

Name: _____

Class Period: _____

Contextualization & Making Inferences... *The Reagan Doctrine*

Historical Thinking Skill 5: Contextualization

Historical thinking involves the ability to **connect historical events and processes to specific circumstances of time and place** and to broader regional, national, or global processes.

Proficient students should be able to ...

- Explain and evaluate ways in which specific historical phenomena, events, or processes connect to broader regional, national, or global processes occurring at the same time.
- Explain and evaluate ways in which a phenomenon, event, or process connects to other, similar historical phenomena across time and place.

Skill 7: Appropriate Use of Relevant Historical Evidence

Historical thinking involves the ability to **describe and evaluate evidence about the past from diverse sources** (including written documents, works of art, archaeological artifacts, oral traditions, and other primary sources) and requires the students to pay attention to the content, authorship, purpose, format, and audience of such sources. It involves the capacity to **extract useful information, make supportable inferences, and draw appropriate conclusions** from historical evidence, while also noting the context in which the evidence was produced and used, recognizing its limitations and assessing the points of view it reflects.

Proficient students should be able to ...

- Analyze features of historical evidence such as audience, purpose, point of view, format, argument, limitations, and context germane to the evidence considered.
- Based on analysis and evaluation of historical evidence, make supportable inferences and draw appropriate conclusions.

From the Period 9 Content Outline:

Key Concept 9.2: The end of the **Cold War** and new challenges to U.S. leadership in the world forced the nation to redefine its foreign policy and global role.

- I. The **Reagan administration** pursued a reinvigorated **anti-Communist** and **interventionist foreign policy** that set the tone for later administrations.
 - A. **President Ronald Reagan**, who initially rejected **détente** with increased defense spending, military action, and bellicose rhetoric, later developed a friendly relationship with Soviet leader **Mikhail Gorbachev**, leading to significant arms reductions by both countries.
 - B. The end of the **Cold War** led to new diplomatic relationships but also new U.S. military and peacekeeping interventions, as well as debates over the nature and extent of American power in the world.

What is the Reagan Doctrine?

During the early years of the Reagan presidency, **Cold War** tensions between the **Soviet Union** and the **United States** intensified. Reagan entered office deeply suspicious of the Soviet Union. Reagan described the Soviet Union as "**an evil empire**" and called for a space-based missile defense system [**Strategic Defense Initiative**], derided by critics as "**Star Wars**." Reagan and his advisers tended to view every regional conflict through a Cold War lens. Nowhere was this truer than in the Western Hemisphere, where he was determined to prevent Communist takeovers. In October 1983, Prime Minister Maurice Bishop of **Grenada**, a small island nation in the Caribbean, was assassinated and a more radical Marxist government took power. Afterwards, Soviet money and Cuban troops came to **Grenada**. When they began constructing an airfield capable of landing large military aircraft, the Reagan administration decided to remove the Communists and restore a pro-American regime. On October 25, U.S. troops invaded **Grenada**, killed or captured 750 Cuban soldiers, and established a new government. The invasion sent a clear message throughout the region that the Reagan administration would not tolerate communism in its hemisphere.

In his 1985 state of the union address, President Reagan pledged his support for **anti-Communist revolutions** in what would become known as the "**Reagan Doctrine**." In **Afghanistan**, the United States was already providing aid to **anti-Soviet freedom fighters**, ultimately, helping to force Soviet troops to withdraw. It was in **Nicaragua**, however, that the doctrine received its most controversial application. In 1979, Nicaraguans revolted against the corrupt Somoza regime. A new junta took power dominated by young Marxists known as **Sandinistas**. The Sandinistas insisted that they favored free elections, non-alignment, and a mixed economy; but once in power, they postponed elections, forced opposition leaders into exile, and turned to the Soviet bloc for arms and advisers. For the Reagan administration, **Nicaragua** looked "like another Cuba," a Communist state that threatened the security of its Central American neighbors. In his first months in office, President Reagan approved covert training of anti-Sandinista rebels (called "**contras**"). While the **contras** waged war on the **Sandinistas** from camps in Honduras, the CIA provided assistance. In 1984, Congress ordered an end to all covert aid to the contras. The Reagan administration circumvented Congress by soliciting contributions for the **contras** from private individuals and from foreign governments seeking U.S. favor. The president also permitted the sale of arms to **Iran**, with profits diverted to the **contras**. The arms sale and transfer of funds to the contras were handled surreptitiously through the CIA intelligence network, apparently with the full support of CIA Director William Casey. Exposure of the **Iran-Contra affair** in late 1986 provoked a major congressional investigation. The scandal seriously weakened the influence of the president. The American preoccupation with **Nicaragua** began to subside in 1987, after President Oscar Arias Sanches of Costa Rica proposed a regional peace plan. In national elections in 1990, the **Nicaraguan** opposition routed the **Sandinistas**, bringing an end to ten turbulent years of Sandinista rule. (source: DigitalHistory.com)

Contextualization and Making Inferences... *The Reagan Doctrine*

Reminder: When analyzing a document, your contextualization must include OUTSIDE knowledge and facts.

"Yes, let us pray for the salvation of all of those who live in totalitarian darkness -- pray they will discover the joy of knowing God. But until they do, let us be aware that while they preach the supremacy of the state, declare its omnipotence over individual man, and predict its eventual domination of all peoples on the Earth, they are the focus of evil in the modern world... But if history teaches anything, it teaches that simple-minded appeasement or wishful thinking about our adversaries is folly. It means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom. So I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military and moral inferiority... So, in your discussions of the nuclear-freeze proposals, I urge you to beware of the temptation of pride -- the temptation of blithely declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil... I believe communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written... yes, change our world... Thomas Paine once said that *we have it in our power to begin the world over again.*" (Ronald Reagan, 1983)

Basic Historical/Local Context

(Who, What, When, Where... BEYOND the obvious, without quoting or describing, and with one specific piece of outside evidence!)

Broad Context

"Big Picture?"

What is the theme?

...BEYOND the obvious,

without quoting,

& with one specific piece of outside evidence!

Comparative/Other Context

Similar in Kind from a Different Time [*U.S. History only*]; Explain how the BROAD context connects from one era to another. *Comparison must have specific piece of outside evidence!*

Name: _____ Class Period: _____

Comparison... *The Reagan Doctrine*

Historical Thinking Skill 4: Comparison (comparing AND contrasting)

Historical thinking involves the ability to describe, compare, and evaluate multiple historical developments within one society, one or more developments across or between different societies, and in various chronological and geographical contexts. It also involves the ability to identify, compare, and evaluate multiple perspectives on a given historical experience. *...it's not just about similarities and differences... its about the significance of those similarities and differences...*

To what extent was the Reagan Doctrine similar to the Monroe Doctrine?

Read the summary and excerpt below, and then address this prompt by comparing and contrasting eras, goals, and impact of each doctrine.

Monroe Doctrine

The Monroe Doctrine, (originally expressed during a message to Congress on December 2, 1823), was written mainly by Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, during the presidential administration of James Monroe. This document is a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy in which President Monroe declared that the Old World and New World had different systems and must remain distinct spheres. The Monroe Doctrine made four basic points: (1) The United States would not interfere in the internal affairs of or the wars between European powers; (2) the United States recognized and would not interfere with existing colonies and dependencies in the Western Hemisphere; (3) the Western Hemisphere was closed to future colonization; and (4) any attempt by a European power to oppress or control any nation in the Western Hemisphere would be viewed as a hostile act against the United States. (source: Encyclopedia Britannica)

Excerpts from Transcript of Monroe Doctrine (1823)

... as a principle in which the rights and interests of the United States are involved, that the American continents...are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. . .
 ... In the wars of the European powers ... we have never taken any part... It is only when our rights are invaded ... that we resent injuries or make preparation for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are of necessity more immediately connected.... We owe it, therefore, ...to the... relations existing between the United States and those powers (in Europe) to declare that ... any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or dependencies of any European power we have not interfered and shall not interfere...
 The late events in Spain and Portugal show that Europe is still unsettled. Our policy in regard to Europe...is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of its powers; ...to cultivate friendly relations with it, and to preserve those relations by a frank, firm, and manly policy.... It is impossible that the allied powers should extend their political system to any portion of either continent without endangering our peace and happiness; nor can anyone believe that our southern brethren (South and Central America would choose this), ... It is still the true policy of the United States to leave the parties to themselves, in hope that other powers will pursue the same course. . . . (source: Avalon.law.yale.edu)

Comparison... *The Reagan Doctrine*

To what extent was the Reagan Doctrine similar to the Truman Doctrine?

Read the summary and excerpt below, and then address this prompt by comparing and contrasting eras, goals, and impact of each doctrine.

Truman Doctrine

On March 12, 1947, President Harry Truman declared immediate economic and military aid to the governments of Greece, threatened by Communist insurrection, and Turkey, under pressure from Soviet expansion in the Mediterranean area. As the United States and the Soviet Union struggled to reach a balance of power during the Cold War that followed World War II, Great Britain announced that it could no longer afford to aid those Mediterranean countries, which the West feared were in danger of falling under Soviet influence. The U.S. Congress responded to a message from Truman by promptly appropriating \$400,000,000 for this purpose.

(source: Encyclopedia Britannica)

Excerpts from Transcript of Truman Doctrine (March 12, 1947)

...The gravity of the situation ... necessitates my appearance before a joint session of the Congress. The foreign policy and the national security of this country are involved. One aspect of the present situation, ... concerns Greece and Turkey. The United States has received from the Greek Government an urgent appeal for financial and economic assistance. ... assistance is imperative if Greece is to survive as a free nation. ... The very existence of the Greek state is today threatened by the terrorist activities of several thousand armed men, led by Communists... Meanwhile, the Greek Government is unable to cope with the situation. The Greek army is small and poorly equipped. There is no other country to which democratic Greece can turn. We have considered how the United Nations might assist in this crisis. But the situation is an urgent one requiring immediate action ...

Greece's neighbor, Turkey, also deserves our attention. The future of Turkey as an independent and economically sound state is clearly no less important to the freedom-loving peoples of the world than the future of Greece. The circumstances in which Turkey finds itself today are considerably different from those of Greece. ... Nevertheless, Turkey now needs our support. Since the war Turkey has sought financial assistance from Great Britain and the United States for the purpose of ... modernization necessary for the maintenance of its national integrity. That integrity is essential to the preservation of order in the Middle East. As in the case of Greece, if Turkey is to have the assistance it needs, the United States must supply it. We are the only country able to provide that help. One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion. This was a fundamental issue in the war with Germany and Japan. Our victory was won over countries which sought to impose their will, and their way of life, upon other nations. At the present moment in world history nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life.... One way of life is based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio; fixed elections, and the suppression of personal freedoms.

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.This is an investment in world freedom and world peace. It is only common sense that we should safeguard this investment ... The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms. (source: Avalon.law.yale.edu)

Comparison... *The Reagan Doctrine*

To what extent was the Reagan Doctrine similar to the Eisenhower Doctrine?

Read the summary and excerpt below, and then address this prompt by comparing and contrasting eras, goals, and impact of each doctrine.

Eisenhower Doctrine

President Dwight Eisenhower presented his Doctrine on January 5, 1957. He promised military or economic aid to any Middle Eastern country needing help in resisting communist aggression. The doctrine was intended to check increased Soviet influence in the Middle East, which had resulted from the supply of arms to Egypt by communist countries as well as from strong communist support of Arab states against an Israeli, French, and British attack on Egypt in October 1956. Eisenhower proclaimed, with the approval of Congress, that he would use the armed forces to protect the independence of any Middle Eastern country seeking American help. The Eisenhower Doctrine represented no radical change in U.S. policy; the Truman Doctrine had pledged similar support to Greece and Turkey 10 years earlier. It was a continuation of the U.S. policy of containment of or resistance to any extension of the Soviet sphere of influence. (source: Encyclopedia Britannica)

Excerpts from The Eisenhower Doctrine on the Middle East, A Message to Congress, January 5, 1957

The Middle East has abruptly reached a new and critical stage in its long and important history. ...Our country supports without reservation the full sovereignty and independence of each and every nation of the Middle East....(J)ust recently there have been hostilities involving Western European nations that once exercised much influence in the area. Also the relatively large attack by Israel in October has intensified the basic differences between (Israel) and its Arab neighbors. All this instability has been heightened and, at times, manipulated by International Communism. Russia's rulers have long sought to dominate the Middle East. That was true of the Czars and it is true of the Bolsheviks. The Soviet Union has nothing whatsoever to fear from the United States in the Middle East, or anywhere else in the world, so long as its rulers do not themselves first resort to aggression. The reason for Russia's interest in the Middle East is solely that of power politics. Considering her announced purpose of communizing the world, it is easy to understand her hope of dominating the Middle East. . . . Thus, we have these simple and indisputable facts: 1. The Middle East, which has always been coveted by Russia, would today be prized more than ever by International Communism. 2. The Soviet rulers continue to show that they do not scruple to use any incants to gain their ends. 3. The free nations of the Mid East need, and for the most part want, added strength to assure their continued independence.

... Our desire is a world environment of freedom, not servitude. ...The action which I propose would have the following features. It would, first of all, authorize the United States to cooperate with and assist any nation or group of nations in the general area of the Middle East in the development of economic strength dedicated to the maintenance of national independence. It would, in the second place, authorize the Executive to undertake ... programs of military assistance and cooperation with any nation or group of nations which desires such aid. It would, in the third place, authorize such assistance and cooperation to include the employment of the armed forces of the United States to secure and protect the territorial integrity and political independence of such nations, requesting such aid, against overt armed aggression from any nation controlled by International Communism. ...The proposed legislation is primarily designed to deal with the possibility of Communist aggression, direct and indirect. Experience shows that indirect aggression rarely if ever succeeds where there is reasonable security against direct aggression; where the government possesses loyal security forces, and where economic conditions are such as not to make Communism seem an attractive alternative. The program I suggest deals with all three aspects of this matter ... And as I have indicated, it will also be necessary for us to contribute economically to strengthen those countries, or groups of countries... Such measures will provide the greatest insurance against Communist inroads. Words alone are not enough. (source: Avalon.law.yale.edu)

Comparison... *The Reagan Doctrine*

To what extent was the Reagan Doctrine similar to the Nixon Doctrine?

Read the summary and excerpt below, and then address this prompt by comparing and contrasting eras, goals, and impact of each doctrine.

Nixon Doctrine

The Nixon Doctrine was presented in a 1969 public address to the nation regarding the War in Vietnam. The policy centered on the continuation of U.S. supplied arms but not the continuation of military forces to its allies in Asia and elsewhere. It was part of his grander "peace with honor" and Vietnamization plans to end the war, which was an important part of his election promise. It took 4 years for him and Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, to secure a cease fire.

Excerpts from President Richard Nixon's Address to the Nation on the War in Vietnam, 1969

I believe that one of the reasons for the deep division about Vietnam is that many Americans have lost confidence in what their Government has told them about our policy. The American people cannot and should not be asked to support a policy which involves the overriding issues of war and peace unless they know the truth about that policy. ...The defense of freedom is everybody's business--not just America's business. And it is particularly the responsibility of the people whose freedom is threatened. In the previous administration, we Americanized the war in Vietnam. In this administration, we are Vietnamizing the search for peace. The policy of the previous administration not only resulted in our assuming the primary responsibility for fighting the war, but even more significantly did not adequately stress the goal of strengthening the South Vietnamese so that they could defend themselves when we left. The Vietnamization plan was launched following Secretary Laird's visit to Vietnam in March. Under the plan, I ordered first a substantial increase in the training and equipment of South Vietnamese forces... We have adopted a plan which we have worked out in cooperation with the South Vietnamese for the complete withdrawal of all U.S. combat ground forces, and their replacement by South Vietnamese forces on an orderly scheduled timetable. This withdrawal will be made from strength and not from weakness. As South Vietnamese forces become stronger, the rate of American withdrawal can become greater...

...I want to end the war to save the lives of those brave young men in Vietnam...But I want to end it in a way which will increase the chance that their younger brothers and their sons will not have to fight in some future Vietnam someplace in the world. Two hundred years ago this Nation was weak and poor. But even then, America was the hope of millions in the world. Today we have become the strongest and richest nation in the world. And the Wheel of destiny has turned so that any hope the world has for the survival of peace and freedom will be determined by whether the American people have the moral stamina and the courage to meet the challenge of free world leadership. Let historians not record that when America was the most powerful nation in the world we passed on the other side of the road and allowed the last hopes for peace and freedom of millions of people to be suffocated by the forces of totalitarianism.

Let us be united for peace. Let us also be united against defeat. Because let us understand: North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that. ...Fifty years ago, in this room and at this very desk, President Woodrow Wilson spoke words which caught the imagination of a war-weary world. He said: "This is the war to end war." His dream for peace after World War I was shattered on the hard realities of great power politics and Woodrow Wilson died a broken man. ... Tonight I do not tell you that the war in Vietnam is the war to end wars. But I do say this: I have initiated a plan which will end this war in a way that will bring us closer to that great goal to which Woodrow Wilson and every American President in our history has been dedicated--the goal of a just and lasting peace..