PRAVDA* is important because it gives insight into how the State Department and the rest of the U.S. government perceived the Soviet interpretation of Churchill’s address. This is problematic however, because the FBIS

---
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reports were processed and interpreted by CIG who had potential to present the
information as confirmation of previous biases or downplay the significance of Soviet
opinion based on the prominent discourses in CIG.

Two days later the Overseas Information Service reported on Soviet historian
Eugene Tarle’s thoughts on Churchill’s speech for *Investia*, the newspaper of the Soviet
government responsible for reporting on foreign policy issues. Tarle’s article is
summarized with the most important parts translated and transmitted for consumption by
the United States State Department and other agencies. Tarle began his discourse by
remarking that diplomacy, whether practiced well or poorly, was largely inconsequential.
Most important, according to Tarle, was the reason for engaging in diplomacy in the first
place. According to Tarle, Churchill spoke at Fulton to present the Soviet Union as a
threat to the United States and the United Kingdom because of the divergent ideologies
and the Soviet subjugation of Eastern Europe. Because of this threat to liberty presented
by Soviet expansion and propaganda, Tarle argued that Churchill advocated for an anti-
Soviet alliance. Tarle continued his examination of Churchill’s address and noted errors
in the former prime minister’s statements. The author took care to address the role of
counties, like the United Kingdom, which interfered in the domestic affairs of countries
which did not suffer defeat during World War II. Countries such as Greece, according to
Tarle, did not suffer defeat during the war; however, Tarle writes that “you used tommy
guns and even naval artillery in order to force upon the Greek people the hated regime of
the fascist Monarch…justified by saying that Greece was an important position for
Britain.” Tarle’s accusation that the United Kingdom violated or interfered with the
democratic processes of Greece helped highlight the hypocritical nature of Churchill’s
address, in which the former prime minister accused the Soviets of aggressive imperialist tendencies. Tarle continued to speak out against Churchill’s claims and recalled the Soviet losses suffered during World War II. Tarle claimed that Churchill was incapable of sympathy for the Soviet people and their suffering and that this prevented him from being able to understand the need for peace on the European continent.65

The subject of Tarle’s address turned from the former prime minister to the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The purpose of recollecting Soviet-American relations was not only to highlight the similarities in the arts, culture and developments in the sciences, but also to remind readers of the loyalty shared between the two countries in times of need. Tarle recounted Russian actions during the American Civil War and the support shown for the Union, while the United Kingdom and France supported the South and its agricultural exports. Despite these good cultural relations, Tarle wrote, there remained an inability until 1933 to establish productive foreign relations. The author hypothesized that reactionary forces in the American government were responsible for the “support of intervention against the young Soviet Republic,” adding that “now Russian-American relations have again begun to assume their traditionally friendly nature…the common struggle against a brutal enemy, drew us even more closely together.”66 The academic then turned his attention back to Churchill, and questioned the goals of the former prime minister’s speech. Tarle posited that the speech was a propaganda-filled attempt to “trample upon political ties, and to address the

Russian people and all the peoples of the U.S.S.R. with ultimatums and with threats of the latest type of a single designed weapon.”67 Because Tarle was such a trusted Soviet academic, his thoughts on Soviet-American-Anglo relations would carry a great significance with the Soviet people. Many normal Soviet citizens, still weary of World War II, would likely interpret his words as truth, and in fact Churchill did damage relations between the U.S.S.R. and United States.

Tarle continued his interpretation with Churchill’s charge that the Soviet Union was responsible for spreading Communism to a large part of Europe and Asia. According to Tarle, Churchill’s address alleged the real threat to peace was the spread of Communist ideology. Either by influencing elections in the Balkan Peninsula, or attempting to tamper with Greek elections, the Soviet Union held responsibility for the subversion of democracy. Additionally, Tarle posited that Churchill believed, despite evidence to the contrary, that “even if the U.S.S.R. were not spreading its ideas openly, it wanted to spread them secretly,” presumably with the goal of extending its iron curtain. Also, Tarle related Churchill’s belief that the Soviet Union would only respect aggressive statecraft or force over conciliatory diplomatic tactics. Tarle countered these assertions. He remarked that even the world press acknowledged “that such a challenge, were it successful, would acutely aggravate the already tense situation.” The continued advocacy of aggression towards the U.S.S.R. was not a popular stance, even among members of Churchill’s own party, Tarle reminded. Concluding his piece, the Soviet academic recalled the great price paid by the Soviet people during the war to save both the continent and the United Kingdom from Nazi Germany. Tarle remarked that “the Soviet

Union, experienced such bloodcurdling horrors as were never dreamed of in those parts of Western Europe that suffered most,” and as a result they could not abide any potential foreign aggression. Tarle reasserted that “nothing could irritate the Russian people more than an attempt to frighten them,” which seemed to largely be the point of Churchill’s address.68

Tarle seemed to serve as the national consciousness for the Soviet people. His analysis of Churchill’s speech examined each point made by the elder statesman in a relatively unbiased fashion, leaving the reader to question Churchill’s aggressive stance. If the intention of the Fulton speech was to provoke the Soviet Union then perhaps Churchill was successful, especially with his call for firm aggressiveness in foreign policy, according to Tarle’s article. Churchill’s repeated calls for international peace, either through the U.N. or by an Anglo-American alliance, became outweighed by the aggressiveness that he advocated. Tarle’s response, as well as that of the previous day’s PRAVDA editorial, highlighted the potential error in Churchill’s analysis and the worsening of relations between the three countries leading to the use of the remaining, or rebuilding, intelligence services.

The discourse in the government was partially formed from analysis of Soviet news reports, a primary source of this information for non-Russian speaking Americans was the FBIS daily translation of Soviet news. On 14 March, Stalin provided his insights on Churchill’s speech to a correspondent from PRAVDA. In this interview Stalin clarified for the Soviet people his perception of the intentions of Churchill’s speech in a question

and answer setting with the newspaper of the political party to which he was not only a member, but also the General Secretary, its highest leader. It is highly likely that the questions were chosen in advance with Stalin’s approval so that he could refute or address any of Churchill’s claims that he wished. The correspondent began by questioning Churchill’s effect on the peace and security of the world given the former prime minister’s inflammatory remarks. Stalin responded that Churchill had indeed occupied the position of a warmonger, but was not alone because of his following in the United States. Stalin compared Churchill and his followers to Hitler and the Nazis, and legitimized his claim by recalling the racial theory espoused by Hitler, which he alleged was then advanced by Churchill’s calls for a uniting of English-language nations against Communism. Stalin’s use of Hitler and the Nazis as evil incarnate was a tool used in similar fashion in the United States because of the intense feelings evoked by the memory of World War II. That memory helped to form the discourse in the Soviet Union, the intense fear of the Nazi’s due to the massive loss of lives during war, was transferred from Nazi Germany to all democracies to intensify the opposition to Churchill’s call for an Anglo-American alliance.

Stalin’s stance depicted Churchill as the aggressor, much as Churchill’s speech did to Stalin. The Soviet leader admitted that he was unable to reconcile parts of Churchill’s speech calling for an extension of the Soviet-British Treaty of Mutual Aid and Collaboration, but that Churchill also appealed for conflict against the U.S.S.R..

---

Stalin remarked that “one cannot take seriously the false declarations of Mr. Churchill’s friends in England in regard to the extension of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty.”

Although Churchill remained out of the government, Stalin still gave significant weight to the statesman’s words and assumed that Churchill spoke for the English-speaking world. This assumption, conveyed to the Soviet people, needlessly declared the treaty as null, as Stalin declared that the English leaders believed the treaty to be “a scrap of paper.” The correspondent then transitioned to the topic of Churchill’s questioning of Soviet interference in the democratic processes of countries in areas of interest to the Soviet Union. Stalin began his response by calling the claim “slanderous and in parts it is rude and lacking in tact.” Additionally, his responses dispelled Churchill’s notions of the supposed expansive behavior of the Soviet Union and the notion that Stalin exerted control over all of the Eastern European nations.

Churchill’s criticism of the expansionistic tendencies of the Soviet Union were not completely unfounded, however his rhetoric failed to understand the Soviet motivations for their actions. Stalin admitted to Soviet control in some European countries, such as Austria and Germany, via postwar agreements to administer governments in former Nazi-held areas. The Soviet leader then recounted the events leading up to Germany’s invasion of the Soviet Union, saying “they were able to invade us through those countries because Governments hostile to the U.S.S.R. were in power.” This resulted in great losses for the Soviet people, Stalin explained, which validated his assertion that it was natural for the U.S.S.R. “to secure itself from the danger for the
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future…to see that in those countries there should be Governments whose attitude to the
U.S.S.R. was a loyal one.”\(^\text{72}\)

This passage solidified the fear within the American and British government of
Soviet interference in democratic processes with Stalin’s admission of intent to influence
governments in Finland, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. While not an outright
admission of making them puppet states to the Soviet Union, Stalin’s choice of words, or
potentially the interpretation of them, signaled to foreign leaders that there was a need to
be wary of Soviet influence of sovereign governments in Europe. Stalin attempted to
explain away the increase in Communist governments by claiming the strength of the
Communist system whose growth “represents a natural phenomenon based on the laws of
development,” rather than forced implementation of a Communist government
subservient to Moscow.

Concluding his interview, Stalin addressed Churchill’s desire to block the
“natural” development of Communism in Eastern Europe. Additionally, Stalin
recollected the opposition to the Soviet regime after World War I, when Churchill then
too attempted to, as Stalin says, “organize a military expedition of 14 states against
Russia,” which ended unsuccessfully.\(^\text{73}\) Stalin concluded by questioning the formation of
another alliance against the Communist cause, but guaranteed the results of such alliance
would meet a similar fate. The publicity the interview received demonstrated its
importance. FBIS reported that Stalin’s response was announced several times in advance
of airing on the radio and printed in the press.\(^\text{74}\)
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In the preceding year the rhetoric used in speeches by Churchill and responses from Stalin would be played out in civil wars and other crises around the world. One year after Churchill’s address to the American public, President Harry S. Truman would address the United States Congress to appeal for aid to war-torn Greece and Turkey, and to present the foreign policy of his administration, all of which increased tensions with the Soviet Union. Along with this increase in tensions came a wider acceptance in American society to the expansion of the national security state in the effort against Communism. In his address to a joint session of Congress, President Truman requested assistance be granted to Greece and Turkey to protect U.S. national security. Also, Truman used the opportunity to present his foreign policy objectives, which would later be known as the Truman Doctrine, to the Congress and the American public. Although the speech was delivered on home soil, the intended audience included the rest of the world as well. Influenced by his interactions with the Soviet Union and the prevailing discourse on Communism provided by others in the U.S. government, Truman outlined his plan for the United States to ensure the freedom and integrity of other counties against aggressive totalitarian governments. By doing so he fueled a shift in the national discourse by explicitly providing support to other countries against totalitarian regimes. This change in the national discourse marked a return of Communist fear in the U.S. where the Soviet Union was now considered the primary threat to democracy. The new discourse therefore necessitated the expansion of the national security state to protect the United States from the spread of Communism.

The language used in President Truman’s address meant to convey not just the gravity of the situation to the American people, but to warn the world of the current threat
to democracy worldwide. Truman began his speech by linking the effectiveness of American foreign policy and national security to the survival of Greece as a free and democratic state. By March 1947, Greece suffered economically and had few possibilities for post-war recovery. Truman’s unfounded belief was that unrest formed by a militant minority and the Greek government’s plea to the United States centered on the elimination of political chaos. Truman and his advisors believed political chaos stunted economic recovery by exploiting the needs of the Greek people. This exploitation created miserable conditions in which the governments of totalitarian regimes could then come to power. Truman presented his plea for assistance to Greece as a humanitarian effort to ensure that the country would become a stable democratic government in the Mediterranean region. Perceptions of the Soviet Union shifted as a result of the new anti-Communist discourse presented to society. This allowed Truman’s plea for assistance and subsequent signature foreign policy doctrine to not only persuade the American public of the need to combat Communism, but also seems to have convinced Americans of the need to create the national security apparatus to do so.

Addressing the joint session of Congress provided the president with an opportunity to present a new foreign policy platform for the administration and the country. Truman began by stating that one of the U.S. government’s primary objectives was to create “conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of
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life free from coercion.” 78 The subject of coercion arose from Soviet use of armed men to influence Greek society. Truman highlighted the role of the UN in the effort to stop the coercion of free people in choosing their governments. Failure, according to Truman, would result if the United States was unwilling “to help free peoples to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements that seek to impose upon them totalitarian regimes.” 79 This had long been a central tenet of American policy, to protect the freedom of self-determination and to foster democratic institutions of government for sovereign states. Truman’s reiteration of Wilsonian ideas helped to solidify the intent of the U.S. government in the effort to combat the infiltration of Communist ideology into free capitalist societies. He specifically mentioned the failure to prevent the coercion of free people in violation of the Yalta agreement. Governments in Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria suffered from coercion and intimidation from the Soviet Union and established Communist governments that were sympathetic to or received direction from Moscow. 80

Truman, posing in effect as protector of democracy for the world, created an American foreign policy that would last for decades and forever alter international relations when he stated that “it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.” 81 This promise to the free peoples of the world would be put to task over the course of the Cold War, but initially Truman presented the plan as an economic stabilizer.
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Truman believed that economic stability would promote social stability and therefore normalize the electoral process by removing economic strife. The economic tension led to the acceptance of Communist ideology and provided a base for violent minorities to launch attacks. The protection of democracy was of vital importance for Truman, not only because it helped the United States, but because it supported the ideas and values of the UN and its foundational charter. Also, Truman believed that the survival, especially of the Greek and Turkish states, was paramount to both the European and Middle Eastern regions. Although the specific term was not officially coined until much later, what Truman described was a “domino effect” that would reverberate throughout the world if democracy fell in these two countries. The rationale for this idea found justification in the assertion that other countries in Europe would not take up the struggle for democracy if the stronger democratic states neglected to assist in the fight for freedom and independence while also repairing the scars of war. It was in that spirit that Truman appealed to Congress for appropriations to assist Greece and Turkey with economic, administrative, and military aid in addition to civilian and military personnel to help with the immense mission of rebuilding in the aftermath of World War II.

In closing, Truman declared that “the seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life had died. We must keep that hope alive.” With the acceptance of the American public, President Truman’s declaration officially shifted the foreign policy of the United States. The discourse of
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anti-Communism that steadily grew within the American government began with Kennan’s “Long Telegram” and continued with Churchill’s “Iron Curtain” speech. The discourse gained considerable momentum, however, with the introduction of the Truman Doctrine, and would reach full realization with a broader, more far-reaching Marshall Plan organized in 1947.

Truman’s correspondence with his family in the days after the introduction of the National Security Act and speech to Congress for aid to Greece and Turkey demonstrated a continual preoccupation with the Soviet Union that in previous letters had been quickly mentioned or an afterthought. In a 14 March letter, written from Key West, Truman related the ongoing important matters at the forefront of his mind, including the Soviet threat. He added that “it was a terrific step to take and one I’ve been worrying about ever since Marshall took over the State Dept. Our very first conversation was what to do about Russia in China, Korea and the Near East.”

Truman and his Secretary of State George C. Marshall, since his January 1947 appointment to the State Department, had focused on the question of what to do about the Soviets and the increasing struggle for global influence. The preoccupation with world peace and countering the Soviet influence in China, Korea, and the Near East indicated that the animosity between the U.S. and Soviet Union had begun in earnest.

Marshall’s promotion in January 1947 marked a change in U.S. foreign policy in the early stage of the Cold War, as highlighted by his 5 June 1947 address at Harvard’s commencement ceremony. Marshall’s choice of language was very different in
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comparison to Truman’s address to Congress for support for Greece and Turkey. Unlike Truman, Marshall made no mention of Communism, instead using the opportunity to speak plainly to the attentive crowd and American public about the need to rebuild Europe. The choice of rhetoric served to limit the possible antagonization of the Soviet Union to the Marshall Plan, getting Soviet leadership to participate in the program would have been viewed as a success, and to present the program as a benevolent action on the part of the United States. Marshall began by recounting the situation in Europe and the seriousness of its countries’ need to reconstruct the cities and economies. The Secretary of State explained the cause of confusion in the reconstruction of Europe and the complications of the peace process. But most importantly, Marshall’s narrative hinged on basic business and economic principals of consumption, trade, and trust in investments that the audience, in the aftermath of World War II, would understand as being vital to any developed country. Marshall continued, stating that the economic situation in Europe was inexorably linked with the economy of the United States. Because of the intertwined economies, Marshall said, “it is logical that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace.”

While not explicitly addressing the Soviet Union and the spread of Communism and Europe, Marshall reiterated President Truman’s remarks from months earlier. U.S. government commitment, at least in terms of the language used, was undeniably forceful and proactive in terms of dealing with the Soviet Union on the world stage. While this
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had been fueled by the rhetoric of Churchill and Kennan in 1946, now in 1947, Truman and Marshall used similar rhetoric in the formation of U.S. foreign policy. In terms of rhetoric, Marshall’s address outlined U.S. foreign policy goals of restoring economic health, saying: “our policy is directed...against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos.” Marshall explained the goal of promoting “the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist.” His language choice is noteworthy because it evokes the rhetoric used by Franklin D. Roosevelt in his 6 January 1941, Four Freedoms speech. Marshall’s choice of “hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos” is similar enough to Roosevelt’s calls for freedoms from want, and freedom from fear.

This choice of language would have been familiar to Americans at the time and added to the discourse presented by Churchill at Westminster and President Truman in his address to Congress. Furthermore, it was their rhetoric, supported by assertions posited by Kennan, that resulted in Marshall’s address in the Summer of 1947, as well as the introduction of the National Security Act of 1947 a few months earlier in March.

Marshall, in a rare moment of outward anti-Communist rhetoric, solidified the position of the State Department by stating that any opponents to European recovery, “governments, political parties or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States.” With this passage Marshall declared the position of his tenure as Secretary of State and his role in the Marshall Plan. This legislation resulted in the creation of integral parts of the future

---

national security apparatus as it is known today, however the legacy of the Marshall Plan also included subverting basic principles of democracy in order to counter Communism.

This chapter argued that the anti-Communist rhetoric employed by Churchill, Kennan, and Truman held such weight with the American people that a shift in the reality of post-war period became possible. The resulting shift in the discourse, or the way in which Americans conceived their world, also resulted in a shift in the alliance with the Soviet Union. This shift in the discourse is further demonstrated in the next chapter in which the formation of the national security state and intelligence apparatus highlight the reality of the post-war world which fostered the Cold War.
III. THE NEW REALITY

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the creation of the U.S. national security state and subsidiary intelligence apparatus, which satisfied a perceived necessity to combat the spread and influence of Communism. The goal of the anti-Communist discourse in the United States was to protect democracy in governments around the world as well as to evade Communist subversion domestically. Similar to the pre-World War discourse, the discourse of the Cold War justified the creation of the intelligence apparatus to fight American enemies at all costs. The discourse of anti-Communism justified a greater devotion to the cause. This discourse resulted in both the American government and public approving the expansion of the military and intelligence organizations. This is important because it demonstrates the result of intense rhetoric on seemingly cherished customs and traditions that Americans valued.

This chapter explores how the gradual shifts in the national discourse result in complementary shifts in the reality of that society. In this chapter Lynn’s model shows American society adjusting to changes in the American discourse of anti-Communism. In the first instance the discourse shifted to allow the expansion of the national security state with the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. The second and more extreme example of a shift in the reality of the post-war period came from the formation of the Office of Policy Coordination (OPC). Because of the lack of oversight from the rest of the national security state that OPC enjoyed the organization was an example of an extreme shift in the reality of post-war America. This chapter examines the founding documents of the intelligence apparatus as well as memos and correspondence. These documents, in addition to showing the language of the creation of the national security
state, demonstrate the capabilities of American intelligence agencies in terms of effecting change in other countries irrespective of the democratic process in those countries. These documents show that OPC and later OSO had, from their inception, the permission from the U.S. government to subvert democracy if that would aid national security at home. This represents a notable and swift change in discourse in comparison to what would have been acceptable just a few years previous.

Participation in the “global fight for democracy,” also known as World War II, necessitated the formation of a wartime intelligence organization known as the Office of Strategic Services (OSS); however, in post-war America such an organization no longer had apparent use according to traditional U.S. discourse. Post-war sentiment in the United States generally called for the demobilization of wartime organizations and a return to normalcy. Following the war, President Truman, U.S. Congressmen, and the public feared that a permanent intelligence agency would create a Gestapo-like organization similar to that of Nazi Germany.¹ This fear became clear from newspaper reports months before the end of the war.

The fear of a domestic intelligence service appeared on 9 February 1945 in Walter Trohan’s article in the Chicago Tribune. Trohan’s article, titled “New Deal Plans Super Spy System: Sleuths Would Snoop on U.S. And The World,” published a memo drafted by General Donovan for President Roosevelt in November 1944. According to Trohan, the memo called for the creation of a permanent peacetime intelligence agency

subordinate to the president, which would have authority over all other government agencies. In his analysis, Trohan alleged that Donovan’s recommendation would have resulted in the director of this proposed organization having the ability to “determine American foreign policy by…coloring information” that was collected, and “permit spying at home and (the) employment of the police powers of existing agencies whenever needed.”"² His analysis of Donovan’s memo was unquestionably skeptical of the proposed organization and the powers proposed for its operation.

Trohan’s analysis fueled skepticism of intelligence collection, as well as the methods proposed to collect intelligence domestically. Trohan highlighted the ability of the proposed organization to order pre-existing agencies like the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to operate within the United States. Departing from standard practice, the FBI would report to General Donovan’s proposed organization instead of Director J. Edgar Hoover at the FBI. While this type of proposal proved to be problematic in terms of media coverage, the article also contained a particularly damning piece of analysis that, if consumed by the Soviet Union, could prove to be detrimental to the hopes of post-war peace. Trohan commented that Donovan’s proposal indicated “that neither Mr. Roosevelt nor Gen. Donovan expects the end of the war to usher in an era of perpetual peace.”³ While this might have been true, the printing of this article might also have served as confirmation for the Soviet Union that the United States presented a future threat with the proposal of a peacetime intelligence service. Soviet specialists such as

---

Kennan and Bohlen communicated the suspicious nature of the Soviet government, but a report like this could confirm Soviet suspicion of American involvement in European and Soviet affairs.

The publication of General Donovan’s 18 November 1944 memo to President Roosevelt, which recommended the creation of a centralized peacetime intelligence service, in the midst of the Yalta Conference, might have been detrimental to the post-war peace process and the relations between allies. The potential for misinterpretation by the Soviets was significant. Most importantly, Trohan’s article is significant because he presents Donovan’s proposed agency as being in direct opposition to the democratic ideas for which the United States had been fighting in World War II. Trohan’s allegations that the proposed spy agency would subvert democracy by setting its own foreign policy seemed plausible to readers. Therefore, the article could have rallied public opinion against any proposal like the one that Donovan advanced and kept the growth of the national security state stunted for a little longer.

Trohan was not alone in questioning the democratic nature of Donovan’s proposed peacetime intelligence agency; opposition was made clear in Trohan’s subsequent article containing Congressional opinion on Donovan’s proposal. Responses to Trohan’s 9 February article came quickly from congressmen in Washington D.C. Trohan himself doubled down on his accusations by likening the proposal to Nazi Germany’s Gestapo or the Soviet Union’s OGPU. Democratic Senator Edwin Johnson (D) from Colorado and Republican Senator Harlan Bushfield (R) from South Dakota both

---

4 Both organizations were the secret police agencies charged with the domestic security of their respective countries.
echoed Trohan’s remarks regarding the similarities to the Soviet and Nazi systems to that of Donovan’s proposal to Roosevelt. Other Republican Senators, like Edward Moore (R) from Oklahoma, Homer Capehart (R) from Indiana, and Kenneth Wherry (R) from Nebraska, all spoke against the proposal on the grounds that this was simply another concentration of power by the executive branch of the government and that the US government already had sufficient intelligence capabilities without additional bureaucracy. House of Representatives members had similar complaints regarding the undemocratic nature of such a proposed organization. Republican Representatives from Michigan, Paul Shafer (R) and Clare Hoffman (R) both accused the President and General Donovan of creating an organization similar to the Gestapo, and suggested the proposal could be the beginning of a turn towards totalitarianism similar to the turn Germany took with Hitler and the Nazi’s.

Representative Leo Allen, a Republican from Illinois, perhaps summed up the mood of many Congressmen to the proposal. Allen responded that he was “determinedly opposed to the introduction into this country of any of the totalitarian concepts which millions of our men are fighting overseas. I am confident that congress will bar any super-Gestapo at home and will view with suspicion any move to take…intelligence away from the Army, Navy, and State Departments.”5 In two sentences Representative Allen echoed the opinion of many Americans who supported freedom and democracy but were fearful of governmental oversight by an agency that had previously been used in other countries to spy on the populace. Also, comparisons to anything possibly related to

Nazis would not be received well because of the fear the Nazi regime inspired and because their actions were largely in contravention of the basic ideas of democracy that Americans valued. However, one element to the criticism is particularly noteworthy. While American legislators and the American public were wary of Nazi-like organizations, Senator Bushfield’s recounting of the Soviet domestic intelligence service, the OGPU, made it seem as if he were nearly envious of the Soviets and their domestic intelligence service. At this point in the war, the US government largely still accepted the Soviet Union as an ally for the long haul in the quest for perpetual peace. This sentiment led many, Truman included, to begin planning for the re-organization of the government and demobilization of many agencies like OSS. The dismantling and re-distribution of war-time organizations indicated that some government leaders believed in the U.S.-U.S.S.R. alliance. However, because others in the government would not allow the vast networks and capabilities built during the war to be wasted, parts of OSS would survive. Trohan’s article and the Congressional response to the article demonstrate the discourses that did not see the Soviets as a dangerous enough threat to justify an overarching national security apparatus.

While Trohan’s article provided transparency into the innerworkings of the government, the author’s use of language presented many problems. As one can see in the author’s use of assumption and supposition, Trohan assumes that “neither Mr. Roosevelt nor General Donovan expects the end of the war to usher in an era of perpetual peace.”6 Although this might have been true, Trohan’s article does not substantiate the claim. Additionally, the authors use of terms such as ‘super-spy’ implied that the

---

proposed agency would gain domestic policing responsibility. However, as the memo was published, there was not any mention of domestic policing. Trohan’s disingenuous report of Donovan’s memo to President Roosevelt not only gave the American people a false sense of the proposed post-war world, but also gave world leaders a false sense of U.S. intentions. This would have been especially true for the Soviet Union, well known during the Yalta Conference for suspicion of allies as well as enemies.

Three months after Trohan’s article on 24 May, President Truman appealed to Congress for legislation that gave him the power to re-organize the government. The next day’s report from Bertram D. Hulen of the New York Times reported the request as being “based on the need of dealing efficiently with war-time organizations and also with the permanent agencies.” While the article did not mention any particular agency, the legislation proposed gave the president control “of any form of organizational adjustment, large or small, for which necessity may arise.” While this legislation did not seem significant, it did give the president the authority to restructure the government, including removing the parts that he or others feared, such as OSS.

Despite success during WWII, concerns regarding the presence of OSS in the post-war era loomed. In a letter from Truman to Donovan sent on 20 September 1945, Truman expressed appreciation for the work that OSS did during the war. Along with Truman’s gratitude for service was notification that OSS would continue the process of dissolution into nonexistence. Despite President Truman’s congratulations to Donovan

---

9 Prior to Japanese surrender, OSS had already begun liquidation of wartime activities not needed during peacetime, according to Truman’s letter to Donovan.
for a job well done, the reality and discourse of post-war U.S. society called for an end to OSS. Truman’s letter to Donovan marked the end of the OSS leader’s career as intelligence chief of the army, but as proclaimed in the letter, parts of OSS that Donovan built would not disappear forever. Moreover, the letter shows Truman’s desire to disassemble the wartime services, but unwillingness to do away with parts he found valuable. Most importantly, Truman’s language demonstrated a feeling of accomplishment in the success of the war. This feeling of accomplishment supported discourses that viewed the United States as having the dominant position in world affairs, therefore making an intelligence agency unnecessary. This message to Donovan was not the only communication sent on 20 September regarding OSS; Truman would also issue a presidential order authorizing the end of OSS.

The latitude given to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to execute Executive Order 9621 signified a shifting discourse within the government. While the president wanted to demobilize the extraneous agencies built during the war, concerns of national security had begun to arise. Truman’s Executive Order 9621 called for the dissolution within ten days of the Office of Strategic Services, which had served as the wartime intelligence service during World War II. The order also instructed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that measures determined “to be necessary to effectuate the transfer or redistribution of functions provided for in this order shall be

---

carried out in such manner as the Director may direct and by such agencies as he may designate.” While EO 9621 worked to dismantle OSS, some in Washington D.C. worked to protect the wartime capabilities of OSS. Unlike the president, they felt the threat of Communism loomed large. Therefore, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget held considerable control over the fate of OSS and American intelligence capabilities in the post-war world.

The hasty execution of Executive Order 9621 left little time for the proponents of a peacetime intelligence agency to pick up the pieces and salvage the resources that OSS had amassed. Fortunately for intelligence development, there were individuals such as Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy and Donald Stone of the Bureau of the Budget who arranged for portions of the OSS to integrate with other, more traditional, existing organizations. Under Stone and McCloy’s guidance the Research and Analysis branch of OSS transferred to the State Department to form the Interim Research and Intelligence Service (IRIS). To facilitate this move Harold Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, allocated an additional $2,000,000 to accommodate the staff and functions of OSS. Similarly, intelligence collection and counterintelligence branches of the OSS formed the Strategic Services Unit (SSU), created by the War Department. Without the actions of these few men, conservation of these organizations would not have been likely

---

due to the discourse in the United States, which did not see a place for intelligence in a post-war peacetime climate.

Within Executive Order 9621, Truman ordered the merger of the OSS Research and Analysis staff and its functions with the State Department by 1 August 1945. This merger created the IRIS. Established to continue the analytical work of OSS, the IRIS would enhance the State Department. The dissolution of OSS highlighted the two opposing viewpoints within the United States regarding the landscape of the post-war world. On one side was Truman and those who believed the post-war world would be overwhelmed by peace, that the Soviet Union was an ally, and that wartime organizations were unnecessary or dangerous to the democratic nature of the United States. On the other side of the U.S. discourse on the post-war world were pragmatists like George Kennan and Donald Stone who saw the value in maintaining any advantage against possible enemies, with an emphasis on the Soviet Union. The State Department boosted its analysis capabilities with the additional staff, which had the benefit of wartime experience, while also gaining valuable regional expertise. However, the transfer of the Research and Analysis Branch to the State Department allowed the core of that branch of OSS to remain in existence. According to Richard Helms, a future Director of Central Intelligence (DCI), the direction of Donald Stone of the Bureau of the Budget proved instrumental in the process of implementing Executive Order 9621.\textsuperscript{14} Because of the latitude given to the Bureau of the Budget in the executive order, Stone held considerable influence over the process of dismantling the wartime OSS organization and the formation of a peacetime intelligence service. Preservation of Research and Analysis

\textsuperscript{14} Helms and Hood, \emph{A Look over My Shoulder}, 68.
within IRIS would prove to be of vital importance to the later formation of the Central Intelligence Group (CIG), and eventually to the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA).15

Limited in scope because Americans generally felt that their society had no enemies, the initial formation of intelligence services conformed to discourses that upheld democratic ideas present during the war. Motivated by the utility found in intelligence briefings on 22 January 1946, President Truman issued a directive that established the National Intelligence Authority (NIA). Composed of the secretaries of State, War, and Navy, the NIA was directed to fund a new group to ensure that “all Federal foreign intelligence activities be planned, developed and coordinated to assure the most effective accomplishment of the intelligence mission related to national security.”16 Although the formation of NIA represented a step towards a permanent post-war intelligence service, it was established with minimal autonomy and lacked the authority that General Donovan called for in his memo. While the formation of the NIA demonstrated concern for intelligence collection, largely for intelligence briefings, its lack of authority stemmed from a diminished fear of foreign enemies. With the same directive that established NIA on 8 February, Truman created the Central Intelligence Group (CIG) with Rear Admiral Sidney Souers as its first director.17 Although previously serving as the deputy head of the Office of Naval Intelligence (ONI), Admiral Souers did not have support of, or

influence with, ONI or U.S. Army Intelligence staff (G-2).\textsuperscript{18} Support from the Navy would guarantee approval from the NIA, which was necessary to secure funding and logistical support for meaningful intelligence operations.

According to interviews with General Donovan conducted by \textit{New York Times} author Cabell Phillips, the inability to produce national intelligence estimates or any actionable intelligence resulted from “interdepartmental jealousies and confused administration, while failing to meet the need for centralized intelligence because there was no provision for channeling raw intelligence.”\textsuperscript{19} The disorganization of the U.S. intelligence apparatus occurred because ONI, G-2, and the department of State each pushed for the preservation of their own services. Rather than working together and allowing the CIG to act as the peacetime intelligence service of the United States, the NIA and its collective leadership protected the bureaucracy of their organization. However, the establishment of the NIA and CIG occurred before Churchill’s address in Fulton and before Kennan’s ‘Long Telegram,’ both of which would influence the formation of intelligence services as well as a renovation of the entire government.

Many in the U.S. government regarded intelligence and the business of collecting it as a disagreeable endeavor, but many were also in opposition for practical reasons: they did not have complete control of the effort. The prevailing discourse within the government, especially that of President Truman, held that the practice of intelligence was dishonorable and compared to Nazi tactics. Secretary of State George Marshall was

\textsuperscript{19} Rudgers, \textit{Creating the Secret State}., 102.
one of the leaders who was “not opposed in principle to some such organization.”

However, Marshall thought that “Foreign Service of the Department of State is the only collection agency of the government which covers the whole world, and we should be very slow to subject the collection and evaluation of this foreign intelligence to other establishments, especially during times of peace.”\(^{20}\) Even though Marshall seemingly had similar reservations as Truman regarding the collection of intelligence in a peacetime setting, partially due to the popular discourse, the prospect of an intelligence service became acceptable if control came from the State Department.

The discourse of the government already began to shift with Kennan’s Long Telegram, which served as a call to action against the Soviet Union. Additionally, during a commencement address at Harvard University, Marshall called for assistance from the international community in the efforts to rebuild Europe. This speech helped to solidify the anti-Communist discourse started by Churchill and continued in public by Truman and Kennan in the government. However, the rhetoric Marshall used warned that “governments, political parties or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit politically will encounter opposition of the United States.”\(^{21}\) The language used in this speech addressed the perceived threat of the Soviets, as forwarded by Kennan. Therefore, it was in large part this address to a class of future leaders and their families that disseminated the perception of a looming enemy on the horizon. This represented a large departure from the outlook of Truman immediately after the war. George


Marshall’s views on this subject are notable because they foreshadow the formation of the Office of Policy Coordination (OPC), directed by the State Department, and Marshall’s efforts to maintain control over intelligence collection and covert activity through George Kennan and Frank Wisner. This shift in the discourse by the Secretary of State signifies an already shifting discourse that acted as a counter to the perceived Soviet threat. The perceived need for intelligence collection and opposition to the Soviet Union helped to form the Cold War’s national security state. Although not the first call for action against the Communist threat, Marshall’s rhetoric and plan for the economic recovery of Europe helped to antagonize the Soviet Union.

In an address to the Congress of the United States, Truman appealed to legislators by presenting the Marshall Plan as an all-encompassing plan to help rebuild Europe while also strengthening the United States. Because of the all-encompassing nature of the Marshall Plan and the need for participating countries complete and unwavering participation, resulted in intelligence operations to ensure Communist interference was held to a minimum. In combination with Marshall’s call to assist Europe, Truman stated that an undertaking of this nature “is proof that free men can effectively join to defend their free institutions against totalitarian pressures.” With this passage of his address, Truman signified a change in the post-war discourse. No longer focused on demobilization during the post-war period, Truman’s focus turned to cooperation

amongst allies. This change in the post-war discourse formed the reality of the Cold War in the early years until the inception of the Korean War in 1950.

As a part of that change, the formation of the CIA was a process of compromise and negotiation throughout the government, with many departments and agencies gaining legitimacy from the National Security Act of 1947. Striking a deal between congressional leaders and members of the administration, the National Security Act of 1947 advanced to Congress on 26 February 1947. The compromise ensured congressional oversight of the new CIA, but also allowed the agency a considerable degree of autonomy over operations. Despite several months of congressional discussion, the act passed on 26 June 1947, establishing the CIA. 24 According to the National Security Act of 1947, the CIA gained responsibility to advise the government and associated agencies of issues relating to national security and of operations undertaken with national security in mind. Additionally, the CIA received responsibilities to carry out the requests and directives of the National Security Council (NSC). 25 Within the directives of the National Security Act of 1947, wrote Hugh Wilford, “an important clause of the Act, which authorized the CIA to perform unspecified ‘other functions and duties related to intelligence affecting the national security’ would later be invoked as legal justification for anti-Soviet covert operations.” 26 Passage of the Act created an opportunity for an increase in the scope of

activities that could be undertaken and granted the autonomy that would be necessary to fight the Cold War effectively.

For Truman, the realities of the National Security Act of 1947 and the implications of its passage weighed heavily because the act represented a movement away from the morals and values the United States exhibited before World War II. Within six months of his last letter to his wife, Truman’s tone grew exceedingly darker. He described the world as being “topsy turvy,” comparing the situation to the Napoleonic era or the time surrounding World War I, times when the world was actively engaged in warfare. The dark tone of the letter continued as Truman remarked: “I can’t see why it was necessary for me to inherit all difficulties and tribulations of the world—but I have them on hand and must work them out some way—I hope for the welfare of all concerned.” This ominous statement that all of the tribulations of the world were his responsibility to solve indicated his belief that only the United States could counter the growing Soviet threat. Truman included that he and Secretary of State Marshall believed the Soviet Union had “shown her hand and it contains the cards Marshall and I thought it would.” Truman’s belief that the Soviet threat was a global concern is made apparent with this letter to his wife. The comparison of the climate to that of the Napoleonic Era or World War I Era proves how dire Truman believed that the situation was by that time.27

The dreary tone worsened by September 1947. Truman described the White House as a “deserted village” where the “ghosts still walk” and for him personally a jail

---

of sorts. In this letter he conveyed to his wife the cost of World War II and the cost for peace through the Marshall Plan. Although he maintained a positive outlook regarding the cost-to-benefit analysis of the plan, Truman was unsure of congressional support due to the programs sixteen billion-dollar price tag. Six days later, on 29 September, Truman and his followers attempted to gain support of congressional leadership according to a letter he wrote to Bess. These meeting with congress were largely unsuccessful. Attempts to gain support of congressional figures would continue to be a priority for Truman. In the 30 September letter to Bess, Truman wrote about the “situation fraught with terrible consequences.” Truman then described the idea of an iron curtain descending over western Europe, and explained the economic benefit of peace across the globe versus the cost in lives and in dollars if conflict with the Soviet Union were to become or had already become unavoidable. As the Marshall Plan looked more likely to succeed, Truman’s tone became more optimistic, demonstrating his faith in the idea for countering Soviet expansion. By October 1947, the tone of Truman’s letters had changed again. Rather than the dark and foreboding tone of the September letters, he now conveyed a more hopeful message. Instead of talking about the descending iron curtain he focused on the plans to pay for the Marshall Plan and additional funds for France and Italy. The change in Truman’s demeanor seems to have come from the introduction of the Marshall Plan and the passage of the National Security Act of 1947. Both

---

developments affirmed that the United States would fight Communism under Truman’s leadership and seemingly gave the president a sense of accomplishment.

While this was a period of fluctuation with many changes and developments in the U.S. government being pushed by personal benefit of government leaders, the creation of personal fiefdoms, or bureaucratic bickering all these elements assisted in shaping the national discourse. However, the most influential was the creation of the intelligence apparatus within the national security state. With the establishment of a peacetime intelligence agency the struggle for control of it quickly began. Within the struggle, an overwhelming interest in covert psychological warfare occurred. The Marshall Plan quickly became the home for OPC and covert activity because of conflicts within the government at the highest levels. Debates throughout 1947 centered on the issue of who had the authority to conduct psychological warfare. Long gone were the conversations regarding the legitimacy of those types of actions; now the conversations revolved around who would receive authority to conduct operations. A struggle of personality and rank broke out between Secretary of Defense James Forestall, Secretary of War Robert Patterson, Director of Central Intelligence Hillenkoetter, and Marshall, each exerting the influence permitted by their position and reputation. Ultimately because of Marshall’s insistence that psychological warfare was an activity outside the scope of the State Department and because CIA had operational experience, such operations would remain CIA’s responsibility but with instruction from State on planning and execution.³² In response to Soviet covert activities, Forrestal instigated the creation of a top-secret addendum to a previous report, NSC 4/A. This report “led to the consideration

³² Ameringer, *U.S. Foreign Intelligence*, 205.
of two streams of U.S. countermeasures...overt foreign information activities while the second would be covert propaganda and psychological warfare operations.”

In order to carry out these actions, the Director of Central Intelligence received “$20 million in unvouchered funds for the CIA to ‘initiate and conduct, within the limit of available funds, covert psychological operations designed to counteract Soviet and Soviet-inspired activities which constitute a threat to world peace and security, or are designed to discredit and defeat the United States in its endeavors to promote world peace and security.’”

NSC 4/A represented a major shift in the reality of the post-war era. The intelligence apparatus now had directives to use covert operations, which was significant because CIA was now in danger of violating democracy abroad in its effort to satisfy the discourse of anti-Communism in American society.

In a few short years, the U.S. government had created several different intelligence organizations, SSU, CIG and now CIA; however, covert political warfare needed a home. Explanations for the formation of the Office of Policy Coordination vary widely. Historians have documented various reasons for the formation of an additional intelligence agency operating outside of the CIA. According to Sallie Pisani, “OPC acted as a complement to the Marshall Plan, providing functions that could not be performed by the CIA or through diplomatic channels...the Marshall Plan was falling short because it had no political functions...CIA had no political capability” The problems for CIA became compounded by the influence of Secretary Forrestal. Requesting assistance from

---

CIA to influence the 1948 Italian elections, Forrestal’s appeals received rejections from Hillenkoetter. Although denied by Hillenkoetter officially, the rejection of Forrestal’s request derived from the advice of CIA’s general counsel, Lawrence Houston. Houston maintained a degree of control over the agency through his position as legal advisor to the agency and trusted advisor to Hillenkoetter. Houston maintained that the National Security Act of 1947 did not allow for the type of covert operations that Forrestal’s request required. General counsel maintained that the 1947 act limited operations to “intelligence gathering, espionage, and counterespionage.” Pisani relates that Secretary Forrestal wanted to change the role of CIA to an active agency that engaged in “covert activities including political, economic, psychological, and paramilitary action.” Because the CIA would not act on Secretary Forrestal’s request for covert action he became formidable opponent for the agency. Forrestal called for the implementation of covert action by an agency independent of CIA and its director. Hillenkoetter’s grasp over his agency and its mission became weaker because of his reluctance to disregard the advice of lawyers. Additionally, because of the influence Secretary Forrestal exerted over the government, the legitimacy of covert action grew and flourished despite Hillenkoetter’s reluctance to support it.36

The most influential factor in CIA’s loss of operational control of covert action and psychological warfare arrived in the form of George Kennan, author of the “Long Telegram” containment policy, and according to some historians the driving force behind the Marshall Plan.37 Forrestal’s concerns regarding the application of covert action and psychological warfare arrived in the form of George Kennan, author of the “Long Telegram” containment policy, and according to some historians the driving force behind the Marshall Plan.37 Forrestal’s concerns regarding the application of covert action and psychological warfare arrived in the form of George Kennan, author of the “Long Telegram” containment policy, and according to some historians the driving force behind the Marshall Plan.37

37 See, for example: Pisani, The CIA and the Marshall Plan, 69.
CIA general counsel denial of agency authority to carry out covert actions a question arose as to who was supposed to, or should carry out these activities.\textsuperscript{38} From his position in the State Department as head of the Policy Planning Staff, George Kennan exerted considerable influence as the chief policy maker for the State Department. As author of the “Long Telegram,” Kennan held considerable influence over the formation of the discourse within the government because his opinions were so influential. In his telegram to Marshall, Kennan used language that referred to the Soviet Union as being incapable of peaceful coexistence with capitalism and identified Soviet goals to “advance relative strength of USSR,” and to “reduce strength and influence, collectively as well as individually, of capitalist powers.”\textsuperscript{39}

The discourse Kennan used in his telegram to Marshall helped to solidify concerns for some in the U.S. government during the beginning of the Cold War. Considered an expert on Russia and its people, Kennan helped to form the discourse used during the Cold War with his commentary on the motives and goals of the Soviet regime. Repeatedly throughout his telegram, Kennan warned of the influence of the Soviets and their attempts to “weaken power and influence of western powers of colonial, backward, or dependent peoples,” with the goal of exposing and exploiting mistakes and weaknesses within colonial administration. The discourse used by the Soviets, one of blame of capitalism for ills of the world, helped to form the discourse of opposition to Communism within the United States. The perception of the Soviet Union being an


opponent received confirmation with Kennan’s telegram. Because of violations against democratic ideals and Kennan’s assertion that the Soviet Union responded to the “logic of force,” a discourse of action through force sprang into being, thus creating a reality of the Cold War in which the United States would counter Soviet actions with swift force or threat of force.40

Specifically chosen by Secretary Marshall, Kennan received a great amount of autonomy to implement U.S. policy regarding the economies of Europe, as well as to implement the Marshall Plan against the forces of Communism.41 Because of the autonomy that Kennan enjoyed, he wrote influential opinion papers that became government policy. One such paper, written and circulated within the State Department on 3 May 1948, was “The Inauguration of Organized Political Warfare,” which sought to fill the void left by CIA and Hillenkoetter’s reluctance to participate in covert activity.42 Kennan’s draft became the basis for NSC 10/2, which Rudgers calls “one of the seminal documents in the history of the CIA and the larger history of U.S. foreign policy conduct during the Cold War.”43 Review of this memorandum leads to a few conclusions regarding Kennan’s role in the formation of NSC 10/2 and OPC. Kennan believed that the United States and Soviet Union were already engaging in political warfare, and his conclusions were skewed by that belief. Kennan posited that the Truman Doctrine and European Recovery Program were programs of U.S. political warfare against the Soviet

---

43 Rudgers, Creating the Secret State, 171.
Union. As such, he proposed an organization with the purpose of countering Soviet influence around the globe by engaging in a full spectrum of overt and covert political warfare.44

Kennan was effective in pressing his point and his position paper became official policy as National Security Council Directive 10/2 on 18 June 1948. Commonly referred to as NSC 10/2, the directive allowed the Office of Policy Coordination to initiate the work of covert operations. The directives for the formation of an Office of Special Projects referenced the “vicious covert activities of the USSR…and Communist groups to discredit and defeat the aims and activities of the United States and other Western powers.” NSC 10/2 began the campaign to challenge these activities with the implementation of covert operations to supplement the overt activities of the United States in a struggle against Communism.45 The initiation of covert operations marked another milestone in the deteriorating U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations. The move from limited overt activities that held the awful potential for World War III to a covert conflict that would ultimately entangle the entire world began in earnest for the United States.

The shifts in the discourse of American society are demonstrated by the formation of the intelligence services as seen in the formation of the Office of Policy Coordination. The formation of a civilian intelligence agency tasked with covert operations, specifically espionage and counterespionage operations, marked a significant change in the official policy, but it would not be the last major change in intelligence.

Within NSC 10/2 an Office of Special Projects, later named the Office of Policy Coordination, formed within the Central Intelligence Agency. Although this new component of American intelligence arose from within CIA, NSC 10/2 established OPC as a separate entity independent of other CIA departments. Tasked with the planning and implementation of covert operations the OPC formed as a component of CIA, but granted considerable autonomy to the appointed Chief of OPC. The head of OPC, nominated by the Secretary of State and approved by the Director of Central Intelligence and the National Security Council, received direction for covert actions from designated representatives appointed by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense. Although appointed, funded, and ostensibly reporting to the Director of Central Intelligence, OPC had the ability to operate outside of CIA authority.\(^46\)

The orders that OPC received to combat Communism were a direct result of the shift in the discourse that justified the creation of OPC and also the organizations mission. NSC 10/2 defined covert operations for OPC as “all activities which are conducted or sponsored by this government against hostile foreign states or groups…but which are so planned and conducted that any US Government responsibility for them is not evident to unauthorized persons.” Furthermore, NSC 10/2 defined covert activities as “economic warfare, preventive direct action, including sabotage, anti-sabotage, demolition and evacuation measures; subversion against hostile states, including assistance to underground resistance movements, guerrillas and refugee liberation groups, and support of indigenous anti-Communist elements in threatened countries of the free

world.” NSC 10/2 established the operational framework from which OPC would operate. Although OPC had an open ended operational directive, there was a restriction on armed conflict. Also, NSC 10/2 limited armed conflict conducted by “recognized military forces”; this included “espionage, counter-intelligence, and cover and deception for military operations.”

Despite these limitations, section 3, part E of NSC 10/2 allowed “covert operations pertaining to economic warfare…conducted by the Office of Special Projects (OSP) under the guidance of the departments and agencies responsible for the planning of economic warfare.” Seemingly an innocuous statement, the addition of this subsection of NSC 10/2 gave George Kennan, the designated representative from the State Department, the main force behind the Marshall Plan, and author of the US Government’s containment policy a considerable amount of influence over OPC.

Because of the influence Kennan gained from Secretary Marshall’s support and Director Hillenkoetter’s ineffective leadership, CIA authority over OPC became nonexistent. Instead, authority to enact policy lay with the State Department’s PPS while OPC acted as the authority to carry out political warfare and responsibility for all activity was left with the Agency. Essentially the arrangement left CIA with sole responsibility for failures and congressional inquiry. The OPC, with policy guidance from PPS, would initiate activity based on its own goals, but with little to no oversight by CIA.

By August 1948, CIA had lost effective control of OPC because of Kennan’s political maneuvering, however Hillenkoetter retained the ability, “as the sole officer of CIA

---

authorized to certify the propriety of the agency’s unvouched expenditures, to exercise line-by-line control over OPC projects.”

With the formalization of covert activities approved in April 1948 concern regarding the legality of those activities began to arise. By 19 October 1948 the General Council for CIA, Lawrence R. Houston, composed a memo with the title “Responsibility and Control for OPC” for the Director of Central Intelligence to act as a counterbalance to the forceful anti-Communist rhetoric that had justified covert action. Houston asserted that within a mere four months, the Director of CIA had lost control of OPC. Houston’s memo demonstrates that the anti-Communist rhetoric had become so influential that in reality OPC operated independently of CIA representing a violation of the bureaucratic arrangements that dictated what operations OPC could and could not carry out. In his memo, Houston stressed the wording of NSC 10/2, outlining the responsibility of the Director of Central Intelligence for overall control and responsibility for covert operations carried out by OPC. Specifically, per Houston, the DCI retained responsibility for overall direction of espionage and counterespionage operations, the Chief of OPC reported directly to the DCI, and the DCI retained the ultimate “control, which presupposes the right to initiate and to veto projects,” proposed by the designees from the State and Defense Departments. Because the funds for projects came from CIA sources of unvouched funds, the DCI held responsibility and lawful control of OPC actions. Houston asserted that the DCI “must have power to set controls for all such expenditures and provide means, by audit or otherwise, to ensure that the funds are properly

---

expended,” the general council continued, “therefore it appears that the Council (NSC) intended no limitation of the Director’s operational control outside of that which may be exercised by the NSC.” Although the DCI may have attempted to exercise some control over covert activities undertaken by OPC, the Houston memo indicated that an improvement in communication between the DCI, State, and Defense Departments were of paramount importance. Houston indicated other problems, such as Kennan’s insistence that OPC receive policy guidance from the State Department and National Military Establishment exclusively, OPC Chief Frank Wisner’s insistence on independence of CIA command structure, and the questionable authority of the NSC to create OPC.\footnote{Lawrence R. Houston, Memorandum for the Director, “Responsibility and Control for OPC,” 19 October 1948. Located in Warner, The CIA under Harry Truman, 236, 237.}\footnote{Warner, The CIA under Harry Truman, 129.} CIA historian Michael Warner asserts that Hillenkoetter had little control over the new OPC, while George Kennan, Frank Wisner, and Allen Dulles began to gain considerable influence over American covert operations and foreign policy.\footnote{Lawrence R. Houston, Memorandum for the Director, “Responsibility and Control for OPC,” 19 October 1948. Located in Warner, The CIA under Harry Truman, 236, 237.}

In Houston’s final analysis, the DCI would retain responsibility for actions over which he had no control, unvouchedered funds for which he could not account, and responsibility for personnel and materials which he could give no direction despite being the head of the agency. Although a short several months had passed since the implementation of NSC 10/2, the document had come under scrutiny by Houston. Houston’s recommendations to the DCI included an amendment to the language of 10/2 to ensure that the DCI be responsible for full administrative control and final authority for funds and the right to veto all operations. Also, Houston recommended that if the
language did not change to give the DCI final control of operations and funds that 10/2
should undergo revision to explicitly define the DCI’s role to an administrative one,
completely without approval of operations, rather solely an administrative support
function. Finally, the general council recommended that if the language of 10/2 did not
undergo revision to give the DCI operational control, then the NSC should make clear
that the DCI had no authority for control of operations utilizing CIA personnel or funds.
Houston continues to assert that in the interest of national security, “all covert activities
should be subject to a single coordination and control, and that there is no means by
which the Director can divest himself of…personal responsibility for the expenditure of
unvouchered funds.” Houston’s criticism of NSC 10/2 was based on the legality of the
operations that the DCI should have retained administrative control over. Despite the
shifting national discourse which acquiesced to the formation of the intelligence
apparatus as a part of the national security state, that rhetoric was not influential enough
to sway Houston’s legal recommendation. As CIA general counsel Houston was
unmoved by the national discourse and felt compelled to protect the integrity of CIA.

Houston’s solution to either make the DCI responsible for all activates connected
to CIA or to change the system by which NSC 10/2 was organized in order to absolve the
DCI from responsibility had merit. This made Houston’s proposal less than attractive and
the largely timid DCI Hillenkoetter seemingly less than enthusiastic about its
implementation. By making OPC completely independent of DCI, Hillenkoetter and the
official chain of command through CIA to the president, the OPC and leaders associated

with it were free to create their own foreign policy separate from that of the U.S. government and President Truman. This free hand to create U.S. foreign policy represented a troubling development in terms of the democratic process in the United States. This arrangement benefited from the reluctance of DCI Hillenkoetter to involve himself with the inner workings of the intelligence business. Unfortunately, the autonomy OPC enjoyed would be short-lived and the incoming Director of Central Intelligence, Lt. General Walter Bedell Smith presented a unique style unlike that of his predecessor.

Appointed as the fourth Director of Central Intelligence in August 1950, Lt. General Walter Bedell Smith had the charisma, reputation, and three-star general rank in the U.S. Army to create his own discourse for CIA. While Smith’s discourse might have been irrespective of any national discourse, he would also be constrained by societal concerns. Even for a rather famous bureaucrat like Smith, he would have been influenced by elected officials in congress as well as the appointed government workers in the State Department. These connections make Smith susceptible to the same feedback loop as his predecessors. Similarly to Houston, DCI Smith represents a counterbalance to the overwhelming anti-Communist discourse present at this time. The justification had been made to create OPC and give it operational carte blanche to undertake covert action as OPC saw fit. These actions largely fell within the popular discourse in America that allowed extreme measures to be taken to conquer Communism. DCI Smith was an augmentation of the reality of OPC operations at that time. Although not officially starting as director until October 1950, Smith began reviewing problems within the agency. A memo drafted by the CIA General Counsel Houston on 29 August 1950 outlined for the new director the problems facing the agency. This document revealed to
the incoming DCI Smith the potential issues which he would encounter, but it also hints to the seriousness that he brought to the position. Additionally, with Smith’s experience on Eisenhower’s staff during the war, he not only had the knowledge and ability to navigate the governmental bureaucracy, but he had the reputation and gravitas to begin reforming CIA. Within the memo prepared by Houston for Smith, section four titled “Special Problems” subsection d, refers to “NSC directives in the field of unconventional warfare…particularly the policy control over CIA granted to the Departments of State and Defense. The separation of clandestine operations into two offices within CIA…creates serious problems.”

Either because of Houston’s memo or Smith’s recognition of problems within CIA and interdepartmental conflicts with State and Defense Departments, Smith launched an overhaul of OPC operations. With Smith’s arrival as DCI the structure of OPC seemed to begin to adhere to the popular national discourse which favored opposition to the Soviet Union, but nothing that could result in conflict between the United States and Soviet Union.

On 7 October 1950, Lt. General Smith became the new DCI and began the reorganization of the intelligence services. Following Houston’s recommendations, Smith initiated the reorganization of OPC by reinterpreting the 12 August 1948, memo titled “Implementation of NSC 10/2.” Chief of OPC Frank Wisner relates in his memo to Smith the notification of the representatives of the Departments of State and Defense of the changes to CIA leaderships interpretation of NSC 10/2. Additionally, within his memo Wisner mentions informing the State and Defense Departments that they would no longer

---

be in a position of giving policy guidance, instruction, or orders directly to OPC. Although OPC would maintain relations with State and Defense Departments, Smith sought to exercise greater control over OPC than his predecessor had. Additionally, by bringing OPC more fully into the already established structure of CIA, Smith effectively squelched the influence of Kennan and his work at the State Department. According to Smith, “he construed NSC 10/2, though somewhat ambiguous, as giving clear authority to the Director of Central Intelligence for the activities of the OPC.” While Smith agreed that guidance from the State and Defense Departments was essential, Wisner and the OPC “would act under the authority and subject to the control of the Director of Central Intelligence, who, under NSC 10/2, was responsible for Mr. Wisner’s operations.”

During this meeting, Smith notified the American intelligence apparatus that any confusion surrounding responsibility for covert operations would rest with the office of the DCI. Although Wisner would receive information from the State Department and Defense, his ultimate superior would be DCI Smith.

The purpose of this chapter has been to demonstrate the formation of the national security state and intelligence apparatus occurring as a result of the anti-Communist discourse after World War II. This chapter also demonstrates that this expansion of the U.S. government resulted in the subversion of American ideals. Democracy represented the idea that the U.S. set out to protect, but the means used resulted in violations of American traditions of freedom. The elements of this chapter are vital to the greater

---

understanding of the shift of discourse in the post-war period. The resulting extreme reality that contributed to the initiation of the Cold War was only possible because of the discourse in American society. According to Lynn’s model, the American discourse shifted in such a dramatic way in a short time. This abrupt shifted necessitated a dramatic shift in the reality, therefore contributing to the Cold War.
IV. CONCLUSION

This influence of rhetoric on a society is profound and undeniable. This thesis has demonstrated that the rhetoric employed by leaders in the post-World War II period immensely influenced society. The discourse created by the rhetoric of the Anglo-American leadership created an intense desire in American society to combat a perceived Communist menace. Despite any potential misperceptions of the Soviet Union, Americans were steadfast in their desire to protect democracy. The thesis demonstrates that the desire to fight the Soviets was so great that government leaders expanded the armed services and created the modern national security state. This development included a peacetime intelligence service that would become the primary weapon in the clandestine Cold War. The development of anti-Communist discourse became so entrenched in the American psyche that the government leaders who created the previously contentious intelligence apparatus loosened the reigns of the very organizations that before the shift in discourse those leaders had likened to the Nazi’s Gestapo. This development allowed the intelligence services like OPC to create U.S. foreign policy irrespective of the views of the president. OPC and later OSO attained the freedom to carry out intelligence operations, regardless of any violations of democracy or other aspects of U.S. ideology.

The creation of the U.S. intelligence community and the national security state, made possible because of the intense rhetoric of the period, violated the democratic values that Americans valued. Although these violations of democracy have been outlined exhaustively in the literature of the Cold War I will outline a few of the most notable covert actions. Operation AJAX in 1953 to remove democratically elected
Mohammed Mossadegh from the presidency in Iran. Operation PBSUCCESS organized a revolt against Guatemalan president Jacobo Arbenz in 1954. These events were closely followed by Operation ZAPATA, the failed attempt to remove Fidel Castro from power in Cuba. Throughout the 1960s into the early 1970s the CIA participated in continued covert actions in Chile to prevent the Communist party from ousting the Christian Democrats from power. Also during this period the CIA participated in covert actions in support of the Vietnam War, often undertaking covert operations in nearby countries not officially involved in the war.

The 1975-1976 Church and Pike congressional committee hearings that investigated the operations of the CIA changed the way the U.S. viewed covert action. The anti-Communist discourse still called for combat with the Soviet Union, but the aftermath of the Vietnam War and revelations of the congressional committees created another shift in reality of the Cold War. The new reality was a ‘perfected’ reality which favored clandestine action. These types of clandestine actions had the additional benefit of plausible deniability which conformed to new reality that eschewed traditional war fought by Americans in favor of proxy warfare. This proxy warfare was funded by the U.S. government but other countries participated in the fighting against the Soviet Union. While this produced success like in Operation CYCLONE, the funding of the mujahedeen against the Soviets in the Afghan-Soviet War (1979-1989), the covert operations had unintended consequences. The discourse of anti-Communism that resulted in the funneling of billions of dollars to fund the Afghan resistance to fight the Soviet Union also trained and radicalized thousands of young Muslim men. While this was
advantageous at the time within a generation it would backfire with the rise of Al-Qaeda and other extremist organizations with ties to the Afghan jihad of the 1980s.

Lynn’s model of discourse and reality assisted this examination of the post-World War II, pre-Cold War period because of its focus on the multiple threads within a society. Considering the multiple speeches, memos, and documents that demonstrated the shifting discourse of the United States it seems that the creation of the national security state was an inescapable development. The strength of the rhetoric was influential enough to overcome fears of large government that seems as integral to the idea of American values as democracy. It is my hope that this analysis might assist other scholars understand the influence of rhetoric on a society.
Appendix A: Notes on Sources

I want to take a moment to address the sources used in this thesis. In a departure from the normal process researching a thesis, I did not visit a physical archive. All archival sources used in this thesis were found in digital archives. While this might not have been possible several years ago, the expansion of libraries and movement of archives to digitize their content has made this possible. The digitization of archival content, especially in a time of decreasing funding for the liberal arts, provides researches with innumerable possibilities to either begin research or completing it all online and defray costs associated with travel costs associated with archival research.

Along with this information is a disclaimer. This thesis was written without visiting a physical archive. Many of the documents found through the online archives were re-creations of the original document. With the exception of documents located in the Harry S. Truman Presidential Library, which has digital scans of the original documents, many online documents were transcribed for consumption on official websites by historians working for the individual agencies. This is the case for the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series from the State Department. In many cases this presents few, if any, issues. However, in the case of compiled FRUS publications like the *Intelligence Community, 1950-1955* the documents are specifically picked to create a narrative pushed by historians employed by the State Department. Although the potential for problems arise with the use of electronic sources and documents the financial considerations largely outweigh the problems.
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