Unit: Détente and the Second Cold War
Lesson Plan Day 1 – Détente

Time: 90 minutes

Essential Question: What is détente, and was it markedly different from the earlier phase of the Cold War?

Objectives:
Objective #1: Students will analyze why the Cold War settled into détente, and then moved into a stage of renewed conflict in 1979.
Objective #2: Students will compare and contrast the first and second phases of the Cold War.

Instructional Strategies:
Character Quotes Processing Activity (35 minutes)
1. Pass out individual quotations - one to each student.
2. Have students individually fill out the worksheet questions on their quotation.
3. Students will discuss their quotations with others, and try to determine whose quotation it is, using the options presented on the powerpoint slide on the projector.
4. Students will group themselves around the room according to which person they think goes with their quotation, explaining their reasoning on their worksheet.
5. The teacher will reveal the authors of the various quotations, and have students rearrange themselves so that they are properly grouped by quotation author. Students will read their quotes to one another and discuss similarities and differences.
   1. Quotes #1-9 – Nixon
   2. Quotes #10-13 – Ford
   3. Quotes #14-21 – Carter
   4. Quotes #22-29 – Reagan
   5. Quotes #30-36 – Gorbachev
6. Two group representatives will report to the class the content of their group discussion.
7. Explain that students should bear in mind the initial responses they had to the quotation going forward as we read through the documents.

Analyzing the Documents (25-30 minutes)
1. Students will read and annotate the documents, answering the questions in the document packet.
2. Students will discuss with their groups.
3. Students will compare the document associated with the author of their quotation and the quotation itself. Do they have a similar tone or message? Would you expect this person to be the author of both of these documents? How do these documents square with the information in our lecture notes on détente?

Final Activity (20 minutes)
1. Two groups will present their multimedia projects to the class.
Detente 1969-1979
Quotation Worksheet

Please staple your quotation to the front of this worksheet when you receive it. Once you have a quotation, read it and answer the first three questions.

What is the tone of your quotation?

This quotation is taken out of context, but what do you think it might be about? Why?

What inferences can you make about the author of this quotation?

Do not answer the question below until instructed to do so.

Now that you see the following leaders on the board as options - which of these leaders do you think is the author of your quotation? Why? Use evidence from your lecture notes to support your answer. You should discuss your quotation and ideas with your group.

Now that you know who the author of your quotation is, does this surprise you? Why or why not?
Nixon’s Grand Plan in Foreign Policy (1968-1969)

“Richard Nixon built his prepresidential career on a strong reputation as a hawkish cold warrior - and thus, ironically, he was in a particularly favorable position to bring some thaw to the chilly Cold War. As a certified conservative, he had a freedom of maneuver that would not have been available to a liberal Democrat, who would have been vulnerable to criticism from the very right wing that Nixon could easily control. Nixon shrewdly saw the implications of the split between China and the Soviet Union that had developed in the 1960s, and he was determined to turn that split to U.S. advantage. In the following passage from his memoirs, Nixon describes his thinking about global affairs as he embarked upon his presidency...”

In the late 1940s and during the 1950s I had seen communism spread to China and other parts of Asia, and to Africa and South America, under the camouflage of parties of socialist revolution, or under the guise of wars of national liberation. And finally, during the 1960s I had watched as Peking and Moscow became rivals for the role of leadership in the Communist world.

Never once in my career have I doubted that the Communists mean it when they say that their goal is to bring the world under Communist control. Nor have I ever forgotten Whittaker Chambers’s chilling comment that when he left communism, he had the feeling he was leaving the winning side. But unlike some anticommunists who think we should refuse to recognize or deal with the Communists lest in doing so we imply or extend an ideological respectability to their philosophy and their system, I have always believed that we can and must communicate and, when possible, negotiate with Communist nations. They are too powerful to ignore. We must always remember that they will never act out of altruism, but only out of self-interest. Once this is understood, it is more sensible - and also safer - to communicate with the Communists than it is to live in icy cold-war isolation or confrontation. In fact, in January of 1969 I felt the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union would probably be the single most important factor in determining whether the world would live at peace during and after my administration.

I felt that we had allowed ourselves to get in a disadvantageous position vis-a-vis the Soviets. They had a major presence in the Arab states of the Middle East, while we had none; they had Castro in Cuba; since the mid-1960s they had supplanted the Chinese as the principal military suppliers of North Vietnam; and except for Tito’s Yugoslavia they still totally controlled Eastern Europe and threatened the stability and security of Western Europe.

There were, however, a few things in our favor. The most important and interesting was the Soviet split with China. There was also some evidence of growing, albeit limited, independence in some of the satellite nations. There were indications that the Soviet leaders were becoming interested in reaching an agreement on strategic arms limitation. They also appeared to be ready to hold serious talks on the anomalous situation in Berlin, which, almost a quarter century after the war had ended, was still a divided city and a constant source of tension, not just between the Soviets and the United States, but also between the Soviets and Western Europe. We sensed that they were looking for a face-saving formula that would lessen the risk of confrontation in the Mideast. And we had some solid evidence that they were anxious for an expansion of trade. ...
During the transition period Kissinger and I developed a new policy for dealing with the Soviets. Since U.S.-Soviet interests as the world’s two competing nuclear superpowers were so widespread and overlapping, it was unrealistic to separate or compartmentalize areas of concern. Therefore we decided to link progress in such areas of Soviet concern as strategic arms limitation and increased trade with progress in areas that were important to us - Vietnam, the Mideast, and Berlin. This concept became known as linkage. ...

Linkage was something uncomfortably new and different for the Soviets, and I was not surprised when they bridled at the restraints it imposed on our relationship. It would take almost two years of patient and hard-nosed determination on our part before they would accept that linkage with what we wanted from them was the price they would have to pay for getting any of the things they wanted from us.

We made our first contacts with the Soviets during the transition period. In mid-December Kissinger met with a Soviet UN diplomat who was, as we knew, actually an intelligence officer. I wanted it made clear that I was not taken in by any of the optimistic rhetoric that had characterized so much of recent Soviet-American relations. Kissinger therefore stated that while the tendency during the last few years had been to emphasize how much our two nations supposedly had in common, the Nixon administration felt that there were real and substantial differences between us and that an effort to lessen the tension created by these differences should be the central focus of our relationship. ...

We received a prompt reply from Moscow. Our UN contact reported that the Soviet leadership was “not pessimistic” because of the election of a Republican President. He said that the Soviet leadership had expressed an interest in knowing if I desired to “open channels of communication.” It was with this in mind that I said in my inaugural address, “After a period of confrontation, we are entering an era of negotiation. Let all nations know that during this administration our lines of communication will be open.”

Questions on the Document
1. Based on the passage, how would Richard Nixon define detente?

2. Why does Nixon feel that detente is necessary?

3. What is linkage and how does it contribute to detente-based foreign policy?
Novikov: First, Mr. President, I want to convey to you what occurred at my meeting with General Secretary Brezhnev before I left Moscow. The General Secretary asked me to send his greetings. He fondly recalled the meeting with you in Vladivostok. He noted what progress was expected in the field of limitation of nuclear armaments. He asked me to convey to you his wishes that the question would be resolved in a positive manner on your side, and he is looking forward to meeting with you soon to resolve it.

The second thing he asked was, on 14 June he addressed a body of the Russian Soviet Federated Republic. Knowing that both we and you devote much time to enhancing and extending détente, he thought he should put it also before his electorate. He wants you to know that he will continue his efforts to strengthen détente. He noted that you have also spoken on the strengthening of détente and that it is something the whole world seeks.

This is his main message. On other questions, he hoped that the American proposals would be constructive and in the interests of the whole world.

President: Thank you, Mr. Minister. Please convey to the General Secretary my greetings and my fond recollections of Vladivostok. Both of us approached the problems of Vladivostok in a constructive way and I think the outcome can be not only in the interests of our two countries but of the world as a whole. I can assure the General Secretary that we will approach the problem of resolving the final issues in a constructive way and we hope the technical issues remaining can be resolved and we can take the final step in the not too distant future. Please also tell General Secretary Brezhnev that I noted his comments in the press when he spoke to the political organization on détente. It coincided with my views on the strengthening of détente. It is important to us both, and to reducing tension on a worldwide basis.

It seems to me that the agreement that you and Secretary Hills will sign on the 19th is a further move to benefit détente. I am very interested in the six subjects which will be agreed to, and I hope that the progress here will be useful in other areas.

Questions on the Document
1. What is the tone of this passage? How are these men speaking to one another?

2. Based on this passage, how do you think Secretary Brezhnev and President Ford feel about détente?
3. For Gerald Ford, what does détente mean? How does he use the word during this meeting?
Document Questions:
1. Describe Image A. What is the tone?

2. What does this cartoon represent?

3. How does Image A depict détente?

4. Describe Image B. What is the tone?

5. What does this cartoon represent?
6. How does Image B depict détente?


Document Questions:

1. Describe Image C. What is the tone?

2. What event or controversy does this cartoon represent? How does it achieve that?

3. What is this cartoon trying to say?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why was the US inclined towards détente?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why was the Soviet Union inclined towards détente?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did Nixon help direct the US towards a policy of détente?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the significance of SALT I from 1969?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What important changes were made regarding Germany that helped enable détente?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were the results of the Helsinki Conference and Accords (1975)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors start to lead to the decline of détente for the Soviet Union?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors start to lead to the decline of détente for the United States?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>