

Georgia State University

ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University

Communication Theses

Department of Communication

Fall 11-9-2011

Identification is Persuasion: Eisenhower's Call for Unity and the Founding of NATO's Military Headquarters

Debra N. Fossum
Georgia State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_theses



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fossum, Debra N., "Identification is Persuasion: Eisenhower's Call for Unity and the Founding of NATO's Military Headquarters." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2011.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.57709/2368739>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact scholarworks@gsu.edu.

IDENTIFICATION IS PERSUASION: EISENHOWER'S CALL FOR UNITY AND THE
FOUNDING OF NATO'S MILITARY HEADQUARTERS

by

DEBRA N. FOSSUM

Under the Direction of Mary E. Stuckey

ABSTRACT

Historians of the founding years of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) acknowledge General Dwight D. Eisenhower's role as the first Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), yet they ignore the effect Eisenhower's rhetoric had in the creation of a sense of unity among Western European nations. Rhetorical analysis of Eisenhower's time as SACEUR offers scholars a unique look into the founding years of NATO and the beginning of European unification. Using Kenneth Burke's theory of the four master tropes, I analyze how Eisenhower's role in the development of NATO was important to the eventual development of a unified Europe.

INDEX WORDS: Dwight D. Eisenhower, Kenneth Burke, Persuasion, Trope,
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), Supreme Allied Commander, European unity

IDENTIFICATION IS PERSUASION: EISENHOWER'S CALL FOR UNITY AND THE
FOUNDING OF NATO'S MILITARY HEADQUARTERS

by

DEBRA N. FOSSUM

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in the College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

2011

Copyright by
Debra Naomi Fossum
2011

IDENTIFICATION IS PERSUASION: EISENHOWER'S CALL FOR UNITY AND THE
FOUNDING OF NATO'S MILITARY HEADQUARTERS

by

DEBRA N. FOSSUM

Committee Chair: Mary E. Stuckey

Committee: James F. Darsey

Carol K. Winkler

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies

College of Arts and Sciences

Georgia State University

December 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Burke’s Master Tropes.....	7
1.2 Analyzing Burkean Tropes in Public Address.....	17
1.3 Chapter Outline.....	19
2. CONTEXT	22
2.1 WWII: Eisenhower and the North African Campaign.....	23
2.2 1948-1950: Efforts Toward Cooperation in Europe.....	37
2.3 1948-1950: NATO and Its First SACEUR.....	45
3. ANALYSIS.....	49
3.1 Metaphor.....	50
3.2 Irony.....	72
3.3 Synecdoche.....	76
3.4 Metonymy.....	78
4. CONCLUSION.....	82
5. REFERENCES	90
6. APPENDIX.....	99

1. INTRODUCTION

On April 4, 1949, twelve nations signed the North Atlantic Treaty to form the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Article 5 of the treaty declared that "an armed attack against one or more of [the NATO countries] in Europe or North America" would be "considered an attack against them all," but the Alliance was not well-prepared to execute that mandate.¹ Troop shortages and a lack of both equipment and centralized command structure left the overall defense of Western Europe to a few scattered, regional committees.² While the legal alliance existed because of the North Atlantic Treaty, the physical alliance had not taken shape. A command structure and centralized leadership were still needed in order to form a cohesive, unified military coalition to stand against the potential military threat of the Soviet Union and communist ideology.

With the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950, the NATO member countries feared the Soviets would attempt to push the "Iron Curtain" westward while the United States (US) was preoccupied with Asia.³ Little more than a year after signing the North Atlantic Treaty, the Alliance agreed to enhance their defense efforts in response to the fear of Soviet expansion.⁴ They began taking steps to build NATO's integrated military command structure under a single command in Europe. In order to begin building said command, the selection of the Supreme

¹ "The North Atlantic Treaty," *North Atlantic Treaty Organization Online*, 9 Dec. 2008. Accessed 4 Oct. 2011 <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm>.

² Each "Regional Planning Group" was charged with creating defense plans for their particular region.

³ One of the most well-known metaphors during Eisenhower's tenure as SACEUR, the "Iron Curtain," was coined by Winston Churchill's 1946 "Sinews of Peace" address at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri." The speech gave the "first authoritative public utterance to many of the leading political and ideological themes of the coming Cold War," including the ideological split between the democratic west and the communist east. Communication scholars Boyd Lynn Hinds and Theodore Otto Windt, Jr. came to agree with Eisenhower's assumption that Churchill's speech would eventually be marked as important. They noted that Churchill's speech "sowed the seeds for a rhetorical process that was to blossom into a new world order, a new political reality." See *The Cold War Rhetoric* (Praeger: New York, 1991).

⁴ Gregory W. Pedlow, "The Evolution of NATO's Command Structure, 1951-2009," *NATO Unclassified*, Web. Accessed 15 Sep. 2011 <www.aco.nato.int>.

Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR), the man who would command all of NATO's military forces in Europe, would be a delicate task. NATO needed someone that was respected by both Americans and Europeans. They needed a man experienced in bringing together diverse groups of soldiers. Only one person fit this bill, and in 1950, US President Harry Truman called on General Dwight D. Eisenhower, the man who led the Allied forces to victory during World War II (WWII), to serve as the fledgling SACEUR for NATO forces.

On January 1, 1951, Eisenhower arrived in Europe as SACEUR to find a dismal situation. He had minimal staff and no troops under his command. Europe had barely begun to recover from WWII, and the European countries committed to NATO had little more than a dozen military divisions available for ground combat should the Soviet Union, with more than 175 military divisions, decide to mount an attack against them.⁵ The Soviet's 175 military divisions were easily and quickly expandable to 300 divisions, backed by 40,000 tanks and tactical aircrafts; as a comparison, the German's maintained 250 divisions during WWII, and that was not enough to hold back the Normandy invasion.⁶ While the European and US governments found funding and troops to bolster their forces, Eisenhower's task was largely rhetorical. He needed to enhance morale among the European nations, reminding them, "Never again must there be a campaign of liberation fought on these shores."⁷ During the next year and a half of his appointment as SACEUR, Eisenhower traveled around Europe, focusing much of his efforts on the political elite in Britain and France. While Western Europe's political leaders knew freedom

⁵ See Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1990), 254. Also see Andrew J. Goodpaster, "The Development of SHAPE: 1950-1953," *International Organization*, 9 (1955): 259. Ambrose claims NATO had 12 military divisions available while Goodpaster cites 14. Regardless, Ambrose (an Eisenhower scholar) and Colonel Goodpaster (a graduate of West Point with military staff assignments with the Pentagon and the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe) both agree on the 175 divisions available to the Soviets. As a testament to Eisenhower's leadership and importance to NATO, by 1953, the year after Eisenhower left NATO and won the US presidency, forces delegated strictly to NATO increased fourfold.

⁶ Charles J. V. Murphy, "The War We May Fight," *Life*, May 28, 1951.

⁷ *Ibid.* 256.

from communist control and Soviet expansion were in their best interest, Eisenhower needed to convince them that the best way to maintain that freedom was through unification with other European nations and joint military action. Joint military action included the rearmament of Western Germany. Gradually, Eisenhower would convince political leadership to commit forces for the combined defense of Europe.⁸ Eisenhower was in a unique position to make these calls to action to Western Europe based on his prevalent leadership role during the WWII Battle of Normandy and other WWII operations with Allied forces. He was an accomplished soldier and leader, admired by his peers and the people he helped protect during WWII.⁹

Apart from his task of conjuring morale and military force, Eisenhower had to work against fears of US hegemony in Europe. The appointment of an American Supreme Commander meant European defense was under the control of the US, and this could have posed a grave threat to the “European spirit.”¹⁰ In response to fears of American hegemony, Eisenhower worked harder to bring people together.¹¹ In his role as SACEUR, Eisenhower was a strong proponent of global equality and European unity. This was one of the many reasons NATO ultimately established a stronghold in Europe and built the foundation for the international organization it is today. Tropes allowed Eisenhower to make his call for European unity, and they help shed light on his unique ability to use specific metaphors, irony, synecdoche and metonymy to specific audiences to create a persuasive call to action.

Historians of the founding years of NATO and the beginning stages of European unification recognize Eisenhower’s role as the first SACEUR, but they ignore the importance of his rhetoric in helping to foster a sense of unity and cooperation among the Western European

⁸ See footnote 3 concerning Eisenhower’s success increasing the number of committed troops.

⁹ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President*.

¹⁰ Robert McGeehan, *The German Rearmament Question* (Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1971), 146.

¹¹ Richard Crable, “Ike: Identification, Argument, and Paradoxical Appeal,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65 (1977): 192.

nations. Moreover, critics have often characterized Eisenhower's presidential rhetoric as that of a speaker lacking the "energy, motivation and political know-how to have a significant impact on events" during the 1950s; Eisenhower was viewed as a "good-natured bumbler" who lacked leadership qualities.¹² Eisenhower was also well-known for mixing metaphors during his time in the White House.¹³ However, this was not the case with his rhetoric during his time as SACEUR. Eisenhower's rhetoric, reviewed in conjunction with the specific context of his role in WWII and the beginning of the Cold War, was an important factor in the development and strength of NATO that has been ignored by historians and rhetoricians alike.¹⁴ Critical rhetorical analysis of Eisenhower's time as SACEUR, taking into account the context surrounding his role, offers scholars a unique look into the developing years of NATO and the beginnings of European unification. This is because historians typically look at matters external to discourse, while

¹² Fred I. Greenstein, *The Hidden Hand Presidency* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1981): 5. While Greenstein is reviewing previous studies and commentaries on Eisenhower's presidential rhetoric, this is an important discussion to note. Until recently, Eisenhower was seen as non-strategic and apolitical in relation to his public address and political dealings. Moreover, he was commonly seen as a person who frequently mixed metaphors, or used them incorrectly, throughout his presidency. Greenstein makes the argument that even if Eisenhower did mix metaphors or use seemingly non-strategic or apolitical rhetoric, it was for a particular reason, and therefore, strategic.

¹³ Mixed metaphors are those that have a vehicle and tenor term that do not match or make sense. A notable mixed metaphor during Eisenhower's presidency included his reference to Joseph McCartney as "a pimple on the path of progress," during a call to the Republican National Committee in March 1954. See Jim Newton, *Eisenhower: The White House Years* (New York: Random House, 2011):123.

¹⁴ There are only two exceptions to the general statement that rhetorical scholars have mainly ignored General Eisenhower's rhetoric. First, Halford Ross Ryan's 1972 dissertation from the University of Illinois, "A Rhetorical Analysis of General Eisenhower's Public Speaking from 1945 to 1951," discussed Eisenhower's rhetoric directly before he became SACEUR. The dissertation was never published outside the university, and it did not result in the publication of any work based on Eisenhower's rhetoric as a general. Second, Ira Chernus's 1999 article, "Eisenhower and the Soviets, 1945-1947: Rhetoric and Policy," and 2002 book, *General Eisenhower: Ideology and Discourse*. In the 1999 article, Chernus concluded that Eisenhower's "new discourse of peace was the ultimate legacy of Eisenhower's postwar rhetoric and policy," and future scholars should consider "how much of that legacy still shapes public rhetoric and public policy in the United States today." He also noted a distinct difference in tone between Eisenhower's private rhetoric and his public rhetoric. Privately, Eisenhower cast the Soviet Union as a great threat while he publically promoted a collaborative relationship between the US and the Soviets. The main premise of *General Eisenhower* is to trace Eisenhower's private and public rhetoric during the ten-year span of 1942 through 1952. See Halford Ross Ryan, "A Rhetorical Analysis of General Eisenhower's Public Speaking from 1945 to 1951." Dissertation. University of Illinois, 1972; also see Ira Chernus, "Eisenhower and the Soviets, 1945-1947," 59-82; and *General Eisenhower: Ideology and Discourse* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2002).

rhetoricians review the discourse itself.¹⁵ Historians have penned numerous biographies and histories of Eisenhower and NATO, and rhetoricians have examined key speeches during Eisenhower's long military and political career. However, none have reviewed how Eisenhower's experiences during WWII, the political atmosphere in Europe leading into 1950, and well-established persuasive abilities created an orator that played a much larger role in the formation of NATO and the early years of European unity than simply acting as an appointed military commander.¹⁶

Using Kenneth Burke's description of the four master tropes, I will discuss how Eisenhower's role in the development of NATO, especially the development of their military arm in Europe, was an important milestone in the eventual development of a unified Europe. One of the largest barriers to this unification was getting Europe to consider the establishment of the European defense community. Eisenhower would overcome this barrier by convincing France, Britain and the remainder of Western Europe that the most effective way to avoid Soviet and communist expansion was through a united military force, including Western Germany. Through public address, he would persuade the NATO countries that a unified, European military effort was the best way to maintain their national sovereignty and freedom during the 1950s.

In the 1950 edition of *A Rhetoric of Motives*, Burke discussed persuasion in public address.¹⁷ As Bryan Crable noted, Burke's discussion in *Rhetoric* suggests that identification was

¹⁵ Stephen E. Lucas, "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 67 (1981): 5.

¹⁶ For a discussion of Eisenhower's explicit and strategic use of arguments and persuasive tactics, see Martin J. Medhurst, "Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' Speech: A Case Study in the Strategic Use of Language," *Communication Monographs*, 54 (1987): 204-220.

¹⁷ Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969). In his introduction, Burke clearly meant for "identification" to be the takeaway of this text, noting, "We emerge from the analysis with the key term, 'Identification,'" (xiii). The first hardback edition of the book was released in 1950, with the first paperback edition entering circulation in 1962. *A Rhetoric of Motives* was meant to be the second in a trilogy of works focused on different aspects of rhetoric; the other two included his already published *Grammar of Motives* and another volume he never completely produced that he intended to title *Symbolic of Motives*. He did later publish *Language*

“inseparably intertwined” with two particular aspects of rhetoric: public address and persuasion.¹⁸ Burke noted that rhetoric, by necessity, is addressed to another person or group of people.¹⁹ As a result, “the realistic use of addressed language was to *induce action in people*” through persuasion.²⁰ Speakers persuade audiences by getting them to identify with the speaker’s interests.²¹ Meanwhile, the speaker begins to identify with the audience by emphasizing a common interest and forming a certain rapport with that audience. In short, Burke blurred the lines between the definitions of persuasion, identification and communication in his articles and published lectures. For Burke, language is identification and identification is persuasion. He noted that there were times when “one or another of these elements may serve best for extending a line of analysis in some particular direction.”²² In the case of Eisenhower, the SACEUR needed to establish a legitimate reason for the formation of a unified European defense against the Soviets and persuade his toughest audience, the British and French, to view his position favorably. Eisenhower employed various tropes within his SACEUR rhetoric in an attempt to persuade his European audiences that German rearmament was the key ingredient for a strong and successful European defense community. To accomplish his instrumental goal, the creation of a unified European coalition, Eisenhower had to accomplish his constitutive goal, the development of a shared sense of identity between the various countries of Europe.

Eisenhower’s use of key master tropes allow me to trace how his rhetoric strategically persuaded Britain and France, countries afraid of losing their sovereignty should they join NATO’s military efforts, that they needed to come together in order to position NATO as a the

as *Symbolic Action* in 1966. Instead of being a completed volume, it was a collection of essays best known for the “man is a symbol-using animal” remark for which Burke is well-known.

¹⁸ Bryan Crable, “Distance as Ultimate Motive: A Dialectical Interpretation of *A Rhetoric of Motives*.” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 39.3 (2009): 224.

¹⁹ Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, 38.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 42. Emphasis in source.

²¹ *Ibid.* 46.

²² *Ibid.*

foundation of a strong, international alliance and support a unified European military effort. Tropes allowed Eisenhower to help his audience associate European unification as the essential foundation to a more secure Europe (metaphor), reduce the Soviet and communist threat to a hostile and menacing gun in the back (synecdoche), emphasize the opposing philosophies of the Soviets versus the NATO countries (irony), and associate the Soviets with representations of Hitler's Germany (metonymy).²³ In sum, Eisenhower's use of tropes allowed him to "control the processes of defining issues" to effectively persuade his key audiences, the French and the British, and reveal the "truth" about the Soviet threat and the urgency of European unity under the guidance of NATO.²⁴

1.1 Burke's Master Tropes

In 1941, Burke published "Four Master Tropes" in John Crowe Ransom's *Kenyon Review*. He identified the key tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony.²⁵ Each of the four tropes usually went by a different name: metaphor as perspective, metonymy as reduction, synecdoche as representation and irony as dialectic.²⁶ For rhetoricians, there are three options for understanding the significance of tropes in public speaking and persuasion: (1) The rhetorician

²³ Burke's tropes were chosen as a focal point for this study out of a myriad of other rhetorical methodologies for two reasons. First, of the options of Burkean theory, Dramatism did not allow me to delve deep enough into why Eisenhower was uniquely positioned to effectively utilize specific persuasive language techniques. Within the upcoming context and analysis chapters, I already identify the agency, act, scene, purpose and agent without explicitly naming them. However, by focusing on which of these pentadic terms was the most dominant would not have allowed me to focus on the most important and overlooked piece of Eisenhower's role as SACEUR: his rhetoric. Second, of all the other rhetorical methodologies available, I did not want to utilize a methodology that focused on revealing an underlying ideology or power structure; I was not trying to establish a genre or map key terminology with Eisenhower's rhetoric. I wanted to critically review how Eisenhower was interpreting the context around him, the "facts," in order to effectively reshape public perception to see that there was no alternative to building a unified coalition in order to prevent another war. Tropes were the most useful and insightful rhetorical tools to achieve this goal. Benjamin R. Bates used metaphors in a similar way. See "Audiences, metaphors, and the Persian Gulf War," *Communication Studies*, 55, (2004): 447-63.

²⁴ Mary E. Stuckey and Frederick J. Antczak, "The Battle of Issues and Images: Establishing Interpretive Dominance," *Communication Quarterly*, 42 (1994): 121.

²⁵ Kenneth Burke, "Four Master Tropes," *Kenyon Review*, 3 (1941): 421-438. While Burke is not credited for coining these tropes, he is one of the most influential scholars to draw attention to the tropes in the field of rhetoric and is most relevant to this study.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 421.

sees tropes as ornaments, or as useful ways of saying something that could have otherwise been said using direct language; (2) the rhetorician understands tropes as a “range of associations that cohere around a signifier,” such as “the tropes of war;”²⁷ or (3) the rhetorician views tropes as an “epistemological category,” seeking to account for the role of tropes in the process of discovering and describing “the truth.”²⁸ The third option, taken from Burke’s *Grammar of Motives*, best describes the way in which the master tropes are viewed in this thesis.²⁹

Metaphor

Burke saw metaphor as a “device for seeing something in terms of something else,” and he draws some of the support for this statement from the early twentieth century, when I.A. Richards wrote *Philosophy of Rhetoric*.³⁰ Richards discussed the nature of the metaphor within rhetorical literary studies and developed the tenor-vehicle model in which the speaker helps the audience see the tenor term, or the term about which the metaphor is asserting something, in relation to the vehicle term, or the term which transfers meaning from another context.³¹ This can be useful, because it can help the speaker assist his or her audience in better understanding an unfamiliar concept as it relates to a more familiar concept. An example would be “Tom is a pig,” in which “Tom” is the tenor term and “pig” is the vehicle term. Even if the speaker’s intended audience does not know Tom, they are likely familiar with the concept of a pig, a dirty farm animal. The speaker helps the audience understand that Tom is a dirty person.

²⁷ See George Lakoff and Michael Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); and also see Robert L. Ivie’s analysis of the metaphor of “force” in pro war discourse, focusing his analysis on the War of 1812 in “The Metaphor of Force in Pro war Discourse: The Case of 1812,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68 (1982): 240-253.

²⁸ Christian Lundberg, “Enjoying God’s Death: *The Passion of the Christ* and the Practices of an Evangelical Public,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 95 (2009): 389.

²⁹ Kenneth Burke, *Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989): 503.

³⁰ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 421.

³¹ Douwe Draaisma, *Metaphors of Memory: A History of Ideas About the Mind*, Trans. Paul Vincent (Great Britain: Cambridge University Press, 1995): 11.

In addition to making the unfamiliar familiar, metaphors are most effective if the audience can buy into the speaker's comparison as "true" or acceptable. Michael Osborn and Douglas Ehninger discussed how the metaphor functioned in relation to discourse; the "metaphor of the orator" was not just a "category of thought" but "an ornament of style."³² If scholars were to take into account the meaningfulness of a metaphor, the audience needed to be considered, because a metaphor was both a stimulus and mental response. As stimulus, the metaphor identifies an idea or object through a sign which generally stood for an entirely different idea or object. As mental response, the metaphor is the interaction of the audience's own thoughts and the contexts surrounding the time the metaphor is used.³³ Therefore, if the audience can accept a metaphor as literal or true over a prolonged period of time, the more influential and persuasive the metaphor. The metaphor only loses its persuasive effect when the audience begins to believe it is a false representation.

Finally, apart from choosing metaphors that can be accepted as literal and sustained over time, Eisenhower also used the same or similar metaphors repeatedly. Arthur Hastings discussed the importance of maintaining the metaphor throughout the entirety of the discourse, and in Eisenhower's case, this meant his tenure as SACEUR. Hastings claimed the imposition of a specific frame of reference on an audience member helps to establish an "identity structure" in which the audience can be "controlled," because the speaker has found a way to make the metaphor rewarding for the audience.³⁴ A metaphor is considered rewarding when an audience can relate to it in some way. For example, if a conservative political candidate spoke to an audience in a rural, Christian Alabama town, he could compare his economic policy to the Ten Commandments in order to garner support. If that same candidate spoke to a group of non-

³² Michael Osborn and Douglas Ehninger, "The Metaphor in Public Address," *Speech Monographs*, 29 (1962): 223.

³³ Ibid. 225-226.

³⁴ Arthur Hastings, "Metaphor in Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication*, 34 (1970): 182-183.

religious individuals, such a metaphor would either be ignored or mean very little, and some could even find it offensive. This means it is important for a speaker to have a clear characterization of his or her audience before deploying metaphors. The speaker must know what tenor and associate vehicle terms will be most acceptable to the audience. Max Black's concept of a "system of associated commonplaces" aligned with the vehicle term of a metaphor. When a metaphor is deployed, the vehicle term, and the ideas or objects connected with it, organize the audience's view of the tenor term.³⁵ The greater the number of associated ideas or objects, the greater the chance the audience could identify with the metaphor.

For Eisenhower, metaphors created clear connections between his message and his audience, pulling from contextual references that made his points clear and concise. Eisenhower sustained select metaphors throughout his tenure as SACEUR, making them more influential and more persuasive over time for his French and British audiences. Sustained metaphors can be more effective, because the more often Eisenhower said the unification of Europe was the foundation for a strong wall of defense against the already-feared Soviet and communist aggression, the more he could make his case that European unity under NATO was the only way to avoid losing freedom. Apart from linking European unity to positive representations through metaphor, Eisenhower also emphasized the difference between the Soviets and the NATO countries through the use of a second trope, irony, augmenting the need for strong military force and increasing the sense of urgency to act before it was too late to deter an invasion.

³⁵ Max Black, "Metaphor," *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, ed. Mark Johnson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1981): 73-75.

Irony

For Burke, “irony demands a fundamental kinship with the enemy,” because it involves the pairing of two dialectics.³⁶ According to Burke, “Irony arises when one tries, by the interaction of terms upon one another, to produce development which uses all the terms.”³⁷ He references it as a “perspective of perspectives,” in which none of the “sub-perspectives” can be labeled as completely correct or completely incorrect.³⁸ An example that explains Burke’s description of irony is the hero/villain dialectic. A person could ironically make a statement about how the villain functions to ultimately strengthen the hero. In one sense, the villain gives the hero a reason to protect others, but the villain can also harm the hero, involving him/her in physical battles or worse. The statement is neither right nor wrong, because irony is created when meanings work in opposition to one another.³⁹

In “Four Master Tropes,” Burke sets apart two distinct forms of irony available to a speaker: romantic irony and dialectic or “true” irony. He said romantic irony has the danger of relativism,⁴⁰ and it constitutes a particular kind of paradox.⁴¹ It is a reversal of expectations. In romantic irony, a term is restated in a way that it no longer appears to mean what it is usually taken to mean, but seems to signify something else. As Burke noted, “what goes forth as A returns as non-A.”⁴² In this inversion, the thing that is unquestioned can become questionable, and the thing that is accepted as common can become strange.⁴³ Speakers utilizing romantic irony often hold a detached, superior attitude; they seek hierarchical distinctions from others as a

³⁶ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 49.

³⁷ Kenneth Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 255.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Elizabeth A. Wright, “Joking Isn’t Safe: Fanny Fern, Irony, and Signifyin(g),” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 31 (2001): 93.

⁴⁰ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 434.

⁴¹ Elizabeth Galewski, “The Strange Case for Women’s Capacity to Reason: Judith Sargent Murray’s Use of Irony in ‘On the Equality of the Sexes’ (1790),” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 93 (2007): 87.

⁴² Kenneth Burke, *Grammar of Motives*, 517.

⁴³ Elizabeth Galewski, 87.

means of positioning and tend to “look down” on others.⁴⁴ Dialectic or “true” irony is quite different. It brings about the attribute of humility and does not make the claim of superiority. As Burke stated, dialectic irony “is based on a sense of fundamental kinship with the enemy, as one needs him/[her].”⁴⁵ The second half of the dialectic becomes a necessary modifier.⁴⁶ Speakers who choose to embrace dialectic irony favor an intimate, collegial attitude, and seek connections with others as a means of positioning themselves.⁴⁷ For Eisenhower, unifying Europe under a fledgling NATO and promoting the rearmament of Western Germany, dialectic irony fostered “connections” between himself, NATO and his European audiences. While romantic irony appeared occasionally in his SACEUR rhetoric, it is not prevalent throughout his speeches.

When implementing irony, speakers are asking their audience to recognize incompatibilities in what the speaker is saying and what the speaker believes, causing the audience to question the validity of a statement. Irony requires an audience’s detailed understanding of the author/speaker.⁴⁸ For irony to effectively allow the speaker to identify with his or her audience, the speaker must be dealing with a fairly high level of cultural homogeneity while recognizing the context of a culturally diverse world.⁴⁹ A speaker relying on irony also needs an audience that is sophisticated enough to recognize the numerous voices at play in ironic statements.⁵⁰ Often, the speaker adds in a “wink” to be sure the audience recognizes the irony.⁵¹

Finally, irony is a tool used to help a speaker and a bifurcated, or split, audience identify with one another to find common ground. David Kaufner identified five cases in which a speaker

⁴⁴ Sarah E. Mahan-Hays and Roger C. Aden, Kenneth Burke’s ‘Attitude’ at the Crossroads of Rhetorical and Cultural Studies: A Proposal and Case Study Illustration,” *Western Journal of Communication*, 67 (2003): 38.

⁴⁵ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 435.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Sarah E. Mahan-Hays and Roger C. Aden, 38.

⁴⁸ Elizabeth A. Wright, 93.

⁴⁹ Chaïm Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969): 208.

⁵⁰ Elizabeth A. Wright, 93.

⁵¹ Wayne Booth, *The Rhetoric of Irony* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974): 53.

could use irony to rhetorically frame a situation for a bifurcated audience, including: (1) building in-group cohesion by victimizing out-groups; (2) victimizing one audience in order to achieve affiliation with another audience; (3) victimizing an audience while addressing it; (4) holding two incompatible audiences at bay; and (5) using irony to convey a false character.⁵² The type of irony implemented within Eisenhower's speeches is best classified as the first option, irony in pursuit of group cohesion. The one thing Eisenhower shared with his audience from the start was the fear of Soviet and communist aggression. Therefore, he could easily make ironic statements about the Soviets, knowing his audience would understand his words were ironic and not literal.

For Eisenhower, irony was the trope used the least in his speeches across Europe, but in particular, he used irony most in France. When he did implement irony, he chose well-known dialectics, such as communism versus freedom or east versus west. While limited in use, irony allowed Eisenhower to make damaging statements about his enemy, the Soviets, without sounding belligerent or compromising his well-known friendly demeanor, and it allowed Eisenhower to reinforce the bond between himself and his audience by choosing to implement dialectics well-known by his audience but that may not have been as accessible to members outside the NATO countries or the US. Irony helped Eisenhower create a close-knit group of NATO countries through his rhetoric. His use of metonymy, while also limited, was meant to help create cohesion among NATO nations as well.

Metonymy

Burke described the basic "strategy" in metonymy as being able to "convey some incorporeal or intangible state in terms of the corporeal or tangible."⁵³ An example is someone claiming they are speaking from "the heart" rather than with "emotions." Other examples include

⁵² David Kaufer, "Irony and Rhetorical Strategy," *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 10 (1977): 100.

⁵³ Kenneth Burke, "Four Master Tropes," 424.

a crown used to represent a King, or a pen may be used to represent a writer.⁵⁴ Peter Cramer highlighted the usage of the metonym grammatically with the term “public,” which can be seen as a representation of the shift from an intangible idea, “a public space,” to the tangible idea of “a public body of people.”⁵⁵ For Burke, metonymy was both poetic and scientific, because metonymy allows poets and scientists to take something like the emotion of “shame” and translate it into the “movement of the eye, a color of the cheek, [or] a certain quality of voice and set of muscles.”⁵⁶ There is a slight difference between Burke’s poetic and scientific metonyms. Burke reasoned that poetic metonymy provides a “terminological reduction whereas the scientific behaviorists offers his reduction as a ‘real’ reduction.”⁵⁷ The difference between the two is not their ability to reduce the content, but their overall knowledge.⁵⁸

As a specific example, Burke said metonyms are often found in our terminology for “spiritual” states. In his 2009 essay, Christian Lundberg discussed how metonymy, among other master tropes, functioned within the evangelical public interested in Mel Gibson’s *The Passion of the Christ* film. In particular, Lundberg noted how the scene of Jesus’s scourge allowed two key metonyms to emerge: (1) Jesus became a metonym for the “evangelical public of the film”: and (2) the Romans, or persecutors of Jesus, became a metonym for the perceived “persecutors

⁵⁴ Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*, 2nd Edition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991): 189

⁵⁵ Peter A. Cramer, “The Frequency of Discourse Features of the Public Metonym,” *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5 (2008): 265-280. For further discussion of grammatical metonyms, see also Peter A. Cramer, “The Public Metonym,” *Informal Logic*, 23 (2003): 183-199.

⁵⁶ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 426.

⁵⁷ Kenneth Burke, *Grammar of Motives*, 507.

⁵⁸ Kenneth Burke, *Grammar of Motives*, 507. Burke noted that poets know that the changes in the body, such as flushed cheeks or eye movement are related to shame, while scientists will focus their attention on the physical chemical reactions occurring the body. In response to Burke, John Crowe Ransom, editor of *The Kenyon Review* in which Burke published “Four Master Tropes,” noted that the difference between poetic and scientific metonymy was actually the content. Because the role of the poet and scientist were so different, it was useless to compare their knowledge. Instead, Ransom suggested the poet reduced by selecting the “most vivid part.” The “truth” depended on the object selected, the content, or in other words, Ransom noted that knowledge was objective. For further detail on the debate, see David Tell’s “Burke’s Encounter with Ransom: Rhetoric and Epistemology in ‘Four Master Tropes,’” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34 (2004): 42.

of the modern evangelical community.”⁵⁹ Again, we see the connection between intangible ideals, victimization and persecution, to more tangible concepts, Jesus and the Roman guard. For Eisenhower, metonyms allowed him to reduce communism, fear and other intangible ideas prevalent in the early 1950s into tangible, “real” things that helped support his urgent need for the unification of Europe, or support of a unified European military, under NATO’s supervision.

Synecdoche

Burke once referred to synecdoche as “Trope No. 1.”⁶⁰ Synecdoche implies “as integral relationship, a relationship of convertibility, between [two terms].”⁶¹ The two terms represent a conversion from part for whole, whole for part, cause for effect, and effect for cause. The “part for whole” is the most common synecdoche. Examples are “all hands on deck” or the use of the term “daily bread” when referring to food.⁶² Synecdoche is an interesting trope, uniting two things that are different from each other or representing intangible ideas or emotions (such as freedom or fear). Yet, it can also make an issue more complex by shifting the real focus of a debate. For example, an environmental debate focused on wetland preservation can shift focus to the protection of a single species, distracting the audience from the original concern and making the problem seem less “important” because the focus is only on one species rather than the entire ecosystem.⁶³ The main different between synecdoche and Burke’s other master trope, metonymy (or reduction), is that synecdoche emphasizes a “connectedness” between two sides of “a road”

⁵⁹ Christian Lundberg, “Enjoying God’s Death,” 403.

⁶⁰ David Tell, “Burke’s Encounter with Ransom: Rhetoric and Epistemology in ‘Four Master Tropes,’” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34 (2004): 43.

⁶¹ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 427.

⁶² Karen A. Foss and Kathy I. Domenici, “Haunting Argentina: Synecdoche in the Protests of the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 87 (2001): 242.

⁶³ While there is the argument that making the consequences of an action more clear is helpful for protests—if you harm the wetlands ecosystem, the green tree frog will go extinct and cause an influx in the insect population in Florida—I would still argue that the “save the tree frog” focus is different than the “save the wetlands” focus—the first may effect numerous ecosystems where tree frog are known to live while the other only effects a single ecosystem of importance to the speaker. Jane Bloodsworth Rowe, “Culture, Progress and the Media: The Shad as Synecdoche in Environmental News Coverage,” *Environmental Communication*, 2 (2008): 364-365.

that extends in either direction, while metonymy follows along “the road” in only one direction.⁶⁴

In other words, metonymy helps speakers lead their audience to a single, specific conclusion while synecdoche allows speakers to show audiences how various concepts are connected.

In communication literature, one of the most well-known rhetorical scholars of synecdoche, with a particular emphasis on social movement controversies, is Mark Moore. Over the years, Moore has discussed the social and political impact of synecdoche’s role as it relates to the spotted owl environmental controversy (the owl representing the endangered environment), the handgun debate (the handgun representing both a threat to life and a protector of liberty) and most recently, how the salmon functions synecdochically as an icon in the Pacific Northwest.⁶⁵ In all of Moore’s case studies, synecdoche functioned to frame the terms of the conflict and determine the different types of solutions available for each conflict.⁶⁶

Within his SACEUR rhetoric, Eisenhower used synecdoche to show an informative and representative connection between linked concepts.⁶⁷ His use of synecdoche allowed him to cast different audiences in Europe (such as the French or British) as representative of the values of all of Europe, a part for a whole. Framing the conflict and eventual solutions was important for Eisenhower’s rhetoric. As Supreme Commander, Eisenhower needed to strategically plan his rhetoric so that the creation of the EDC and eventual rearmament of Germany were the only viable solutions to a more secure Europe, helping NATO establish a stronghold in Europe and build its foundation for becoming the international organization it is today. Synecdoche, coupled

⁶⁴ Kenneth Burke, *Grammar of Motives*, 508.

⁶⁵ See Mark P. Moore, “Constructing Irreconcilable Conflict: The Function of Synecdoche in the Spotted Owl Controversy,” *Communication Monographs*, 60 (1993): 258-274; “Life, Liberty, and the Handgun: The Function of Synecdoche in the Brady Bill Debate,” *Communication Quarterly*, 42.4 (1994): 434-447; and “Making Sense of Salmon: Synecdoche and Irony in a Natural Resource Crisis,” *Western Journal of Communication*, 67.1 (2003): 74-96.

⁶⁶ Karen A. Foss and Kathy I. Domenici, 243.

⁶⁷ Mark P. Moore, “Making Sense of Salmon,” 76.

with his use of metaphor, metonymy and irony, allowed Eisenhower to identify with his European audience and craft a persuasive call for the unification of Europe under NATO.

1.2 Analyzing Burkean Tropes in Public Address

I have used Burke's theory of the four master tropes to examine Eisenhower's unique role in the development of a unified European community, through his argument favoring the unification of European defense forces against a common enemy. By persuading European countries to favor unification during his tenure as SACEUR, Eisenhower was able to create a foundation for the development of NATO as a strong, multinational organization. Using key speeches,⁶⁸ I review how Eisenhower's use of tropes shed light on his persuasive strategies.⁶⁹

For my analysis, I applied Burke's framework to identify when and how Eisenhower employs each trope, in selected speeches, letters and diary entries. I begin by analyzing transcripts of key speeches.⁷⁰ Eisenhower's audiences for these speeches, and the context surrounding them, made the selected speeches ideal for this analysis. In terms of audience, the

⁶⁸ The selected speeches (located in the appendix of this thesis) were chosen for two distinct reasons. First, they were delivered to key audiences, the British, the French and diplomats or European political leadership visiting the SHAPE in France. As explained, the British and French were those most adamantly opposed to a loss of sovereignty, as they viewed it, and the creation of a unified European military coalition. Second, the speeches accurately span Eisenhower's time as SACEUR. Each speech takes place approximately 2-3 months after the other when placed in chronological order. This allows for a look at Eisenhower's messaging and use of persuasive tropes over the duration of his time as SACEUR, not just during a few patches of time. They provide a more holistic view of his rhetoric.

⁶⁹ In his metaphoric analysis of Cold War "idealists," Robert Ivie described a method for identifying metaphors. He notes critics must first identify their key metaphor(s) by following five basic steps: (1) become familiar with the speaker's text and its context; (2) select representative texts for a series of close-readings; (3) arrange the set of marked vehicles into subgroups by clustering those with similar entailments; (4) create a list of immediate contexts for the cluster(s); and (5) identify patterns of usage by the speaker. See "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" *Communication Monographs*, 54 (1987): 165-182. Other scholars that have used a similar method include Thomas Farrell and Thomas Goodnight's "Accidental Rhetoric: The Root Metaphors of Three Mile Island," *Communication Monographs*, 48 (1981): 271-300; Randall Lake's "Temporal Metaphors, Religions, and Arguments," Bruce E. Gronbeck, ed. *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation* (Annandale VA: Speech Communication Association, 1989): 245-254; and Theresa Donofrio's "Ground Zero and Place-Making Authority: The Conservative Metaphors in 9/11 Families' 'Take Back the Memorial' Rhetoric," *W. Journal of Communication*, 74 (2010): 150-169.

⁷⁰ For a comprehensive listing of speeches used in this study, as well as the full text of those speeches, please see the Appendix at the end of this thesis.

British and French were important audiences for Eisenhower, of particular importance to his overall efforts in attempting to establish the EDC and enable the rearmament of Western Germany. The French led the effort against the rearmament of Germany because of past conflicts, and the British were against the idea of being bound to the rest of Europe by the proposed European defense community. This made the political leadership of both countries key audiences when looking at persuasion tactics in Eisenhower's SACEUR rhetoric. Not only are they the audiences a key reason for the choice of these particular speeches, but they also span the entirety of Eisenhower's term as SACEUR, allowing me to trace his use of tropes holistically and over time.

In addition to a detailed review of these speech transcripts, I review Eisenhower's various personal diary entries and letters to various officials surrounding the dates of these particular speeches and the general topics of German rearmament, the creation of unified European military force and the founding of NATO to establish contextual support for my speech analysis.⁷¹ Third, I will identify when and where Eisenhower employs each master trope and explain how they reveal (1) how he sought to identify with his audiences to overcome his lack of legitimacy in front of a European audience and (2) how he asked the audience to identify with his message concerning the need to rearm West Germany, form the European defense community and ultimately, trust in NATO.

In addition, I will explain why Eisenhower used specific tropes to bring his message of unity to the forefront of his rhetoric. Metaphors are most powerful when they are accepted as literal by the audience; the longer the metaphor could be maintained over time, the greater the influence of the speaker. Eisenhower sustained select metaphors throughout his tenure as

⁷¹ See *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XI-XII*. Louis Galambos et al., eds. (The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore: 1989).

SACEUR, theoretically making them more influential and more persuasive over time for his audiences. Synecdoche and metonymy allowed Eisenhower to frame the conflict over the creation of a unified European defense community and rearmament of Germany as potential solutions. Finally, irony gave Eisenhower a tool to establish camaraderie between himself and his audiences. All were vital, because as Supreme Commander, Eisenhower needed to strategically plan his rhetoric so that the creation of a unified European military was the only viable solution to a more secure Europe during the early 1950s.

1.3 Chapter Outline

The remainder of this thesis will proceed in three chapters concentrated on relevant historical events that occurred prior to Eisenhower's tenure as SACEUR, Eisenhower's use of specific tropes designed to help him persuade and identify with audiences, and a discussion of the importance of this often overlooked time in Eisenhower's rhetorical career and the history of the development of the European Union and NATO.

The second chapter is a discussion of the context leading up to and surrounding Eisenhower's various addresses as SACEUR, including information gathered from his personal diary entries, letters written to various US and foreign intelligence personnel, historical accounts and rhetorical analyses. The chapter will be broken down into the following sections: (1) An overview of Eisenhower's debated appointment to lead TORCH and the North African campaign and the complicated political dealings of TORCH, the North African campaign and OVERLORD; (2) A discussion of the treaties and international agreements leading up to NATO and during Eisenhower's time as SACEUR that enabled the idea of the European defense community to become a policy option for Eisenhower's forces in Europe; and (3) A review the

1947-1950 build-up of Soviet Union and US and Europe conflict leading into Eisenhower's appointment as SACEUR, as well as explain events surrounding Eisenhower's appointment.

This detailed contextual set-up is vital, because, as Martin J. Medhurst noted, "To analyze Cold War rhetoric the critic must first become a strategist, seeking to understand the goals being pursued, the historical, political, economic, diplomatic and military constraints that exist, and the precise situational configuration."⁷² The critic must understand the context of the rhetoric, including the goals, constraints and forces interacting to form said context, in order to have a solid position from which to analyze, interpret and judge particular pieces of discourse. To better judge Eisenhower's SACEUR rhetoric, create an adequate understanding of the surrounding contexts, and review how those contexts worked to influence what he could and could not say to his audience is critical.

The third chapter will provide a rhetorical analysis of Eisenhower's SACEUR speeches to French, British and NATO-specific audiences, such as the NATO Council and SHAPE staff, relying on Kenneth's Burke's theory of persuasion through the use of the four master tropes: metaphor, irony, metonymy and synecdoche. This analysis will bring to the forefront two things. First, it will show the way in which Eisenhower sought to identify with his audiences, and second, the ways in which Eisenhower asks the audience to identify with his message concerning the need to create a strong, structured and unified European defense force. The analysis will be broken into four sections, each correlating to one of Burke's four tropes. These sections of the analysis will shed light on Eisenhower's overall use of tropes and how they each enabled him to position NATO as a strong international alliance and springboard for a unified European military, and eventually, unified European community

⁷² Martin J. Medhurst, "Rhetoric and Cold War: A Strategic Approach," 20.

The fourth and final chapter of this thesis will summarize the earlier chapters and identify themes of argument between each of them. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of how rhetorical and historical scholars have glossed over an important time in Eisenhower's life and rhetoric, his time as SACEUR in the early 1950s, and how this better understanding of Eisenhower's persuasive tactics could add further insight into future scholarship on Eisenhower, the founding years of NATO and the early attempts to unify Europe, leading to the eventual creation of the European Union. The final chapter will also contain a discussion of potential related studies on other overlooked pieces of Eisenhower's rhetoric after his service in WWII and prior to his presidency in 1952.

2. CONTEXT

In 1942, America's challenge was to build an army and establish an organization to craft an agreement between Britain and France on a strategy to defeat Hitler's Germany win the war in the Pacific.⁷³ Eisenhower's greatest effort in Allied cooperation occurred between 1942 and 1945, from the beginning of operation TORCH, meant to drive the Axis powers⁷⁴ from their stronghold in North Africa, to the close of operation OVERLORD, the final push against the Germans on the beaches of Normandy, France, known as D-Day.⁷⁵

Eisenhower's journey from TORCH to OVERLORD was not easy. This chapter proceeds in two parts. First, I review Eisenhower's role in coalition building and conflict negotiation during the closing years of WWII. I discuss (1) Eisenhower's controversial appointment to lead TORCH and the North African campaign, his complicated political dealings with the Vichy French, and his poor negotiation of the campaign; (2) The various treaties and international agreements leading up to the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty and during Eisenhower's time as SACEUR that enabled the idea of the European Defense Community (EDC) to become a policy option for Eisenhower's forces in Europe; and (3) The 1947-1950 build-up of the east (Soviet Union) and west (US and Europe) conflict leading into Eisenhower's appointment as SACEUR as well as the discussion surrounding Eisenhower's appointment as SACEUR.

By the end of this chapter, the striking similarities between Eisenhower's role near the end of WWII and Eisenhower's role at the beginning of NATO will be evident. Eisenhower's service in WWII, particularly his role in the preparation and execution of operations TORCH and OVERLORD, introduced him to the complexities of managing the military aspect of

⁷³ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander: The War Years of General Dwight D. Eisenhower* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 1970): 20.

⁷⁴ The Axis powers consisted of Germany, Italy and Japan.

⁷⁵ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 23.

international cooperation, including the difficulties of Allied cooperation. He also began his diplomatic education, forcing him to engage in political decision making and “subtle niceties” despite his desire to remain apolitical and focused strictly on military strategy.⁷⁶ Eisenhower would use these lessons, especially in relation to his dealings with Vichy French leadership, when called to lead NATO forces in Europe. In both cases, in order to accomplish his instrumental goal—the creation of a unified European coalition, Eisenhower had to accomplish his constitutive goal, the development of a shared sense of identity between the various countries of Europe.

2.1 WWII: Eisenhower and the North African Campaign

Shortly after the attack at Pearl Harbor, Eisenhower received word that he was to leave his post as Chief of Staff of the US Third Army in San Antonio, Texas, and report to Army Chief of Staff George C. Marshall in Washington, D.C. In 1942, America needed to build their army, secure the shipping route to get that army to Europe, establish an organization that would allow America and Britain to agree on a plan to defeat Germany and resist the pull to put the Pacific conflict first.⁷⁷ The army’s responsibility to help secure these objectives was ultimately left to Marshall, and in turn, to Eisenhower. According to Stephen Ambrose, a preeminent Eisenhower scholar, Marshall chose Eisenhower partially due to his past service on the staff of notable US military leaders—including General Douglas MacArthur—and partly because he was known in the army as a man that would “assume responsibility.”⁷⁸ Indeed, during his time under Marshall, Eisenhower was described as “the perfect man to take Marshall’s concepts and translate them

⁷⁶ Ibid. 97.

⁷⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁸ Ibid. 9.

into practice.”⁷⁹ Eisenhower brought the know-how to create action in support of Marshall’s strengths, including policy, organization and strategy.

His achievements to date had been as a staff officer. And while his superiors believed he would be a success as an independent commander, Eisenhower had only served under strong-willed superiors; he needed a way to prove his leadership ability, and operation TORCH would serve that purpose. There was some debate on who should lead TORCH. The Combined Chiefs of Staff (CCS), the supreme military command for the Western Allies during WWII, wanted Marshall. Regardless of what the CCS wanted, Marshall would never have left his position for a field command position and US President Franklin Delano Roosevelt would not have let him.⁸⁰ The solution the CCS and the British finally agreed upon was Eisenhower; he was available, he served directly under Marshall and, under their original plan, he would only be in charge of planning TORCH until someone else higher in rank became available to assume command over the operation.⁸¹ It seemed a win-win solution for all parties involved.

On June 11, 1942, Marshall told Eisenhower he was “the guy” that would become the Commanding General of the European Theater of Operations against Germany.⁸² On August 2, Eisenhower took “executive authority” over TORCH planning as Commander-in-Chief.⁸³ His first task was to build a headquarters to run his operations. He needed to ensure the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces (SHAEF), an essential component of the British-American effort, was strong and operational.⁸⁴ Even though SHAEF was essentially a British-

⁷⁹ Ibid. 23.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid. 79-80.

⁸² William Snyder, “Walter Bendell Smith: Eisenhower’s Chief of Staff,” *Military Affairs*, 48 (1984): 6.

⁸³ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 80. The CCS were originally going to call the leader of operation TORCH Supreme Commander, but once Eisenhower was appointed to the position, as a temporary fix they thought, they decided he would be a better candidate for the title of Commander-in-Chief. Eisenhower did not have any disagreements.

⁸⁴ William A. Kowlton, “Early Stages in the Organization of ‘Shape,’” *International Organization*, 13 (1959): 2.

American effort, there were differences between the training of these Allied troops. The British were long-time experts in dealing with “peoples and organizations of varying interests,” and this meant the British seemed to be “better qualified” to serve on an international military staff than their American counterparts.⁸⁵ The Americans were less accustomed to working outside the US. This caused some tension between the Americans and the British. To create cooperation among the ranks, Eisenhower recruited as equally as possible from American and British forces. As Ambrose noted, “The system worked, mainly because of the determination of the participants to make it work, partly because of Eisenhower’s leadership.”⁸⁶ Solidarity was a vital and necessary characteristic for Eisenhower’s troops, so he maintained this “opposite number” system, two officers, one American and one British, paired together in every position in the organization.⁸⁷ Americans who refused to cooperate with their British counterparts were sent back to the US.⁸⁸ By sifting out soldiers who refused to respect one another, Eisenhower began building a coalition headquarters comprised of an international staff that worked together as an allied team. With the headquarters up and running, Eisenhower began detailed planning for operation TORCH.

To successfully drive the Axis powers out of North Africa, the Allied forces would have to push them out through French Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia. This involved long distances and the need for a cooperative relationship between the Allies and the neutral Vichy French, who held control of half of the North African coast.⁸⁹ Moreover, while fighting back the Axis, Eisenhower’s troops would have to be on guard against the imminent flood of German troops into Tunis, the capital of Tunisia in the Gulf of Tunis in the Mediterranean Sea, once the Allied attack began. Eisenhower needed Vichy troops to form a resistance against the Germans,

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 79.

⁸⁷ William A. Kowlton, 3.

⁸⁸ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 80.

⁸⁹ Ibid. 85.

blocking their movement into North Africa while the Allied forces fought the Axis. Eisenhower needed to find a Vichy leader he could trust to carry out the task. Yet the task of finding someone in the Vichy hierarchy to assume leadership in North Africa would not be without its own set of challenges, not least among them the difficult relationship between the Vichy and Free French. And while Eisenhower would make mistakes during his negotiations, his dealings with Vichy leadership would help prepare him for his later dealings with the French in 1951.

TORCH: Politics, Policy and Negotiations

There were important political and strategic issues at stake in the selection of a Vichy leader for the North African campaign. The Vichy Government was formed after the 1940 German defeat of the French. By the end of the German invasion, France was divided into three German occupation zones governed by a rump state, Vichy France. The Vichy maintained the most control in the southern “free zone” under the leadership of Marshal Philippe Pétain, yet Pétain’s leadership was challenged by exiled General, and leader of the Free French movement, Charles de Gaulle, a man who claimed to represent the legitimacy and continuity of the French government.⁹⁰ In order to make operation TORCH a success, Eisenhower needed to decide who he could trust most to place the Allies’ interests above those of the Axis. To make matters worse, the British and the Americans did not agree on where to begin their search.

Prior to TORCH, the US had maintained diplomatic relations with the Vichy government, including Pétain and his followers such as Admiral Jean Darlan and French General Henri Giraud. In American eyes, the US could “do business” with the Vichy while de Gaulle was combative.⁹¹ He continuously denounced the US for its pro-Vichy policies. In opposition, the British had given their support to de Gaulle. Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Britain,

⁹⁰ “France: The Vichy Government. “ *Encyclopedia Britannica*, accessed 4 Sept. 2011. Web.

⁹¹ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 106.

had decided that de Gaulle's Free French Movement was a far greater alliance than the Vichy, because de Gaulle and followers had not "accepted surrender and dishonor" during the 1940 invasion of France.⁹² While the British fought side-by-side with the French during WWII, Churchill felt that the Vichy French enabled the German strike against Britain during the Battle of Britain and disliked the idea of having to work with them during TORCH.⁹³ With the British supporting de Gaulle and the US supporting Giraud, Darlan or anyone besides de Gaulle, there was a clear split in Allied operations Eisenhower needed to address. Eisenhower "knew practically nothing of the political complexities" and was only interested in the military problem: finding a Frenchman who would help his troops move through North Africa and secure Tunis.⁹⁴

Based on recommendations from the US State Department, Eisenhower began discussions with Giraud.⁹⁵ Eisenhower acknowledged that the selection of a French leader would be a rather "delicate" matter, but he assured his superiors that he could handle it. Yet his lack of experience in political negotiation became apparent rather quickly. For Eisenhower, Giraud's military rank and lack of opposition to Allied entrance into North Africa made him the first choice for the job.⁹⁶ Immediately there was a roadblock. Giraud wanted nothing less than to be named Commander-in-Chief not only of the French forces, but of the entire Allied operation after the landing in Algeria.⁹⁷ From Giraud's point of view, the Allies were invading his country, asking him to be the face of their aggression but withholding any real authority from him.

⁹² Ibid. The British Expeditionary Forces were evacuated during operation Dynamo. Shortly after the evacuation, Winston Churchill gave a speech titled "This Was Their Finest Hour" on June 18, 1940 to the British House of Commons. He stated that "the Battle of France is over. I expect the Battle of Britain is about to begin." And while the British came out victorious at the end of the Battle of Britain, had Hitler gained control of Britain, it would have been disastrous for the Allied forces.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ The US had decided to anyone other than de Gaulle. Roosevelt neither liked nor trusted Charles de Gaulle. De Gaulle was a French general and statesman who led the Free French Forces during World War II. He later founded the French Fifth Republic in 1958 and served as its first President from 1959 to 1969.

⁹⁶ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 106. Giraud was the only pro-Ally officer with sufficient seniority and prestige. He was also not "tainted" by the Vichy regime, because he had been captured in 1940.

⁹⁷ Arthur Funk, "Eisenhower, Giraud, and the Command of 'TORCH,'" *Military Affairs*, 35 (1971): 103.

Eisenhower tried to compromise. He promised Giraud could be Governor—essentially the president—of North Africa with enough money to build his own army, navy and air force. He would not give him command of the military forces. Giraud refused. He would accept nothing less than supreme command. After further negotiation, Eisenhower eventually agreed to allow Giraud to be Commander-in-Chief of the French ground forces and governor of the area after the fight concluded. Even though he had made a deal with Giraud, Eisenhower soon realized Giraud had no real authority or place in the French hierarchy.⁹⁸ Darlan did. Eisenhower now needed to convince Darlan to agree to become actively involved in TORCH.

Darlan was the Commander-in-Chief of French armed forces, and the Vichy could only fight under Eisenhower if Darlan issued the order.⁹⁹ Eisenhower made Darlan Chief Administrative Officer in North Africa and placed Giraud under his command. Eisenhower's only concern was saving the French fleet in Tunis. He naively disregarded the US and British reaction to a deal with Darlan; he expected minor complaints but assumed that as long as Darlan came through in the end, everyone would agree he made the right decision.¹⁰⁰ The British were furious. They had agreed to ignore de Gaulle only if Giraud was the next choice. Giraud had no Vichy connections while Darlan represented everything Churchill opposed.¹⁰¹ Churchill strongly

⁹⁸ Ibid. In many ways, his lack of Vichy ties and official place in the military chain was an advantage, as it might immunize him against attacks from those who believed the Allies should have no truck whatsoever with Petain's government. But it meant that no one could predict how much influence Giraud would wield with regular French troops; and while Giraud himself was confident that the army would rally to him, he was in no position to estimate the political climate in North Africa. This concerned Eisenhower.

⁹⁹ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 120.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. 127. One complaint I do not address in this chapter or the remainder of this thesis is the fact that Pétrain and Darlan were associated with some of Hitler's anti-Semitic campaigns. While I understand the importance of this information and the richer depth of the Vichy French movement, I do not feel an extensive review of the history of the Vichy French is needed for a full understanding of this analysis and Eisenhower's dealings with the French during WWII operations.

¹⁰¹ Robert L. Melka, "Darlan between Britain and Germany, 1940-41," *Journal of Contemporary History*, 8 (1973): 58. In spite of occasional anti-British outbursts, Darlan worked hard and loyally in the French-British alliance and, unlike so many later collaborators. However, contacts with his British colleagues after September 1939 did nothing to change his attitude towards the British Admiralty, which he said was "directed not by a man, but by a board of directors who could never make up their minds about anything until it was too late."

believed he could get de Gaulle to work with Giraud, but he knew de Gaulle would never work with Darlan. Darlan had denounced the Free French Movement even more vociferously than Pétain.¹⁰² After numerous letters and discussions between Churchill and Roosevelt, Roosevelt finally got Churchill to agree to ratify Eisenhower's agreement with Darlan. Roosevelt knew Eisenhower would take most of the blame if anything went awry. Now that Roosevelt had approved what became known as the Darlan Deal, Eisenhower thought he could turn his focus away from the political and back to the military forces on the ground.

He was wrong. Darlan soon began to start backtracking on his deal with Eisenhower. According to the deal, Darlan was not to take any position as a genuine head of government until after the conflict had ended and the Allies had successfully removed the Axis threat from North Africa; Darlan had other motives. When Pétain was taken prisoner by German forces, Darlan planned to announce he was taking over as Head of State, but Eisenhower immediately put a stop to Darlan's announcement. He noted that Darlan's authority was only local and he was not in charge of the Vichy state.¹⁰³ Criticism of the Darlan Deal continued until December 24, 1942, when Eisenhower received word that Darlan had been assassinated. Overall, Darlan's death was a positive for Eisenhower and the US—it removed the lingering tension between the British and US, opening the door to a unified policy with regard to the French, and it helped Eisenhower put an end to his political embarrassment.¹⁰⁴ With Darlan gone, Eisenhower could finally turn his attention to military matters and the battle of Tunisia.

¹⁰² Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 127.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.* 144.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.* 148. As US General Mark W. Clark noted, “Admiral Darlan's death was, to me, an act of Providence...His removal from the scene was like the lancing of a troublesome boil. He had served his purpose, and his death solved what could have been the very difficult problem of what to do with him in the future.”

The Allies eventually won back control of Kasserine Pass, forcing the Axis from Tunisia and allowing Eisenhower to increase forces and equipment daily.¹⁰⁵ With the Axis powers driven from North Africa, the Allies continued to force the German ground troops to retreat, paving the way for operation HUSKY, or the invasion of Sicily and Italy.¹⁰⁶ TORCH was just the foothold needed to make HUSKY, a large scale airborne operation followed by six weeks of land combat, possible. HUSKY ended in August 1943, with the Allies taking control of Sicily, and eventually Italy, from the Axis powers.¹⁰⁷ HUSKY would eventually lead into the battle that would end the European part of WWII in Normandy: Operation OVERLORD. Going into TORCH, Eisenhower had never commanded his own forces. During TORCH, he had a rude awakening as he learned how to juggle political and military disagreements with regards to the Vichy French and the Allied relationship between Britain and the US. After TORCH and HUSKY, Eisenhower had finally earned the trust of his superiors, and if he could keep that trust, he would also be seen as a success as Supreme Commander, Allied Expeditionary Forces for operation OVERLORD.

OVERLORD: Politics, Policy and Negotiations

In late 1943, operation OVERLORD was the next step in overtaking the Axis and defeating them in Western Europe. The main goal of the operation was to get on shore in France and move from there to Berlin. At the time, it was to be the “largest military undertaking in man’s history,” and finding the right military commander for the operation was essential. Similar

¹⁰⁵ George F. Howe, “Faid—Kasserine: The German View,” *Military Affairs*, 13 (1949): 216-222. The Battle of Kasserine Pass opened up a gap in the Atlas Mountains in Western Tunisia, allowing the Allies a quick route to garner troops and equipment into Tunisia.

¹⁰⁶ For additional information on Eisenhower and America’s contribution to the intervention in North Africa and the six months of fighting in Tunisia, leading to the eventual expulsion of the Axis powers from Africa, see Hanson W. Baldwin, “America at War: December 1942-May 1943,” *Foreign Affairs*, 21 (1943): 606-617.

¹⁰⁷ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 231. Operation HUSKY opened up Mediterranean sea lanes for the Allied forces and ended the dictatorship of Italy’s Benito Mussolini. It opened the way for the Allied invasion of Italy, beginning on September 3, 1943. By the beginning of October, all of southern Italy was under Allied control. Allied forces continued to make their way through Italy, gaining ground through June 4, 1944, when they earned victory in Rome just two days before the Normandy invasion and OVERLORD.

to TORCH, Eisenhower was not the first and only choice for command.¹⁰⁸ Usually, the CCS was responsible for the selection of the commander, but since members of the CCS were potential candidates for the honor, they deferred to the heads of state, Churchill and Roosevelt, and Churchill deferred to Roosevelt. Roosevelt's first choice was Marshall, the one who had thought up OVERLORD initially and pressed for its importance in the overall WWII allied strategy.¹⁰⁹ After some negative initial reactions to his choice, Roosevelt decided to keep his options open.¹¹⁰ Eisenhower began to stand out as the next logical choice. He presented to the CCS on the current plans for OVERLORD and impressed them with his "firm grasp of the military situation" and his "realistic" position about the possibilities of the operation.¹¹¹ Moreover, if Marshall was not going to command the operation, there still needed to be an American in charge. With the USSR and Britain pushing for a commander to be named immediately, Roosevelt finally decided that Eisenhower would command OVERLORD. On a side trip to Tunisia, Roosevelt met Eisenhower on a plane and simply said, "Well, Ike, you are going to command OVERLORD"¹¹² As Eisenhower took over preparations for the final siege of the war, Charles de Gaulle—who played a role during Eisenhower's negotiation of the Darlan Deal—became a central issue again.

In December 1943, de Gaulle decided to take decisive action against the Vichy French administration that opposed him. He placed central Vichy leaders under arrest with the threat to

¹⁰⁸ Ibid. 295.

¹⁰⁹ Jon Meacham, *Franklin and Winston: An Intimate Portrait of an Epic Friendship* (Random House Trade Paperbacks: New York, 2004): 257.

¹¹⁰ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 296. According to Ambrose, President Roosevelt liked to use leaked press stories to gauge US reaction to an action. He leaked the story of Marshall's potential appointment to command OVERLORD. Political opponents started to claim Roosevelt wanted to eventually appoint Marshall as Chief of Staff so that he could manipulate war contracts in a way that would ensure Roosevelt's re-election, while military journals did not like the idea of Marshall going into OVERLORD because they wanted him to maintain his current position in the Army and not move to the CCS. Rumors also had Eisenhower replacing Marshall as Army Chief of Staff, and Eisenhower was not pleased with this. He wanted to stay in the Mediterranean and did not feel he was "temperamentally fitted for the job" of political dealings as well as Marshall. In short, he still wanted to isolate the strategic from the political. Moreover, if Marshall was selected to command OVERLORD and Eisenhower was made Army Chief of Staff, he would have outranked Marshall.

¹¹¹ Ibid. 305.

¹¹² Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Eisenhower's Crusade in Europe," *Life*, December 13, 1948: 136.

kill them. Since OVERLORD was to take place on the beaches of Normandy, France, and Eisenhower needed the support of the French Resistance and de Gaulle, Eisenhower was immediately concerned about Roosevelt and Churchill's reactions to de Gaulle's actions; Eisenhower was correct to have concerns. Churchill wanted to offer the arrested Frenchman asylum to send a warning to de Gaulle, and Roosevelt went so far as to order de Gaulle to "take no action" against the individuals who had helped fight with the Allied armies during TORCH.¹¹³ Because Eisenhower and de Gaulle had formed a working relationship during TORCH, de Gaulle trusted Eisenhower and wanted to negotiate with him. When de Gaulle asked that his French troops be the first into the French capital during OVERLORD, Eisenhower, along with Roosevelt, agreed. Roosevelt only compromised because if the French did not participate in OVERLORD, de Gaulle would be unhappy. If de Gaulle was unhappy, he would not have the Resistance move allied troops from the Mediterranean through the south of France in preparation for OVERLORD. Finally, once pleased with the deal, de Gaulle ensured he would not harm the Vichy administrators.¹¹⁴ Eisenhower was learning how to deal with French political leadership.

Yet soon after earning de Gaulle's agreement to support the Allied invasion, Roosevelt and Churchill created another rift in their dealings with de Gaulle, and they placed Eisenhower in the middle of that rift. Once the conflict ended with Allied victory and France was liberated, Roosevelt wanted the American Army to hold France in trust until free elections could take place for new French leadership.¹¹⁵ Churchill's only concern was a strong and vigorous France after

¹¹³ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 316.

¹¹⁴ Ibid. 323, 337. According to Ambrose, de Gaulle "liked, respected and counted on [Eisenhower] heavily." De Gaulle reportedly told Eisenhower, "I want to tell you that the French Committee of national Liberation has full confidence in you in the employment of French forces that it is placing under your command for the next allied operations." De Gaulle realized that Eisenhower was his "best friend" in the Allied camp and Eisenhower knew that de Gaulle would be of great help in resolving the complex problems that would arise when France was liberated from the Germans and forced to rebuild.

¹¹⁵ Ibid. 378. Roosevelt's reasoning for not wanting de Gaulle to have authority or assume a leadership capacity in France fell in line with this; he wanted the French people to elect their leadership. Yet he had also told Churchill and

the war, because Britain needed a strong ally to hold back the communist threat once the German army was defeated.¹¹⁶ While Roosevelt agreed a strong France was ideal in the fight against the communists, his personal dislike of de Gaulle made him push against placing de Gaulle in a position of power without election after OVERLORD. Eisenhower needed to reconcile these conflicting Allied policies while keeping the military focus on the defeat of Germany.

Eisenhower decided to convince Roosevelt and the US State Department that a Gaullist France was the better option during and after OVERLORD for numerous reasons.¹¹⁷

In January 1944, Eisenhower began his campaign to form a working relationship between Washington and de Gaulle.¹¹⁸ Eisenhower stood by his belief that de Gaulle and the French Resistance were vital to the success of the French campaign, but Roosevelt held fast to his position that forcing the French to follow de Gaulle could cause a Civil War. Personal disagreements aside, Roosevelt claimed to be perfectly willing to make de Gaulle the new French figurehead as long as it was not against the will of the French people; if the majority of the French wanted de Gaulle's leadership, Roosevelt would not get in the way.¹¹⁹ Conferences went on for two months in London until Churchill decided to invite de Gaulle into the discussion. Churchill and Roosevelt proceeded to brief de Gaulle on OVERLORD and asked for

others at times that he did not want the US to police Europe once the conflict with Germany was finished. There was some contradiction to Roosevelt's policy during the preparation for OVERLORD.

¹¹⁶ Richard M. Leighton, "Overlord Revisited: An Interpretation of American Strategy in the European War, 1942-1944," *The American Historical Review*, 68 (1963): 936. Britain, including Churchill, had reservations regarding OVERLORD from the beginning, because Churchill did not want to carry out the plan unless there was a reasonable chance of success. Success was partially equivalent to a strong France and a weakened Germany.

¹¹⁷ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 379.

¹¹⁸ Col. Cole C. Kingseed, "Ike's Three Great Decisions that Shaped World War II," *Army*, 61 (2011): 35. It was not until February 12, 1944, when Eisenhower received the formal directive from the CCS stating he was "hereby designated as Supreme Allied Commander of the forces placed under your orders for operations for liberation of Europe from Germans... You will enter the continent of Europe and, in conjunction with the other united Nations, undertake operations aimed at the heart of Germany and the destruction of her armed forces."

¹¹⁹ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 381-382. Roosevelt wanted the following if de Gaulle was to take any kind of political authority in France: (1) De Gaulle and the Resistance had no intention of exercising the powers of government indefinitely; (2) They were to favor the re-establishment of all French liberties; and (3) They would take no action to oppose the selection of a constitutional government by the choice of the free French people

his cooperation in getting the French and the Resistance to follow Eisenhower's command. De Gaulle refused, saying politics and the military were tied together; he would not lend his support until he was recognized as a political leader.¹²⁰ He would not get in the way of the Allied operation, but de Gaulle refused to help them until he was given something in return.

On the eve of OVERLORD, June 5, 1944, de Gaulle still refused to support the operation even after the American and British announcements of support. Eisenhower finally became fed up with the entire situation and told his staff to tell de Gaulle, "To hell with him and if he doesn't come through, we'll deal with someone else."¹²¹ This may have been just the push needed to get de Gaulle to cooperate to some extent. On the morning of the invasion, de Gaulle, made a statement of support for OVERLORD and noted that Eisenhower was a recognized leader whose orders should be acknowledged by the French.¹²²

OVERLORD began on June 6 and ended in September 1944.¹²³ Yet near the end of OVERLORD, de Gaulle once again became an obstacle. When Eisenhower had agreed to have de Gaulle help with OVERLORD, it was implied de Gaulle would help liberate Paris. A liberated Paris translated to a liberated France. In August, when the Allied forces reached Paris, de Gaulle and other members of the Resistance began pressuring Eisenhower to allow them into the capital. Eisenhower struggled with this decision, because so far, he had managed to keep military and political decisions separate. If he allowed de Gaulle to move forward with his troops, allowing the French to use their military for political gain independent of the Allied

¹²⁰ Ibid. 384.

¹²¹ Ibid. 386-387.

¹²² Ibid. De Gaulle had said specifically, "The orders given by the French government and by the leaders which it has recognized must be followed precisely."

¹²³ Ronald M. D'AMura, "Campaigns: The Essence of Operational Warfare," *Parameters*, Summer (1987): 42-51. During the final blow against Nazi Germany, Eisenhower had one British, Canadian, French and Allied airborne, four US armies, and the British and US tactical air forces at his command—100,000 men in eight divisions.

command, there would not be much in the way to stop other countries from doing the same.¹²⁴ In the end, Eisenhower decided it was in the best interests of the military operation to move forward and take control of Paris from the Germans. The political aspect returned once de Gaulle had secured Paris and asked for formal recognition from Britain and the United States on the legitimacy of his leadership. After a long struggle, the United States, the Soviet Union, Britain and five other nations recognized the French provisional government lead by de Gaulle. The political problem seemed solved, but the end of the war brought one last dispute with the French.

After the Allied victory, the Allies would not allow the French representation in the Allied Control Council (ACC) even though the French had committed a large number of troops to the effort against the Germans in OVERLORD and subsequent battles. As an act of protest, de Gaulle gave orders for the French forces to ignore orders from Eisenhower, Allied commander. De Gaulle assured Eisenhower his lack of support was only due to the recent disagreement with the Allied governments. This was the most direct challenge to Eisenhower's authority to date.¹²⁵ Eventually, de Gaulle got what he wanted: A seat on the ACC.¹²⁶ By the end of OVERLORD and his multiple dealings with de Gaulle and the French Resistance, Eisenhower realized that the political and the military efforts were not as separate as he had tried to keep them when it came to the French.

WWII: Lessons Learned

On May 7, 1945, WWII came to an end in Europe with victory for the Allies.¹²⁷

Eisenhower's command in operations TORCH and OVERLORD introduced him to the

¹²⁴ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 485.

¹²⁵ Ibid. 657.

¹²⁶ Philip E. Mosley, "Dismemberment of Germany: The Allied Negotiations from Yalta to Postdam," *Foreign Affairs*, 28 (1950): 490. The Allied Control Council was the governing body of the Allied Occupation Zones in Germany during and after the end of WWII. Initially made up of the US, the UK, and the Soviet Union, France was later added due to de Gaulle's timely protest.

¹²⁷ The war ended on September 2, 1945, when Japan surrendered.

complexities of managing the military aspect of international cooperation, including the difficulties of Allied cooperation seen during the establishment of SHAEF and the garnering of Allied forces. In addition, the planning and implementation of OVERLORD were essential to the execution of Eisenhower's main objective, the destruction of the German forces. The OVERLORD campaign was divided into six phases, each consisting of a number of sequential and simultaneous operations, including the various discussions with the French and Vichy leadership.¹²⁸ While not discussed earlier, because the remainder of this thesis does not delve too far into Eisenhower's military planning or tactics during his time as SACEUR, Eisenhower's ability to strategically create a plan and execute it in order to achieve his ultimate goal can be seen as a similar task to what he would do with Western Europe during his time as SACEUR.

Moreover, his negotiations with French leadership, including Darlan, Giraud, Pétain and de Gaulle, gave him insight into how to best deal with the French while SACEUR. First, the French did not want to be given false promises. Eisenhower was very clear, precise and did not like to waste time with lengthy negotiations. As Ambrose said, "Darlan and de Gaulle felt they could trust Eisenhower because they knew where he stood and that he said exactly what he meant."¹²⁹ His honesty made him trustworthy during negotiations; his word was taken as reliable. Second, the French were stubborn and sometimes hasty with their demands. Eisenhower's natural personality, his "lack of ruthlessness" served him well when dealing with this aspect of the French politicians. He was never quick to instigate conflict. Eisenhower always worked to "adjust personalities to one another" to smooth over differences between opposing

¹²⁸ D'Amura, 43-44. The seven phases, as D'Amura laid them out, were as follows: (1) the ambitious assault on the Normandy beaches by British and American forces; (2) buildup of a logistics base, and the subsequent breakout from German encirclement; (3-4) Allied pursuit of the German army across France to the Rhine River; (5) the destruction of German forces west of the Rhine; and (6) the destruction of remaining enemy forces throughout Germany.

¹²⁹ Stephen E. Ambrose, *The Supreme Commander*, 324.

parties. When it came to the numerous disagreements between de Gaulle and Eisenhower and Churchill during OVERLORD planning, this was a key trait. Finally, Eisenhower learned he would need patience. Any dealing with French political leadership would not happen overnight; it would take time, a great deal of effort and would entail a variety of setbacks.

Yet in the years between the end of WWII and Eisenhower's emergence as SACEUR, the French found themselves in the middle of numerous events that would deepen the tension between the Soviets in the east and the US and Europe to the west. This Cold War would make Eisenhower's call for the creations of a unified European coalition a tough case to make under the fledgling NATO.

2.2 1948-1950: Efforts Toward Cooperation in Europe

By 1948, the ideological split between Soviet communists and Western Europe and the US was already clear. The Soviet Union had begun anti-Western propaganda, claiming that the world was split between the socialist and capitalist camps, noting the former would triumph in the end.¹³⁰ The US and the UK had adopted a policy of containment, working to ensure the Soviet Union could not spread its sphere of influence into Western Europe and beyond.¹³¹ The "state of world tension" made it very "advisable for every nation to overhaul its military machine."¹³² As various declassified memos and reports from the Central Intelligence Agency suggest, the US made the assumption that the Soviets were preparing for war while, the Soviets

¹³⁰ Kevin Ruane, *The Rise and Fall of the European Defense Community: Anglo-American Relations and the Crisis of European Defense, 1950-1955* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000): 1.

¹³¹ George Kennan is best known for creating the "containment" policy, the basic U.S. strategy for fighting the Cold War with the Soviet Union. Kennan's idea of containment first appeared as an anonymous contribution to *Foreign Affairs*, known as the X-Article because he signed it with an "X." Kennan wrote, "The main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be that of a long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies."

¹³² U.S. Army, "Indications of Soviet Preparations for War," 1 Sept. 1948. Retrieved 7, Nov. 2010. *The Digital National Security Archive*, National Security Agency: Organization and Operations, 1945-2009.

assume the US and Western Europe were making their own preparations against a possible clandestine attack.¹³³

In order for the US and Europe to best defend themselves from the threat of Soviet and communist expansion, the countries needed to establish an organized, cooperative Western Europe. The Marshall Plan, the British-French-Benelux Treaty (commonly called the Treaty of Brussels), the Schuman Plan and the Pleven Plan were all efforts that served as the base for the concept of the European Defense Community (EDC) which Eisenhower would later promote as SACEUR. These plans were all discussed before or during 1950, the year Eisenhower took his position as SACEUR. Their roles in various attempts at unifying European countries must be explored to best understand Eisenhower's push for the EDC through his SACEUR rhetoric.

The Marshall Plan and the Treaty of Brussels

In September 1946, Churchill gave his famous Zurich speech, calling for the creation of a "kind of United States of Europe," and at that time, Europe was still recovering from WWII and was in a dire economic state requiring international aid from the US and other nations.¹³⁴ Following Marshall's speech outlining a post-war European aid program during a Harvard University commencement ceremony in June 1947, the Committee on European Economic Cooperation (CEEC) met in Paris to draft a recovery plan for Europe.¹³⁵ The main goals included economic aid and planning principles that would guide European and

¹³³ See various National Security Council reports by The Department of State and The Executive Secretary dating from 1948 to 1955 detailing Soviet capabilities and preparations for potential war with the US, Europe and other nations available from *The Digital National Security Archive*, including a Central Intelligence Agency memorandums and reports titled, "Soviet Preparations for Major Hostilities in 1950," "Soviet Capabilities for a Military Attack on the United States Before July 1952" and "Soviet Capabilities for Clandestine Attack Against the US with Weapons of Mass Destruction and the Vulnerability of the US to Such an Attack."

¹³⁴ Norbert Wiggershaus and Roland G. Foerster, *The Western Security Community: Common Problems and Conflicting National Interests During the Foundation Phase of the North Atlantic Alliance* (Oxford: Berg Publishers, 1993): 30.

¹³⁵ Michael J. Hogan, "American Marshall Planners and the Search for a European Neocapitalism," *The American Historical Review*, 90 (1985): 46. It is also important to note that The Marshall Plan provided a clear avenue of influence from the US to Western Europe.

American action in the years to come. These principles included self-help and mutual aid, resource sharing and, eventually, German reconstruction.¹³⁶ The Marshall Plan countries needed a “new pattern of intra-European trade and exchange,” new efforts to adjust national economies to the needs of Europe as a whole, and revised uses of Europe’s resources.¹³⁷ According to the American strategy, West Germany needed to be included in the common structure of a “free Europe” if the West was to avoid a threatening Soviet-German partnership or German economic leadership in the already-weakened continent. Western Europe wanted Germany’s economic resources, even if their mistrust of German intentions meant that they couldn’t agree to involve Germany in NATO until the mid-1950s.¹³⁸

The French were determined to incorporate their Monnet Plan for industrial re-equipment and modernization in any plan for general European recovery, and the British were wary of agreeing to any plan that could threaten their trade and payment options with Western Europe.¹³⁹ The Benelux governments offered a third option to help participating European countries balance their budgets, establish realistic exchange rates and make currencies transferable between nations. The British and French still held up the process, and the Americans felt they were not being “realistic” in their decisions at the CEEC because they refused to eliminate waste and take the considerations of Europe as a whole

¹³⁶ Michael J. Hogan, “Paths to Plenty: Marshall Planners and the Debate over European Integration, 1947-1948,” *Pacific Historical Review*, 53 (1984): 339.

¹³⁷ Michael J. Hogan, “American Marshall Planners and the Search for a European Neocapitalism,” 47.

¹³⁸ Ten years after Hitler’s Nazi Germany was defeated during OVERLORD, West Germany was finally able to join NATO on May 9, 1955.

¹³⁹ Michael J. Hogan, “Paths to Plenty.” 347-348. The Monnet Plan was a reconstruction plan for France that proposed giving France control over the German coal and steel to bring France to 150% of pre-war industrial production. It was meant to ensure the use of Germany’s resources for European reconstruction. The British economy, on the other hand, had deteriorated quickly during the summer of 1947, with the British dollar reserves dropping by \$176 million per week. They did not want to support any plan that promoted payment liberalization while they were trying to reverse their trade deficits and protect their dwindling reserves.

into account.¹⁴⁰ By September, it was clear that the US was not going to make any progress in crafting a European union at this time. Instead of the CEEC becoming a sort of supra-national organization that would govern Europe's recovery efforts as a whole, the CEEC finished its work as a committee with the simple goal of monitoring the progress of various countries' recovery programs, issuing reports and encouraging the countries to engage in self-help and mutual aid to meet the objectives of their recovery programs.¹⁴¹

And while the British-French-Benelux Treaty, also called the Brussels Pact, was signed on March 17, 1948, at Brussels, Belgium, there were still valid concerns in place concerning the unification of Europe.¹⁴² The disagreements between the US and European nations, mostly Britain and France, were simple: For the Europeans, the imperatives were national interest and sovereignty, and for the Americans, they were transnational action and cooperation. These differences would continue to stand as a challenge to US policy makers and to European economic recovery, adding tension to the European-American relationship during the next few years. And when Eisenhower began his own push in support of the EDC, a call for a united European military not all that different from the Marshall Plan's call for a united European economic recovery plan, he would come up against the same challenges.¹⁴³ Britain and France would still push for national interest and sovereignty while

¹⁴⁰ Ibid. 355.

¹⁴¹ Michael J. Hogan, "Paths to Plenty," 360, and Norbert Wiggershaus and Roland G. Foerster, 33.

¹⁴² "Text of British-French-Benelux Treaty: Signed at Brussels, Belgium," *Vital Speeches of the Day* (1948): 377-379. The Brussels Treaty was signed by Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the UK. Again, its motives were purely economic, with Article I beginning, "Convinced of the close community of their interests and of the necessity of uniting in order to promote the economic recovery of Europe, the high contracting parties will so organize and co-ordinate their economic activities as to produce the best possible results, by the elimination of conflict in their economic policies, co-ordination of production and development of commercial exchange." See also Sir Nicholas Henderson 11-14 and Charles Cogan, 33.

¹⁴³ As a side note, the Europeans and the US did do one thing right in these negotiations: they made economic recovery a priority over military union in these early stages of the discussion of a United States of Europe. As George Kennan noted in a memo in January 1948, stating, "Military union should not be the starting point. It should flow from the political, economic and spiritual union—not vice versa." HE also noted in that same memo that introducing a military integration from the start could have had the effect of frightening numerous European

Eisenhower called for transnational action and cooperation among the European nations. In time, the French would come to develop their own attempt to help in the overall defense and unity of Western Europe.

The Schuman Plan and the Pleven Plan

Charles Cogan wrote that during the late 1940s and early 1950s “the great preoccupation of the Russians [was] in the area of security” and “the great obsession of the French... [was] that national independence, lost in 1940, must never be lost again.”¹⁴⁴ Of all the great nations of Europe at the time of WWII, France was the only one conquered by Germany.¹⁴⁵ As a victim of Nazi Germany, France was in the best position in the Western Alliance to argue against the recovery and rearmament of its former enemy.¹⁴⁶ As seen with the Marshall Plan, France fought to maintain its recently-returned sovereignty. France led the charge against German rearmament, not only because they feared the German revival, having experienced three German invasions in living memory (1870, 1914, 1940),¹⁴⁷ but they genuinely “believed that German independence could only be controlled in a wider, European framework.”¹⁴⁸ The French did not trust Germany to maintain armed forces without fear of an attack on the French, and therefore, wanted to maintain tight control over the rearmament process.

By 1950, the Schuman Plan was France’s attempt to remain sovereign while trying to foster unity in Europe with the help of Germany. It was as much a response to the arguments

countries. Moreover, “the role of the German people in any European union [would] eventually be of prime importance.” We see this when we get to Eisenhower’s time as SACEUR and his dealings, once more, with the British and the French political elite. See Charles G. Cogan, *Forced to Choose: France, the Atlantic Alliance, and NATO—Then and Now*. (London: Prager, 1997), 39.

¹⁴⁴ Charles G. Cogan, *Forced to Choose: France, the Atlantic Alliance, and NATO—Then and Now* (London: Prager, 1997), 6.

¹⁴⁵ The “great nations” is a reference to the historic notion of the traditional European group of nations: Great Britain, France, Russia, Prussia and Austria-Hungary.

¹⁴⁶ Charles G. Cogan, ix.

¹⁴⁷ 1870 was the France-Prussia War; 1914 references when Germany declared war on France at the beginning of WWI; and 1940 was the Battle of France during WWII.

¹⁴⁸ John Young, *Britain and European Unity, 1945-1992* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1993): 21.

of French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman as it was to international pressures for France to accept the need for European unity; Eisenhower was part of that international pressure. As we will see in the analysis in the following chapter, Schuman and Jean Monnet, the principal authors of the plan, may be considered the “fathers of a united Europe,” Eisenhower was an important component—currently ignored by historians and rhetoricians during his time as SACEUR—in helping persuade the French to pursue a relationship with their former enemy, Germany. The Schuman Plan, leading to the creation of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951, and the ECSC laid the foundation of the Treaty of Rome of 1957, a document leading to the founding of the European Economic Community and eventual creation of the European Union.¹⁴⁹

During June 1950, during the first year of Eisenhower’s appointment as SACEUR, talks concerning the creation of the ECSC began. From the beginning, the original six participating governments knew that the Schuman Plan was only the “first step” on the road to European unity. The ECSC was meant to take the place of the Council of Europe, which had proved incapable of bringing the governments of Europe together.¹⁵⁰ France and

¹⁴⁹ William I. Hitchcock, “France, the Western Alliance, and the origins of the Schuman Plan, 1948-1950,” *Diplomatic History*, 21 (1997): 603. The European Economic Community included Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. In 1965, the merger Treaty (also known as the Treaty of Brussels) created the European Communities from the European Economic Community, The European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. By 1993, with the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht, these organizations helped form the European Union that we know today. All in all, the Schumann Plan was an important step in eventual European unity and European military integration through NATO.

¹⁵⁰ Norbert Wiggershaus and Roland G. Foerster, 36. The Council of Europe was created on May 5, 1949 by the Treaty of London. It was signed by Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the UK. It was meant to help bind the signed countries through common values and common political decisions. While it was an example of an attempt to form a unified European coalition, it is looked at by some as a failure, because all attempts at creating a supranational authority over the signed nations due to numerous vetoes from the UK. And, as Wiggershaus and Foerster note, even if the supranational organization could have been developed, it would have maintained limited power, because all military matters were excluded the Council of Europe scope. For this reason, and because Eisenhower never mentions the Council during his time as SACEUR, I only mention it.

Germany, for different reasons, were the most invested in the success of the plan.¹⁵¹ The ECSC was meant to remove the control of the coal and steel production from the Ruhr (German) and Lorraine (French) Valleys and give operating authority to a supranational group.¹⁵² This would ultimately reduce, if not eliminate the German-French hostility that had plagued Europe through the middle of the 1900s.¹⁵³ By August, delegates were reporting to their national governments that discussions would soon be concluded. The French and the Germans seemed certain a successful conclusion was nearly a reality. The Schuman plan negotiations fell into two phases. The first phase included rapid political progress on the institutions of the projected community, and the second phase included the bargaining over the re-organization of German industry.¹⁵⁴ On April 18, 1951, six original countries signed the Treaty establishing the ECSC, marking a great step forward in the unification of European by creating the first “supranational institution” and laying the foundation for a more organized Europe.”¹⁵⁵

With the economic and political elements of German and French cooperation involved in the Schuman Plan, the Pleven Plan, named for French Prime Minister Rene Pleven, was concerned with the rearmament of Western Germany and the addition of French forces to the NATO military coalition. It is important to note that the Pleven Plan did not contain any provision that mandated German forces merge with NATO forces or that Germany should be made a member of NATO, and negotiations on the Pleven Plan began

¹⁵¹ A.W. Lovett, “The United States and the Schuman Plan: A Study in French Diplomacy 1950-1952, *The Historical Journal*, 39 (1996): 431.

¹⁵² Nicholas Crafts and Gianni Toniolo, *Economic Growth in Europe since 1945* (Cambridge, Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge: 1996): 45. The ECSC created monitoring and surveillance technologies that guaranteed the French steel industry access to German coal and the German coal industry access to French iron ore.

¹⁵³ Charles Cogan, 87. Economic and political factors would help prevent future conflict.

¹⁵⁴ A.W. Lovett, 438.

¹⁵⁵ “Treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community, ECSC Treaty,” Accessed 2 October 2011 from http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/institutional_affairs/treaties/treaties_ecsc_en.htm.

during negotiations for the Schuman Plan.¹⁵⁶ The Pleven Plan called for a European Army, or European Defense Community (EDC), that was to be placed under the control of a supranational authority, very similar to the ECSC created by the Schuman Plan. If the Germans were to be part of the European Army, but not members of NATO, the French believed that the European Army would not fall under the control of NATO but would respond to the SACEUR. The rationalization behind the Pleven Plan made Britain and the US, including Eisenhower, skeptical of its ability to succeed for two reasons. First, the structure and plans needed to create a viable national defense system were much different than those needed to create a coal and steel organization. The rules that created the ECSC were not easily translated for the creation of an army. Second, while the British were largely excluded from the Schuman Plan, they could not be excluded from a discussion about European defense.¹⁵⁷

The EDC: Lessons Learned

What can be taken as a theme from these various plans and treaties developed in an attempt to foster unity in Europe is the fact that the success or failure of a political union in Europe was tied to the progress of the creation of a unified European military.¹⁵⁸ As Eisenhower noted in an address to the NATO Council meeting in Italy, “This European Force would serve another great purpose, it would stand alongside the Schuman Plan—which must be successful—and the two would constitute great steps toward the goal of complete European unity!”¹⁵⁹ One form of European unification could not exist without the other. From 1950 to 1954, the concept of the EDC occupied a dominant position on the

¹⁵⁶ Charles Cogan, 97.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid. 98-99.

¹⁵⁸ Norbert Wiggershaus and Roland G. Foerster, 38.

¹⁵⁹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “NATO Council,” November 27, 1951.

emerging Western European security structure and a central role in developing the foundation for European integration.¹⁶⁰

The EDC could not be successful unless it was supported by the three main players in the Western community: the US, Britain and Western Europe. Eisenhower, already aware that a unified Western European military effort was essential to a strong defense against a potential Soviet attack, would have to get Britain and Western Europe, namely France, to agree with the US that the EDC, including the rearmament of Western Germany, was the best option for the NATO countries.¹⁶¹

2.3 1948-1950: NATO and Its First SACEUR

In May 1948, the Berlin Blockade raised central questions about American foreign policy in relation to Germany and Western Europe.¹⁶² In addition to this definitive US break with the Soviets over Germany, three key events raised the urgency of the defense of Western Europe between 1949 and 1950: The Soviets tested an atomic bomb in August 1949, the Communists had a victory in China in October 1949, and the Korean War began with the invasion of South Korea in mid-1950.¹⁶³ The US and Western Europe were in desperate need of a unified military that was ready and willing to defend the West against the Soviets and communism.¹⁶⁴ In early 1949, Europe and the US became involved in

¹⁶⁰ Renata Dwan, "Jean Monnet and the European Defense Community, 1950-54," *Cold War History*, 1 (2000): 141.

¹⁶¹ Kevin Ruane, "Agonizing Reappraisals: Anthony Eden, John Foster Dulles and the Crisis of European Defense, 1953-54," *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 13 (2002): 151-185. The US backed the idea of a unified military defense in Western Europe so much, that in 1953, they threatened to undertake an "agonizing reappraisal" of its commitment to European security if the rearmament of Western Germany through the EDC did not move forward.

¹⁶² James McAllister, *No Exit: America and the German Problem, 1943-1954* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002): 23. The Berlin Blockade was the first international crisis during the Cold War that involved casualties, occurring when the Soviets blocked Western Allies' railway and road access to sections of Berlin under Allied control during the multinational occupation of post-WWII Germany.

¹⁶³ Charles Cogan, 91.

¹⁶⁴ Kevin Ruane, *The Rise and Fall of the European Defense Community*, 3. By the spring of 1950, the US government produced NSC-68, positioning the Soviet Union as a threat to the "free world" and the Western

negotiations for a political and military treaty structured to create defense plan against the building Soviet threat. The unified political and military outcome would become known as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the person who would ensure that Europe joined, unified, under this military command was Eisenhower. By 1949, after considerable discussion concerning the duration of the North Atlantic Pact, all parties decided that the Pact would be signed in Washington, DC on April 4.¹⁶⁵ The Treaty marked the beginning of a “revolutionary and constructive experiment” in international relations.¹⁶⁶ With the signing of the North Atlantic Pact, the fall of the Berlin Blockade and the resumption of talks with the Kremlin, a “lull” was created in Washington, but not in Europe, which was living with the harsh military reality.¹⁶⁷ Western Europe was low on troops after WWII. They had just begun rebuilding their national forces and were vulnerable to the impending threat of the Soviets.

While there had been thoughts about the structure of the military arm of NATO during the negotiation of the Treaty, it had been decided that efforts to establish the alliance’s military would be taken after NATO had been successfully founded.¹⁶⁸ By 1950, a year after the signing of the Treaty, NATO began focusing on the development of its military arm. President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson stressed sending more US troops to Europe to bolster their military efforts, establishing a North Atlantic Defense structure, and appointing an American to

European Allies in particular. NSC-68 advocated military containment, including a huge expansion in US armed forces and nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons.

¹⁶⁵ Sir Nicholas Henderson, *The Birth of NATO* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1983): 100. The Committee originally wanted to sign the Treaty in Bermuda, but Acheson did not believe he would have time to leave Washington in the near future, so the Committee decided US support and a possible speech from the President was reason enough to move the signing to Washington, DC.

¹⁶⁶ Lord Ismay, *NATO: The First Five Years* (Netherlands: Bosch-Utrecht, 1954): ix, 11. The twelve governments included Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the UK and the US. In 1952, Greece and Turkey were asked to join the Alliance. They accepted membership on February 18, 1952.

¹⁶⁷ Don Cook, *Forging the Alliance: NATO, 1945-1950* (New York: Arbor House, 1989): 224.

¹⁶⁸ Norbert Wiggershaus and Roland G. Foerster, 265.

the position of Allied Commander in Europe. Essentially, these steps would convert “an alliance into a permanent defense *organization* (NATO),” as long as Western Europe accepted the rearmament of Western Germany.¹⁶⁹ Many of the NATO nations agreed that there was a need for a unified European defense community, and the US was convinced “the appropriate and early rearming of Western Germany [was] of fundamental importance to the defense of Western Europe against the USSR.”¹⁷⁰ Yet, Germany was only one of the hurdles standing in the way of European military unification, predominantly opposed by France, while a threat to national sovereignty, highlighted primarily by the British, was a second hurdle. Eisenhower would be the man to lead Europe over these hurdles, one at a time. President Truman would call him back to active duty for this important military role.

Between 1948 and 1950, Eisenhower was relatively quiet, spending much of his time reflecting on his time as Supreme Allied Commander during WWII. He retired as Chief of Staff of the US Army, leaving active military duty for the first time in 37 years, and in November 1948, Eisenhower published the story of his experiences in WWII, written during his three-month hiatus between his work at the Pentagon and Columbia, titled *Crusade in Europe*. For the next two years, “the book was a great bestseller, serialized in newspaper and television, it would constitute his primary impact on the public.”¹⁷¹ The themes of his book include the global scope of war, the need for industrial and military preparedness, the need for teamwork, the crucial role of morale, and the need for universal sacrifice.¹⁷² Essentially, his memoir summarized all of the lessons he had learned from his role as Supreme Allied Commander in WWII, and he would take these themes and lessons with him

¹⁶⁹ Kevin Ruane, *The Rise and Fall of the European Defense Community*, 4. Emphasis from source.

¹⁷⁰ Geoffrey Warner, “The United States and the Rearmament of West Germany, 1950-4,” *International Affairs*, 61 (1984): 279.

¹⁷¹ Ira Chernus, *General Eisenhower*, 187.

¹⁷² Ira Chernus, *General Eisenhower*, 189.

as he entered into his tenure as SACEUR with NATO. Apart from his memoir, Eisenhower received numerous honors and the overall support of the American people for leading the Allies to victory in WWII. As Richard Crable noted, “He had become widely sought as a speaker, a political standard-bearer, and a leader of the people.”¹⁷³ This was important, because NATO needed a well-respected, universally-accepted leader to work with the scattered NATO nations on a unified military force, and Eisenhower wanted to bolster his credentials for his run for the US presidency in 1952.¹⁷⁴

By the fall of 1950, Eisenhower was itching to leave his post as president of Columbia University, and in October, US President Truman called Eisenhower to a meeting where the President requested Eisenhower accept the appointment as SACEUR. Eisenhower replied that he was “a soldier and ready to respond to whatever orders my superiors” may give.¹⁷⁵ When Eisenhower arrived in France in January 1951, he began a tour of the eleven European capitals of the NATO countries. One of his goals during this European tour was to “get from the Europeans positive commitments to NATO” that they were giving their defense efforts “chief priority.”¹⁷⁶ If defense was not a top priority, it would be up to Eisenhower to convince the NATO countries that it needed to be a priority. Defense was the only priority that mattered, because without a unified Western European defense under NATO command, the communists and Soviets could invade Western Europe. It was up to Eisenhower to persuade Western Europe, especially Britain and France, of the importance of military unification.

¹⁷³ Richard Crable, 194.

¹⁷⁴ Jacob Travis Beal. “Eisenhower, the American Assembly, and 1952.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 22 (1992): 455-468. In 1948, Eisenhower had turned down the presidency, but by 1952, after his brief time as SACEUR, Eisenhower returned to the US to run for the Republican presidential nomination. Eisenhower wanted to win that nomination through acclaim, and his time as SACEUR with NATO helped him return to the US as a victorious and strong military and political leader.

¹⁷⁵ Stephen E. Ambrose, *Eisenhower: Soldier and President*, 249.

¹⁷⁶ *Ibid.* 253.

3. ANALYSIS

On January 1, 1951, Eisenhower arrived in France to begin the planning for the structure of the new command. While article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty agreed that an armed attack against any one of the signees would be considered an attack against the other 11, there was no real command structure to direct the overall defense of Western Europe should an attack on one of the NATO nations occur.

In a March 1951 letter, Eisenhower noted his main purpose as Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR):

Although my mission has economic, political, and especially morale facets, as well as military, SHAPE is primarily a military headquarters. And for the months to come, all our efforts must be bent toward the establishment and maintenance of forces adequate for the armed defense of Europe and powerful enough to give pause to any possible aggressor. If every man I have could work round the clock, even days a week, there would still be little time for matters other than those directly and immediately concerned with the military mission.¹⁷⁷

Eisenhower made his duty as SACEUR his first priority. He also tried, as he did during World War II (WWII), to avoid any political dealings. He was a soldier, a military commander; he tried to stick with what he knew best. Yet part of his job as SACEUR was creating a cohesive group of soldiers that were ready and willing to fight together against any impending Soviet or communist threat. In order to create a unified force, Eisenhower brought some of his lessons learned during his dealings with the French political elite during WWII with him during his various speeches around Europe.

¹⁷⁷ *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XI*, Letter 70 to William Fletcher Russell. Russell was the president of Columbia University's Teachers College.

Eisenhower used key master tropes, allowing me to trace how his rhetoric strategically argued that Germany, England, France and the remaining Western European nations, who previously thought of themselves as independent entities, should come together in order to position NATO as a foundation of a strong, international alliance and protect Western Europe from the well-known threat of the Soviets. A close reading of his speeches emphasizing the use of these tropes used throughout key speeches during Eisenhower's term as SACEUR, alongside the history and context surrounding these speeches, provides a more complete understanding of Eisenhower's rhetorical transactions during the early 1950s. This analysis also sheds light on the first attempts to unify Europe.¹⁷⁸ In addition, the close reading of Eisenhower's speeches draws attention to the previously overlooked relationship between Eisenhower's rhetoric and the formation of a joint military effort between NATO countries. Eisenhower's toughest audience was the French political elite, yet he continued use tropes with various NATO audiences, helping maintain his argument across key audiences: The French, the British and the NATO Council.

3.1 Metaphor

Kenneth Burke saw metaphor as a "device for seeing something in terms of something else."¹⁷⁹ Often, a speaker will use a metaphor to help an audience understand a more abstract or complex concept by comparing the more complex concept to a more trivial or familiar concept.¹⁸⁰ For example, the abstract concept of "freedom" can be compared to a US citizen burning the American flag in protest. While freedom is an abstract term that can mean various things to various people, the concept of burning a flag without punishment is something concrete that most people can understand. Eisenhower used key metaphors in a similar way, making the

¹⁷⁸ This is especially true for historical discourses. See Michael J. Hostetler's analysis of Winston Churchill's "Sinews of Peace" address in "The Enigmatic Ends of Rhetoric: Churchill's Fulton Address as Great Art and Failed Persuasion." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 83 (1997): 418.

¹⁷⁹ Kenneth Burke, "Four Master Tropes," 421.

¹⁸⁰ George Lakoff and Michael Johnson.

complex idea of European unity and, in specific instances, the rearmament of Western Germany, to various familiar concepts. In particular, Eisenhower employed metaphors focused on construction, nature or travel, military efforts and science to help make the concept of a unified military alliance between the NATO countries a goal that was both attainable and essential to Western Europe's continued security.

Construction Metaphors

The construction metaphor, sometimes called the edifice metaphor, is one of the most commonly used metaphors.¹⁸¹ The point of such a metaphor is show movement, either upward or downward. Therefore, the speaker will often start with a foundation component on which to build a strong case for his/ her point of view, or, if discussing an opposing viewpoint, discuss the demolition or tearing-down of that point of view.¹⁸² The idea of "building" is commonly used, especially the idea of an argument as a building or society as a building.¹⁸³ Throughout his SACEUR rhetoric, Eisenhower implemented similar metaphors, helping his audience to better understand the need for European unity and how best to build that unity and cohesion within the framework of NATO.

Eisenhower began his series of construction metaphors by noting the values that form the foundation of European unity, Eisenhower discussed the structure that helped maintain that foundation: SHAPE and France. In a speech to French statesmen visiting SHAPE, Eisenhower noted, "But, gentlemen, the solution to NATO's problems lies in the hearts and minds of the

¹⁸¹ J. Vernon Jensen, "Metaphor in Argumentation," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 13 (1983): 201. A relatively well-known edifice metaphor is the wall metaphor describing the separation of church and state initiated by Thomas Jefferson in a letter to Danbury Baptist in 1802. Jefferson was writing an interpretation of the First Amendment, noting that the legislature should "make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibition the free exercise thereof," thus building a wall of separation. See Ben Voth, "A Case Study in Metaphor as Argument: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Wall Separating Church and State," *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 34 (1998): 127. Voth looks at how Jefferson's metaphor functions within Supreme Court rhetoric.

¹⁸² Leland M. Griffin, "The Edifice Metaphor in Rhetorical Theory," *Speech Monographs*, 27 (1960): 279-292.

¹⁸³ See George Lakoff and Michael Johnson, and Andrew Goatly, *The Language of Metaphors* (London: Routledge, 1997).

millions of people that make up the population of the United States and Britain and all the other North Atlantic Nations to include, of course, at the very foundation of the European complex, this one.”¹⁸⁴ Here, Eisenhower noted that the foundation of unity is with SHAPE, and by extension, France, where SHAPE was based. He reiterated this statement later in a speech in 1952 by stating, “The past year at SHAPE has been very valuable: We have plowed difficult ground and established successfully the political, psychological and organizational foundations upon which to build.”¹⁸⁵ Again, SHAPE provided the foundation from which to build the unified military needed to stand against the Soviet threat. And once that foundation was established, Eisenhower could effectively argue he could manage and command a NATO military force. Due to his immense efforts and personal responsibility to the build-up of SHAPE, and the previous build-up of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Expeditionary Forces during WWII, Eisenhower knew the importance of developing a solid foundation from which to run and command any large group of soldiers or military personnel.

With the foundation of military unity set, Eisenhower implemented the edifice metaphor to describe the construction of a wall or barrier based on that foundation during his speech commemorating the seventh anniversary of the D-Day invasion of Normandy, France. Eisenhower gave this particular speech in Normandy, speaking to the French citizens and

¹⁸⁴ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Talk to French Statesman at Shape Briefing,” November 19, 1951. It was not uncommon for country statesman to visit SHAPE at various times throughout the year, and Eisenhower was used to giving impromptu speeches or talks to the officials that came by. See *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 230 to Joseph Lawton Collins. Collins was Army Chief of Staff. Eisenhower wrote, “By the nature of things, my job is a complicated *Allied* one...our job is so much one of selling and inspiring—of making people see this job from the American viewpoint—we consider it highly important to greet [important visitors from all nations that want to pay call at this headquarters].”

¹⁸⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Unidentified Statement,” 1952. In this particular case, Eisenhower is mixing metaphors. The concept of plowing is a farming term mixed with the metaphor that the hearts and minds of the Western European people that will create the foundation for his military efforts. As Eisenhower was from Abilene, Kansas, he often referenced farming terminology in his various discussions. Yet those references were not as persuasive to his audience as the idea of building a foundation for Western European defense efforts.

political elite.¹⁸⁶ Eisenhower's experience leading the troops during the D-Day invasion made him an authority on the invasion and allowed him to use D-Day as a unique parallel to the current ideological battle between the West and the Soviets. He noted, "But we know—out of tragic experience—that peace can never be the portion of the divided, the fearful, or of those who would stand aside, in the vain hope that the hordes of tyranny might overlook them. We shall be strong only as we are one. And we look to the future knowing that the strength of the free nations can be built into an invincible barrier against aggression."¹⁸⁷ The metaphor here is Eisenhower's statement that the strength of free nations can be considered a wall against the aggressive push of the communist nations. Essentially, the unified mindset of the free West could deter any threat the Soviets attempt to make.

Eisenhower repeated his call for the creation of a barrier or wall in 1951 in an unidentified statement. Given the content of this speech, Eisenhower was likely speaking to a group of staff at the SHAPE based in Marly, France.¹⁸⁸ When he spoke of the difficulty of creating a union among numerous nations, Eisenhower noted, "If you take fourteen grains of sand on the seashore and put them in your hand and attempt to make a ball of them, you would not be trying anything more difficult than to get fourteen independent nations working together for a common purpose. But we do know that we can go to another part of the countryside, get a bit of rock, make some cement from it and then—out of those fourteen grains of sand—create something that was practically indestructible."¹⁸⁹ Eisenhower's allusion to fourteen grains of

¹⁸⁶ We know this speech was given in Normandy, because Eisenhower places himself in Normandy in the fourth line of the speech, which reads, "Here in Normandy, it is particularly fitting that we commemorate the glory and the sacrifice of the Liberation." Dwight D. Eisenhower, "D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies," June 6, 1951.

¹⁸⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies," June 6, 1951.

¹⁸⁸ Eisenhower begins his speech by noting the accomplishments of SHAPE over "the past year," and later cited the last "year and a half," placing the speech in early to late 1952, as Eisenhower took office in January 1951. Moreover, he notes to his audience that the "exercise" of establishing the headquarters means they must now garner the forces to be supported by SHAPE.

¹⁸⁹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Unidentified SHAPE Statement," 1952.

sand directly related one grain of sand to each of the countries that constituted Western Europe in 1950.¹⁹⁰ His reference to cement could be explained by a speech delivered to the British Parliament where he noted, “Enlightened self-interest is the cement that must bind us together.”¹⁹¹ This enlightened self-interest is the idea that each of the NATO nations must come to realize that it is in their best interest to come together, bond, against the shared threat of communism. This idea of adhesion is also important, because it allowed Eisenhower to make a call for the coming together of individual nations, a metaphorical way of expressing Burke’s notion of identification.¹⁹² Unification is the best, solid defense against Soviet expansion, and it needed to be made by each individual nation. If it was a forced decision, if the nations were pushed together like the grains of sand in the palm of a hand, then they would only stay together for a brief amount of time before falling apart. Eisenhower used the wall metaphor in other speeches, but these were the most vital, as the French were one of his most stubborn audiences when it came to the idea of a unified European military front.¹⁹³ Helping them see the importance of creating a barrier against aggression was vital to his overall call for a unified military front. Given Eisenhower’s experience moving through TORCH and OVERLORD, he was well-aware of the importance of the barriers and walls needed to hold back enemy troops and create a secure and solid military coalition.

¹⁹⁰ The countries of Western Europe included Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, West Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and Britain.

¹⁹¹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Address to Members of British Parliament,” January 15, 1952.

¹⁹² J. Vernon Jensen, 203.

¹⁹³ Eisenhower also used the wall metaphor specifically in his “Report to the Nation from the Pentagon” on February 2, 1951. He noted, “Today we are faced by an aggressive imperialism that has more than once announced its implacable hostility to free government. Therefore, we strive to erect a wall of security for the free world behind which free institutions can live. That wall must be maintained until Communistic imperialism dies of its own inherent evils.” This metaphor constitutes a footnote, because while his subject is the NATO efforts in Western Europe, his audience is American. Therefore, while an important example of how he utilizes his metaphors over time, it was not an appropriate passage for review in an analysis based on speeches to European audiences.

In addition to making the call for the creation of a wall between the east and west to separate communism from freedom-loving democracy, Eisenhower called for the destruction of smaller walls or barrier between the nation-states of Europe and the creation of a strong foundation to foster the unity he so strongly desires. Eisenhower made his call to destroy the barrier between the nation-states early on in his July 1951 speech to the English Speaking Union. This was one of the most documented speeches during Eisenhower's tenure as SACEUR, in the sense that we know that this speech was received very favorably by the British audience in attendance and Europe as a whole.¹⁹⁴ This meant that apart from reaching his immediate British audience, his speech was reprinted and circulated among all Western European nations. The following metaphor appeared nearly halfway through the speech, after Eisenhower had established the numerous challenges to integrating Western Europe. He stated, "Europe cannot attain the towering material stature possible to its peoples' skills and spirit so long as it is divided

¹⁹⁴ The English Speaking Union is a British charity designed to help "build skills and confidence in communication" and give people the "opportunity to realize their potential." It was established by a Royal Charter in 1918. From *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 252, Diary. On Tuesday evening, July 3, Eisenhower, accompanied by his wife, would be honored at a dinner given by the English Speaking Union in the great ballroom at Grosvenor House, Park Lane. Nearly one thousand dinner guests would hear Eisenhower deliver a "major address in which he urged political unity and economic integration of the peoples of Western Europe." British Prime Minister Clement Richard Attlee, British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs Herbert Stanley Morrison, and former Prime Minister Winston Churchill would be among the speakers to praise Eisenhower, whose own speech was widely covered by the press. From *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 269 to John Lawrence Hennessy. Hennessy was the president and director J.L. Hennessy Associates, a firm that operated hotels and restaurants in New York City. Hennessy sent Eisenhower a clipping of a July 5 editorial entitled "The Unity of Europe" from the *New York Herald Tribune* that praised Eisenhower's recent speech at the English Speaking Union. Eisenhower was described as a leader "who views his task in terms of its broadest possibilities and its loftiest implication." It called Eisenhower a "master of the spoken word" who had demonstrated in his speech a "shrewd balance between the ideal and the necessity—between what ought to be done and what must be done. This is a supreme faculty of statesmanship." From *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 279 to Harold Boeschstein. He has met with Eisenhower on June 12 in Paris and noted that the speech in London "merits cheers for its eloquent forthrightness." See *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 303 to William Benton. Benton was a Democratic Senator from Connecticut; Benton has written Eisenhower about a July 7, 1951 *New York Times* article written by Ann O' Hare McCormick noting that Eisenhower's July 3 speech in London was impressive but that "British reception was less than enthusiastic. According to McCormick, the concept of European political and economic integration that Eisenhower urged, while necessary to the ultimate success of NATO, ran against historic British sentiments of independence from the nations of continental Europe." In Eisenhower's letter he wrote in response to the article, "I am not quite certain where she got the impression that my London talk was so coolly received. The reverse was true, both at the time of the meeting and in my later correspondence and contacts."

by patchwork fences. They foster localized instead of common interest... In the political field, these barriers promote distrust and suspicion.”¹⁹⁵ Eisenhower noted there were patchwork fences that separated the nations, meaning they were not strong or sturdy. He emphasized that these fences, or barriers as he later called them, were not in the best interest of Europe. Europeans did not need to be suspicious of one another but of the Soviets. They needed to demolish these fences and openly operate as a single unit in order to have the best chance to stand against the Soviets and communism. Any type of dissension in the ranks would make their defense weak. This particular metaphor can be tied back to Eisenhower’s development of SHAPE headquarters, where he only allowed American s and British to stay stationed at the headquarters if they developed a strong camaraderie between nationalities. Eisenhower had built coalitions during WWII, and was in the process of building a coalition for SHAPE. He knew well what enabled and what hindered that effort.

Eisenhower went so far as to explain how to get rid of the fencing. He noted, “May we never forget that our common devotion to deep human values and our mutual trust are the bedrock of our joint strength.”¹⁹⁶ The human values Eisenhower repeatedly mentioned throughout his rhetoric were freedom and prosperity, two values not associated in the Western mind with the communists. As long as Western Europe held strong to their commitment to freedom and deterrent of the Soviet/communist threat, the “barriers” between the nations could fall and Europe could come together as a strong alliance.

In all these cases, Eisenhower implemented the construction or edifice metaphors well. He began by discussing the foundation needed to build a unified military, moved to the barrier he would then like to see in place against the Soviets and also calls for the destruction of barrier

¹⁹⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “English Speaking Union Dinner London,” July 3, 1951.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

impeding the progression to a unified Europe. These metaphors also allowed the development of a sense of identification with his audience. He knew his audience—the French political elite and SHAPE staff located in France or the British—after his dealings with the French during WWII. Eisenhower learned he needed to seem trustworthy and to the point when dealing with the French.¹⁹⁷ During his D-Day Commemoration Speech, Eisenhower made the wall metaphor persuasive by identifying with his audience prior to its implementation. Going into the speech, he already shared a common experience with his audience: The memory of or participation in D-Day. For the 1952 statement, he shared the experience of working at SHAPE and working toward the same goal: creating a structure and military command for the build-up of NATO forces. For the English Speaking Union, he shared the English language. During all three speeches, Eisenhower also cast a common threat, communism, and created a collective “we” within his discourse. Eisenhower never referenced himself or individual countries when discussing success, but he always noted “we” in relation to the SHAPE staff or the group of NATO countries. By creating a sense of community, Eisenhower could better identify with his audience, helping make his metaphors more persuasive.¹⁹⁸

Military Metaphors

As Eisenhower worked to establish the foundation and barriers used to help prevent Soviet expansion, he also further established the fact that there was a necessity for a unified force to work against a common enemy. This is when he used the military metaphor. He discussed how and why the West needed to attack, repulse, contain and destroy the opposing communists. He also reviewed when the West would be required to stand and fight and when they would need

¹⁹⁷ See Chapter 2, Section 1 for a discussion of the lessons learned from Eisenhower’s dealings with the French political elite during WWII.

¹⁹⁸ Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, 38-46.

to retreat, if ever.¹⁹⁹ Most importantly, he continued to establish that the NATO countries needed to gradually limit their autonomy and become part of a unified military group. During all of Eisenhower's select military metaphors, he once again had a unique position from which to use them. He was a decorated war hero, commander and successful military strategist. He was entrusted with the command of the forces that led to the end of WWII in Europe and was now entrusted with the protection of Europe's freedom from communism. If anyone was going to use military comparisons, Eisenhower was certainly knowledgeable on the topic.

Urgency was a key theme throughout Eisenhower's implementation of military metaphors. One way he made clear the vital need for a unified military force was by comparing the current situation facing Western Europe, the threat of communist expansion and Soviet attack, to a battlefield. While speaking to the NATO Council in Italy, Eisenhower said, "On the battle field, when the bullets are flying, no soldier waits for tractor to bring up a ditch-digging machine to get him a bit of shelter from those bullets. He gets ahold of an entrenching tool, or even his bayonet, and he scratches gravel; he digs into the mud, into the rocks or anything else, so as to get his body protected. Now, we have so long neglected our common defenses and our military developments that we are, in a way, in the position of that soldier on a battlefield. So let's grab an entrenching tool!"²⁰⁰ According to Eisenhower, NATO did not have that combined military effort is so greatly needs. The NATO countries were in grave danger from flying bullets metaphorically coming from the East. If they continued as they were, separate entities only bound by a treaty and not by a combined military, they would remain unprotected. However, if they realized the danger and took initiative to protect against the danger themselves, they would avoid a communist takeover. In order to fight against the number of forces under Soviet control,

¹⁹⁹ J. Vernon Jensen, 204.

²⁰⁰ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "NATO Council," November 27, 1951.

the European nations needed to come together to increase the forces needed to match and withstand a potential Soviet attack. And an important factor for Eisenhower, Western Europe would be protected with minimal aid from the outside “machines” such as the US.²⁰¹ Eisenhower felt they could move in this direction as long as Europe realized it needed to stand on its own two feet. Not only did Europe need to come together, they needed to come together as a proud unit, without foreign aid.

While Europe was still realizing how to best come together, Eisenhower continued to carry on the military metaphor during the NATO Council meeting. Jean Monnet, the architect of the Schumann Plan and concept of the European Defense Community (EDC) had called on Eisenhower to call for the acceptance of European unification.²⁰² At the meeting, Eisenhower compared the development of NATO forces to the forging of weapons when he said, “We are producing, forging, and sharpening the instruments that we require.”²⁰³ In order to craft NATO forces that would be the strongest available in Western Europe, Eisenhower noted the development of the “instruments” needed to enable his forces to succeed. These instruments were still moving through the same process that a piece of metal would move through in order to

²⁰¹ *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 233 to Edward Everett Hazlett. In both the US and Europe, defense production was proving to be a major stumbling block to Eisenhower’s organizational efforts. He wrote, “I insist that Europe must, as a whole, provide in the long run for its own defense. The United States can move in and, with its psychological, intellectual, and material leadership, help to produce arms, units and the confidence that will allow Europe to solve its problem. In the long run, if it is not possible—and most certainly not desirable—that Europe should become an occupied territory defended by legions brought in from abroad, somewhat in the fashion that Rome’s territories vainly sought security many hundred years ago.” Eisenhower constantly noted that Europe needed to defend itself, produce its own arms and not sit back and wait for the US to solve its problem. He pushed this through his rhetoric and through his numerous letters and diary entries during his time as SACEUR.

²⁰² For more on the Schumann Plan and the European Defense Community, see Chapter 2. For more on Monnet’s request to Eisenhower, see *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 502, Diary. Eisenhower wrote, “Jean Monnet came to see me. He cannot go to the Rome meeting and is anxious that I stress the need for European amalgamation—political as well as the earlier steps involved in the Schuman Plan and European Army. Since I believe implicitly in the idea I shall do so, even if some of the politicians present resent my intrusion into their field. America has spent billions in [the European Defense Community] and in [the Major Defense Acquisition Plan], and much of it will be sheer waste unless Europe coalesces. Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy, France and western Germany should be *one* Federal State. To help this America could *afford* to spend a lot, because we’d *get* something successful, strong, sturdy!”

²⁰³ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “NATO Council,” November 27, 1951.

become a useable sword in battle. The blacksmith (SHAPE and Eisenhower) began with rough metal (Europe at the beginning of 1951), and was now shaping that metal into a viable weapon in the same way Eisenhower was working to rhetorically shape Europe's view on the need to unify against the Soviets. Eisenhower's ultimate goal was to ensure Western Europe would come to realize the need to build their forces against their common enemy, to unify against the Soviets.

During his speech at the D-Day Commemoration ceremony and the English Speaking Union dinner, Eisenhower compared the Soviets to a literal military force continuously pushing against the Western European countries. During the commemoration ceremony in France, he said, "The integrity of all Western Europe must be defended against predatory force."²⁰⁴ Just a month later in Britain he noted, "Subversion, propaganda, deceit and the threat of naked force are daily hurled against us and our friends in a globe-encircling relentless campaign."²⁰⁵ This masculine imagery of reckless activity, danger and war, made the case that there is already a war happening, whether France and Britain wanted to accept it or not. They needed to take a stand against the continuous threat of communism, trying to sneak through the Iron Curtain on a daily basis. Moreover, if Eisenhower could make it seem like the Soviets were making the first attack, it would be less morally difficult for Britain and France to accept the fact that they needed to act against the Soviets. It also justified NATO and Eisenhower's call for unity. There was a real threat bombarding the Western countries.²⁰⁶ In addition, Eisenhower was well-versed in identifying and articulating propaganda and deceit during his time as a commander of Normandy forces against Hitler's Germany; he witnessed first-hand the threat of a campaign seeking to eradicate a certain way of being. For Hitler, this meant a campaign in favor of the eradication of

²⁰⁴ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies," June 6, 1951.

²⁰⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "English Speaking Union Dinner London," July 3, 1951.

²⁰⁶ Radhika Parameswaran, "Military Metaphors, Masculine Modes, and Critical Commentary: Deconstructing Journalists' Inner Tales of September 11," *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 30 (2006): 48-49.

the non-Arian race, and for the Soviets, it meant the eradication of freedom and those not accepting of communism,

Overall, Eisenhower implemented military metaphors for particular audiences. All instances, apart from the one metaphor used at the English Speaking Dinner, were used during a speech directly concerned with military efforts. The NATO Council was expecting an update on Eisenhower's efforts to garner further military troops throughout Europe. The D-Day commemorative speech was meant to argue that the sacrifice of the soldiers on the beaches of Normandy would not have to be felt again, because NATO would help create a unified European army that would prevent the hostile takeover of France or any other Western European country ever again. Apart from the fact that the military metaphors were used in very appropriate settings, making them expected and relatable to his audience, Eisenhower was also the SACEUR. If anyone had the authority and ethos to compare the current situation in Europe to a military campaign against the Soviets, it was Eisenhower and his experiences from WWII.

Nature Metaphors

In addition to military metaphors, there were a myriad of metaphors used within discourse related to natural phenomena and the concept of a journey. Images of a ravine or gap that needed to be crossed, the hill that needs to be summited or the ocean that needs to be explored are just a few examples.²⁰⁷ Michael Osborn's concept of the light-dark archetypal metaphor fits into this category as well.²⁰⁸ The journey metaphor creates a useful tool for speakers to discuss progress and forward movement toward a certain goal.²⁰⁹ Such metaphors help to show problem-solving as well, visualizing movement from point A to point B. There is a

²⁰⁷ J. Vernon Jensen, 205

²⁰⁸ Michael Osborn, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53 (1967): 115-126.

²⁰⁹ Markus J. Milne et al., "Creating Adventures in Wonderland: The Journey Metaphor and Environmental Sustainability," *Organization*, 13 (2006): 811.

beginning or a starting point and an end destination, and the journey metaphor is so “fundamental” and a “part of our collective unconscious” that it holds mass appeal to various audiences.²¹⁰ Eisenhower used both in his SACEUR rhetoric to help his audience see the progress being made by SHAPE and NATO as well as help his audiences see the goal that NATO is traveling toward.

One nature metaphor, describing an interconnected web, often associated with a spider’s web, is common in twentieth century discourse.²¹¹ In his speech to the English Speaking Union, Eisenhower used a web metaphor to show a barrier between his goal, European unification, and his current position, minimal and scattered forces.²¹² He noted, “But it is in that vital region, history, custom, language and prejudice have combined to hamper integration. Without unity, the effect hobbled by a web of custom barriers interlaced with bilateral agreements, multilateral cartels, local shortages, and economic monstrosities.”²¹³ In other words, in order to get from an organization of 12 separate NATO nations to a unified NATO military command, Western Europe needed to break through web of roadblocks. The fact that he references a spider’s web is also important, as Eisenhower is reinforcing that any impediment to European unity was a negative thing.

Eisenhower continued his use of nature metaphors during his address at the English Speaking Union. Eisenhower established a clear comparison between the words of Winston Churchill’s call for European unity during his “Iron Curtain” address and a fruit-bearing tree.

²¹⁰ James Darsey, “Barack Obama and America’s Journey,” *Southern Communication Journal*, 74 (2009): 91.

²¹¹ Star A. Muir, “The Web and the Spaceship: Metaphors of the Environment,” *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 51 (1994): 146. I intentionally do not tie Eisenhower’s use of the web metaphor to what Muir states is commonly referred to as the “entangled ecosystem,” because at the time of Eisenhower’s speech (1951), the environmental movement had not yet begun, and therefore, would not have had any real meaning for Eisenhower’s audience.

²¹² While this metaphor is a mix between a construction metaphor (a barrier wall) and a nature metaphor (the web), I chose to place it with the nature metaphors, as the main comparison is between the various political elements and the web.

²¹³ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “English Speaking Union Dinner London,” July 3, 1951.

Eisenhower said, “Winston Churchill’s pleas for a united Europe can yet bear such greatness of fruit that it may well be remembered as the most notable achievement of a career, marked by achievement.”²¹⁴ At the time of Churchill’s speech, the speech and the idea of a unified Europe was not favorably accepted. Within that particular speech, one that should have been well-known by his British audience at the dinner, Churchill called for the US and Britain to labor together to build a brotherhood against the Soviet communist policy, something very similar to what Eisenhower was trying to do during his time as SACEUR.²¹⁵ While Britain was one of the largest voices against European unity, because unification posed a threat to their sovereign authority and favored separation from the rest of mainland Europe, Eisenhower’s reference to Britain’s own Prime Minister gave his argument further credibility. Churchill’s call was essentially compared to a fruit-bearing tree.²¹⁶ If Churchill’s call for unity were given support, then Eisenhower’s call for European unity would also earn support from the British. Their support, very similar to the nutrients given to a tree, would aid in creating a unified Europe, fostering freedom from communism and Soviet expansion on a continual basis given a strong foundation, similar to the perennial fruit on a tree.

Later in the same speech, Eisenhower compared the lack of freedom to a harvested and dying flower. He stated, “Freedom has its life in the heart, the actions, and the spirit of men and so it must be duly earned and refreshed—else like a flower cut from its life giving roots, it will

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Michael J. Hostetler, 420.

²¹⁶ As Eisenhower noted in a letter dated three days before his speech to the English Speaking Union, “I believe there is no real answer for the European problem until there is definitely established a United States of Europe. As a consequence if the present tensions and emergencies, I believe that such a step should be taken by Europe’s political leaders in a single plunge. The sooner the better! I get exceedingly weary of the step-by-step gradual, cautious approach. The United States and Britain could afford to do almost anything to support and make successful such a venture, because by this act, our entire objective in this region could be almost instantaneously achieved.” *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 251 to William Averell Harriman. If Britain agreed to join a united Europe, it would be easy according to Eisenhower, to earn French support and garner his unified military force.

wither and die.”²¹⁷ In order for a flower to thrive, it needs to be given fertilizer and water, which it absorbs through its root system. Without its roots, Eisenhower noted, the flower dies from a lack of nutrients. Like a flower, freedom needs the personal conviction and belief of men to thrive. If men begin to take freedom for granted or stop continually fighting to keep their freedom, it will be at risk of loss. Freedom is delicate and must be nurtured.²¹⁸ This is why Eisenhower was pushing so hard for the creation of a unified military front, because sovereign nations only remain sovereign if they can be protected from external threats, such as the Soviets.

The fact that Eisenhower compared freedom to a flower is also significant because flowers are often used exclusively to describe females versus males.²¹⁹ Stereotypically, especially during the early 1950s, women needed to be protected from the outside world, and their place was in the home, specifically the kitchen.²²⁰ The most visible image in America during the 1950s was the suburban family, living in their single-family home behind a white picket fence. A man’s job paid the mortgage; he was the “breadwinner” while the woman kept the house as the “homemaker.”²²¹ The woman was free to express herself, but only from the security of her kitchen. Similarly, freedom needed to be protected from the Soviet and communist threats outside the walls of the Western Europe “home.” The male soldiers needed to band together to protect their homes and their freedom from any threat. In terms of the fruit-bearing tree and floral metaphors, Eisenhower had a unique vantage point from which to use

²¹⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “English Speaking Union Dinner London,” July 3, 1951.

²¹⁸ Think of Lady Liberty in relation to the Statue of Liberty. In the west, liberty is often seen as a feminine virtue also in need of protection. .

²¹⁹ Jane L. Hegstrom and Joyce McCarl-Nielsen, “Gender and Metaphor: Descriptions of Familiar Persons,” *Discourse Processes*, 33 (2002): 228.

²²⁰ Janet Floyd, “Coming Out of the Kitchen: Texts, Contexts and Debates,” *Cultural Geographies*, 10 (2004): 61-73.

²²¹ Mary Drake McFeely, *Can She Bake a Sherry Pie?: American Women and the Kitchen in the Twentieth Century* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2001): 90. Advertising during the mid- to late-1940s and early 1950s even glorified women’s role in the kitchen as “patriotic” and a “duty” to one’s country. See Mei-ling Yang, “Creating the Kitchen Patriot: Media Promotion of Food Rationing and Nutrition Campaigns on the American Home Front During World War II,” *American Journalism*, 22 (2005): 55-75.

these metaphors because of his time as a soldier and military commander during WWII. Soldiers must protect freedom, and they must also protect women and children. The fact that liberty is mentioned also implies lady liberty, in need of protection. As a soldier, there are few others with the experience needed to discuss the value and necessity of protection and defense.

Finally, Eisenhower implemented a nature metaphor related to water, depicting the end results for NATO should their efforts to build a unified Europe fail. He said, “We will be nothing more than a feeble ripple, washed away and forgotten.”²²² Water has been tied to six various ideas in various studies: nature, life sustainer, movement, power, purity and femininity.²²³ In this case, due to the fact that Eisenhower qualified the ripple of water as “feeble,” Eisenhower was tying water directly to the idea of power. Water generally moves, and has power in that movement. Water runs downstream; it is seen as forceful and persistent. But if the water becomes stagnant, it loses its power. If the NATO countries did not keep moving in the direction of their goal, they would lose their power and not be able to fight against the Soviets. If they lost the momentum of building their unified military coalition, it could give the Soviets or communists just the opening they need to invade the NATO countries. Moreover, if Eisenhower meant to tie his use of the water metaphor back to the concept of life sustainer and femininity, then once again, as a soldier, he was uniquely positioned to use this metaphor in a powerful and meaningful way for his audience.

Through his use of nature metaphors, Eisenhower proved that the negative web of barriers forming in Britain against the efforts of NATO could be easily removed. Eisenhower cast a common threat, and created a collective “we” within his discourse. Eisenhower never referenced himself or individual countries when discussing success, but he always noted “we” in

²²² Dwight D. Eisenhower, “NATO Council,” November 27, 1951.

²²³ Yaning Nie and Rong Chen, “Water Metaphors and Metonymies in Chinese: A Semantic Network,” *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 16 (2008): 511.

relation to the SHAPE staff or the NATO countries. The only time he diverged from his use of the collective “we” was when he was trying to bolster the position of the French, singling them out in an attempt to give them a leadership role in the fight against communist.

Journey Metaphors

In addition to Eisenhower’s implementation of metaphors directly related to nature, he often used metaphors related to a journey or traveling over time. A clear example of this was during his talks with a group of French statesman at SHAPE and a discussion with members of the British Parliament, in which he alludes to the urgency of unifying Europe. To the French he stated, “If we need security, let's get it now...Now that is the only time schedule that I can see applies to [earning security]. Because, if you are out in the Bay swimming for your life, you don't say, ‘I must reach the land by evening, or I won't reach it.’ You'll say, ‘I bloody well have got to reach the land.’ That's what you say, and that's what we say now.”²²⁴ And just two months later, he made this comment, almost identical, to the British parliament, “If you are drowning in the middle of the river you don't say ‘I can't swim as far as the shore,’ you just swim. At least, you don't give up. That's where we are.”²²⁵ His urgency likely came from various sources, including US intelligence reports at the time, verifying the fact that the Soviets would be capable of attack on the West at any time.²²⁶ Given this fact, it was vital that the French and the British agreed that they did not have time to tread water and potentially drown. They needed to take action and move forward with the request of the Schumann Plan and the proposed European defense community. Inaction would cause them to drown and lose the one thing they have fought

²²⁴ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Talk to French Statesmen at Shape Briefing,” November 19, 1951.

²²⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Address to Members of British Parliament,” January 15, 1952.

²²⁶ See Central Intelligence Agency report titled “Soviet Preparations for Major Hostilities in 1950.” Intelligence Memorandum No. 323-SRC, 25 Aug. 1950. *The Digital National Security Archive*, accessed 11 Oct. 2010. The Korean War had already begun, and therefore, US officials felt that the Soviets were taking specific action to accelerate their war readiness program, including an increase in petroleum processing, air craft production, airfield construction and the stockpiling of reserves.

to maintain throughout already devastating conflicts: freedom. During his time as commander of forces for OVERLORD, Eisenhower learned the meaning of fighting for freedom at all costs, with more than 9,000 Allied soldiers killed or wounded during the Normandy campaign.²²⁷

Apart from the urgency of the journey, there were bound to be obstacles or pitfalls that the NATO countries needed to avoid so they did not endanger their journey or stall the progress toward European unity that was so urgently required.²²⁸ When speaking at the English Speaking Union, Eisenhower noted, “The road ahead may be long—it is certain to be marked by critical and difficult passages. But if we march together, endure together, share together, we shall succeed—we shall gloriously succeed together!”²²⁹ At this point, Eisenhower was looking forward. There was much to still do, especially with regards to Britain’s support of a unified European military, and getting from disagreement to agreement on how to involve Britain in the goal of unity needed to be done as directly and without hindrance as possible.

Also, inherent an inherent component of the journey metaphor is the idea of a burden, another form of an obstacle, something heavy or cumbersome that makes the journey more difficult than needed. When speaking to the NATO Council in Rome, that burden was caution. Eisenhower said, “I believe that if we, now, allow the influence of traditionalism, cautious approach, calculations as to what is politically feasible, and if we are burdened too much by all other deterrent influences that affect men—if we allow these influences to keep us from positive and direct action, there will be nothing in history about us and the organization we represent.”²³⁰ The idea of getting rid of the burdens and obstacles in that impede the journey again brought recognition to the urgency and immediacy of the threat of the Soviets. As noted before, the threat

²²⁷ The National D-Day Memorial, Web. Accessed 20 Nov. 2011. <<http://www.dday.org/>>.

²²⁸ J. Vernon Jensen, 202.

²²⁹ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “English Speaking Union Dinner London,” July 3, 1951.

²³⁰ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “NATO Council,” November 27, 1951.

of the Soviets was not up for debate; Western Europe was well-aware that the communists and Soviets were a threat. Eisenhower's goal was to push the fact that they were an immediate threat, and this meant that the build-up of NATO forces was urgent and required without delay.

In both cases, metaphors referencing obstacles and burdens during a journey, can be tied back to Eisenhower's numerous negotiations and setbacks during his discussions with Giraud, Darlan and de Gaulle in preparation for operations TORCH and OVERLORD. Giraud's unrealistic demands for power, Darlan's assassination and de Gaulle's demand to become the recognized leader of a revitalized French government were just some of the political challenges that stood in the way of Eisenhower's military goals during WWII. However, once those obstacles were overcome, Eisenhower led his forces to victory, just as Western Europe will overcome the Soviet threat if they can overcome their preference for caution and inaction. Through these particular speeches, Eisenhower employed journey metaphors, reiterating that while some barriers to the end goal, continued freedom with a unified military defense, they were also barriers that could be overturned or overcome. These barriers needed to be demolished quickly and without delay, because "we," or Western Europe, did not have the luxury of time. As a unified group, the NATO countries needed to move forward and work together to create a joint military front against the Soviets.²³¹

Archetypal Metaphors

Eisenhower implemented metaphors that can fall into both journey and nature categories, creating a hybrid metaphor that shows progress is being made and the end result will be positive for those involved in the journey.²³² In particular, he used archetypal metaphors, depicting the

²³¹ Kenneth Burke, *Rhetoric of Motives*, 38-46.

²³² See James Darsey, 89. As Darsey noted, the journey metaphor holds up well against all six of the features that Osborne defines for the archetypal metaphor. These six features are: (1) archetypal metaphors are popular in rhetorical discourse; (2) this popularity seems immune to changes over time; (3) the metaphors are grounded in

light-dark dichotomy. While speaking on the second anniversary of SHAPE in France, Eisenhower made it clear that the past year's efforts were not in vain. He noted, "Only this week, my staff and I have prepared a report on the progress we have achieved. One of its purposes will be to fight any discouragement that might come about from the realization that objectives are still a long way off on the horizon—by glancing briefly over our shoulders to see how far we have come."²³³ NATO and SHAPE had accomplished a lot over the past year, but good times and unity were ahead on the horizon, in the future, a place where the sun rises, while the past, the darkness, must only be given a quick glance. This reassuring movement from dark to light helped the SHAPE staff remain steadfast in the face of a long journey ahead.

Eisenhower also employed a similar metaphor when speaking to the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences of the Institute of France. Here, Eisenhower compared France to a beacon. He said, "History and destiny, tradition and geography, have combined through the years to focus the eye of people all over the world on this great land. They look to France as a beacon of freedom and progress along the long and arduous road towards human happiness."²³⁴ Based on his dealings with the French in WWII, Eisenhower knew he had to make his arguments clear and concise when dealing with the French. By comparing France to a beacon of light, a guiding light and example to be seen by the rest of Europe, he helped bolster the French ego and make his call for European unity all the more palatable. If the French were going to share glory with anyone, at least they would be seen as the group that made that glory possible.

experiences or objects commonly known to all people, including death; (4) archetypal metaphors are appealing as long as they embody basic human motivations, such as a vertical scale implying an increase in power or authority; (5) these metaphors have a particularly persuasive potency; and (6) archetypal metaphors occupy prominent positions within speeches and are significant within most significant speeches within a society. See also Michael Osborne, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family," 116-117.

²³³ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "2nd Anniversary of SHAPE," April 2, 1952.

²³⁴ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Remarks at Academy of Moral and Political Sciences of the Institute of France," January 21, 1952.

Through these speeches, Eisenhower employed archetypal metaphors of light and dark to help emphasize his previous use of the journey metaphors: NATO would continue to move forward along the road, moving toward the light and bright future and away from the past and potential darkness that would come from Soviet and communist expansion. Eisenhower's declaration of confidence in the future, something needed to ensure his audience that NATO's efforts were not in vain, helped enhance his ethos, suggesting he was a man of great faith.²³⁵ Additionally, the dark and light dichotomy allowed Eisenhower to emphasize the good (light) aspect of NATO's call for a unified European force against the evil (dark) aspect of the build-up of the Soviet and communist threat. This comparison between one group and another continues as Eisenhower employed other metaphors in his rhetoric.

Scientific Metaphors

Scientific metaphors allow the speaker to compare one group or universe to some other domain. For example, a speaker could say that the human mind/brain is a computer. This would emphasize the fact that the brain, like a computer, contains a place to store data (a hard drive) and the ability to understand information (a processor).²³⁶ Eisenhower used scientific metaphors during two specific occasions within the selected speeches to French statesmen at SHAPE and the British Parliament. Both occasions involved the same vehicle term, a vacuum, but separate tenor terms, Europe and West Germany. To the French, Eisenhower stated, "But we know that that center of Europe is not going to remain a vacuum. It is not going to remain completely outside of this ideological struggle of freedom on the one hand and regimentation on the other. We must absorb the major part of the European strength, of that German strength or it would

²³⁵ Michael Osborn, 118.

²³⁶ Robert R. Hoffman, "Metaphor in Science," R.P. Honeck and R.R. Hoffman, Eds. *Cognition and Figurative Language* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980): 405.

assuredly go the other way.”²³⁷ To the British, not two months later, Eisenhower made a similar statement, “And we know Western Germany is not going to remain a vacuum. And, in the same way, every needle is going to point to one of the poles. And, in the same way, every country in the world has to make up its mind, as long as power has become polarized; are you going to cling to the Free World concept, or are you going to accept without protest the authoritarian rule?”²³⁸

These two metaphors can be taken together, because they are working toward the same goal. Both seek to convince the audience that while Europe may seem safe and secure at the moment, it will not remain secure forever. The “security vacuum” surrounding Europe and West Germany could at any time be overcome by the domination of a greater power influence, such as the Soviets. The British and the French could not remain content to assume the Soviet influence will not eventually infiltrate their borders, and they should greatly consider joining the EDC and rearming Western Germany under NATO. Yet France led the charge against German rearmament, partially because they feared another possible attack from the Germans if the country were rearmed.²³⁹ Eisenhower had sympathy for the French situation, but he again called for their understanding and acceptance of the need for German rearmament. If West Germany fell under Soviet control, there would be no way to defend against an attack on the NATO countries. If Germany stayed as it was, unarmed and simply occupied by Western Europe, then NATO could only hope to create a stalemate with the Soviets. The only way to defeat the Soviets, should they attack, would be to garner German cooperation and forces to fight with the French, British and remainder of NATO forces.²⁴⁰ If anyone would know the number of troops or the strength of forces needed to withhold the potential invasion or bombardment from the

²³⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Talk to French Statesmen at Shape Briefing,” November 19, 1951.

²³⁸ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Address to Members of British Parliament,” January 15, 1952.

²³⁹ As noted earlier, the three specific attacks in recent French memory were in 1870 (France-Prussia War), 1914 (Germany declared war on France at the beginning of WWI), and 1940 (Battle of France during WWII).

²⁴⁰ *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 505 to George Whitney. Whitney was a US banker.

Soviets, it would be Eisenhower. Based on his of more than 40 years of military service, Eisenhower participated in and planned numerous military campaigns and was well-aware of the numerous aspects of their planning, including troop sizes, weaponry and threat levels.

Overall, Eisenhower used metaphors within his SACEUR rhetoric to make the complex idea of European unity and, in specific instances, the rearmament of Western Germany, more tangible for his French, British and NATO audiences. In particular, Eisenhower employed metaphors focused on construction, nature, travel, military efforts, light, and science to help make the concept of a unified military alliance between the NATO countries a goal that was both attainable and very much essential for Western Europe. Construction metaphors allowed Eisenhower to liken unity to the foundation of the strongest defense against the Soviets. Military and scientific metaphors helped Eisenhower emphasize the urgency behind his call for unity. On the battlefield, Western Europe needed to be on the offense, and in order to do so, they needed the help of Western German forces to bolster their manpower. Nature metaphors allowed for the setbacks and obstacles that might try to prevent European unification, while journey metaphors enabled Eisenhower to explain how the NATO countries could ultimately overcome those obstacles together. Metaphor allowed Eisenhower to make abstract ideas such as unification a tangible and positive idea for his audiences. His use of irony only further helped emphasize the need for unification.

3.2 Irony

Irony involves the pairing of two dialectics and occurs when a speaker tries to produce meaning that takes into account both terms at the same time.²⁴¹ Irony can only be used effectively if the audience is certain about the speaker's opinion on the terms or concepts used

²⁴¹ Kenneth Burke, *On Symbols and Society*, 255.

within the ironic statement.²⁴² Eisenhower used irony in key instances, using Burke's concept of "true" irony more than romantic irony. In particular, Eisenhower used irony when discussing the motives of the communists and his role within NATO.

During his D-Day Commemoration speech in Normandy, Eisenhower used irony as a way of creating group cohesion over the fact that the Communist's motives are not as "peaceful" as the motives of NATO. He said, "We know that we want only a peace among nations that will permit all men—of East and West alike—to live decent and productive lives. The rulers of the Communistic world say that their purpose is the same."²⁴³ However, Eisenhower made it clear that the communist purpose is not peaceful in both the remainder of this speech and his personal letters; his audience was well-aware he was being ironic, pairing the two dialectics of communism and peace, in order to emphasize how different the communists were from the moral ideals of the West. The communists wanted to acquire new territories and occupy lands, while Western Europeans simply wanted to keep the communists out of Europe to maintain peace and solidarity between the 12 European nations.²⁴⁴ To make this point even clearer, in case his audience was not already aware of his position and feelings on the communists and Soviets, he continued by saying, "But how can we believe those who talk of liberty when they permit no liberty at home; who promise benefits to the workers although millions labor in their slave camps; who speak of peasant problems with mock sympathy after wrenching from the peasants at home their land and produce? How can we believe those who talk of peace while they support

²⁴² David Kaufer, 94.

²⁴³ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies," June 6, 1951.

²⁴⁴ In a diary entry dated a month after this speech, Eisenhower wrote, "With respect to these things, my own reaction is that the stopping of the Communist acquisition of new territories is so important that it is up to us to inspire better understanding and better cooperation in the areas that seem unusually important to our future than Europe; in fact, it is difficult for me to see how we would ever stop the progressive disintegration of the entire European, African, Asian, and possibly even parts of south American areas if Europe should fall." *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII*, Letter 292 to Sterling Morton. Morton was the chairman of the board of the Morton Salt Company in Chicago.

aggression in the Orient and arm Eastern Germany in the face of no conceivable threat?”²⁴⁵ This follow-up comment drove home the idea that while the communists might try to make it seem like they want “all men to live decent lives,” but based on the continuous threat of Soviet and communist expansion, Eisenhower made it clear neither party was concerned for the wellbeing of others.

Eisenhower also used irony during his NATO Farewell Address from France to the NATO Council members. He said, “Ladies and gentlemen, I am certainly in a unique position. You know, you are my bosses and usually one does not go around giving good advice and lecturing to his bosses, so I will try today to avoid being in the position of teacher or preacher. I shall try to tell you, in my own way, something of what I think of this Group, something of my respect for its opportunities for service, its capacity for good in the world today.”²⁴⁶ This statement was ironic for two reasons. First, it was the first sentence of his speech. So in order to be true and not ironic, Eisenhower would have had to have not made any lasting requests for how NATO should carry on or run after he left. This was not the case. Throughout the speech, Eisenhower discussed the “duties” each of the Council members has to work with their member countries to continue to develop the “rights and privileges of free people” and “unity” as their primary job and responsibility. This sounded like Eisenhower’s final opportunity to preach his goal of European unity and a strong military coalition to the NATO Council. This was important because it was the last time Eisenhower addressed NATO, and he needed this speech to encapsulate his accomplishments and hopes that the organization would continue to move forward with the positive momentum he helped create. His methods were working, and the next SACEUR and the remaining NATO Council needed to continue along his path.

²⁴⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies,” June 6, 1951. The aggression in the Orient is in reference to the Soviet support of North Korea in the Korean War.

²⁴⁶ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Farewell to NATO Paris, France,” May 21, 1952.

Second, this is an ironic statement, because those closest to Eisenhower and familiar with his previous rhetoric from WWII knew that he often referred to himself as a leader and member of the Crusade for Freedom. Eisenhower's memoir of his experiences during his command during WWII was titled *Crusade in Europe*. In March 1951, Eisenhower wrote that he had "joined the Crusade for Freedom once more," in a letter.²⁴⁷ Eisenhower also launched the Crusade for Freedom campaign nationwide in the US during the summer of 1950. The Crusade was meant to provide a way for Americans to exemplify their indignation with the Soviets and communists.²⁴⁸ Eisenhower wanted to help Western Europe exemplify their indignation with the Soviets as well.

Overall, Eisenhower used irony when discussing the motives of the communists, the spirit of the NATO countries and his role within NATO. In particular, he noted the extreme opposition between the motives of the communists (domination) and the motives of the NATO countries (freedom). Endurance and spirit were traits NATO countries, as exemplified by France, needed to defeat the Soviets. And finally, Eisenhower's word was that of a hypothetical preacher, a trusted leader whose advice should be adhered to even after his departure from his position as SACEUR, because the crusade against the Soviets and in favor of freedom was not a task that would depart NATO with Eisenhower. Irony emphasized Eisenhower's already clear position in relation to the Soviet threat and helped further engrain in his audience the need for a united front against communist expansion.

²⁴⁷ See *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XI*, Letter 86 to Lucious Du Bignon Clay, national chairman of the Crusade for Europe.

²⁴⁸ Martin J. Medhurst, "Eisenhower and the Crusade for Freedom: The Rhetorical Origins of a Cold War Campaign," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 27 (1997): 646-661

3.3 Synecdoche

Synecdoche implies an integral relationship, a relationship of convertibility, between two terms.²⁴⁹ The two terms represent a conversion from part for whole, whole for part, cause for effect and effect for cause; it is a very interchangeable and organic relationship. Synecdoche is an interesting trope, uniting two things that are different from each other or representing intangible ideas or emotions. An example comes from environmental literature, in which a fish used by Native American tribes can come to represent a conflict between the tribe and the proponents of a reservoir to be created in a river used for spawning on the reservation.²⁵⁰

Eisenhower used similar instances of metonymy when he discussed the threat of communism to Western Europe, making the threat not only real, but a representation of Adolf Hitler's Germany.

During Hitler's rule in Germany and Joseph Stalin's rule of the Soviet Union during WWII, the concept of the purge of those that did not adhere to the Nazi or Fascists philosophy is somewhat well-known.²⁵¹ If an individual was not a Nazi, "he [was] wiped out" even if he eventually wanted to "swallow his past and accept Adolf Hitler's leadership."²⁵² Eisenhower used this common image of Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Soviet Union during WWII to draw a distinct parallel between the actions of these dictators and the potential actions of the communists and Soviets during the English Speaking Dinner. He said, "The drawn and haunted faces in the docks of the purge courts are grim evidence of what Communistic domination

²⁴⁹ Kenneth Burke, "Four Master Tropes," 427.

²⁵⁰ Jane Bloodworth Rowe, 362. The Mattaponi Indians, who lived on a 150-acre reservation near the site of a proposed reservoir, opposed a proposed reservoir because they feared that it would cause environmental damage to the river, and in turn, a threat to the tribe's way of life.

²⁵¹ Joseph Stalin held a series of purges between 1936 and 1938 focused on Communists, government officials, peasants, Red Army leadership and those suspected of sabotage. Also similar to Hitler's trials of those against his regime, Stalin held trials of those accused of conspiring against him and other Soviet leadership. The difference between the two is that during WWII, Stalin was part of the Allied forces (Great Britain, Soviets and the US) and Hitler and Mussolini were part of the Axis forces (Germany, Italy and Japan). At one point, in October 1940, there were a series of German-Soviet talks concerning the potential of the Soviet Union to join as the fourth Axis power. However, that fell through when Germany invaded the Soviet Union in June 1941.

²⁵² Hamilton Fish Armstrong, "Hitler's Reich: The First Phase," *Foreign Affairs*, 11 (1933): 589.

means.”²⁵³ One of the more well-known purges of those unwilling to accept the Nazi regime was a series of political murders known as the Operation Hummingbird, in which more than 100 people were killed and more than a thousand imprisoned for refusing to follow Hitler.²⁵⁴ Hitler’s reign was one of zero tolerance towards opposition. Nazi unity was coerced, a characteristic Eisenhower also associated with Soviet and communist unity. The NATO countries needed to enter into a unified coalition of their own free will.

Eisenhower went on to characterize the actions of NATO in direct opposition to the actions of the Nazi’s. NATO would never threaten its member countries with the fear of being placed in a concentration camp. During his remarks at the opening of SHAPE headquarters he said, “We strive to lift from the hearts of men the fear of the cell block and the slave camp. We strive to establish a 'Pax Atlantica' under which all men may push forward to new heights, to new levels of achievement.”²⁵⁵ The fears of the Nazi cell block or concentration slave camps were not needed to mobilize and unify the NATO nations. The “Pax Atlantica” helps develop the sense that the NATO union is one of peace and friendship between member nations as people. The term “pax” can mean peace, a truce or, in some cases, a friendship.²⁵⁶ Eisenhower repeated a similar statement at the English Speaking Union Dinner in London, where he stated, “Our community possesses a potential might that far surpasses the sinister forces of slave camps and chained millions.”²⁵⁷ The use of the term “community” again fostered a sense of unity without coercion. His final reference to Hitler’s Nazi regime and Stalin’s Fascist dictatorship was during his address to the NATO Council. He noted, “For you are not trying to lead any captives in

²⁵³ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “English Speaking Union Dinner London,” July 3, 1951.

²⁵⁴ Hamilton Fish Armstrong, 590-591. Before the Sturmabteilung (SA), Hitler’s commonly referred to paramilitary “brownshirts,” were under Hitler control, they posed a threat to his Nazi regime because they favored independence. Between June 30 and July 2, 1934, Hitler deployed Operation Hummingbird. The people and institutions that stood as the last line of defense against the un-contradicted Nazi dictatorship were destroyed.

²⁵⁵ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Remarks at Official Opening of SHAPE Headquarters at Marly,” July 23, 1951.

²⁵⁶ See “Pax” in *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Third Edition, September 2005, Web.

²⁵⁷ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “English Speaking Union Dinner London,” July 3, 1951.

chains down the streets of any NATO city. You are seeking no triumph, except the triumph of giving free men the right and opportunity to live as they desire.”²⁵⁸ NATO needed to ensure those that signed the North Atlantic Treaty would remain free from communist oppression.

For Eisenhower, synecdoche allowed him to reduce communism, the Soviet threat, and the fear associated with them into tangible ideas. He made the potential invasion of the communists into Western Europe equivalent to the takeover of Germany by Hitler’s Nazi regime. The fact that Hitler’s actions were a not-to-distant memory in the minds of his various audiences helped add to Eisenhower’s emphasis of the urgency and reality of the Soviet threat. A threat that called for a defense against a possible enemy of Hitler’s caliber. A threat that require a unified European military effort under unified command, namely NATO. Eisenhower was in a unique position to use the purge courts and concentration camps as interchangeable references for Nazi Germany, because he was actively involved in the WWII conflict with the Germans. Eisenhower’s use of synecdoche in relation to Hitler’s Germany made the very recent horrors of the Nazi regime just the threatening potential outcome for Eisenhower to imply could happen again if the Soviets were to gain a foothold in Western Europe.

3.4 Metonymy

Burke described the basic “strategy” in metonymy as being able to “convey some incorporeal or intangible state in terms of the corporeal or tangible.”²⁵⁹ Easily understandable examples are the use of the term Hollywood in place of American cinema studios or the term Westminster in place of the British Parliament because both are the well-known locations for each and are often associated with one another. Various films or government representatives are reduced to a single city or single location. In his SACEUR rhetoric, Eisenhower uses metonymy

²⁵⁸ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “NATO Council,” November 27, 1951.

²⁵⁹ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 424.

to represent conflict between the Soviets and the NATO countries. In particular, he used metonymy to cast the Soviets and communists as untrustworthy and deceptive.

During his speeches to the NATO Council in Italy and his Farewell Address to the NATO Council in France, Eisenhower used the idea of murder, a deceptive and horrific act, as a way of depicting the Soviets and communists as untrustworthy. In Italy, he claimed, “In direct comparison with the dictatorship that has announced its implacable hostility to our way of life, there is only one thing in which we are inferior. This is the unity, in his case achieved by pistol in the back. Free men don't have to use such methods.”²⁶⁰ First, Eisenhower compares the Soviets and communists to dictators, a factor that played into the beginnings of WWII, both Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini were considered dictators, untrustworthy and after absolute power and authority over all of their subjects.²⁶¹ The pistol in the back can be linked to the idea of being taken hostage, especially in the context of the rest of the sentence and the speech, and had been used previously to characterize the actions of Mussolini.²⁶² A gun in the back became associated with Mussolini and other dictator-like leaders, such as Hitler. Eisenhower was making the point that the unity achieved by the communists and the Soviets is a unity driven by fear and force. Those under dictators fear that if they do not comply they will be shot in the back. Being shot in the back is also deceptive, a killer that is too weak and pitiful to look his or her victim in the eye

²⁶⁰ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “NATO Council,” November 27, 1951. This is not the only time Eisenhower makes reference to the Soviets and communists as dictators. During his November 19, 1951, talk to French statesmen at SHAPE, he said, “The phenomenon of our time that has disarranged the lives and aspirations and purposes of all of us is that a very powerful dictatorship existing in the world has announced, in time of peace, that it cannot live amicably with another form of government in the world.” And during his speech at the English Speaking Union, he said, “Opposed to us—cold and forbidding—is an ideological front that marshals every weapon in the arsenal of dictatorship.”

²⁶¹ Mussolini was an Italian politician and leader of the National Fascist Party. Hitler and Mussolini were often characterized as the dictators of the axis forces, and much effort was put into the Hitler/Mussolini relationship during WWII to help show a “friendship” between Nazi Germany and fascist Italy. See Paul Baxa, “Capturing the Fascist Moment: Hitler’s Visit to Italy in 1938 and the Radicalization of Fascist Italy,” *Journal of Contemporary History*, 42 (2007): 227-242.

²⁶² On June 10, 1940, US President Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave a speech appropriately known as the “Stab in the Back” address at the University of Virginia. In it, Roosevelt described Italy’s decision to stand with Hitler’s Germany as the “hand that held the dagger has struck it into the back of its neighbor.”

before taking their life. It made the communist unity untrustworthy and frail, implying the NATO countries were trustworthy and unified by free will.

During his farewell address to the NATO Council in France, Eisenhower made a similar point but further distinguished between the Western European alliance and the communist alliance. He stated, “Now the Communist uses the gun in the kidneys—a knife between the shoulder blades—and of course people are unified or else they do not exist.”²⁶³ Again, the gun in the kidneys and the knives between the shoulder blades depict a forced or coerced unity. It is as if the individuals following the communist ideals were hostages. If they were ever to go against their leaders, they would be killed as Eisenhower noted. Moreover, a gun in the back once again implied deception and a clear association with a dictatorial regime meant to mirror the current actions of the Soviets.

Eisenhower also noted that while the communists were represented with weapons to the back, the NATO countries were joined together by friendship and a common understanding. There was no cohesion. Eisenhower stated, “We have to find better ways. One of the ways is this body and I can see the development of friendship, understanding, unity as a primary job of you gentlemen who stand in the front row and bear heavy responsibilities.”²⁶⁴ According to Eisenhower’s use of metonymy, NATO stood in the front row, not the back, when it came to leading the call for a unified Western European military. This unity was best represented by a friend-to-friend relationship while the Soviet’s and communist’s unity is best represented by an aggressor-to-hostage relationship.

²⁶³ Dwight D. Eisenhower, “Farewell to NATO Paris, France,” May 21, 1952.

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

Metonymy is a powerful trope because it has the ability to affect perception or summarize a situation or set of contexts.²⁶⁵ The gun and knife to the back are used as representative anecdotes that connect two sides of the equation: communists and unification. The relationship is a forced relationship, and without the fear and force, the communist and Soviet unity would fail. Therefore, Eisenhower argues the NATO can form a unified European coalition based not on fear but on friendship. Bonds of friendship are bonds of choice and are much more difficult to break over time. In particular, the ties of forced unity linking back to Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, two dictators still fresh in the minds of European citizens not that far past WWII helped Eisenhower remind his audiences that both dictators were overcome by a unified Allied coalition. A similar coalition was needed now to face the deceptive communists in their omnipresent threat to European freedom. Eisenhower used metonymy in a similar sense, reducing the actions of the Soviets and communist to mirror Hitler's Germany. He could effectively and convincingly do so, because he had the first-hand experience in dealing with Hitler's regimes and military coalitions during WWII.

²⁶⁵ Karen A. Foss and Kathy I. Domenici, 242.

4. CONCLUSION

On July 16, 1951, Andre Laguerre, a *Life* magazine reporter, wrote the following about Eisenhower's role as Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR): "For in West Europe this summer the US is engaged in a colossal task not merely of physical reconstruction or military rearmament but primarily of moral and psychological regeneration. In this sense the Eisenhower mission—far more even than the Marshall Plan—is a historic enterprise without parallel."²⁶⁶

Over many centuries, Europe had experienced a myriad of alliances, but none had ever bound all the nations to a single treaty. Trust between the nations did not come easily, but it was gradually and firmly established through Eisenhower's diplomacy and leadership during the early 1950s. Eisenhower's greatest enduring contribution during his NATO service was his effort to develop a feeling of partnership, unification and a restoration of confidence among the European nations. This was an unacknowledged step towards the creation of today's European Union that was only possible within the specific context of Eisenhower's previous experiences during World War II (WWII) and the founding years of NATO, including the previous attempts made at unifying the Western European nations.

During his time as Supreme Allied Commander, Eisenhower developed his persuasive strategies between 1942 and 1945. During Operation TORCH, he had numerous political dealings and strategic conversations with some of France's most elite political leadership: Giraud, Darlan and de Gaulle. And while Eisenhower went into TORCH knowing little of the political atmosphere within France, he soon learned that the political disagreements between French leadership and the military planning for the Allied forces were enmeshed. While Giraud

²⁶⁶ Andre Laguerre, "Optimist in Arms," *Life*, July 16, 1951, 108. According to the article, Laguerre spent weeks following Eisenhower on his early 1951 journey around to the NATO countries' capital cities. As he followed Eisenhower, he spoke with defense ministers, chiefs of staff, politicians and businessmen that noted "the heart of Europe [was] beating more strongly than any time since WWII."

seemed like the best person suited to lead the Vichy forces in Africa, he held no real political power within the Vichy regime. Darlan did hold such power, but due to his overzealous desire to earn greater political authority and unfavorable relationship with the British, he was not the best choice for a military commander.

During Operation OVERLORD, Eisenhower needed to court a French official that was not favored by Roosevelt and Churchill, Charles de Gaulle. While de Gaulle and Eisenhower had worked together during TORCH, Eisenhower needed to keep his trust in order to have the help of the French Resistance forces in the final push against Germany on the beaches of Normandy. Eisenhower's trustworthy and honest nature helped him work well with French leadership. His calm demeanor and lack of ruthlessness helped him smooth over differences not only within the Vichy French and Resistance regimes, but between the American, British and French leadership. His patience helped him wait it out until he could get what he wanted from his counterparts. After WWII, various events between 1948 and 1950 provided a solid backdrop from which Eisenhower could eventually make his call for European unification while SACEUR.

In order for the US and Europe to best defend themselves from the threat of Soviet and communist expansion, the countries needed to establish an organized, cooperative Western Europe. The Marshall Plan, the Treaty of Brussels, the Schuman Plan and the Pleven Plan were all efforts that served as the base for the concept of the unified European defense effort needed in order for the political union of the Western European nations to occur under NATO's watch. The Marshall Plan and the Treaty of Brussels were meant to be types of economic stimulus for a unified Western Europe, enabling European countries to balance their budgets. While it was ultimately ineffective in that regard, it did create the Committee on European Economic Cooperation, meant to help Western European countries monitor their progress during WWII

recovery efforts. The Schuman Plan and the Pleven Plan were attempts by France to foster unity among Western European nations while still maintaining their first priority: national sovereignty. Having suffered various German invasions during the past century, the French were resistant to the rearmament of their greatest historical opponent. All four of these major treaties and plans ended with the eventual creation of a “supranational institution” designed to help govern various aspects of European development or recovery. All were difficult to pass or eventually failed because the British and French would continue to push for national interest and sovereignty.

During his time as SACEUR Eisenhower made his call for transnational action and cooperation among the Western European nations, paying particular attention to his most difficult audiences, the British and French. During his various speeches, Eisenhower made his call for a unified Western European military effort against the Soviets. His identification with and persuasion of his audience were created through his use of Burke’s four master tropes—metaphor, irony, synecdoche and metonymy. All four of these tropes were used to discover and describe “the truth,” as Eisenhower saw it, to the rest of Western Europe.²⁶⁷ He also used tropes to connect his ideas and opinion of a unified Western European military with conduct that was or was not admirable to his audience. For example, communism was tied to the enslavement of millions while European unity was compared to a protective wall. Eisenhower was aware of his audience’s opinions and morals, and he used those opinions to his advantage.²⁶⁸ Overall, he was able to persuade his audience using these four tropes, because he played to their moral values, their opinions and “truths” within the specific context of their shared experiences of WWII.

²⁶⁷ Kenneth Burke, “Four Master Tropes,” 421.

²⁶⁸ Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives*, 54-55.

Themes of Eisenhower's SACEUR Rhetoric

There are numerous themes present throughout Eisenhower's use of tropes as tools of persuasion with his key audiences: the British, French and NATO elite.

Eisenhower used various tropes to call attention to shared experiences with his audiences. WWII was by far his largest shared experience, relevant to the French, British and other NATO countries for various reasons.²⁶⁹ During his speech to commemorate D-Day, the WWII invasion that ended the war in Western Europe, Eisenhower referenced the shared "tragic experience" of nations that refuse to stand against the aggression of dictators by crafting an "invincible" and metaphoric "barrier against aggression" as the Allied forces did.²⁷⁰ The Western European nations also shared the common values of freedom and prosperity, values not associated with the communist or Soviet Union.

These common values also needed to be defended on the "battlefield" against Western Europe's shared enemies to the East. Essentially, Eisenhower used his rhetoric to swap out the threat of German rearmament with the threat of Soviet attack. He made the Soviet threat a greater enemy, requiring France and the remainder of Western Europe to come to terms with the fact that German rearmament was a necessary addition to NATO's defenses against the Soviets. The fact that Western Europe had a single enemy, large enough to mount an attack against them at any time, made Eisenhower's call for unity once of urgency. The Soviet and communist threat were compared to the bullets on the battlefield, and Western Europe needed to either forge their own armor as soon as possible, or suffer traumatic loss. Eisenhower's discussion of NATO's

²⁶⁹ This was also a problem, because WWII brought with it memories of an uncontrollable, Nazi Germany. Memories of WWII were one of the main reasons why France was so adamant to keep the German's unarmed. Eisenhower had to work around this, making it work to his advantage. He did this by partially placing most of the blame for Germany's actions on Adolf Hitler, using metonymy to make his point that the German people were enslaved, imprisoned, and had to choose but to follow Hitler. Now, given the choice between Western Europe and the Soviets, Germany would undoubtedly choose Western Europe and remain nonthreatening, especially under the control of NATO.

²⁷⁰ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies," June 6, 1951.

actions as a journey, moving along a path, also aided his call for urgency. The NATO nations were always moving away from the past and toward a bright future, especially with the help of the efforts from France, a beacon for the rest of Europe. Eisenhower's comparison of the Soviet and communist threat to the actions of Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin's dictatorships also created a sense of urgency in combating their enemy. Western Europe had witnessed first-hand the purge courts, concentration camps and enslavement wrought by dictators, and if they wanted to maintain their freedom, they could not allow the Soviets to gain any kind of foothold in Western Europe. The longer they waited to prevent an attack, the more vulnerable they would become. There was only so much outside help, especially from the US, could do. Western Europeans needed to join together to defend their shared values.

These values were shared by all of the people in Eisenhower's audiences, referenced throughout his speeches simply as "we." When Eisenhower noted that "we" were engaged in producing a military effort against the Soviets, he is referencing the all the Western European states and all the NATO member countries. When Eisenhower noted that "we" would become nothing more than a feeble ripple of water should the Soviets gain influence, he was referring to Western Europe but also to the NATO organization. NATO was created to help deter the Soviet threat. If NATO did not continue to make progress, gaining additional member countries and moving along its path to deter the communist threat, then the "we" in Western Europe would have been lost.

Eisenhower's use of tropes to persuade his audiences through shared experiences, common enemies and sense of collectivity helped foster a sense of community and camaraderie that could only have been established by an individual with Eisenhower's history—he was the man responsible for leading the Allies to victory against Hitler and Germany—and universal

respect across European nations. Eisenhower was known for bringing diverse and conflicting individuals together—his time in operation TORCH and OVERLORD provided him with the patience and straightforward nature needed to be an honest and trustworthy speaker. His military background also gave him the ability to stay just far enough removed from the need for political gain within Europe to focus his efforts on the military front.²⁷¹ This was essential, because without a unified military effort, Europe would never have begun to come together politically to form the foundation for the European Union.

A unified European defense community was the beginning of that military unification, and the European Defense Community (EDC) Treaty was signed on May 27, 1952, just six days after Eisenhower’s Farewell address to NATO. And while the EDC Treaty was never ratified in the French Parliament, it failed by a vote of 264-319 in August 1954, the Treaty itself was an important step forward in European unification.²⁷² The European Union of today and NATO both carry out some of the functions that were initially envisioned by the EDC Treaty, they just avoid some of the supranational military control that the EDC would have provided for. According to US historian William Hitchcock, the failure of the EDC was called a “fiasco” at the time, but ultimately, it helped bring about new proposals and widen economic integration between the Western European countries.²⁷³ The “failure” of the EDC ultimately led to a sort of wake-up-call to those that believed a political and military union could be developed in Europe

²⁷¹ Of Aristotle’s three proofs discussed in *Rhetoric*—ethos, logos and pathos—Eisenhower had a very good ethos or character. According to Lynette Hunter, establishing ethos is a “procedure for legitimation and justification of political action,” and therefore, Eisenhower’s past experiences (his time in WWII) help secure the idea that he has the background and know-how needed to make the claims he did about the unification of Western Europe as essential to their security against the Soviets. See “Ideology as the Ethos of the Nation State,” *Rhetoric: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric*, 14 (1996): 201.

²⁷² James McAllister, 230-244.

²⁷³ William I. Hitchcock, *The Struggle for Europe: The Turbulent History of a Divided Continent, 1945-Present* (New York: Anchor House, 2003).

overnight.²⁷⁴ The crisis of the EDC Treaty failure in 1954 led to Germany's entrance into NATO in 1955 and the eventual creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1957.²⁷⁵ Eisenhower's push for the EDC during his time as SACEUR helped develop initial acceptance of the idea within France and the remaining Western European countries.

Eisenhower Overlooked

The importance of Eisenhower's rhetoric during his time as SACEUR is not the only portion of Eisenhower's rhetoric that remains untouched by rhetorical critics. On April 2, 1946, General Eisenhower gave a speech titled, "Art in Peace and War" at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. The speech was meant to commemorate his election as an Honorary Fellow for Life by the Trustees. Eisenhower was presented his certificate of fellowship by Mr. Rowland Redmond, who noted "Dwight David Eisenhower, soldier, diplomat, and statesman, through whose wisdom and foresight many irreplaceable art treasures were saved for future generations."²⁷⁶ In this speech Eisenhower touched on his time as a WWII General, referencing his North African campaign. He also developed an interesting dichotomy between art and war and the artist and the soldier. Eisenhower's "Art in Peace and War" speech is another example of a piece of Eisenhower's rhetoric that has been overlooked by historical and rhetorical scholars alike during the transitional period between WWII and the beginning of the Cold War. In

²⁷⁴ *Crises in European Integration: Challenges and Responses, 1945-2005*, Ludger Kuhnhardt, ed. (Berghahn Books: 2009): 33.

²⁷⁵ The EEC was created by the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (Treaty of Rome; renamed Treaty on the functioning of the European Union in 2009) of 1957. It gained a common set of institutions along with the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) under the 1965 Merger Treaty (Treaty of Brussels). With the entry into force of the Treaty on European Union (Treaty of Maastricht) in 1993, the organization changed its name from the EEC to the European Community (EC) and was along with the other aforementioned EC made to comprise the first of the three pillars of the new European Union (EU). The entire pillar division, and the EC along with it, was abolished upon the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009. The legal personality of the EC was at this point transferred to the EU as a whole, a change in line with the Lisbon Treaty's wider aim of consolidating the legal nature of the EU. See "The History of the European Union," *Europa: Gateway to the European Union*, Web. Accessed 24 Sep. 2011. <http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm>.

²⁷⁶ Dwight D. Eisenhower, "Art in Peace and War," *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, New Series*, 4 (1946): 221-223.

particular, this speech sheds light on a role Eisenhower held outside both the military and politics. Much like his time as President of Columbia University, this speech could help further develop his ability to adapt to his audience and make a persuasive case.

Overall, Eisenhower's role as SACEUR, and his many other roles apart from WWII and the presidency, have been overlooked by historians and rhetoricians alike. Eisenhower helped revive Western Europe's will power and made real progress toward helping them take a stand against very real threat of the Soviet Union and communism during the early 1950s.

Eisenhower's rhetorical efforts taken in particular political contexts help illustrate how he played a largely overlooked role in the development of NATO and the eventual formation of the European Union we know today. I encourage further analysis of other overlooked rhetoric from Eisenhower's long and intriguing career.

5. REFERENCES

- Abbott, Don. "Marxist Influences on the Rhetorical Theory of Kenneth Burke." *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 7.4 (1974): 217-233.
- Bates, Benjamin R. "Audiences, Metaphors, and the Persian Gulf War." *Communication Studies*, 55, (2004): 447-63.
- Baxa, Paul. "Capturing the Fascist Moment: Hitler's Visit to Italy in 1938 and the Radicalization of Fascist Italy." *Journal of Contemporary History*, 42 (2007): 227-242.
- Brock, Bernard, L., Kenneth Burke, et al. "Dramatism as Ontology or Epistemology: A Symposium." *Communication Quarterly*, 33.1 (1985): 17-33.
- Browne, Stephen Howard. "Response: Context in Critical Theory and Practice." *Western Journal of Communication*, 65 (2001): 330-335.
- Brummett, Barry. "Kenneth Burke's Symbolic Trinity." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 28.3 (1995): 234-251.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. University of California Press, Berkeley: 1969.
- . *A Rhetoric of Motives*. University of California Press, Los Angeles: 1969.
- . *Dramatism and Development*. Clark University Press with Barre Publishers, Barre, MA: 1972.
- . "On Persuasion, Identification, and Dialectical Symmetry." James Zappen, ed. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 39.4 (2006): 333-339.
- . *On Symbols and Society*. Joseph R. Gusfield, ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago: 1989.
- Carcasson, Martin. "Review of *General Eisenhower: Ideology and Discourse* and *Eisenhower's Atoms for Peace* By Ira Chernus." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 90 (2004): 521-522.
- Carpenter, Ronald H. "A Stylistic Basis of Burkeian Identification." *Today's Speech*, 20.1 (1972): 19-24.
- . "General Eisenhower: Ideology and Discourse Book Review." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 7.2 (2004): 238-241.
- Cheney, George. "The Rhetoric of Identification and the Study of Organizational Communication." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 69 (1983): 143-158.
- Chernus, Ira. *Apocalypse Management: Eisenhower and the Discourse of National Security*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2008.

- . "Eisenhower and the Soviets, 1945-1947: Rhetoric and Policy." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 2 (1999): 59-82.
- . *General Eisenhower: Ideology and Discourse*. Michigan State University Press, East Lansing: 2002.
- Cook, Don. *Forging the Alliance: NATO, 1945-1950*. Arbor House/William Morrow, New York: 1989.
- Coleman, David G. "Eisenhower and the Berlin Problem, 1953-1954." *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 2.1 (2000): 3-34.
- Crable, Bryan. "Distance as Ultimate Motive: A Dialectical Interpretation of *A Rhetoric of Motives*." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 39.3 (2009): 213-239.
- Crable, Richard E. "Ike: Identification, Argument, and Paradoxical Appeal." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 65 (1977): 188-195.
- . "Rhetoric, Anxiety, and Character Armor: Burke's Interactional Rhetoric of Identity." *Western Journal of Communication*, 70.1 (2006): 1-22.
- Crafts, Nicholas and Gianni Toniolo. *Economic Growth in Europe since 1945*. Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, Cambridge: 1996.
- Creswell, Michael and Marc Trachtenberg. "France and the German Question, 1945-1955." *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 5.3 (2003): 5-28.
- D'AMura, Ronald M. "Campaigns: The Essence of Operational Warfare." *Parameters*, Summer (1987): 42-51.
- Darsey, James. "Barack Obama and America's Journey," *Southern Communication Journal*, 74 (2009): 88-103.
- Donofrio, Theresa Ann. "Ground Zero and Place-Making Authority: The Conservative Metaphors in 9/11 Families' 'Take Back the Memorial' Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication*, 74 (2010): 150-169.
- Draaisma, Douwe. *Metaphors of Memory: A History of Ideas About the Mind*, Trans. Paul Vincent. Cambridge University Press, Great Britain: 1995.
- Dwan, Renata. "Jean Monnet and the European Defense Community, 1950-54." *Cold War History*, 1 (2000): 141-160.
- Eisenhower, Dwight D. "2nd Anniversary of SHAPE, SHAPE Headquarters," *Pre-Presidential Speeches*. 2 Apr. 1952. Dwight D. Eisenhower Library Online Archives. PDF: 334-335. <<http://www.eisenhower.archives.gov>>.

- . "Address to British Members of Parliament, SHAPE Headquarters." *Pre-Presidential Speeches*. 15 Jan. 1952. Dwight D. Eisenhower Library Online Archives. PDF: 320-322.
 - . "Art in Peace and War." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin, New Series*, 4 (1946): 221-223.
 - . "D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies." *Speeches*. 6 Jun. 1951. Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Web. Accessed 20 Sept. 2011. <<http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org>>.
 - . "English Speaking Union Dinner." *Speeches*. 3 Jul. 1951. Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Web. Accessed 20 Sept. 2011. <<http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org>>.
 - . "Extemporaneous Remarks to the Press at SHAPE." *Pre-Presidential Speeches*. 21 Jan. 1952. Dwight D. Eisenhower Library Online Archives. PDF: 323-328.
 - . "Farewell to NATO." *Speeches*. 21 May 1952. Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Web. Accessed 20 Sept. 2011. <<http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org>>.
 - . "NATO Council, Rome, Italy." *Pre-Presidential Speeches*. 27 Nov. 1951. Dwight D. Eisenhower Library Online Archives. PDF: 317-320.
 - . "Radio Statement Upon Arrival in Paris." *Speeches*. 7 Jan. 1951. Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Web. Accessed 20 Sept. 2011. <<http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org>>.
 - . "Remarks at Academy of Moral and Political Sciences of the Institute of France." *Speeches*. 21 Jan. 1952. Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Web. Accessed 20 Sept. 2011. <<http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org>>.
 - . "Remarks at Official Opening of SHAPE Headquarters at Marly." *Pre-Presidential Speeches*. 23 Jul. 1951. Dwight D. Eisenhower Library Online Archives. PDF: 321-322.
 - . "Talk to French Statesman at SHAPE Briefing, Paris, France." *Pre-Presidential Speeches*. 19 Nov. 1951. Dwight D. Eisenhower Library Online Archives. PDF: 313-316.
 - . "Talk to SHAPE Staff." *Speeches*. 14 Jun. 1951. Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Web. Accessed 20 Sept. 2011. <<http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org>>.
 - . "Unidentified SHAPE Statement." *Speeches*. 1952. Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission. Web. Accessed 20 Sept. 2011. <<http://www.eisenhowermemorial.org>>.
- Engels, Jeremy. "Friend of For? Naming the Enemy." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 12.1 (2009): 37-64.

- Farrell, Thomas B. and G. Thomas Goodnight, "Accidental Rhetoric: The Root Metaphors of Three Mile Island," *Communication Monographs*, 48 (1981): 271-300.
- Floyd, Janet. "Coming Out of the Kitchen: Texts, Contexts and Debates," *Cultural Geographies*, 10 (2004): 61-73.
- Foss, Karen A. and Kathy I. Domenici. "Haunting Argentina: Synecdoche in the Protests of the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 87 (2001): 237-258.
- Funk, Arthur L. "Eisenhower, Giraud, and the Command of 'TORCH,'" *Military Affairs*, 35 (1971): 103-108.
- Goatly, Andrew. *The Language of Metaphors*. Routledge, London: 1997.
- Greenstein, Fred I. *The Hidden-Hand Presidency*. New York, Basic Books, Inc., Publishers: 1981.
- Griffin, Leland M. "The Edifice Metaphor in Rhetorical Theory," *Speech Monographs*, 27 (1960): 279-292.
- Haberman, Frederick W. "The Election of 1952: A Symposium." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 38 (1952): 397-414.
- Hegstrom, Jane L. and Joyce McCarl-Nielsen, "Gender and Metaphor: Descriptions of Familiar Persons," *Discourse Processes*, 33 (2002): 219-234.
- Henderson, Sir Nicholas. *The Birth of NATO*. Westview Press, Boulder, CO: 1983.
- Hinds, Boyd Lynn and Theodore Otto Windt, Jr. *The Cold War Rhetoric*. Praeger, New York: 1991.
- Hitchcock, William I. "Response to 'France and the German Question, 1945-1955,' by Michael Creswell and Marc Trachtenberg." *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 5.3 (2003): 33-36.
- . *The Struggle for Europe: The Turbulent History of a Divided Continent, 1945-Present*. New York, Anchor House: 2003.
- Hoffman, Robert R. "Metaphor in Science." R.P. Honeck and R.R. Hoffman, Eds. *Cognition and Figurative Language* (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ: 1980): 393-423.
- Hogan, Michael J. "American Marshall Planners and the Search for a European Neocapitalism." *The American Historical Review*, 90 (1985): 44-72.
- "Paths to Plenty: Marshall Planners and the Debate over European Integration, 1947-1948." *Pacific Historical Review*, 53 (1984): 337-366.

- Holland, Virginia. "Rhetorical Criticism: A Burkeian Method." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 39 (1953): 444-450.
- Hostetler, Michael J. "The Enigmatic Ends of Rhetoric: Churchill's Fulton Address as Great Art and Failed Persuasion." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 83 (1997): 416-428.
- Howe, George F. "Faid—Kasserine: The German View," *Military Affairs*, 13 (1949): 216-222.
- Ismay, Lord. *NATO: The First Five Years*. Bosch-Utrecht, Netherlands: 1954.
- Ivie, Robert L. "Dwight D. Eisenhower's 'Chance for Peace' Speech: Quest or Crusade?" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 1 (1998): 227-243.
- . "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists.'" *Communication Monographs*, 54 (1987): 165-182.
- Jackson, Michael Gordon. "Eisenhower, Nuclear War Fighting, and Korea, 1953-1968." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 35 (2005): 52-75.
- Jacobs, Travis Beal. "Eisenhower, the American Assembly, and 1952." *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 22 (1992): 455-468.
- Jensen, J. Vernon. "Metaphor in Argumentation," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 13 (1983): 201-207.
- Lake, Randall A. "Temporal Metaphors, Religions, and Arguments." Bruce E. Gronbeck, ed. *Spheres of Argument: Proceedings of the Sixth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. Annandale VA: Speech Communication Association, 1989, 245-254.
- Kaufert, David. "Irony and Rhetorical Strategy," *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 10 (1977): 90-110.
- Kirk, John W. "Kenneth Burke and Identification." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 47 (1961): 414-415.
- Knepprath, Eugene and Theodore Clevenger, Jr. "A Quantitative Analysis of Logical and Emotional Content in Selected Campaign Speeches of Eisenhower and Stevenson." *Western Speech*, 30.3 (1966): 144-150.
- . "Reasoned Discourse and Motive Appeals in Selected Political Speeches." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 51 (1965): 152-156.
- Kowlton, William A. "Early Stages in the Organization of 'Shape.'" *International Organization*, 13 (1959): 1-18.
- Laguerre, Andre. "Optimist in Arms." *Life*, July 16, 1951: 108-131.

- Lovett, A.W. "The United States and the Schuman Plan: A Study in French Diplomacy 1950-1952." *The Historical Journal*, 39 (1996): 425-455.
- Lucas, Stephen E. "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 67 (1981): 1-20.
- McAllister, James. *No Exit: American and the German Problem, 1943-1954*. Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY: 2002.
- McGeehan, Robert. *The German Rearmament Question: American Diplomacy and European Defense After World War II*. University of Illinois Press, Chicago: 1971.
- Meacham, Jon. *Franklin and Winston: An Intimate Portrait of an Epic Friendship*. Random House Trade Paperbacks, New York: 2004.
- Medhurst, Martin J. *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Strategic Communicator*. Greenwood Press, London: 1993.
- . "Eisenhower and the Crusade for Freedom: The Rhetorical Origins of a Cold War Campaign," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 27 (1997): 646-661.
- . "Eisenhower's 'Atoms for Peace' Speech: A Case Study in the Strategic Use of Language." *Communication Monographs*, 54 (1987): 204-220.
- . "Reconceptualizing Rhetorical History: Eisenhower's Farewell Address." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 80 (1994): 195-218.
- . "Robert L. Scott Plays Dwight D. Eisenhower." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 81 (1995): 502-506.
- . "The Contemporary Study of Public Address: Renewal, Recovery, and Reconfiguration." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 4.3 (2001): 495-511.
- Medhurst, Martin J., ed. *Eisenhower's War of Words: Rhetoric and Leadership*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1994.
- Medhurst, Martin J. et al. *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1990.
- Melka, Robert L. "Darlan between Britain and Germany, 1940-41." *Journal of Contemporary History*, 8 (1973): 57-80.
- Milne, Markus J., Kate Kearins and Sara Walton. "Creating Adventures in Wonderland: The Journey Metaphor and Environmental Sustainability." *Organization*, 13 (2006): 801-839.
- Moore, Mark P. "Constructing Irreconcilable Conflict: The Function of Synecdoche in the Spotted Owl Controversy." *Communication Monographs*, 60 (1993): 258-274.

- . "Life, Liberty, and the Handgun: The Function of Synecdoche in the Brady Bill Debate." *Communication Quarterly*, 42.4 (1994): 434-447.
- . "Making Sense of Salmon: Synecdoche and Irony in a Natural Resource Crisis." *Western Journal of Communication*, 67.1 (2003): 74-96.
- Mosley, Philip E. "Dismemberment of Germany: The Allied Negotiations from Yalta to Postdam," *Foreign Affairs*, 28 (1950): 487-498.
- Muir, Star A. "The Web and the Spaceship: Metaphors of the Environment," *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, 51 (1994): 145-152.
- Murphy, Charles J. V. "The War We May Fight." *Life*, May 28, 1951: 76-95.
- Murray, Jeffrey W. "Kenneth Burke: A Dialogue of Motives." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 35.1 (2001): 22-49.
- Nie, Yaning and Rong Chen. "Water Metaphors and Metonymies in Chinese: A Semantic Network." *Pragmatics & Cognition*, 16 (2008): 492-516.
- Olson, Gregory A. "Review of General Eisenhower: Ideology and Discourse." *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 40 (2003): 131-133.
- Osborn, Michael. "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53 (1967): 115-126.
- Parameswaran, Radhika. "Military Metaphors, Masculine Modes, and Critical Commentary: Deconstructing Journalists' Inner Tales of September 11," *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 30 (2006): 42-64.
- Parry-Giles, Shawn J. "Rhetorical Experimentation and the Cold War, 1947-1953: The Development of an Internationalist Approach to Propaganda," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 80 (1994): 448-467.
- Parsons, Craig. "Showing Ideas as Causes: The Origins of the European Union." *International Organization*, 56.1 (2002): 47-84.
- Pedlow, Gregory W. "The Evolution of NATO's Command Structure, 1951-2009." *NATO Unclassified*. Web. Accessed 15 Sep. 2011 <www.aco.nato.int>.
- Perelman, Chaïm and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame: 1969.
- Rohler, Lloyd. "Review of General Eisenhower: Ideology and Discourse." *Southern Journal of Communication*, 68 (2003): 172-173.

- Rowe, Jane Bloodsworth. "Culture, Progress and the Media: The Shad as Synecdoche in Environmental News Coverage." *Environmental Communication*, 2 (2008): 362-378.
- Ruane, Kevin. "Agonizing Reappraisals: Anthony Eden, John Foster Dulles and the Crisis of European Defense, 1953-54," *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, 13 (2002): 151-185.
- . *The Rise and Fall of the European Defense Community: Anglo-American Relations and the Crisis of European Defense, 1950-1955*. St. Martin's Press, New York: 2000.
- Ryan, Halford Ross. *A Rhetorical Analysis of General Eisenhower's Public Speaking from 1945 to 1951*. Dissertation. University of Illinois, 1972.
- Scott, Robert L. "Eisenhower's Farewell Address: Response to Medhurst." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 81 (1995): 496-501.
- Seiter, John S. "When Identification is Too Much of a Good Thing: An Examination of Kenneth Burke's Concept in Organizational, Intercultural, and Group Communication Contexts." *Journal of the Northeast Communication Association* (1998): 39-4
- Sheetz, Mark S. "France and the German Question: Avant-garde or Rearguard? Comment on Creswell and Trachtenberg." *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 5.3 (2003): 37-45.
- Snyder, William P. "Walter Bendell Smith: Eisenhower's Chief of Staff." *Military Affairs*, 48 (1984): 6-14.
- Stuckey, Mary E. and Frederick J. Antczak. "The Battle of Issues and Images: Establishing Interpretive Dominance." *Communication Quarterly*, 42 (1994): 120-132.
- Tell, David. "Burke's Encounter with Ransom: Rhetoric and Epistemology in 'Four Master Tropes.'" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 34 (2004): 33-54.
- "Text of British-French-Benelux Treaty: Signed at Brussels, Belgium," *Vital Speeches of the Day* (1948): 377-379.
- The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XI: Columbia University*. Louis Galambos et al., eds. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore: 1989.
- The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XII: NATO and the Campaign of 1952*. Louis Galambos et al., eds. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore: 1989.
- The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower, Volume XIII: NATO and the Campaign of 1952*. Louis Galambos et al., eds. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore: 1989.
- Trauschweizer, Ingo Wolfgang. "Learning with an Ally: The U.S. Army and the Bundeswehr in the Cold War." *Journal of Military History*, 72.2 (2008): 477-508.

- Voth, Ben. "A Case Study in Metaphor as Argument: A Longitudinal Analysis of the Wall Separating Church and State." *Argumentation & Advocacy*, 34 (1998): 127
- Wander, Philip. "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 339-361.
- Warner, Geoffrey. "The United States and the Rearmament of West Germany, 1950-4," *International Affairs*, 61 (1984): 279-286.
- Wiggershaus, Norbert and Roland G. Foerster. *The Western Security Community: Common Problems and conflicting National Interests During the Foundation Phase of the North Atlantic Alliance*. Berg Publishers, Oxford: 1993.
- Zappen, James P. "Kenneth Burke on Dialectical-Rhetorical Transcendence." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 42.3 (2009): 279-301
- Zimmermann, Hubert. "The Improbable Permanence of a Commitment America's Troop Presence in Europe During the Cold War." *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 11.1 (2009): 3-27.

6. APPENDIX

Transcripts of Dwight D. Eisenhower SACEUR Speeches: 1951-1951

From the Dwight D. Eisenhower Library and Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission

6.1 Radio Statement Upon Arrival in Paris: January 7, 1951

Greetings to all our neighbors in the Atlantic community - to Europe and the British Isles. I return to Europe as a military commander but with no miraculous plans, no display of military force. I return with an unshakable faith in Europe - this land of our ancestors - in the underlying courage of its people, in their willingness to live and sacrifice for a secure peace and the continuance and the progress of civilization. I approach my present task in full awareness that no amount of outside aid alone could defend Europe. Moreover, although the North Atlantic Treaty nations have now undertaken a great cooperative enterprise for their common security, it is obvious that each must still contribute the hard core of its own defense. In the great heritage of Europe, in the genius and productivity of its people, must be found the will, the moral strength, and much of the means to build defenses behind which its children may prosper and live in peace. These are the children of Europe not just of Holland, Italy, France, or other nations. The children of all nations deserve better than we have so far been able to promise them. They bear no hatred, suspicion or distrust. They have earned none against themselves. Let us work for them and put aside all prejudices and past grievances. And let us never shirk from defending their birthright of liberty, even as ours has been cherished and staunchly defended for us. I cling to the hope that the young lives, the blood and suffering of the last war were not spent as the profligate squanders his inheritance - but that from the common ordeal will now rise up a strong and united Europe, a Europe that can look forward confidently to a future of peace, advancement and mutual security. This is our goal. We must put our hearts and hands to its achievement. No lesser purpose, no warped nationalism, and above all, no aggressive or predatory design, should be allowed to turn us away from this noble enterprise. In the same degree that we believe danger threatens all, we must meet it together. Our task is to preserve the peace, not to incite war. We approach that task, not in appeasement, but with the clear eyes and stout hearts of men who know that theirs is a righteous cause. There is power in our union - and resourcefulness on sea, land and air. Aroused and united, there is nothing which the nations of the Atlantic Community cannot achieve. Let those who might be tempted to put this power to the test ponder well the lessons of history. The cause of freedom can never be defeated. We are committed to a great partnership, and I, in all humility, am proud to serve in one phase of attaining the aspirations of our several peoples. Should mankind, through our solidarity, our prayers for peace, and through the mercy of God, be spared the catastrophe of another war, then this organization will have served a noble purpose. It will have demonstrated that an alliance for peace rather than for war is an entirely practical measure - that the power generated in an alliance of such magnitude can bring confidence - not fear - to the hearts of men.

6.2 D-Day Commemoration Ceremonies: June 6, 1951

Seven years ago, the land and sea and air forces of the Allied Nations launched the final blow against a tyranny entrenched on the European continent. In weapons of war - guns and armor and planes - the Allies were to become within months the most formidable military machine of all

time. Yet on the sixth of June, 1944, those who landed on Normandy's beaches were few in number and weak, measured against the defenses that awaited them. But they were strong in the spirit and resolution of the free world. With them rode the hopes of all who loved freedom. Behind them, in an ever increasing flood of supply and reinforcement, poured forward the might of the West. Ahead of them in every town of France, they were assured a legion of friends whose aid and welcome would fortify their arms and hearts. So armed and supported, they could not fall short of complete victory. Here in Normandy, it is particularly fitting that we commemorate the glory and the sacrifice of the Liberation. For you were eye-witnesses and your towns bear mute testimony to the tragic cost that must be paid to regain freedom - once freedom has been lost. The young men of the Allied Force who died in the hedgerows, their wounded fellows, those of your families and your friends who fell in the war, your ravaged homes and fields - all these are the price which we of the West paid. Today, the West is united to defend freedom - before it is lost. Never again must there be a campaign of liberation fought on these shores. The integrity of all Western Europe must be defended against predatory force. In this endeavor, we seek only peace. But we know - out of tragic experience - that peace can never be the portion of the divided, the fearful, or of those who would stand aside, in the vain hope that the hordes of tyranny might overlook them. We shall be strong only as we are one. And we look to the future knowing that the strength of the free nations can be built into an invincible barrier against aggression. The free world is strong - spiritually, economically, and materially. It has vast resources, technical skill, and productivity. Given the single ingredient of unity - unity in determination, in purpose and in readiness to sacrifice - there is nothing it cannot accomplish. Those who seek the enslavement of men strive by every means to set one against the other. They attempt, in every free land, to sow discord and dissention, turning neighbor against neighbor, fomenting class warfare that farmer and factory worker and manager alike may more easily be oppressed. Within the community of nations, they use every device of propaganda to separate us so that one by one we may be more easily incorporated into the regimented world. They shall not succeed. We know that we want only a peace among nations that will permit all men - of East and West alike - to live decent and productive lives. The rulers of the Communistic world say that their purpose is the same. But how can we believe those who talk of liberty when they permit no liberty at home; who promise benefits to the workers although millions labor in their slave camps; who speak of peasant problems with mock sympathy after wrenching from the peasants at home their land and produce? How can we believe those who talk of peace while they support aggression in the Orient and arm Eastern Germany in the face of no conceivable threat? The free world's partnership for peace will endure because its high purpose is to assure - for ourselves and for all who in good faith join with us - the freedom demanded by the dignity of man. Freedom is not won and forever possessed - it must be re-earned every day in every generation. The men who lie in the cemeteries of Normandy died that we, each day of our lives, might prove ourselves worthy of their sacrifice for freedom. We shall meet the test of our day in the spirit of those whose heroism we here commemorate. We will give our best - even as they, who here gave their all.

6.3 Talk to SHAPE Staff: June 14, 1951

My reason for asking you to come here, ladies and gentlemen, is a very simple one. Since the last time I tried to see all the members of SHAPE - sometime I think in the middle of February - it seems that we've grown considerably. When I expressed a desire to meet every member of our

little Astoria community, I was informed we had no room big enough to hold them all at once. It was a bit alarming and shocking to me because we have been bragging about the small size of our headquarters. Now, I realize that when you are split up among a very great number of sections that you get down to numbers that are not large and that many of you feel overworked. But let us remember that we are working in the service of nations which are trying to do a job important to civilization. In fact, it's successful performance is vital to the civilization we know and it makes no difference from what country we come. Failure of the project might be felt more quickly in a forward country than it would in America. But it would be felt in America no less firmly and no less conclusively when the full effects finally reached there. Knowing as we do that the defense effort is straining our economic and financial resources to the utmost, it is up to us to give example of austerity so far as we can. To substitute quality for quantity, to do a little bit more than is expected of us, to be an example everywhere, to be an example in front of the citizenry of this city, in our own countries when we go home, to be showing every minute that we believe wholeheartedly in the conviction that the free world must work together and well or there is going to be no free world. So the effort to keep down our size is not merely one of not being able to stand criticism - it is because I believe we should be an example of economy and efficiency. In that connection, I hope you won't mind my saying that the staff work that has come from this headquarters is superior to any that I have had in the past, indicating to me that possibly small staffs are just a bit more efficient. Maybe we don't make quite so much work for each other and don't need so many assistants to answer our comrade across the hall. Now, on the more personal side, I have a favor to ask of you. When I see you in our hotel accommodations here, or anywhere else, on the sidewalk, or in the building, I am delighted naturally to have your greetings. I would feel very disappointed - I would feel that I was something of a failure if there was anyone here who would rather pass me in silence and not recognize me than to say something on the form of good morning or hello. But I do beg of you on the steps and around the halls of this building, please don't turn aside and stand at attention. It sort of worries me that I ought to stand there also, and if we both started to, I don't know when either of us will get to work. If that's a custom in your country I would be very appreciative if you would let it go in this international place, because there must definitely be a family feeling among us if we are to be successful. We have to be great friends, we have to be convinced, so convinced that each of us is indispensable to this great cause and therefore we are quite busy. We have time to greet a partner but we haven't time to stand around too long in some mistaken idea of formality. I assure you that I don't want to stand in the way of your ability to do your work and get home at the proper time instead of staying here until dark. Now maybe I seem to be violating my own advice by asking you to come here. But at least I can do this - first, I can give myself the opportunity of seeing you collectively and possibly may be able to identify you in the future, or I can make sure of this: that each of you will know which particular bald-headed, round-faced man it is that you are greeting when you happen to run into your commander. I can't conceive of any more important job that any of you could be doing in your particular sphere, in your particular capacity, in your particular rank than you are doing here today. If I didn't believe this, I certainly wouldn't be here and I am quite sure that none of you would. Now, because I do look upon you as a selected group of highly qualified people, because all of our countries also look on you in the same way, I call again attention to our responsibility for leadership and good example. I am quite certain no other body could meet that test more successfully. Since the day when I was as young as some of you here and joined the Army as a 2nd Lt., I have had one little practice which I persist in keeping until the end of my days. It is this: there is no one in my organization who

doesn't have the right to come to see me if he feels that his problem is not properly dealt with by his own immediate superior and the chain of superiors between him and me. If he has a personal problem that he believes is ignored or not properly handled, if he believes he has an idea with respect to this organization, that is so important that he cannot take no for an answer, he is perfectly justified in coming all the way up. Anybody who gets in your way would be removed. But they won't get in your way, because that is the kind of burning conviction we are looking for. Even if in my great wisdom I decide you are wrong, I can still admire that kind of determination and that kind of courage. In the meantime, good luck and thank you again for the time you have given me to say 'hello.'

6.4 English Speaking Union Dinner, London: July 3, 1951

One hundred seventy-five years ago, the founding fathers of the American Republic declared their independence of the British crown, Little could they have known – in the heat and bitterness of the hour – that the severance, accomplished in passion, would through the years flower into an alliance of such fitness and worth that it was never recorded on legal parchment, but in the hearts of our two peoples. The bond that joins us – stronger than blood lines, than common tongue and common law – is the fundamental conviction that man was created to be free, that he can be trusted with freedom, that governance have as a primary function the protection of his freedom. In the scale of values of the English-speaking people, freedom is the first and most precious right. Without it, no other right can be exercised, and human existence loses all significance. This unity of ours in fundamentals is an international fact. Yet on more than one occasion, it has been obscured in Britain and in my own country by concern with trifles and small disputes, fanned into the flames of senseless antagonisms. Serious differences in convictions must be beaten out on the anvil of logic and justice. But scarcely need they be dragged into the public forum, in the petty hope of capturing a fleeting local acclaim, at the expense of an absent partner. There are men in this room with whom, in World War II, I had arguments, hotly sustained and of long duration. Had all these been headlined in the press of our two countries, they could have created public bitterness, confusing our peoples in the midst of our joint effort. Decisions were reached without such calamitous results, because those at odds did not find it necessary to seek justification for their personal views in a public hue and cry. Incidentally, a more personal reason for this expression of satisfaction is a later conclusion that my own position in the arguments was not always right. In any case, may we never forget that our common devotion to deep human values and our mutual trust are the bedrock of our joint strength. In that spirit our countries are joined with the peoples of Western Europe and the North Atlantic to defend the freedom of western civilization. Opposed to us – cold and forbidding – is an ideological front that marshals every weapon in the arsenal of dictatorship. Subversion, propaganda, deceit and the threat of naked force are daily hurled against us and our friends in a globe-encircling, relentless campaign. We earnestly hope that the call for a truce in Korea marks a change in attitude. If such a welcome development does occur, the brave men of the United Nations forces did much to bring it about. We entered the conflict one year ago, resolved that aggression against free and friendly South Korea would not be tolerated. Certain of the nation's furnishing forces had heavy demands elsewhere, including postwar reconstruction at home. Nevertheless, every contingent added evidence of the solidarity and firmness of the free nations in giving an object lesson to aggression. Our success in this difficult and distant operation reflects the fortitude of the Allied troops and the leadership that guided them. The stand in Korea

should serve notice in this area, as well as in the Far East, that we will resist aggression. Our effort to provide security against the possibility of another and even greater emergency – an emergency which will never be of our making – must go forward with the same resolution and courage that has characterized our Korean forces. The member nations in the north Atlantic Treaty Organization need not fear any future or nay Communistic threat if we are alert, realistic and resolute. Our community possesses a potential might that far surpasses the sinister forces of slave camps and chained millions. But to achieve the serenity and confidence that our potential can provide, we must press forward with the mobilization of our spiritual and intellectual strengths, we must develop promptly the material force that will assure the safety of our friends upon the continent and the security of the free world. This is the challenge of our times that, until satisfactorily met, establishes priorities in all our thoughts, our work, our sacrifice. The hand of the aggressor is stayed by strength – and strength alone. Although the security of each of us is bound up in the safety of all of us, the immediate threat is most keenly felt in Europe. Half the continent is already within the monolithic mass of totalitarianism. The drawn and haunted faces in the docks of the purge courts are grim evidence of what Communistic domination means. It is clearly necessary that we quickly develop maximum strength within free Europe itself. Our own interests demand it. It is a truism that where, among partners, strength is demanded in its fullness unity is the first requisite. Without unity, the effect becomes less powerful in application, less decisive in result. This fact has special application in Europe. It would be difficult indeed to overstate the benefits, in those years of stress and tension that would accrue to NATO if the free nations of Europe were truly a unit. But it is in that vital region, history, custom, language and prejudice have combined to hamper integration. Progress has been hobbled by a web of customs barriers interlaced with bilateral agreements, multilateral cartels, local shortages, and economic monstrosities. How tragic! Free men, facing the specter of political bondage, are crippled by artificial bonds that they themselves have forged, and they alone can loosen! Here is a task to challenge the efforts of the wisest statesman, the best economists, the most brilliant diplomats. European leaders, seeking a sound and wise solution, are spurred by the vision of a man at this table – a man of inspiring courage in dark hours, of wise counsel in grave decisions. Winston Churchill's plea for a united Europe can yet bear such greatness of fruit that it may well be remembered as the most notable achievement of a career marked by achievement. The difficulties of integrating Western Europe of course appear staggering to those who live by ritual. But great majorities in Europe earnestly want liberty, peace and the opportunity to pass on to their children the fair lands and the culture of Western Europe. They deserve, at the very least, a fair chance to work together for the common purpose; freed of the costly encumbrances they are now compelled to carry. Europe cannot attain the towering material stature possible to its peoples' skills and spirit so long as it is divided by patchwork fences. They foster localized instead of common interest. They pyramid every cost with middlemen, tariffs, taxes, and overheads. Barred, absolutely, are the efficient division of labor and resources and the easy flow of free trade. In the political field, these barriers promote distrust and suspicion. They serve vested interests at the expense of peoples and prevent truly concerted action for Europe's own obvious good. This is not to say that, as a commander, I have found anything but ready cooperation among the Governments of Western Europe. Time and again, I have saluted from my heart the spirit of their armed services – of officers and men alike – from the mountains of Italy to the fjords of Norway, from Normandy to the Curtain. Within political circles, I have found statesmen eager to assure the success of their current defense programs. I have no doubts as to the capacity of NATO to surmount even the formidable obstacles imposed upon us by the

political facts of present day Europe. Yet with the handicaps of enforced division, it is clear that even the minimum essential security effort will seriously strain the resources of Europe. We ignore this danger at our peril since the effects of economic failure would be disastrous upon the spiritual and material strength alike. True security never rests upon the shoulders of men denied a decent present and the hope of a better future. But with unity achieved, Europe could build adequate security and, at the same time, continue the march of human betterment that has characterized western civilization. Once united, the farms and factories of France and Belgium, the foundries of Germany, the rich farmlands of Holland and Denmark, the skilled labor of Italy, will produce miracles for the common good. In such unity is a secure future for these peoples. It would mean early independence of aid from America and other Atlantic countries. The coffers, mines and factories of that continent are not inexhaustible. Dependence upon must be minimized by the maximum cooperative effort. The establishment a workable European federation would go far to create confidence among people everywhere that Europe was doing its full and vital share in giving this cooperation. Any soldier contemplating this problem would be moved to express the opinion that it cannot be attacked successfully by slow infiltration, but only by direct and decisive assault, with all available means. The project faces the deadly danger of procrastination, timid measures, slow steps and cautious stages. Granted that the bars of tradition and habit are numerous and stout, the greatest bar to this or any human enterprise, lie in the minds of men themselves. The negative is always the easy side, since it holds that nothing should be done. The negative is happy in lethargy, contemplating almost with complacent satisfaction, the difficulties of any other course. But difficulties are often of such slight substance that they fade into nothing at the first sign of success. If obstacles are of greater consequence, they can always be overcome when they must be overcome. And which of these obstacles could be so important to as peace, security and prosperity for Europe's populations? Could we not help? We the people of the British Commonwealth and of the United States have profited by unity at home. If, with our moral and material assistance, the free European nations could attain a similar integration, our friends could be strengthened, our own economies improved and the laborious NATO machinery of mutual defense vastly simplified. A solid, healthy, confident Europe would be the greatest possible boon to the functioning of the Atlantic Pact. But granting that we cannot reach maximum security without a united Europe, let us by no means neglect what is within our immediate grasp or depreciate the achievements already attained. Look back, I ask you, over a space of two years only. Consider the dangerous level to which morale and defensive defense had descended; the despairing counsel of neutralism, appeasement and defeatism that then existed. Against such a backdrop, the accomplishments of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are magnificent; manifest. We are joined together in purpose and growing determination; we know the danger, we have defined our goals. Each day we make headway. The basic economies of European nations are on the upswing; the chaos and floundering of the postwar years are definitely behind. The international forces of the Atlantic defense are no longer merely figures on paper; the international organization is no longer a headquarters without troops. The forces – ground, naval and air – are assembling. They are training together and the spirit of mutual respect and cooperation that marks their joint maneuvers is heartening and encouraging. Still far too few in numbers and short of equipment, their ranks are filling; machines and weapons reach them in steady stream. The military and political leaders of the participating nations no longer slowly feel their way forward in an endeavor without guiding precedent. Caution that is inescapable in a new and unique enterprise has been replaced by confidence born out of obstacles overcome. The Allied Powers in Europe are constituting a team

for defense; one capable of assuring a lasting and secure peace. The winning of freedom is not to be compared to the winning of a game – with the victory recorded forever in history. Freedom has its life in the heart, the actions, the spirit of men and so it must be duly earned and refreshed – else like a flower cut from its life-giving roots, it will wither and die. All of us have pledged our word, one to the other that this shall never be. We have cut the pattern for our effort – we are devoting to it available resources for its realization. We fight not only our own battle – we are defending for all mankind those things that allow personal dignity to the least of us – those things that permit each to believe himself important in the eyes of God. We are preserving opportunity for men to lift up their hearts and minds to the highest places – there must be no stragglers in such a conflict. The road ahead may be long – it is certain to be marked by critical and difficult passages. But if we march together, endure together, share together, we shall succeed – we shall gloriously succeed together!

6.5 Remarks at the Official Opening of SHAPE Headquarters at Marly: July 23, 1951

Mr. President, on behalf of the North Atlantic Treaty Nations, I thank you, your Minister of Defense, Mr. Moch, other governmental officials of France and all your people for providing this Headquarters for the Allied Forces in Europe. Our special thanks to you, Sir, because of your unfailing personal cooperation and assistance, particularly in making available this beautiful spot in the Forest of Marly, for this Headquarters. In all history this is the first time that an Allied Headquarters has been set up in peace to preserve the peace, and not to wage war. It is our prayer that with high courage, and with the support of our people, and the grace of God, we shall not fail in this purpose. We strive to lift from the hearts of men the fear of the cell block and the slave camp. We strive to establish a 'Pax Atlantica' under which all men may push forward to new heights, to new levels of achievement. In a secure peace attained through strength is now the safety and security of the free nations. And now, Mr. President, I declare the Headquarters to be officially opened.

6.6 Talk to French Statesman at SHAPE Briefing: November 19, 1951

Gentlemen, it is a very great honor to speak to this distinguished group about the affairs of SHAPE. As a matter of fact, it is more than honor. There is a certain, deep responsibility involved for me, because you gentlemen are inescapably part of the high command that must direct the fortunes of the Free World. The decisions which you must make as members of one of the parliaments of one of the NATO countries are so grave, so significant for the future of all of us that we can afford nothing less than the full truth. We must have the full truth, all the facts, that we can bring to bear upon these complicated questions. So, it is in an effort to clarify for you, or to present before you, a picture of some of those things in which we here in SHAPE are involved, that I address you this morning. Now, I'm quite certain that General Carpentier has taken you through a series of statistics, factual information, and considerations of the kind applying to our problem, to the point that you probably do not expect of me any further delving into detail of that kind. I shall do my best to stick to principle, to basic truth, as we see it; and then, if there is any question you should like to ask me, I shall attempt to answer it. The phenomenon of our time that has disarranged the lives and aspirations and purposes of all of us is that a very powerful dictatorship existing in the world has announced, in time of peace, that it cannot live amicably with another form of government in the world. In other words, we not only

have the evidence of unsuccessful conferences concerning specific matters to show us that the Iron Curtain countries have no intention of trying to accommodate themselves to any of our purposes or desires - we have their own announced words. In the face of that, the free countries, or a group of free countries, decided that we must match the unity that dictatorships achieve with a dagger in the back and with secret police, we must match that unity with the kind of unity that free men can develop among equal partners. Now our first great world war President, Woodrow Wilson, stated that idea; that the highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people. That is, of course, a statement of high principle; but it's a truth that has as much application to the affairs of one nation as it does to another nation. In the gross, or aggregate amount of resources that the Free World has, as compared to the gross or aggregate resources available to the Iron Curtain countries, we are in very good shape indeed. Our productivity; our levels of education; the genius of our scientists; the accessibility we have to the raw materials of the world; the speed with which we can convert them to our own needs. In all these things we are far superior to the Soviets. The one thing they have is this unity. That is the one place where we must achieve equality; in my view, superiority. Now that unity does not apply merely to the command of some units in the field already produced by the several countries. Indeed, I sometimes think that the sheer, or mere military functions or phase of this problem is the simplest. Let us first take a look at the composition of a nation's power - and I mean power in the sense that it can exert influence in the field of force. It is first made up of the spirit of man. All human progress has its source in man's heart, his spirit. It is made up of his understanding; the products of his brain. It is made up very, very largely of the productivity of his economy; its ability to support whatever purely military force must be placed in the field. Without the capability of an economy to support military force, whatever military force we have is worse than useless; because it's a drain upon the national economy that in the moment of crisis will disappear and be of no use, because there is nothing behind it. The soldier of today, the soldiers in this headquarters. The soldier of today, the soldiers in this headquarters, must study every day, as they try to make up the composition of their recommendations: Where is that balance of power between an economy and an actual force in being or in reserve that makes the greatest sum total of strength we can produce? Now here is where it comes in again - the spirit of man: That sum total of the economic and military power is not necessarily fixed by the number of men, the amount of money, and the number of factories that we have. Human beings themselves make the variation. If we are dedicated to a purpose, if we fervently support of belief in the dignity and freedom of man, we'll do more than if we say this is just another chore that we must perform because it's to our advantage to do so. How much do we believe it? I would not be bold enough to recall to you some of the glories of your own history. But I could put my question in this way: Are all of us in this thing, in 12 nations, are we ready to attempt to measure up to the spirit that the French showed in Verdun in 1916? Now, gentlemen, if we can do that there is no question about the answer that we are going to achieve. Now the methods towards which we proceed toward those answers are not simple, because we do have gaps in our economy caused by war's destruction; by discouragement; by the loss of men in your own country - loss of men that reaches back even into World War I, and the absence almost - at least, a great part, of a generation - we have all sorts of factors which make this problem very difficult to solve. The point is, if we are so united in our devotion to freedom, in 12 countries, we are not going to allow any particular difficulty in one to overcome us, because we go back again to our belief in united strength. And if we do our best, we can see our way over any obstacle, any difficulty, that may impede our progress toward this goal of a peaceful security. Remember, that's all the Free World

asks. We don't ask for the power; we don't want the power, that would tempt us into military adventure. We want a peaceful security so that, behind this wall the productivity of man's hands and hearts and brain can be devoted to the betterment of humans. In the long run, unless our system provides to the men and women who live under it a better living; betterment in his opportunity to achieve spiritual goals; better in its opportunity to provide material advantages, for themselves and their children, then we will fail. Now our system is a better one, and this is one of the strongest elements in our whole armament. The Soviets themselves say ours is better, else why do they have to destroy ours in order to live themselves? It is the weakness of their own system that compels them to take an aggressive attitude toward us. Free people are perfectly willing to say: 'Why, we don't mind if Russia wants to live that way. Let them go.' But they have to say that, "If that free system continues, we'll go down." In the long run, the appeal of the free system to the hearts and minds of men is the crisis of this whole thing. Now, I wonder whether you would allow me to come just a little bit closer to the affairs of the staffs as we plod along, day by day. We have the job of taking what the Governments give us, organizing it, commanding it, arranging it, so that it can be most effective: first, in giving confidence to our own people; secondly, in order to meet the test of war if it is thrust upon us. The first point I should like to make is a factor concerning this command business that is too often overlooked. As I see it, in an allied command, particularly one of such vast scope as are the NATO commands, the first thing that a nation should think about, if offered the post of command in any place, is not prestige; not any flower in the crown the nation will wear, but rather the terrific national responsibility picked up when it assumes that command. I do not mind telling you that the one question I asked my own Government when they told me to come over here in response to the NATO Council, to command, this last winter. I said, 'Have you carefully considered the responsibility that the nation is picking up in the eyes of the world when you ask an American to go to Europe?? Now the mere fact that they did shows that there has been a very great deal of leadership exercised in my country; to get people to accept, at least in promise, the great burdens and responsibilities that go with such a place; the responsibilities to supply munitions; pay the taxes; to help - in short, to be a true partner in such an enterprise, each giving according to his capacities; and only each nation even capable of determining what their capacity is. I can no more tell you what the capacity of France is than you could try to interpret for me the feeling of Abilene, Kansas, a little town in the center of the United States where I was raised. So, in this command business, we here at SHAPE constantly emphasize the responsibility that a nation picks up when it is helping, through its own nationals, to direct the affairs of any particular group. I should like to make that point very earnestly and very strongly, because in the long run it cannot be escaped. Now, I have touched upon a point just now of the leadership that was involved in America to get an acceptance of this kind of responsibility. We talk often of the morale of men; and there is no question about the terrific importance of morale in any struggle of this kind. We too often, I think, talk about the development of morale through sophisticated measures and ideas. We speak of the pocket book as the most sensitive nerve in the body. We talk about a full stomach being necessary to morale, as if hungry men had never fought and fought well. What I'm getting at is this: There is a direct, as well as a material approach to the heart of man. There is needed now, as probably more than anywhere else, leadership in our populations, to explain to them, first, the essentials of this task. That it is freedom against slavery; that is, liberty against regimentation. We must all understand it. We must understand how we are attempting to combine together, to get the strength that is inherent in unity. We must make our people understand that unless each does his best, then there is no safety for anybody. That it is enlightened self-interest that is the

keynote to our cling together. The enlightened self-interest of France must be served in NATO, or you will never stay with NATO long. It must be the very same in my country. The enlightened self-interest of each single one of these 12 nations must be served by this clinging together, or it will never cling together. If it does not cling together, we'll fall victim to the kind of thing that one of my country's early statesmen, who made much of his early reputation here in your country, referred to when he said, 'We must all hang together, or we will assuredly each hang separately.' Now, that's reducing it to a very low order of appeal. But, gentlemen, the solution to NATO's problems lies in the hearts and minds of the millions of people that make up the population of the United States and Britain and all the other North Atlantic Nations to include, of course, at the very foundation of the European complex, this one. I want to mention, specifically, another subject in which I know each of you take a very great interest. It is the need for the strength of Western Germany in our coalition. Now we can, without Germany, produce, although at some excessive cost. I think - but we can produce a position of military stalemate in the areas where we not exist - where France lives, where Italy lives, where Belgium lives, and so on. But that is not good enough. You aren't going to have the security, the confidence, that comes with some depth in your defense; some greater power in your defense; the serenity and confidence that will allow you to turn more and more of your productivity to the betterment of men instead of the production of useless, sterile and negative formations that we call armies, navies and air forces. You can't do that unless you get this strength of Western Germany into the whole complex. Now, gentlemen, if there were any one of several courses that would apply to this problem, it might be one for study. But we know that that center of Europe is not going to remain a vacuum. It is not going to remain completely outside of this ideological struggle of freedom on the one hand and regimentation on the other. We must absorb the major part of the European strength, of that German strength or it would assuredly go the other way. There is no one in this headquarters; there is no one in any of the NATO organizations to whom I have spoken who does not clearly realize, and sympathize with, the justifiable apprehension in this corner of the world if we should allow Germany, undeterred, and too independently, to achieve a military force and powers that would begin to let them resort to the military adventures of the kind that they have so often before undertaken. We must not even let them get into a blackmailing position. Now the job of leadership today, in the NATO, with respect to this one, is how to solve that problem. I've heard many soldiers stand up and give you the sophisticated, obvious, material answers about a force that would be made up of a conglomerate of nations. With respect to that, I don't think that merely because the materialistic view considers a problem to be impossible, we should necessarily shrink from it. It was probably impossible to bring off the great military feat that you people did in the late 18th Century when, alone, because of your resolution you had to stand against the might of Europe. And you not only defended your own, but you drove them back. That is the kind of thing that must be done again. Now, all the way up and down the line here, I believe that we've got perfectly good, sound answers, if we can have confidence in our partners; if each of us determines this: "I shall do my best." And I mean, when I say I, I mean a nation; this nation will do its best: whether its mine at home, yours here, Belgium, Denmark, it makes no difference. Each must do its best; and it alone can be the judge of the sights it will set for itself. Frankly, my tendency probably would be to set your sights too low. My belief is that you would do more in the goals I would give to you. Now, on the other hand, in setting those goals, I do not place this same pressure on the time element that some others do. If you're going to buy an insurance policy for your wife, you say 'Well, I'd better buy it today, because you might die tomorrow, as well as two years from now.' In that sense, this problem is always

urgent. If we need security, let's get it now. But there is no man alive who can tell you that you have a point of critical danger in June 1953, June 1954, or any other time. The sole criterion is this: How fast may we go in the attainment of our own goals set in conformity with our own legitimate aspirations? Now that is the only time schedule that I can see applies to this thing. Because, if you are out in the Bay swimming for your life, you don't say, "I must reach the land by evening, or I won't reach it." You'll say, "I bloody well have got to reach the land." That's what you say, and that's what we say now. Now, I assure you, I've been accused of being an incurable optimist; and I want to make one remark about that - I've even been called naive, I'm so optimistic. When we have determined, gentlemen, that a job must be done; that there's no acceptable alternative - may I ask you, what is the use of pulling a long face about it? Did any of the people that you remember as leaders in history - did they achieve what they had to do by weeping in front of their followers? By pulling a long face? Why don't we go at this thing, each of us, each in his own way, as a free citizen of a free country, and say, "Come what may, it will be done"? Now if you do that you're bound to put on your face a look that the world will call optimistic. Because you're not to be defeated by a low order of obstacle; by the material impediments that people bring up to prove that we cannot do it. I'm going to finish this morning by quoting a little verse I quoted down at the school, so at least one member here has heard it before: There is, in the words of the Prince of Peace, a very, very wise observation. It is recorded in the Bible in the Book of Saint Luke, and reads this way: "When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace." Gentlemen, that's all we have to do. Thank you very much. You might tell them that during the course of the luncheon, which is going to be very informal, in our room up there, that I could maybe get around and speak to any of them who has a personal question. All right, thank you very much.

6.7 NATO Council: November 27, 1951

I shall start by making brief comments on the two presentations you have heard this afternoon, one by my Chief of Staff, the other by Mr. Harriman and Sir Edwin Plowden. With respect to the report rendered to you by the Temporary Council Committee, my observation is that in their work can be found some measure of the progress of NATO. Twelve sovereign nations have met together, through the medium of this committee, and each has there tabled its military programs, its capacity for supporting military programs, its readiness to support a great idea in common security. This has been done freely, willingly, without any thought of being subjected to the processes of the inquisition. Far from it - no one has even thought of this work except in the form of a cooperative, beneficial effort. I submit that if we could get the Soviets to agree, with other nations, to even a partial mutual examination of this kind, there would probably be no necessity for us to be working at the particular jobs in which we are now engaged. This investigation also gives evidence to me of a growing capacity on the part of the NATO machinery to take specific decisions in specific instances, to reach results so that we can get ahead - so that we can get away from mere statements of principle and great hopes and translate these things into the field of concrete action. The presentation by my Chief of Staff, General Gruenther, gives you some idea of the work that is going on in your SHAPE Headquarters. There, each of our NATO countries has provided accomplished staff officers. They form a unique group: they have no patronage to spread around; they do not make promotions; they cannot increase pay; but they can work - possibly because they are relieved from these routine and customary concerns and preoccupations of normal staff. They can give their entire attention to the real mission that this

Council has set before them, and I assure you that that staff works around the clock, with one idea only, the preservation of the peace through the production of a collective strength. It is zealous; it is efficient. I appear before you as the leader of the European Command of these twelve nations. You are responsible for issuing instructions to me and other commanders. You are responsible for the major decisions. You can make wise decisions only if you possess the facts, and only if you know the true feelings which animate your subordinates. Our reports to you, therefore, must cover everything in which you might possibly have a responsibility with respect to us, if you are to continue to function in such fashion that the machinery of NATO will be truly effective. It seems scarcely necessary to observe that I have never sought the role of philosopher; most certainly I have never had any reputation as such. But I submit that any man would be completely insensible to the influence of History if he could tread the streets of this city and not feel that he was living in the very midst of the recorded history of our civilization. Reaching far back beyond the beginning of our own era, there is fixed in majestic stone the record of almost every century of man's accomplishments. In this eternal city we are meeting for a brief moment only, but fifty years from now there will probably be some concern as to what we have done in the organization that you gentlemen direct, and in which my staff and I labor. It seems appropriate to consider, however briefly, how history will look at us; for we cannot escape the consequences of our own words and acts. I believe that if we, now, allow the influence of traditionalism, cautious approach, calculations as to what is politically feasible, and if we are burdened too much by all other deterrent influences that affect men - if we allow these influences to keep us from positive and direct action, there will be nothing in history about us and the organization we represent. We will be nothing more than a feeble ripple, washed away and forgotten. But if the problems that you men have taken upon your shoulders are met with courage and fortitude and confidence; if each in his own niche, can perform the task of leadership that have fallen to his lot to perform, then there will be no monument in history capable really of typifying the grandeur of your accomplishment. For you are not trying to lead any captives in chains down the streets of any NATO city. You are seeking no triumph, except the triumph of giving free men the right and opportunity to live as they desire. On the shield that each SHAPE man wears appears the motto, 'Vigilance is the price of liberty.' There is another text that we observe in SHAPE. It is a text spoken by the Prince of Peace. It runs, 'When a strong man, armed, keepeth his palace, his goods are in peace.' In our case the man is twelve nations. The strength of these nations is a great combination of moral force, integrity of individuals and nations, the scientific and intellectual achievements of our peoples. It includes our capacity for producing arms, for using them effectively and efficiently, if such becomes necessary. The goods of the men of whom we speak comprise many things, but certainly they are not merely property. They are not merely rights or even the lives of nations and individuals. The most precious item among them is a way of life; a way of life that has been won for us through boundless sacrifice and can be preserved in each generation only by further sacrifices from its adherents. Because, therefore, we are defending a way of life, we must be respectful of that way of life as we proceed to the solution of our problem. We must not violate its principles and its precepts, and we must not destroy from within what we are trying to defend from without. The economic fabric of a nation is a part of its way of life; possibly you can make a case for saying the economy is more valuable than the arms it has produced, because, without economic support, any amount of arms is futile in the emergency of war. We are now engaged in producing the military portion of the strong man's strength, so that he may be sufficiently armed to allow his goods to remain in peace. We are producing, forging, and sharpening the instruments that we require. There has been much

talk of '52 goals, '53 goals, '54 goals, and so on, and I must say to you gentlemen that inflexible dates leave me cold. While such figures and dates are necessary for purposes of planning and putting appropriate sums in the national budgets in order to obtain what we need, our real objective is to gain for our people at the earliest possible moment the tranquility of mind, the peaceful and confident security to which they are entitled. In that sense there is no time to waste. Why should we sit here and wonder whether or not we are going to be attacked? We are free people. We know our rights. We know our strength, so ably stated a few moments ago by Mr. Harriman and Sir Edwin Plowden. In direct comparison with the dictatorship that has announced its implacable hostility to our way of life, there is only one thing in which we are inferior. This is the unity, in his case achieved by pistol in the back. Free men don't have to use such methods. But we must, each of us, see that the enlightened self-interest of each of our countries is served by the progress we make in producing collective security. It is stated in one of the founding documents in my own country that governments are established among men for certain purposes, one of which is to provide for the common security. We have come to realize that in the face of powerful, ruthless threats posed by dictatorship, there is no longer a possibility that any one nation may by itself produce the necessary security for its own people. Thus, whether we like it or not, our ancient idea of sovereignty has been impinged upon and modified by world conditions. But this does not mean that the cure is necessarily in conceding sovereignty to any group or supra-national structure, but certainly it does indicate a pooling of a portion of our sovereignty, and by pooling, regain the strength to perform for each of us one of the functions for which each government was set up. So, I say, as we proceed toward this goal, let us not delude ourselves with repetitions of dates and years, be it '53, '54, or any other. The target is there. It is something of a reasonable nature, but changing daily with new scientific appliances that come up to the battlefield. Every kind of influence that affects warfare will affect our problem and our list of requirements. So let us by no means delay objectives that should be obtained now. Neither should we, on the other hand, so badly coordinate our military progress with economic capacity that we destroy both. This describes, partially, the problem for which you have set up the TCC. And I submit again that if our hearts, if our determination, if our qualities of leadership are equal to the task, then the economic limitations will not be nearly so rigid as we may first judge them to be. Morale can help here. In these modern and sophisticated times, we have come to think of morale as something that you purchase materially. We seem to believe that morale and confidence and courage are produced by a full stomach, warm clothing, and a roof over the head - by a standard of living. A reasonable and endurable status in this regard is, of course, necessary to life itself; but true morale is likewise produced by direct appeal to the heart of man. Let us make no mistake about it. Now, I am going to talk a little bit about a favorite subject of mine. It is also a favorite subject of several of my friends at this table; in fact, of practically everyone to whom I have talked in Europe. It is the idea of European unity! The advantages to be gained by us through unification of Europe are so great that I have never found anyone to quarrel with the abstraction, the statement of the principle. But I should like to have it distinctly understood that when I talk about advantages to be gained by a complete unity that may not be immediately within our grasp. I am not setting up any alibi for anyone failing to do his best today! We must continue, urgently, to march forward with what we have, and make the best of it. On the battle field, when the bullets are flying, no soldier waits for tractor to bring up a ditch-digging machine to get him a bit of shelter from those bullets. He gets ahold of an entrenching tool, or even his bayonet, and he scratches gravel; he digs into the mud, into the rocks or anything else, so as to get his body protected. Now, we have so long neglected our common defenses and our military

developments that we are, in a way, in the position of that soldier on a battlefield. So let's grab an entrenching tool! I do not need to recite to such a body as this the great advantages that would come to us through unification of Western Europe, unification in its economy, its military systems, finally its political organisms. Under such conditions we would no longer have the job of trying to determine what each nation would have; we would have Mr. Monnet's true concept of a single balanced force for the whole. No nation would have to keep, for prestige purposes alone, particular units, officers, organizations, or services. All this you can easily comprehend. But even as we long for such a great advance, I assure you that under the programs now in hand we can, in Western Europe, erect a defense that can at least, although expensively and uneasily, produce a stalemate. But that is not good enough. As my Chief of Staff pointed out to you, we need depth to our defensive position; we need German assistance, both in geography and in military strength, if these can be obtained with justice and respect to them and to ourselves. It is because of reasons, of which the ones I have given are only a few, that I have come to believe that we should have a European Defense Force. But merely because I believe we must have a European Defense Force does not mean that I am stopping for one instant my efforts to cooperate with every one of the chiefs of Staff in all our countries to produce, now, what they can as effective national forces. But if we go ahead with the European Defense Force, gaining German strength without creating a menace to any others and in such a way that the Germans could cooperate with self-respect, our goals will become much more readily obtainable. Here I must say one word about the German position. We cannot have mere hirelings and expect them to operate efficiently. NATO has no use for soldiers representing a second-rate morale or a second-rate country. German help will be tremendously important as it is freely given; and it can be so given, I believe, through a European Defense Force. This European Force would serve another great purpose it would stand alongside the Schuman Plan – which must be successful - and the two would constitute great steps toward the goal of complete European unity! Just as European unity is important to all of us, there is nothing more important to the entire NATO organization than an underlying unity among all of us based on a clear comprehension of the facts at issue. It is not enough that we here around this table agree on essentials. It is not enough that all of our governments agree. The important thing is that the populations standing behind those governments must agree. Our peoples must understand that, for each nation, the concept of collective security by cooperation must be successful or there is no acceptable alternative for any of us. All of us must understand that the task we have set for ourselves can be done because of our great resources and our determination and skill. All of us must understand that this task must take first priority over and above all else except only that of assuring acceptable levels of living in our own countries. Unless this kind of information is gotten out and understood, we are victims first of our own laziness, our own failures as leaders, and secondly we are victims of Soviet propaganda, because they will, in all cases assert the contrary. They will assert that we are trying to get together to launch a great invasion, when they well know that the entire aggregate of the forces we are talking about have no power to launch any attack across Europe. All soldiers know that it is an entirely different thing to establish a military stalemate in Western Europe on the one hand, and, on the other, to conduct an offensive. The Soviet General Staff is completely capable of understanding this. All of their verbal assaults and attacks against our motives are spurious. They know it and we know it; but the point is our populations everywhere must know that we are united for peace. During this past year, NATO has marshaled and organized under competent commanders and splendid staffs, such troops as we have. I believe they could already give a gallant account of themselves if attacked, even though we are far too weak to provide the

assured safety that we require. I might stop to observe that when your self-preservation demands the accomplishment of a job there is nothing that is impossible. The impossible then merely becomes a difficulty, something to be solved and something to be done. You don't give up when your life is at stake. So, even now, our troops are not helpless. There was a famous old cavalry general in my country who once had part of his force surrounded by overwhelming numbers. A message came through to him describing the terrible situation, and the query was, 'What shall we do'? The commander who was a bit illiterate sent back 'Fight 'em' and he spelled the message = 'fitem.' Now, if the balloon goes up today what we are going to do is fight, make no mistake about it. All of us would be doing the same. I repeat that aside from their immediately available and disposable military force, the only attribute in which the Soviets have a temporary advantage over us is in their unity. And that unity has this one defect. In time of crisis - when the fear of the machine gun behind the line loses its relative importance because of the danger in front - that kind of unity begins to fall apart. What we must do is to produce throughout our countries, the certainty, the knowledge that we can voluntarily build a unity that will win and secure the peace. My Chairman and Gentlemen, I assure you that it has been a very great honor to appear here with my staff to give you a few of the ideas and observations we have on this developing scene. And I assure you also that we are keenly sensible of the heavy responsibilities resting upon you Gentlemen. I tell you now, as a body, what I have frequently told you individually, whenever we meet with you it in the spirit of cooperation, in the confidence that we can attain NATO's goals of security and peace if we all do it together.

6.8 Unidentified SHAPE Statement: 1952

The past year at SHAPE has been very valuable: we have plowed difficult ground and established successfully the political, psychological and organizational foundations upon which to build. But this exercise must have made it very clear to you gentlemen that we must now get about the business of building the structure - the forces, the facilities, the command techniques, and the imaginative tactics that will make this organization an insuperable obstacle to any aggressor from the East. Air strength, Reserves, Logistics, Training. We should quickly consummate arrangements for German participation in the framework for the European Army. You gentlemen from the participating nations can do much toward expediting the realization of this important goal. On this, a far-sighted view is essential, focusing on the major problems rather than on particular and minor difficulties. As you go back to your assignments, I think you will have gained an understanding and view of our security problem in its full dimensions, and as a joint endeavor in which all our forces are joined together for a common end. It has been a notable meeting - unique in composition and truly beneficial in result. NATO will profit much from it. I trust it will be repeated at least yearly. For me, it will probably be the last meeting of this sort. But whenever I depart, I shall feel a heavy burden of sadness on leaving this post. Almost certainly, it will be my last military command - and I need not tell you what that means to a man who has spent his complete adult life in uniform. Moreover, my feelings will be the more acute on departure from this continent with which much of my military career has been so closely associated. Were a man to choose his final post of military service, he could not have found a better one. The past year and a half has been a tremendously inspiring and rewarding experience for me. I have enjoyed and profited by the fullest cooperation from all of your governments and from every official in those governments. I have had the most sympathetic and understanding support at all times from the National Military chiefs. And I have had the support

and loyalty of one of the finest staffs it has ever been the honor of a soldier to lead. Behind us, all in the NATO countries have worked devotedly to make SHAPE a reality that could stand as a guardian for peace and justice. But I am sure there are plenty of critics and military experts who regard it as a military monstrosity - as something that could not live long among the strains and pressures that influence nations individually and collectively. These skeptics are perhaps fewer in numbers than they were a year ago, but they are still with us, voicing their dire predictions of eventual collapse. It is to us and specifically to you gentlemen, who must carry on, to prove that they are wrong. We shall not fail because we must not fail. It is true that a union among sovereign bodies is a very difficult thing to accomplish. If you take fourteen grains of sand on the seashore and put them in your hand and attempt to make a ball of them, you would not be trying anything more difficult than to get fourteen independent nations working together for a common purpose. But we do know that we can go to another part of the countryside, get a bit of rock, make some cement from it and then - out of those fourteen grains of sand - create something that is practically indestructible. By treaties alone, you cannot produce a unity among sovereign nations which will hold up in the emergency of war. You can write all the provisos, clauses, and conditions into a treaty, but when a nation's existence is at stake - when it believes that it may be in total danger by clinging to the provisions of this treaty - words will not be enough to hold it together. The force that will hold is mutual confidence. And as it grows and develops from the highest level of government to the soldier in ranks and the man in the street, there is finally produced something the strength of which is almost incalculable. We are building such a bond between us, and its growing strength is the hope of the free world. From Norway, through Western Europe and across the Mediterranean to the Black Sea, I have seen this unity growing - this feeling of common goals and common destiny. In the space of a year, I have seen hope return to faces that before were shadowed with worry and despair. With high courage, we have met thus far the challenge of history: in brotherhood we have joined to defend freedom. Now we must persevere - with pride in our task - and will through all obstacles to gain our peaceful and honorable ends.

6.9 Address to Members of British Parliament: January 15, 1952

Gentlemen, I am going to address you in particular capacity. As I see it, you are a part of the high command of the Free World, and it is in that way that I want to talk to you. In your hands are part of the decisions that must rule the fate, current and future, of that part of the world not now under the Iron curtain; and, more specifically, that part represented in NATO. Consequently, where others have talked to you about statistics of supply, the economies of various countries, the financial situation and production of munitions, I am going to speak more in the abstract in order to show you the motivation of this group here in SHAPE; and what we believe is, or, indeed I am bold enough to say, should be, representative of the attitude of twelve nations. We start with a very simple basis: It is success in this, or it is 'or else?' for the Free World. Now that statement is not nearly so radical as it might sound at first. It stems from this: Given the interdependence of the modern world with its machines, its steel civilization, and the complex industrial fabric that is built up over the world, we find that there is no nation in the world which is capable of carrying on and operating successfully its economy by itself. At the same time that we have that situation, we have an announced enemy of any free system of government: The Communist doctrine states that it cannot co-exist with free governments. So, with that enemy, united by the power of the gun in the kidneys, arrayed against this Free World

in which actions must depend upon each other in order to exist, we find that there is no single one of these nations which can exist by itself; that can protect itself. This applies particularly to those that are close to the Iron Curtain. If we merely adopt the policy that we are not our brother's keeper and retire each unto himself and say, 'We'll make the most of what we've got and let it stand, we will find that, one by one, due to the many-sided nature of the Communist attack, the weaker countries will fall. The attack is not purely and strictly military. Equally important, and sometimes more effective, I think, is the threat of using the military. All of the free nations are involved in each other's problems in one way or another. Take the case of Indo-China. What would happen there if we should withdraw support of France completely? And then think of Siam, Malaya, Burma, in succession, and what would happen to India? And soon you see yourself in such a shrinking world that finally even great powers like the United States and Great Britain have to struggle for mere existence. So, from our point of view it is this 'or else. Produce collective security that can encompass us all. So we start from there. If we start from there, our next point is: All related, all ancillary problems are of no great importance to us. We represent that part of the decision of the high command that compels unified action. And so, in this headquarters - and I wish each of you could come back for informal visits, to go into each section, at your own sweet will, to visit them and see these men working together. There is no representation of any strictly nationalistic view in the solution of a problem. It is done professionally. The nationalistic views are represented on a level higher than we are. I mean, in bodies higher than we are. They are decided there and we get them. But, in this unification and the production of the power that is the objective, the production of, let us say, the peacekeeping power that is the objective of the NATO nations, there is one great truth that none of us must ever forget. It is this: This power for keeping the peace is not merely the sum of the moral, economic, and military strength you can develop. It is the product. And the reason that that is important, is this: Let any one of those three factors fall to zero, and the whole is zero. If you economic power falls to zero, if you're busted, then you have no power to support the Free World. If your military power falls to zero, you are nothing but a fat cat waiting to be knocked off. If your morale, or spiritual power falls to zero, you are useless. You are just of no account. So, in this business we find these three things have to be produced: Moral or spiritual, economic and military power. Now, the area with which we are most concerned, because of its great scope, is Western Continental Europe. I am not going to repeat what you must have heard about what would occur if we should lose Europe. There is nobody here who isn't completely alert to the extraordinary advantages that would accrue to us - if we should lose Europe. But how are we going to keep Europe, remembering that there must be a military power with an economy, viable economy, and can support that military power, and a spirit to keep it going. And these things are interrelated, and reciprocal, in their effect. The morale works on the military power, and the military power raises the morale. They are all intertwined. But we come to this basic factor in Western Europe: You must have a viable economy or you will have no security in this area. If you have no security in this area, we know what the whole effect would be on NATO; on our nations, our two maritime Atlantic nations. And so you can almost say there is a viable economy in Western Europe or, it's this 'or else. Now how are you going to produce a viable economy in Western Europe? You've got Holland, Belgium, Luxembourg, other small nations; nations reduced, weakened by the war, competing with each other - not merely competing with the British economy and the American economy, but competing with each other in trying to make a living. All the Marshall Plan help in the world, in my mind, will never put Europe, Western Europe, that has had its old trade route and trade connections with Eastern Europe - with its

bread-basket - cut off - you're never going to have a viable economy until you get rid of these little artificial separations and make Western Europe a federated unity, certainly to the extent of federating its economy and, therefore, many or most of its political decisions. We therefore come to this fact: If you don't produce a federated Western Europe, you are never going to get a long-term cure for the threat now overwhelming the world unless, of course, there should be an internal collapse within the countries posing that threat, a circumstance for which we may devoutly pray, but which we cannot expect too suddenly; it is probably too big to have it happen suddenly. Within that framework, then, we say, 'Now let us produce the forces. And we run into another factor. Western Europe itself is shallow geographically. There is little depth in which to produce a defense. Instantly, your eyes turn to Germany because of the depth which it provides geographically to your defense. Also, your minds turn toward the Germans because most of us here have certain reasons to respect their fighting prowess, and we would like them on our side. And we know Western Germany is not going to remain a vacuum. And, in the same way, every needle is going to point to one of the poles. And, in the same way, every country in the world has to make up its mind, as long as power has become polarized; are you going to cling to the Free World concept, or are you going to accept without protest the authoritarian rule? To get that power into Western Europe, that strength of the Germans - and remember we also know that finally we have to produce a political entity here - the European Army has been devised. I know you have been discussing this issue today with a number of people, and I am therefore not going into any details about it. I would simply say this: If you don't like the European Army, propose an answer that will meet this situation. But don't, when you do it, try to duck around and get away from the basic alternatives there are for a proper and satisfactory solution of this problem. I think you will come to the type of conclusion to which a leader in war often has to come; he brings up two or three plans, and since the function of the staff is always to point out the risks and the dangers, soon he has the sum of the negatives that are applied to each one, and every one becomes impossible. But if you don't do one of them, you are going to lose the war. So you have just got to go to work. We have reasoned ourselves down to these basic truths: First, it is NATO 'or else?'; next, it is a unified Western Europe 'or else?'; and fitting into that picture comes the strength of Western Germany, which means for the present a European Army 'or else', which fits into the other concept. And we see no way of ducking it. Now I have just one aphorism, probably an aphorism, and it is not very profound, and it is that: When there comes a problem in human affairs that is a must, that is compulsory, then, gentlemen, there are no impossibilities. From that time on there are only obstacles to be overcome. If you are drowning in the middle of the river you don't say 'I can't swim as far as the shore', you just swim. At least, you don't give up. That's where we are. I can set before you, in my mind, what seemed to be the accomplishments of the past year, the progress we have made on the rocky road towards the ideals, the objectives, the aims we are trying to reach. I can show you where have been the discouragements, the setbacks. But this group remembers what we have to accomplish. We have been given a job by twelve countries and we intend to do it.

6.10 Remarks at Academy of Moral and Political Sciences: January 21, 1952

I deeply appreciate the great honor of being received as a foreign associate of the Academy of Moral and Political Sciences of the historic Institute of France. This is the third occasion in my military career when I have been serving in France, and I am particularly happy that circumstances have made it possible for me to be with you today. Here at this ancient seat of

culture and learning, whence the genius of the French people has shone forth for so many centuries, I feel especially conscious of the role of France and her people in the past, in the present and in the future. History and destiny, tradition and geography, have combined through the years to focus the eye of people all over the world on this great land. They look to France as a beacon of freedom and progress along the long and arduous road towards human happiness. They look to France for the leadership and vision which she has so often given mankind. The freedom loving peoples of the world have now embarked on a great collective effort to preserve those things which make life worth living. We can succeed in this great endeavor only if each and every one of us is willing to give the full measure of courage, sacrifice, work and vision; not in a divided effort, but working together in the pursuit of our common goal. In so doing, we are undertaking a task of a scope never before seen in peacetime, even during the three centuries of the existence of this ancient institution. We do not know what the precise solutions are, but we do know that we cannot succeed unless we are united. We do know that our purpose is a just and moral one, for we seek only peace with freedom. This endeavor must be exerted in every field, for the fabric of security is made up of the will to preserve our heritage, and the readiness to make any sacrifice therefore. There is hardly a political decision in the international field that does not have some security aspects; and similarly, there are few high-level military decisions which do not necessarily have profound moral, political and economic implications. A world which has suffered so much in recent years wants peace. It is the challenge of our time to win that peace. We can meet this challenge only if we work together, each one of us striving to do a little more than the other to achieve our common goal. The building of security which will give us peace is the business of all, for freedom itself is at stake. The work of this academy, defining and holding before us these eternal moral values, is the most precious contribution to the cause of free men. In this task, I know that France, which has contributed so much to the cause of human progress in the past, will prove herself worthy of the glorious heritage which is hers.

6.11 2nd Anniversary of SHAPE: April 2, 1952

Three years ago this week, representatives of our several nations signed the treaty that set up NATO. Sometime later, recognizing the special situation of Western Europe and their purpose of maintaining security of the Western World, they decided to place the forces already raised under a single command, and so SHAPE was born. One year ago today, this Headquarters assumed operational command of the troops actually stationed in Europe for the defense of this great area. The purpose of our governments was a very simple one - to retain the peace through establishment of a sound collective security. This purpose was in complete conformity with the spirit and intent of the United Nations Organization - a regional pact to maintain the peace. The Organization of all of these independent countries to establish a military organization was, of course, a rather complicated sort of thing to do. They had many tasks to achieve before their objectives could be attained. As we proceed along the path toward the attainment of objectives that reach into our spiritual, our economic and our military activity, progress sometimes seems distressingly slow. Only this week, my staff and I have prepared a report on the progress we have achieved. One of its purposes will be to fight any discouragement that might come about from the realization that objectives are still a long way off on the horizon - by glancing briefly over our shoulders to see how far we have come. As in all things human, this report will be neither wholly white nor wholly black. We have had our discouragements, just as we have had our important advances. On the discouraging side, for example, we have had the strained economies

in Europe developing, threatening and slowing previously predicted schedules. We know that, in spite of the expenditure of vast sums of money in the United States and elsewhere, the flow of equipment has not been so rapid as previously predicted. In Korea, Indo-China and Malaya, NATO nations of Europe and in America are carrying very heavy burdens; burdens that are costly, both in blood and in treasure. They have a direct effect upon our efforts here to establish a secure defensive arrangement in Western Europe. On the encouraging side, there has been almost a revolutionary rise in the morale of the armed forces. Their training is efficient, directed by some of the most experienced soldiers, sailors and airmen alive today. In each case, in each unit, there is a growing confidence that they can do their job - do the job that they have been given by our United Nations. Another encouraging factor has been the accretion of Turkey and Greece to our organization. These two sturdy, self-reliant nations have joined us in the same spirit that others have displayed - to maintain peace through development of a collective security organization. At last, ladies and gentlemen, the great productive machinery of the Western World is beginning to roll. Equipment is being produced at a much faster rate than has been the case over the past many months. It is to be anticipated that this will encourage and allow speed-up in the organization of military units. A very important, possibly the most important single encouraging factor of the past year, has been the progress toward centralization and unification in Western Europe. We have had the Schuman Plan, soon to go into operation. We have had evidence of the nation's trying to get together through agriculture and electric power and similar types of economic activities. Finally, we have the European Defense Force, an arrangement whereby German strength can be brought into the Western Security Organization with full status of respectability for Germany and without endangering the peace of Western Europe. It will bind together a single economic, political whole, to make the peace of this region secure and safe. Along with this, there is strong hope that a permanent peace treaty will soon be signed between Germany and the three Western Powers. We here at SHAPE, representatives of many nations, work day by day constantly with these intricate and difficult problems. We have absolute faith that you can do the job. Of course you can do the job. All that is necessary is that each country remember that its own enlightened self-interest is served best by developing the common security so necessary to us all. The task, incident to it, must have first priority. We require faith, self-confidence, devotion, and tenacity - always tenacity.

6.12 Farewell Address Paris, France: May 21, 1952

Ladies and gentlemen, I am certainly in a unique position. You know, you are my bosses and usually one does not go around giving good advice and lecturing to his bosses, so I will try today to avoid being in the position of teacher or preacher. I shall try to tell you, in my own way, something of what I think of this Group, something of my respect for its opportunities for service, its capacity for good in the world today. Primarily, I believe this is the only body in the whole free world that is meeting day-by-day and studying objectively the real issues, the real problems, that are of concern to all of us. Those problems involve our freedoms as individuals - the rights that came to us when we were born in the image of God. Fundamentally, this is what you are dealing with and you are the only Group that is meeting and dispassionately studying the problem all the way from its material aspects such as making a living for ourselves and producing the strength to protect that living, to the challenge of growing culturally, intellectually, spiritually throughout our whole lives. Now, because I have the deep conviction that you people have a mission of such transcendent importance to the free world, I likewise feel that it is going

to take courage on your part to discharge it effectively and properly. I realize, of course, that each of the members of the Council - the principals, the ones that have to bear the responsibility - each of you has a certain relationship with your own government, which is a sovereign nation, and that you have to present views in certain meetings that are not necessarily your own views. In such cases you have to present the opinion and conviction or the decision of your government, but thank God that is only part of your work. As intelligent men studying the great problems before our community, you not only have the opportunity but, in my humble opinion, you have the duty of reaching conclusions and convictions based on your own intelligence, your own heart and your own beliefs. And, moreover, I believe that you really have the duty once in a while in telling your own country, your own government, this fact, because I repeat, there is no one who can possibly have the opportunity to study these subjects as dispassionately, as objectively, as the members of this Group. In talking to you today I could recite experiences of the past year which would illustrate the very fine cooperation and support that we have received from the civilian sections of NATO. Such sentiments would be very sincere and, of course, they are rather characteristic of such occasions as this when some associate or member of an Organization is leaving. However, I think you know how cordial our association has been. I think that you, like those at SHAPE, have been animated by the same passionate hope of serving free humanity, of making it secure, of gaining ground toward that level of security where we can devote our income, our resources, our productivity to the good of people. We should soon like to reach that point where we do not have to divert so much of our national incomes into the profitless, sterile, negative means that we call military formations. It is a Group such as yours that can possibly do more to preserve that balance between what is necessary in a world threatened by evil, and what we must earnestly try to do in a more constructive direction, more in keeping with the ideals for which free government was set up. Now I realize when discussing such subjects before a body like this, that I am talking to people who in their intellectual and scholarly attainments can take the same subject and make something eloquent out of it. The only thing that I can maintain as I stand before you is that no one could believe more than I in the rights and privileges of free people. I believe also that they have it within their capacity to hold their freedom if each will meet his just obligations and duties. In the free world, the accumulated combined resources are such that it sometimes appears that we are foolish, practically ridiculous, to be frightened of any force in the world. Our one trouble is that we are not united; we too much enjoy the special prejudices and suspicions that keep us apart. Now the Communist uses the gun in the kidneys - a knife between the shoulder blades - and of course people are unified or else they do not exist. We have to find better ways. One of the ways is this body and I can see the development of friendship, understanding, unity as a primary job of you gentlemen who stand in the front row and bear heavy responsibilities. You have got a great organization. It's going to be far more numerous than SHAPE pretty soon! Everybody in that organization can do something - in their letters home; in all their communications with people throughout the world; in their day by day meetings. We can do this thing, and we can produce something close to that described by a great American President, Woodrow Wilson. He said, 'The highest form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people? Now, if you will simply take the expression 'free people? and make it plural instead of singular I believe you will have the slogan, the watchword, the objective, that should guide everybody associated with this kind of an effort. I should hope that I would not be out of place, Lord Ismay, in just making one simple pledge before I say my final goodbye. Wherever I am, whatever I shall be doing, I shall never lose my faith, my conviction, in the essential truth of what I have been trying to say to you just now. I shall

continue to work in that direction conscious that we must – quickly as is possible - get out of the strictly military business here and get into something that is more profitable for us as a whole - more in keeping, as I say, with our culture and our purposes of our type of civilization. With that pledge, I hope that I have established a fact that with this body and with everybody in it I shall always be warmly associated in heart even if I am not here to clasp your hand - goodbye.