The Discourse of the Marshall Plan and the Shaping of U.S. Cultural Knowledge

By
Natasha Lüth

Submitted to
Central European University
Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts

Supervisor: Professor Susan Zimmermann

Budapest, Hungary
2012

Abstract:

The Marshall Plan, or officially the European Recovery Program (ERP), played a crucial role in transatlantic relations in the twentieth century. Using a critical discourse analysis supplemented by feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis, in this thesis I will look at the discourse of the Marshall Plan by the leaders of the U.S. government at the time of its inception. I will analyze the hearings pertaining to the Marshall Plan in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate to investigate what binaries the discourse portrays and what cultural knowledge this shape in the United States. My reading and cultural understanding of the discourse evokes Othering of the Soviet Union and Europe, resulting in two consequences. First, the discourse creates Othering of the USSR and Europe in what seems to be dichotomous relationships. Second, the discourse also genders the U.S. as a hegemonic masculinity and Europe as a subordinate masculinity. Consequently, this allows the discourse to posit the United States at the top of a hierarchical order of actors in the international system. This in turn creates an image of the U.S. as superior to the Others (i.e. USSR and Europe), which shapes U.S. cultural knowledge.

Acknowledgements:

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

World War II left most of Europe devastated. The continent saw some of the greatest human atrocities of the century. Tens of millions of people died through the Holocaust, war, and war-related famine and disease. The bombings of major metropolitan areas across Europe left hundreds of thousands homeless and the major transportation networks of Europe had been ruined. By 1945, railway lines, bridges, roads, canals, public transportation, and merchant water transportation had been almost entirely destroyed. Graver still, almost all of Europe, with the exception of Sweden and Switzerland, faced massive food shortages. Eastern Europe, which traditionally supplied agricultural products to Western Europe, faced famine conditions in 1946, followed by a continent wide freezing winter and an extremely dry summer. With transportation systems not working, the little food supplies and coal for heating that was available could not be easily transported to Western Europe (Judt 2005, 82-87). Europe in general faced severe shortages of basic needs.

Simultaneously, a riff in world politics had begun. The Soviet Union and the United States exited a tragic war to enter into another that would be characterized by competition between the two states. From the position of the U.S., the Cold War entailed a fight over the reconstruction of European economies. The leaders of the American government designed the Marshall Plan, or officially the European Recovery Program (ERP). The Marshall Plan undoubtedly shaped the future of many European states; for what some argue is positive or negative. For example, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) began in order to allocate the funding of the ERP, and the OEEC can be said to spark the idea of what became the Common Market of the European Union (European Union 2011). Yet Marxist scholars might argue that the ERP was simply a tool for American economic imperialism. While these are both fascinating topics that should be researched, I will not

have the space in this thesis to do so. Instead, I am focusing on how the discourse of the Marshall Plan shaped cultural knowledge in the United States.

My academic interests lie in transatlantic relations and European Union (EU) policies. I have studied the history and development of the EU through the academic fields of Policy Studies and International Relations (IR). Yet, these histories rarely include a discussion on gender and the international system, and when gender is mentioned, it usually refers only to the representation of women in state parliaments or in the EU institutions. I would like to move beyond simple representation of women in world politics and focus on the gendered system of states in the international arena. There is only a very small debate in IR on what I call anthropomorphic states. One scholar, Alexander Wendt, argues that states do in fact have a personhood. However other scholars, such as Patrick Jackson and Colin Wight, contend that states do not have a personhood per se, but rather are only talked about 'as if' they are people. Coming from a feminist perspective in Gender Studies, I maintain, in Chapter 4, that the discourse used to talk of states attaches human characteristics to a unified (and essentialized) identity of the state. As many feminist scholars have illustrated and argued, social systems are often constructed by Othering, gendering, and ranking sets of binaries that allow patriarchic structures to thrive. Thus, I focus on the United States and the discourse surrounding the Marshall Plan. My reading and cultural understanding of the discourse evokes Others of the Soviet Union and Europe, resulting in two consequences. First, the discourse creates Othering of the USSR and Europe in what seems to be dichotomous relationships. Second, discourse also genders the U.S. as a hegemonic masculinity and Europe as a subordinate masculinity. Consequently, this allows the discourse to posit the United States at the top of a hierarchical order of actors in the international system. This in turn creates an image of the U.S. as superior to the Others (i.e. USSR and Europe), which shapes U.S. cultural knowledge.

In order to come to these conclusions, I drew on theories from many feminist (and non-feminist) scholars in different academic disciplines such as Sociology, Philosophy, International Relations, Political Science, Gender Studies, History, Cultural Studies, and Security Studies. Therefore, this thesis cannot, and should not, be placed in one academic field. Rather, the contributions of this thesis are numerous. For example, the thesis adds to the IR debate on state personhood, it furthers IR gender theory beyond simple representation of women in world politics, and it enhances the cultural understanding of the United States and its relationship with the Soviet Union and Europe.

In this thesis, I focus on the ERP because it is considered one of the most influential policies in transatlantic relations of the twentieth century. Scholarly works, notably that of Lynn Hinds and Theodor Windt Jr., have undertaken the examination of the impact of public media discussion of the Marshall Plan on U.S. cultural knowledge. However none have directly analyzed the Congressional hearings of the ERP. Therefore I chose the hearings in Committee on Foreign Affairs in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations in the U.S. Senate as my topic of analysis.

I will conduct a discourse analysis of the Marshall Plan hearings in the aforementioned Committees. Discourse can have several definitions in different contexts. For the purpose of this thesis, discourse takes on two meanings. First, discourse means the talk or text between people or groups. Second, as explained by Judith Baxter, "discourses are forms of knowledge or powerful sets of assumptions, expectations and explanations, governing mainstream social and cultural practices. They are systematic ways of making sense of the world by inscribing and shaping power relations within all texts…" (Baxter 2003, 7). When looking at the transcripts of the Marshall Plan hearings, I am reading discourse as defined in the first definition. However my analysis focuses on the knowledge and assumptions inherent in the hearings.

3

There are different ways to analyze discourse. I focus on critical discourse analysis (CDA) and feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis (FPDA). On the one hand, scholar Teun van Dijk states that "critical discourse analysis is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context" (van Dijk 2003). Some basic principles of CDA are, among others, the focus on social problems, studying who has the power to control discourse, analysis is needed to determine if language is ideological, and discourse should be analyzed in its historical context. On the other hand, feminist scholar Judith Baxter writes that "FPDA can be defined as a feminist approach to analyzing the ways in which speakers negotiate their identities, relationships and positions in their world according to the ways in which they are located by competing yet interwoven discourses " (Baxter 2003, 1).

Both critical discourse analysis and feminist post-structuralist discourse analysis are similar in several ways. First, neither are homogenous methods. Second, both examine the power relations within discourse (Baxter 2003; van Dijk 2003). Third, both methods of analysis are skeptical of paradigms of knowledge and critique universal static meanings of knowledge. Finally, both methods assume that identities are formed through discourse (Baxter 2003, chapter 1).

Baxter, in her book *Positioning Gender in Discourse*, argues that FPDA can supplement CDA. In CDA, discourse is in a dialectic relationship to society and culture since society and culture are shaped by discourse (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, and Vetter 2000, 146). According to Baxter, FPDA can enhance CDA, because FPDA does not view discourse as dialectic. Instead, the theory assumes that there are a multiplicity of discourse competing and that language simultaneously composes and opposes social meaning through the discourses.

Moreover, the competition of the discourses results in creating meaning in the material world and our social realities (Baxter 2003, Introduction).

There are thousands pages of transcribed text from the Congressional hearings of the ERP. The breath of the Marshall Plan touched on almost every organ of U.S. government. Several leaders of the cabinets and ministries testified in front of Congress; for example, Secretary Harriman from the Department of Commerce, the Secretary of Agriculture Clinton Anderson, the Secretary of the Interior Julius Krug, the Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder, a representative of the Export-Import Bank, and Secretary of State George Marshall (U.S. Senate 1948).

While writing on CDA, van Dijk writes, "members of more powerful social groups and intuitions, and especially their leaders (the elites), have more or less exclusive access to, and control over, one or more types of public discourse" (van Dijk 2003, 356). Additionally, van Dijk argues that knowledge and information can direct public discourse (van Dijk 2003). George Marshall, at the time of the ERP hearings, was viewed as an extremely knowledgeable member of the elite community of male politicians. Moreover, in 1947, Secretary Marshall was considered to be the great 'American hero' and a well respected statesman. Although there was skepticism of the ERP in 1947/1948, Secretary Marshall's arguments in favor of the legislation was listened to and respected. Indeed, Marshall testified in 110 different public Congressional sessions culminating in over 600 pages of testimony. Additionally, Marshall was considered to have a talent in oration (George C. Marshall Foundation 2011 and 2011a; U.S. House of Representatives 1948). In fact, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives said, "Mr. Secretary,…, you are a master of the English language… (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 42). Therefore, for the analysis of my thesis I focus on the discourse between Secretary Marshall and members of two Committees in the House of Representatives and Senate.

I will begin the thesis by setting the stage of the European Recovery Program. In Chapter 2, I outline the dominant theory of International Relations in the beginning of the Cold War. I also describe the Marshall Plan in its historical context as a tool of international relations among states. Chapter 3 explains my use of gender as an analytical tool. Additionally, I describe how analyzing the process of conveying meaning to words can illuminate cultural knowledge, or the meaning that is produced and understood by cultures or societies. In Chapter 4, I account for the Othering, gendering, and ranking of anthropomorphic states. I analyze the discourse of the Congressional hearings on the Marshall Plan in Chapter 5. I give numerous examples of how I believe that, from the United States' perspective, the discourse others the USSR and Europe, and genders and ranks the United States and Europe. Additionally, I discuss how this shaped the cultural knowledge of the United States. Finally, in Chapter 6, I conclude the thesis by briefly explaining what I contend and presenting future research.

Chapter 2

Setting the Stage: International Relations Theory and Practice during the Marshall Plan

Alexander Wendt writes that theorizing "…involves choosing a social system (family, Congress, international system), identifying the relevant actors and how they are structured, and developing propositions about what is going on" (Wentdt 1999, 6). International Relations-the academic discipline-has numerous theories that explain systems, structures, and the interaction between actors. In IR, how one identifies actors and chooses social systems to investigate can reveal one's worldview, yet one's worldview can also determine the choice of actors and systems. To complicate matters, international relations also refers to the practice of international politics between systems and actors. Often it is difficult to know if the theory or practice evolved first and also if one influenced the other. However, that is not goal of this thesis. Instead, this chapter will place the Marshall Plan in the historical and theoretical context of the end of World War II. First, I will outline the main points of Realism; the dominant theory of International Relations during the time of the Marshall Plan. Second, I will give background information on the Marshall Plan itself, since it was the United State's practice of international relations towards Europe from 1948 to 1952.

2.1 The Theory of International Relations: Realism as the Dominant IR Theory of State Interaction during the Marshall Plan

IR scholars developed an array of theories to explain the interactions and relationships between states. Through her writings, Cynthia Weber suggests that Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism are the three major theories used by IR scholars. Liberalism is closely related to Realism-they both focus on the state as a main actor-yet they differ in the conceptualized structure of the international system. For example, Idealist IR scholars believe that international organizations, such as the United Nations, can be used as a mechanism to force

states into compliance (Weber 2001). Constructivism, on the other hand, focuses on how actors are created. Constructivism argues that actors are socially constructed (Wendt 1999, 6). However, in this thesis I focus on the Realist theory of International Relations because, according to several leading theorists, Realism was the dominant theory used by policy makers and the leaders of the U.S. government during the planning and discussion of the European Recovery Program (Mearsheimer 2001, Chapter 3; Saull 2001, 7; Tickner 1992, 9-12; Weber 2001, 36-37; Wendt 1999, 8).

Realist scholars argue that the Cold War began during World War II with the defeat of 'traditional' European Great Powers, or states with the military capability to dominate other countries. The political, economic, and/or military deterioration of states such as Germany, France, and the United Kingdom left a void in Europe and in the international system. Many scholars, such as Thomas Volgy, Alison Bailin, John Mearsheimer, and Jennifer See, argue that the two states emerging out of the end of the war with enough military strength to dominate others were the United States and the Soviet Union. This created a bipolar international system, or what Volgy and Bailin say occur when "…the vast majority of global military and economic capabilities are held by two states" (Volgy and Bailin 2003, 35).

Realist IR theory is based on three basic and essential assumptions about the conceptualization of the international system. First, realism focuses on sovereign states. States are assumed to be sovereign (meaning that the state has absolute authority over its own territory) and states are the central actor in the international system. Although, many theorists argue that other actors do also influence the international system. For example, Liberalist IR theorists claim that international organizations, such as the United Nations, can be used as a mechanism to comply with a law or action (Weber 2001). Additionally feminist scholars Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Whitworth state that liberal feminists in IR focus on

8

women as actors in the international arena (Sjoberg 2009; Whitworth 2008). Still, Realism focuses on sovereign states.

Additionally, Realism during the Cold War assumed that the only actors were states and the states were portrayed as unified entities (Saull 2001; Mearsheimer 2001; Weber 2001, 14-16). Richard Saull, a Cold War scholar, writes that "…Realism 'collapses' the notion of power with the state" and therefore Realist discussions on actors is concerned with "…power as it is institutionally expressed within the organizational form of the [sovereign] state" (Saull 2001, 33). The focus on power of the sovereign states makes states the only relevant actors in the international system for Realism.

The second assumption of Realism is that the international order has no world government. Although international organizations and institutions exist, according to Realism they do not have the power to force states into actions since states are sovereign. Therefore, Realists argue that there is no world government. The third and final assumption of Realism is based on the second. Realism assumes that the lack of order in the international system makes it, in IR terms, anarchical. Given that states are sovereign, they are the central actors in the international system, and by definition (according to Realism) there is no world government, then there is a lack of order in the international system (Weber 2001, 14-16).

Besides focusing on states and describing the international system as anarchical, realist theorists have developed ideas of power. One concept of power in Realism is power maximization, which refers to the idea of a state trying to become the hegemon in the international system in order to secure its own survival. Becoming the hegemon is important because of how power is conceptualized in Realism. In brief, power is conceived of as being a limited commodity in the international system. State power is also thought to be in a fluctuating dichotomous relation to another state; meaning that if one state gains power, another state is losing power (Saull 2001, Chapter 3).

9

John Mearsheimer, a leading Realist scholar, and other IR theorists claim that during the Cold War era Realist theory conceptualizes power as being limited and only in relation to one state at a time. Given the bipolarity of the international system during the Cold War and the idea of a limited amount of power was available, resulted in binary oppositions in the conception of power. When reflecting on the Cold War, Realists argue that only the U.S. and the USSR were trying to gain power as sovereign states since it was assumed that as America gained power, the Soviet Union was losing power, and vice-versa[1] (Mearsheimer 2001; Saull 2001; Weber 2001).

Yet, the Realist concept of power is not solely derived from military power. Mearsheimer argues that states encompass two types of power that are related to each other; military power and latent power. According to Mearsheimer:

> Latent power refers to the socio-economic ingredients that go into building military power; it is largely based on a state's wealth and the overall size of its population. Great powers need money, technology, and personnel to build military forces and to fight wars, and a state's latent power refers to the raw potential it can draw on when competing with rival states (Mearsheimer 2001, 55).

Consequently, economic wealth is also important in Mearsheimer's equation of power. In the above quote and in the rest of his book, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, Mearsheimer claims that people plus wealth (monetary, land, and technological) equals military power. In this equation, wealth is essential in latent power because "…a state cannot build a powerful military if it does not have the money and technology to equip, train, and continually modernize its fighting forces" (Mearsheimer 2001, 61). Thus, in Mearsheimer's Realist calculations, a large population combined with a large and strong economy ensures a strong military force. A strong military force, according to Mearsheimer, can lead to hegemony of power in the international system. Since no other country can rival the

---

[1] Feminist critiques show that Realist visions of power and the state are normative and essentialized into binary oppositions (Cohn 1987, 1993; Sjoberg 2009; Tickner 1991, 1992, 2001). I agree with these scholars, yet I will not go into this argument here, since it is not an essential point of this thesis. However, as discussed in the previous chapter, feminist Historian Joan Scott has illustrated how binary opposites are used to uphold normative ideas and a hierarchical system. I will go more into detail on Scott's arguments in the next chapters.

hegemonic power, this creates security for the state. Therefore, in an international bipolar system where power is limited and two Great Powers are vying for more power than the other, a strong military power will tip the balance of power to one Great Power, which in turn, according to Realism, will provide security for the state (Mearsheimer 2001). Thus, Realism posits the post-World War II international order as an anarchical bipolar system with two Great Powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, competing to gain the most amount of power (Saull 2001; Mearsheimer 2001; Weber 2001; Volgy and Bailin 2003, 29-34).

2.2 The Practice of international relations: the Marshall Plan

The dichotomous thinking of state power in IR theory is present in the practice of international relations during the time of the Marshall Plan. In January 1945, Harry S. Truman became the Vice-President of the United States. Just shy of three months in office, President Franklin D. Roosevelt died, leading to the inauguration of President Truman. One of the first major foreign policy events Truman attended was the Potsdam Conference in July/August 1945. Along with British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, Churchill's successor Prime Minister Clement Attlee, and the Communist Party General Secretary Joseph Stalin, President Truman discussed the post-war peace treaties. In the middle of the Conference, Churchill lost the general election for Prime Minister, which left a space open for Truman to negotiate with Stalin without the presence of Churchill. With Churchill out of the peace agreement negotiations, combined with the knowledge that the U.S. has recently developed and tested an atomic bomb, President Truman publically negotiated with the Soviet leader, but privately he distrusted the Soviet government. In fact, Truman wrote in a private correspondence that "'force is the only thing the Russians understand….What Stalin wanted was control of the Black Sea straits and the Danube. The Russians were planning world conquest'" (Truman quoted in Hinds and Windt 1991, 67). In general, the leaders of

11

the American government at the time thought that the Soviet Union would try to spread communism across Europe in order to gain political and economic influence in the region ("The Immediate Need For Emergency Aid To Europe" 1947; Hinds and Windt 1991). Through this framework, the U.S. interpreted most of the events of the Cold War.

The statements of Truman suggest a distrust of the USSR, and privately, the State Department was trying to figure out which direction U.S. foreign policy would go. For example, Charles Bohlen, Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, wrote a memorandum arguing that the United States should hinder Soviet 'domination' in Eastern European countries. However, Foreign Service Officer Cloyce Huston argued a different perspective and stated that the U.S. should help the Soviet's instill 'friendly governments' in Eastern European countries. In response, Special Assistant Bohlen and Columbia University professor Geroid Robinson provided President Truman with a memorandum outlining two possible policies for U.S. foreign policy toward the Soviet Union. The first policy entailed acknowledging that the U.S. held atomic weapons and to create a buffer zone in the Eastern European states between U.S. allies and the USSR. The second policy was to help the European countries recover so those states would ally with the U.S. against the Soviet Union and increase the balance of power to the United States (Hinds and Windt 1991, chapter 3).

According to scholars, although Truman distrusted the Soviet Union, he knew little of U.S. foreign policy so he relied on his White House staff and the State Department for guidance. Truman, unlike his predecessor, encouraged his staff and the members of the State Department to share their personal opinions and experiences on U.S. foreign policy with him. This allowed for State Department employees to inject their personal opinions of Soviet actions into U.S. foreign policy. The direction of U.S. foreign policy was greatly influenced by George Kennan, who was in charge of the U.S. Embassy in Moscow. On 9 February 1946, Stalin gave an election speech. The majority of the speech laid out Stalin's five year

plan and defended the actions of the Soviet administration, whereas approximately ten

percent of the speech dealt with Soviet foreign affairs. Most in the U.S. Administration

dismissed Stalin's speech and President Truman even stated that Stalin was merely trying to

rouse the emotions of the voting public (Hinds and Windt 1991, chapter 3). Yet, George

Kennan disagreed. In fact, Kennan understood the speech as Stalin hinting to an ideological

conflict between communism and capitalism (Kennan 1946).

Shortly after Stalin's speech, Kennan sent U.S. Secretary of State James Byrnes a

telegram outlining his analysis of Soviet propaganda and the USSR's outlook of capitalism.

Kennan's analysis described what he believed was the Soviet view of capitalism. Kennan

wrote that the USSR alleged that the "capitalist world is beset with internal conflicts, inherent

in nature of capitalist society. These conflicts are insoluble by means of peaceful

compromise." Kennan continued to write that Soviet propaganda conveys a message that

"internal conflicts of capitalism inevitably generate wars" (Kennan 1946). From his analysis,

Kennan deduced that the Soviet government will do everything to advance the Soviet Union

in the international arena. Kennan also concluded that the Soviets would try to reduce the

influence and strength of the capitalist powers (Kennan 1946). In response to his own

conclusions that the USSR would try to hinder American influence in Europe, Kennan wrote

that:

> [The United States] must formulate and put forward for other nations a much
> more positive and constructive picture of sort of world we would like to see than
> we have put forward in past. It is not enough to urge people to develop political
> processes similar to our own. Many foreign peoples, in Europe at least, are tired
> and frightened by experiences of past, and are less interested in abstract freedom
> than in security. They are seeking guidance rather than responsibilities. We
> should be better able than Russians to give them this. And unless we do, Russians
> certainly will (Kennan 1946).

Indeed, the United States was already giving aid relief in the form of loans and grants to

selected European Countries, but the leaders of the U.S. Administration decided that a

comprehensive and encompassing aid plan was needed to 'guide' Europe and hinder Soviet

involvement in the region ("The Immediate Need For Emergency Aid To Europe" 1947).

Actually, from 1945-1947, the U.S. granted loans to the U.K. ($4.4 billion), France ($1.9 billion), Italy ($513 million), Denmark ($272 million), Poland ($251 million), and Greece ($161 million) (Judt 2005, 90; Acheson 1947).

Yet these emergency measures were not designed to sustain recipient countries and help them create sustainable economies; rather it provided relief for the immediate problems the countries faced. The leaders of the U.S. government feared uprisings and an increased strength in Communist parties due to the inability of leading democratic governments to provide basic resources to citizens ("The Immediate Need For Emergency Aid For Europe" 1947; Acheson 1947; U.S. Department of State 1947). In fact, a U.S. government classified document from September 1947 stated that:

> [totalitarian forces] are hoping that the food and financial situation in Europe this winter will produce economic conditions sufficiently serious that they can be aggravated by aggressive communist actions to a point where the position of democratic governments in France and Italy can be made untenable and communist regimes installed ("The Immediate Need For Emergency Aid To Europe" 1947, 13-14).

Additionally, "by early 1946, U.S. policymakers were becoming increasingly convinced that the Soviet Union had embarked upon a path toward world domination" (Sibley 2002, 95). Thus, the Truman Administration began a plan that was intended to revamp (Western) European economies and simultaneously create an economic and political barrier to Soviet expansion (Judt 2005, 63-99; Price 1955, 3-18).

On 12 March 1947, President Truman officially announced to Congress the U.S.'s new foreign policy that would last for forty years. Twenty days before the announcement, the British government informed Secretary Marshall and Undersecretary Acheson that they would halt all funding to Greece and Turkey, which, as most member of the U.S. Administration thought, would lead to the economic collapse of both countries and a possible political shift to a communist government. In the matter of one weekend, the State

Department drafted a policy paper that was endorsed by Secretary Marshall, in which the

State Department argued that the United States should financially and militarily secure

Turkey and Greece. Truman, having read Kennan's analysis of Soviet 'strategy' already

believed that the Soviet Union was trying to take control of the Black Sea Straits to the

Mediterranean Sea. Thus, President Truman did not hesitate to start a policy of aid to Turkey

and Greece-although neither country requested it-in order to 'contain' communism and

Soviet influence in the European sphere (Hinds and Windt 1991, chapter 5).

At the announcement to Congress in March, Truman talked of "alternative ways of

life" and stated that one way was "based upon the will of the majority, and is distinguished by

free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty,

freedom of speech and religion, and freedom from political oppression." The other

alternative Truman characterized as "…the will of a minority forcibly imposed upon the

majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press radio, fixed elections, and

the suppression of personal freedoms." Moreover, Truman stated, "I believe it must be the

policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by

armed minorities or by outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work

out their own destinies in their own way" (Truman 1947).

Just like IR Realist theory, using binary opposites Truman characterized the world

into two spheres; one sphere being led by the U.S. and the other by the USSR. As Hinds and

Windt write, "[Truman] gave Americans a linguistically created political reality in which the

confusions of the present were clarified in the simple terms of a contest between the defense

of freedom and the threat of totalitarianism, between two mutually exclusive ways of life,

between political good and political evil" (Hinds and Windt 1999, 151). This dichotomy of

competition would become the backbone of the Truman Doctrine and U.S. foreign policy.

With the new U.S foreign policy dividing the world into two spheres, the goal of containing communism took precedent. George Marshall drew together a new policy planning group that was directed by George Kennan. Together, the group drafted the European Recovery Program. Marshall, who at the time was considered an American hero, and his group were faced with the dilemma of offering aid to European states and wanting to exclude the USSR, yet not wanting to make it seem as if the U.S. was excluding the Soviet Union. To do so, Marshall presented the ERP in 'humanitarian' and 'economic' terms (Hinds and Windt 1999, chapter 7).

On 5 June 1947, sixteen months after Kennan's telegram, George Marshall gave a speech at Harvard University's commencement ceremony. In his speech, the Secretary of State officially unveiled to the American public that the U.S. Administration planned a policy for European recovery. During the speech, Marshall painted a grave picture of the state of Europe. He said that, "the truth of the matter is that Europe's requirements for the next three or four years of foreign food and other essential products – principally from America – are so much greater than her present ability to pay that she must have substantial additional help or face economic, social and political deterioration of a very grave character." Additionally Marshall said, "the remedy lies in…restoring the confidence of the European people in the economic future of their own countries and of Europe as a whole" (Marshall 1947).

Shortly after Marshall's speech, the foreign ministers of the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union met in Paris. Without being able to come to a consensus on the U.S. offer for aid, the USSR's Foreign Minister Vyacheslav Molotov left the meetings by the beginning of July. On 5 July 1947, France and Great Britain invited all European countries to meet to decide on appropriate action. Sixteen[2] countries attended the meeting, however most

---

[2] The sixteen countries were: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom (Judt 2005, 91).

16

CEU eTD Collection

Eastern European countries already looking to the Soviet Union for recovery assistance did not attend (European Recovery Program 1947, 7; Judt 2005, 91-93; Price 1955, 25-29).

In fact, both the United States and the Soviet Union offered help to Europe in the form of aid programs. After Molotov left the meeting in Paris, the USSR presented the Molotovo Plan, or officially Comecon (the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance), to European states as well. Melinda Goodrich writes that Comecon "was to enable member states 'to exchange economic experiences, extend technical aid to one another, and to render mutual assistance with respect to raw materials, foodstuffs, machines, equipment, etc.'" (Goodrich 2011). In short, the Molotov Plan enabled the USSR to supply Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania with food, raw materials, and hard goods, and in return, these countries delivered machinery and consumer goods to the Soviet Union (Goodrich 2011).

The U.S., on the other hand, offered aid to Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United Kingdom through the Marshall Plan. The ERP became the tool and framework of the U.S. in the competition race of the Cold War. The Marshall Plan replaced the aforementioned bilateral emergency aid agreements between the U.S. and individual countries. The U.S. required all participating countries to create a four year action plan for economic recovery. Only after the plan was approved by the U.S. government was the country eligible for aid through the ERP (Judt 2005; 90-99).

In brief, the ERP offered goods and investments, in the form of grants and loans, to Western European countries (Guinnane 2004, 17). To operate the transfer of goods and money for the Marshall Plan, the U.S. in conjunction with all participating states set up the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) and the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA). The ECA, under the administration of Paul Hoffman, was in charge

of organizing and transferring goods, credits, and money from the U.S. to recipient countries. Then the OEEC allocated the funding for goods and services (Mee 1984, 246-263). The goods were sold in recipient countries to produce funds for the state in their own national currencies. The state could then use the currency, in accordance with bilateral agreements with the United States, to generate the necessities to stabilize the economy and rebuild the country (Acheson 1947; Judt 2005; 90-99).

The ERP aid paid for all sorts of goods, services, research, and expertise from America. Charles Mee, in his book on the Marshall Plan, describes the use of many American products, knowledge, and services in Europe. He writes:

> In Norway, fishermen used new nets made from…cotton from the United States. In Offenbach, Germany, Marshall Plan leather revived the handbag industry. In Denmark, a Philadelphia knitting machine raised production at Hanson Brothers Knitting Works by 10 percent. In Vienna, children received 1,000 baby chicks from American 4-H Club members, financed by the Marshall Plan. In Greece, American experts informed dairymen that the reason their cows licked the whitewashed stone walls was that they suffered from a calcium deficiency. In Turkey, American public health officials predicted they could wipe out malaria in three years....French harbors…were completely restored after two years of Marshall Plan aid. Jeanne Vidal, stricken with polio, received an iron lung from Denver....[and] within two years Marshall Plan aid put another 100,000 tractors into the fields [of France] (Mee 1984, 251).

As noted in Mee's quote, the ERP did allow for many resources to be used to help rebuild European states. The Marshall Plan, from the standpoint of the United States, was a practice of international relations in the post-war period.

2.3 Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter I have provided a short background on the dominant theory of International Relations that is used to describe the era of the Marshall Plan. IR Realist theory dominated the ideology of international relations during the inception of the ERP. This world view included a conceptualization of a bipolar international system where the U.S. and the Soviet Union competed to gain power in order to gain state security and influence other countries. In practice, the Marshall Plan was based the Truman Doctrine's dichotomy of two 'ways of

life' and was designed by policy makers like George Kennan who clearly thought that the world was divided into a binary structure based on ideological and economic terms.

This dichotomous structure plays a role in the shaping of U.S. cultural knowledge. I will explain in more detail in chapter 4. Yet first I will outline my definition of gender, myths, and cultural knowledge in the next chapter.

Chapter 3

Gender, Imagery, and Cultural Knowledge

Conceptualizing gender can be difficult. Although gender surrounds us in our everyday lives, some concepts of gender can be quite difficult to define. Gender can have one meaning to an individual, a different significance to someone else, and still an alternative connotation to a society as a whole. In different contexts, gender can be defined in a myriad of ways. Some think of gender as sex, based on the genetic composition (chromosomes) or biology (genitals) of a person (Cranny-Francis et al 2003, chapter 1; Carpenter 2002). Others, such as Georgina Waylen, who focuses on International Political Economy, use gender as a synonym for women (Waylen 2006; Scott 1986, 1056). However, feminist theorists from different academic fields have shown gender's relation to sex. For example, works in sociology and anthropology have argued that gender is a social construct, where certain behaviors are 'assigned' to male or female bodies and thus coded as masculine or feminine.

For Carol Cohn[3], a feminist scholar in Security Studies, gender denotes "… the constellation of meanings that a given culture assigns to biological sex differences." She states that gender "… refer[s] to a symbolic system, a central organizing discourse of culture, one that not only shapes how we experience and understand ourselves as men and women, but that also interweaves with other discourses and shapes *them*-and therefore shapes other aspects of our world" (Cohn 1993, 228; italics original). In fact, Lauren Wilcox, a more recent feminist theorist in Security Studies uses a similar version of gender as Cohn. Wilcox also argues that gender is a socially constructed hierarchical system of meaning based on perceived associations of masculinity and femininity, where masculinity is valued more than femininity (Wilcox 2009).

---

[3] Carol Cohn takes her definition of gender from Ann Tickner (Cohn 1987, 1993), who in turn bases her use of gender on Joan Scott's work (Tickner 1992, 7-9).

For other scholars, gender is an analytical tool to show power relations. To begin, language, defined by the prominent Historian Joan Scott, refers to "a system of meaning or a process of signification" (Scott 1987, 6). Language provides a social consciousness for the collective based on common terms or denotations of concepts (Scott 1999, chapter 5). Words show us how people perceived their world at a specific point in time and in a specific culture (Scott 1987, 5). The meanings of words are usually thought to be constructed through their relationship to a binary opposite. Yet words derive meaning also through discourses since they are multidimensional and have multiple relationships with other words simultaneously. So, at the same time one word constructs its meaning from an antithesis, yet also from a variety of words—such as words that imply inclusion and exclusion. Words are also dynamic and their concepts and meanings change throughout time and across cultures (Scott 1986, 1987, 1999; Foucault 1978, 81-102).

Although words are dynamic, absolutist ideas of the meaning of words or categories uphold normative ideas and the hierarchical system the words and concepts are placed in. In her extensive research on gender and labor history, Joan Scott argues that:

> Fixed oppositions conceal the heterogeneity of either category, the extent to which terms presented as oppositional are interdependent-that is, derive their meaning from internally established contrast rather than from some inherent or pure antithesis. Furthermore, the interdependence is usually hierarchical, with one term dominate, prior, and visible, the opposite subordinate, secondary, and often absent or invisible (Scott 1999, 7).

Thus, binaries are posited against each other and seem like they are natural, fixed, opposites, inherent, and homogenous. Since binaries function in a hierarchical system, this perception of natural, fixed, etc. also posits one binary as the 'original' and thus valued, and the other as the 'copy' and as a result devalued (Butler 1993).

Gender, for example, is often perceived as an absolutist normative idea with one binary valued over the other. Gender is usually seen as a binary (male or female) that is fixed because it is thought to be 'natural' or 'biological'. Moreover, normative definitions of

gender are entrenched in culture and code characteristics as masculine and feminine. Coding does not necessarily have to do with how males and females act in real life; nevertheless the coding provides a set of rules that demarcate 'proper' behavior or men and women (Scott 1987, 7; Cohn 1987, 1993; Cohn and Enloe 2003).

Besides providing the boundaries for male and female behavior, gender and its coded characteristics also signify relationships of power. Entire systems of power are hierarchical, legitimized, and maintained through perceived binary opposites. Although gender may not seem to be involved in some binaries, gender is a crucial organization of society into binary oppositions based on perceived 'naturalness' (Scott 1986, 1999; Tickner 2001, 1-8; Cohn 1987, 1993; Cohn and Enloe 2003; Sjoberg 2009). Questioning the binaries would undermine the entire system of power because it would show that in fact words and concepts have several relationships simultaneously and thus the definitions are dynamic, formed, and heterogeneous (Foucault 1978, 81-102). Therefore, it is important to look at the process in which the meanings of words are shaped in order to understand why certain words or concepts are posited as binaries and to see what the effects of the binary oppositions are (Scott 1987, 1999).

In other words, analyzing the process of conveying meaning to words can illuminate cultural knowledge, or the meaning that is produced and understood by cultures or societies. Knowledge is how "...relationships of power-of domination and subordination-are constructed. Knowledge refers not only to ideas but to institution and structures, everyday practices as well as specialized rituals, all of which constitute social relationships. Knowledge is a way of ordering the world…" (Scott 1999, 2). Additionally, Michel Foucault shows that producers of knowledge are usually those in a society that are presumed to be intelligent and pure, so no one questions the knowledge they create (Foucault 1978). Moreover, Foucault and others have illustrated that knowledge is produced through discourse

(Foucault 1978; Scott 1986, 1987, 1999; Cohn 1987, 1993; Cohn and Enloe 2003; Tickner 1991; Whitworth 2008). Furthermore, Cynthia Weber writes that discourse conveys images that are used to transform interpretations into 'fact'. An image can change something that is a worldview in a particular culture or society and make it appear to be a 'truth' that is universal and natural (Weber 2001, Introduction). Take for example the self-images of nations. As a collective, a nation can set forth a self-image of the nation, that is complex and relies on conveying images that are so ingrained in society that they are taken as axioms (Weber 2001, Introduction).

The United States is not new to presenting a self-image to the world. Research on the U.S. shows that the 'collective image' of America is complex, multifaceted, and has changed over time and in different contexts (Hinds and Windt 1991; Sieber 2005, Introduction; Smith-Rosenberg 2004). Scholar Carroll Smith-Rosenberg wrote that in the end of the eighteenth century, the "…European Americans represented themselves as radically new freedom-loving republicans…" (Smith-Rosenberg 2004, 61). In his sociological and cultural historical work, Sam Sieber argues that the antagonism between the United States and the Soviet Union created a logical "order" for Americans and shaped the U.S.'s self-image as the "'leader of the free world'" (Sieber 2005, xv).

In their book, *The Cold War as Rhetoric*, Lynn Boyd Hinds and Theodore Otto Windt, Jr. formed a thought provoking analysis of how the Cold War self-image of the U.S. developed through discourse. The authors focus on the United States to see how the Cold War was produced through political speeches, government documents, and written media (magazines, newspapers, etc.) from 1945-1950. The authors argue that through the Truman Doctrine and speeches, President Truman's rhetoric reinforced the ideology of the time; namely the world was divided into two spheres based on ideological differences. Secretary of State Marshall, respected and adored at the time as an American Hero, presented the ERP

in public speeches as morally good and willing to come to the aid of Europe and the world

(Hinds and Windt 1991). In fact, Hinds and Windt write:

> Truman and others had portrayed the enemy as tyrannical and expansionist. The American…side was portrayed as democratic and peaceful. The Marshall Plan served to fill in the details of the portrait of the United States as a generous, peaceful nation ready to play the role of Good Samaritan, one that would give of its resources freely to aid sickly nations devastated by war and unable to recover on their own (Hinds and Windt 1991, 187).

Additionally, Hinds and Windt's argue that supplementing the rhetoric of Truman and

Marshall was George Kennan's rhetoric of the "villainous Soviets".   In his public speeches

and essays, Kennan (the US's leading 'Soviet expert' and architect of the ERP) demonized

the USSR as a nation bent on spreading communism and hindering the freedom and

redevelopment of the war torn countries of Western Europe (Hinds and Windt 1991).

Since Hinds and Windt have already analyzed the public debates in public speeches,

written media, etc., I will look into the discourse of the Marshall Plan in the Congressional

hearings, paying close attention to the discourses that are invoked by the politicians and

policy-makers. Therefore, my analysis will look at the discourse of the Marshall Plan by the

leaders of the U.S. government at the time of its inception. I will analyze the hearings

pertaining to the ERP in the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. Although

we know that binaries are more complex than a simple thesis and antithesis, nonetheless the

discourse presents such dichotomies and shapes cultural knowledge. I am investigating what

binaries the discourse of the Marshall Plan portrays and what cultural knowledge this shapes

in the United States. But first we must look at the Othering, gendering, and ranking of

anthropomorphic states in the next chapter. I then continue with my analysis in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4

The Triad: Othering, Gendering, and Ranking Anthropomorphic States

In this chapter I will lay the foundation for my arguments on Othering, gendering, and ranking states. I begin this chapter by providing a summary of the small debate in IR on state personhood versus talking of states 'as if' they are people. I argue that regardless if a state has a personhood or not, the discourse of the debate and IR attaches human characteristics to states. This, I believe, places states in a socially constructed system that societies and people understand. More importantly, this is a system that feminist scholars have illustrated is gendered and hierarchical. Therefore, in the following sections I also describe in general how states are Othered, gendered, and ranked because the discourse of state interaction places states as unified actors in a system that is socially constructed.

4.1 The Anthropomorphic State

A small debate on personifying the state stems from a larger debate on states as actors. Although the states as an actor debate began in 1959 in the field of IR, it was not until forty years later when Alexander Wendt published his groundbreaking work *Social Theory of International Politics* that the academic discussion on state personhood began. Through his work, Wendt argues, inter alia, that the discourse of IR theory personifies the state. The author argues that states are spoken about as actors that can have identities, interests, emotions, desires, attitudes, etc. (Jackson 2004; Wendt 1999, chapter 5; Wendt 2004). In essence, Wendt argues that "to say that states are 'actors' or 'persons' is to attribute to them properties we associate first with human beings…" (Wendt 2004, 289). For example, states are often described as self-interested, hostile, cooperative, or they are thought to have fear of other states. Indeed, fear, a human emotion, is central to anarchy; one of the basic

assumptions of the international system in Realism (Wendt 2004, 313; Weber 2001, 31-33).

Weber writes that "anarchy requires fear to differentiate the behaviour of those acting within

[the international system] from their behaviour within hierarchy" (Weber 2001, 32). In

essence, Weber argues that without the human emotion of fear attached to states in Realist IR

theory, anarchy could be cooperative instead of conflictual (Weber 2001, 31-33).

Besides theorists attaching human characteristics to states, Wendt writes that states

develop their own national consciousness. To begin, Benedict Anderson, a renowned theorist

on nationalism, defines the nation as "…an imagined political community…" (Anderson

1991, 6). Anderson claims that the nation is imagined since the members of the nation will

never meet all other members, yet each member has his or her own idea and concept of who

is part of the nation. Also, Anderson writes that the nation is a community because "..the

nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship" (Anderson 1991, 7).

Additionally, Anderson argues that with the rise of capitalism and print technology,

inhabitants of nations began to conceptualize a national consciousness (Anderson 1991).

More importantly, the national consciousness is most often attached to the Westphalian[4]

notion of the state (Anderson 1991; Huntington 2004). It is argued then, by Wendt, that

ascribing human attributes to the state, combined with national consciousness, gives states a

personhood.

Patrick Jackson agrees somewhat with Alexander Wendt. Jackson argues that states

are social actors in the international system. Although, Jackson argues that states do not have

personhood per se. Instead states are comprised of people and states are "…entities in the

name of which actions are performed" (Jackson 2004a, 281). The author uses Thomas

Hobbes' term 'personation', which is "…the social process by which someone is empowered

to speak on behalf of (or 'in the name of') an entity, *thereby making that entity an actor…*"

---

[4] IR theory uses the Peace of Westphalia, a series of treaties signed in 1648 that ended the Thirty Years' War, as
the start of what is known today as the international system of states. The Treaties began the concept of
sovereign nation-states with the right to self-govern and non-interference from other states (Osiander 2001).

(Jackson 2004a, 286-287; italics original). Jackson does not study if states have personhood, rather he investigates the process in which IR theorists personify the state and talk 'as if' the state were a person (Jackson 2004a). Additionally, Colin Wight argues that when theorists discuss states' actions, all are participating in a 'collective illusion' that allows one to talk of states as if they are people. Consequently, in academic and public discourse the state is talked about as if it is an autonomous actor, although, according to Wight, states do not have a personhood (Wight 2004).

If Jackson, Wight, or Wendt are correct is not, for my purposes, the interesting part of their debate on states as actors. I argue that the discourse personifies the state regardless of whether states are talked about in a 'collective illusion', or 'as if' they are people, or if they do actually have a personhood. When discussing a state 'as if' or discussing a state with a personhood, one essentializes the state as a unified actor and attaches human characteristics to it. Anthropomorphizing the state, whether 'real' or not, placed the state into a system we, as social beings, know and understand; a system that feminist scholars have illustrated is socially constructed, gendered, and hierarchical.

In the next two sections I will argue that anthropomorphic states are placed in a socially constructed system that is gendered and hierarchical. Consequently, states are also Othered, gendered, and ranked.

4.2. The Triad: the Othering, Gendering, and Ranking of Anthropomorphic States

As I have argued in the previous section, the discourse of states personifies the state with human characteristics. This in turn places the state in a socially constructed system that humans understand. Moreover, the social system is on that feminist scholars have shown is gendered and hierarchical. Consequently, I argue in the next two sections that that states are

Othered, gendered, and ranked because they are theorized and discussed in a system that is socially constructed.

In the next two sub-sections I will discuss Othering, gendering, and ranking in general and then apply this to states.

4.2.1 Othering Anthropomorphic States

In general, Othering is used to shape the consciousness of the Subject. In 1949, Simone de Beauvoir published *The Second Sex*, where she outlined her theories about the social oppression of women. Beauvoir bases her arguments on existentialist philosophy and the concept of the Other. Briefly, Beauvoir argues that the shaping of the consciousness of the Subject is relational to the Other, with the Subject at the center point. The Subject defines itself against the Other (i.e. the Other is not me). Thus, the Other is excluded from the definition of the Subject in order to define the Subject against the Other. Consequently, since the center point is the position of the Subject, everything else is the Other (Beauvoir 1988; Mizielinska 1998, chapter 1).

Moreover, the Other is also essentialized, which creates a universal Other that is positioned in a point of reference to the Subject. In fact, feminist critics argue that essentialization hides the heterogeneity of the group that is defined as the Other (Butler 1990, 1993; Mizielinska 1998; Mohanty 1998; Rich 1993). Yet the Subject must posit the Other as universal in order to subjugate the Other. Beauvoir argues that a struggle to subjugate occurs between the Subject and the Other because the two fight for recognition in order to be seen, to be heard, and to be considered. More importantly, the two fight for recognition because being recognized is to be a being (Beauvoir 1988, Introduction; Wendt 1999, 2004).

In a similar way, the national consciousness of a state is also formed through Othering. States also perceive themselves and the Other as one entity. Although, as Anderson has illustrated, a closer look shows that countries are made of several different

national consciousnesses, yet individual citizens of states often think of what they perceive to be *the* universal narrative that describes the national consciousness. In addition, Saull points out that IR Realist theory treats states "as absolute and autonomous entities" (Saull 2001, 34). Also, citizens exclude the Other to define their own national consciousness. Wendt writes that "states are constituted by narratives of 'We' as opposed to 'Them', which define individuals as members of collective identities that are not reducible to individuals. Such narratives constitute collective memories, through which individuals can share the 'experiences' of their group" (Wendt 2004, 313-314). Creating a divide between universal Subject and the Other or the normative 'we' and 'them' contributes to the solidification of national consciousness that is then attached to the state (Anderson 1991; Huntington 2004, chapter 2). In essence, this divide places one state at the center point and makes other states the Other.

4.2.2 Gendering and Ranking Anthropomorphic States
In the fight for recognition between the Subject and the Other, Beauvoir argues that the Subject creates characteristics of how the Other is or should be. This not only helps to create clearer boundaries between the Subject and the Other, but it also is a survival tactic. Giving characteristics to the Other allows the Subject to devalue the Other so the Subject is still in the center position. Devaluation occurs because of the binary relationship and since the Subject is posited as the center point, the Subject can posit itself as the valued since it needs to be recognized.

The characteristics of what the Other should be does not necessarily have anything to do with how the Other actually is, but the characteristics are placed on the Other by the Subject in order to essentialize the Other, create a clear boundary between the two, and consequently, to better define, from the Subject's point of view, the Subject (Beauvoir 1988, Introduction; Mizielinska 1998, chapters 2 and 3). For example, by characterizing the Other,

the Subject can give itself positive characteristics, such as 'good', 'male', and 'free', while at the same time characterizing the Other as the opposites, like 'bad', 'female', and 'enslaved'.

As feminist scholars have shown (see chapter 3), gender binaries are one of the most essential dichotomous structures of most societies. The gendered system is organized in binaries, which also organizes other thoughts and concepts into dichotomies that are thought to be mutually exclusive. For example, concepts such as mind/body, culture/nature, public/private, logic/intuition, objectivity/subjectivity, political/personal, aggressive/passive etc., are posited as binaries. Furthermore, since human characteristics have been gendered they are instilled with gendered cultural meanings, consequently concepts that are used to characterize the Other come to also have a gendered meaning (Beauvoir 1988; Cohn 1987, 1993; Cohn and Enloe 2003; Scott 1986, 1987, 1999). Thus, in the process of characterizing the Other, the Subject and Other are placed in a gendered system of binaries. Therefore, when discussing state in the international system, states are Othered and also characterized in a gendered system that is hierarchical.

The international system is hierarchical, even if IR theory and scholars do not recognize it (Clark 1989; Cohn 1993; Weber 2000, 1; Wendt 2004). Realist theory, and politicians and policy-makers involved in foreign policy who use a realist outlook, focus on states and differences of power in international arena. Consequently, they are also ranking states in hierarchical order. As Ian Clark writes, "after all, a system of states organized in terms of disparities in power had been intrinsically a hierarchical arrangement…" (Clark 1989, 2). IR theorists, politicians, and policy-makers may not use the term hierarchy, yet their terminology indicates such. For example, to speak of states and power in the international arena, one uses, in descending order of power, the terms Super Powers, Great Powers, medium powers, and small powers. Or one theorizes on high and low politics.

Additionally, in economic terms, one talks of the first, third, or even fourth worlds (Clark 1989; Tickner 1992). These terms convey a ranking or hierarchy of states.

More importantly, the international system is hierarchical because states are more than just gendered; they are associated with masculinity and femininity in a hierarchical power structure. Feminist scholars, such as Cohn and Scott, have illustrated that characteristics 'assigned' to men are coded as masculine and characteristics 'assigned' to women are coded as feminine (Cohn 1993; Scott 1986, 1999). More importantly, since dichotomous characteristics of female/male are posited against one another, one is valued over the other. In other words, "… to be manly is not simply to be manly, but also to be in the more highly valued position in the discourse …. It associates [one] with a particular gender, and also with a higher or lower valuation" (Cohn 1993, 229). Additionally, discourse can place a gender on subjects by the words used and the gendered imagery that the words convey (Cohn 1993; Cohn and Enloe 2003). Take the contemporary transatlantic debate on 'hard' versus 'soft' power as an example. The large debate on the European Union's (EU) common defense policy is centered on the idea of the EU as a 'hard' power (i.e. having a military) or a 'soft' power (i.e. influencing other actors through economic sanctions or incentives and also through membership enticements). Also, the debate on the end of U.S. hegemony in the international system due to the increase of 'soft' power by the EU evokes also a dichotomous gendered imagery (Leonard 2005; McCormick 2006; Reid 2004; Nye 2004). This too, is placed in a binary and coded as feminine (soft) and masculine (hard). Thus, by coding characteristics as masculine and feminine then attaching the characteristics to a state, this also places some states in a valued position over other states because of the dichotomous structure. Hence, the discourse about states, in IR theory and in the practice of international relations, places states in a system that is both gendered and hierarchical.

4.3 Chapter Conclusion

I will go into more detail on the idea of a hierarchy of states in the international arena in the next chapter, where I will analyze the discourse of the Marshall Plan in some of the Congressional hearings. I will focus on the United States as the Subject and how the U.S. Others the Soviet Union and Europe. I will also discuss how this Othering allows for gendering of the U.S. and Europe, which shapes U.S. cultural knowledge.

Chapter 5

The Discourse of the Marshall Plan and the Shaping of U.S. Cultural Knowledge

In this chapter I will analyze the transcripts of two Congressional hearing on the European Recovery Program. Much of the discourse between the testifying persons and the members of the Senate and House of Representative Committees is recurring. I could have used several quotes to illustrate my reading of the discourse. However, to limit the repetitiveness, I extracted several quotes which I believe exemplifies the Othering, gendering, and ranking of the Soviet Union and Europe.

In the first section I begin with how the discourse posits the United States as the center point and simultaneously Othering both the USSR and Europe. I then continue to show my reading of discourse conjures imagery of a gendered the U.S. and Europe. Finally, in the last section, I argue that the gendering and ranking of states shaped U.S. cultural knowledge.

5.1 The Othering and Gendering of Europe and the USSR

In this section I will discuss how the discourse Others Europe and the Soviet Union in order to posit the U.S. as the center point. In the second subsection I illustrate how the discourse genders the United States.

5.1.1 We, the [Savior] United States

As I explained in the previous chapters, Subjects define themselves against the Other in order to better define the Subject. The Other is also essentialized because essentializing creates a universal that is positioned in a point of reference, which makes everything else in relation to the center. Simultaneously, the center makes everything else the Other (Mizielinska 1998,

chapter 1). Moreover, essentializing also naturalizes categories of the Other, which is then

transferred onto the Other to categorize the Other into a group (Scott 1991).

States are no different. Since states are discussed in a socially created system, states

are also essentialized, seen as a unified actor, and Othered. This may occur in several

different ways. For example, on the first day of the hearings, 8 January 1948, Secretary of

State George Marshall and U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain Lewis W. Douglas testified in

front of eleven Senators on the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Within five

hours of testimony, the men in the room used the phrases 'we', 'us', 'our', 'them', 'they', and

'their' a total of 917 times (396, 49, 147, 51, 168, and 106 times respectively). Senator

Wiley, upon questioning Marshall on the ERP legislation, states, "the thesis of this bill is

based upon the general premise that it is in the interest of the general welfare, of *our* welfare,

and in the interests of *our* country, that *we* undertake this program" (U.S. Senate 1948, 29;

italics added). Additionally, Senator Wiley said:

> So we are contemplating building power plants, contemplating building up their
> transportation system and other things. Has that been worked out, as to what,
> security Uncle Sam should have for building up those substantial improvements
> in Europe? (U.S. Senate 1948, 33).

The Senator talked of 'their' as Europe and references the U.S. by the famous war imagery of

Uncle Sam when he questions the benefit of the United States helping to reconstruct Europe.

Here Senator Wiley clearly distinguished between the United States and Europe as two

separate entities. He does so by placing Uncle Sam as the reference point and othering

Europe through the use of 'their'.

Another example that I see as positing the United States in the center point took place

in the U.S. House of Representatives. Chairman Eaton of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

asks Secretary Marshall to explain in more detail the operation of administering state funds.

Chairman Eaton states:

> Now, will you explain to us, Mr. Secretary, how *we* are going to go into *these*
> sovereign states and administer *our* funds for *their* interest without encroaching

on the age-long method of intercourse between the governments of *those* sovereign states and *this* sovereign State? (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 38; italics added).

Here, Chairman Eaton brings forth the notion of sovereign states, which includes the concept of a state entity as a single unit (rather than just the cooperation of several sub-regions of a state). Not only does Eaton reference essentialized single state entities, he also uses 'we', 'our' and 'this sovereign State' to talk of the U.S. Furthermore, the Chairman used 'these', 'their', and 'those' to describe Europe. In one sentence, Chairman Eaton has Othered Europe three times.

Secretary Marshall also Others Europe several times. For example, during part of the Senate hearings Marshall stated the following:

> The initial suggestion of June 5 last, the concept of American assistance to Europe, has been based on the premise that European initiative and cooperation are prerequisite to European recovery. *Only the Europeans themselves can finally solve their problem.*
> The participating nations have signified *their* intention to retain the initiative in promoting their own joint recovery. *They* have pledged themselves to take effective cooperative measures. *They* have established ambitious production targets for themselves. *They* have recognized the need for financial and monetary stability and have agreed to take the necessary steps in this direction. *They* have agreed to establish a continuing organization to make most effective their cooperative work and the application of American assistance. When *our* program is initiated *we* may expect that the participating European countries will reaffirm as an organic part of that program *their* multilateral agreements (U.S. Senate 1948, 7; italics added).

Again, Marshall utilizes 'their' and 'they' to Other Europe. By using pronouns like they and their six times before talking of 'our' program and what 'we' expect, Marshall clearly marks a divide between 'we' the United States and Europe as the Other.

The discourse also essentializes the Soviet Union. In a short dialogue between Chairman Vandenberg of the Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations and Secretary Marshall, Vandenberg questions the status of a declaration of war from the Soviet Union:

> The CHAIRMAN: …has the Soviet Union officially categorically declared war-let's say declared cold war-on the success of this program?
> Secretary MARSHALL: In effect, by the statement of a responsible official of the Soviet Government in connection with the Comintern-it made a declaration of antagonism and hostility to the program. Mr. Molotov has indicated very plainly

35

his hostile attitude, the hostile attitude of the Soviet Government to the program. (U.S. Senate 1948, 16).

The discourse essentializes the USSR here, as the entire Union, a vast and diverse area, is

talked about as if it is only the Soviet country. This essentializes the USSR into just the

leaders of government.

Besides essentializing, the discourse during the Congressional hearings also Others

the Soviet Union. In front of the U.S. Senate, Secretary Marshall stated:

> Finally, the operation of the program must be related to the foreign policy of the Nation. The importance of the recovery program in our foreign affairs needs no argument.… It should, I think, be constantly kept in mind that this great project, which would be difficult enough in a normal international political climate, must be carried to success against the avowed determination of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party to oppose and sabotage it at every turn (U.S. Senate 1948, 9).

In his quote, Marshall uses the Nation to describe the United States. Although, as I outlined

in chapter 4, individuals and society may hold several concepts of a nation. Yet, here,

Marshall essentializes the array of concepts and images of the U.S. into a single word;

Nation. By doing so, Marshall conveys a sense of unity in the government and society.

Moreover, by describing how the Soviet Union and the Communist party are 'avowed' to

'sabotage' the ERP, Marshall creates a sense of unity in the United States that is directly

opposed to the evils of the USSR. The binary opposition allows for the U.S. to posit itself as

the center reference point and the USSR as the Other.

During the opening remarks of the U.S. Senate hearing, Secretary Marshall

essentializes the U.S., the USSR, and Europe. Simultaneously, he also Others the Soviet

Union and Europe. Marshall states:

> One of the major justifications of asking the American people to make the sacrifice necessary under this program is the vital stake that the United States has in helping to preserve democracy in Europe. As democratic governments they are responsive, like our own, the people of their countries-and we would not have it otherwise. We cannot expect any democratic government to take upon itself obligations or accept conditions which run counter to the basic national sentiment of its people. This program calls for free cooperation among nations mutually respecting one another's sincerity of purpose in the common endeavor-a

cooperation which we hope will long outlive the period of American assistance (U.S. Senate 1948, 7).
Marshall continues to say:

To be quite clear, this unprecedented endeavor of the New World to help the Old is neither sure nor easy. It is a calculated risk. But there can be no doubts as to the alternatives. The way of life that we have known is literally in balance.

Our country is now faced with a momentous decision. If we decide that the United States is unable or unwilling effectively to assist in the reconstruction of western Europe, we must accept the consequences of its collapse into the dictatorship of police states.

…There are efforts to almost change the face of Europe, contrary to the interests of mankind in advancing civilization, certainly as we understand and desire it (U.S. Senate 1948, 10).

In these two quotes there are several important issues to point out. First, European states are again essentialized. Marshall references the 'national sentiment of its people' yet he still shows the unity of a state by saying 'free cooperation among nations'. Additionally, Marshall employs the imagery of the New World (i.e. the contemporary America) and the Old World (i.e. the old Europe, which European fled in order to gain freedoms in what became the United States). Moreover, 'dictatorship of police states', 'efforts to change face of Europe', and 'way of life' (which refers to Truman's speech to Congress) all references the USSR without explicitly using the worlds the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Marshall attaches human characteristics to states when he says "mutually respecting one another's sincerity'. Finally, the discourse posits the U.S. as the 'preserver' of democracy.

Positing the U.S. as something positive also occurred when Senator Wiley had the floor. The dialogue went as follows:

Senator WILEY: First, Mr. Secretary, it is your judgment, and I think of all the important men in Europe, that there is an imperative need for food, clothing, and sustenance. You agree to that?
Secretary MARSHALL: Yes, sir.
Senator WILEY: That I do not think any American objects to.
Secretary MARSHALL: I think, as you said, it is our duty as a good Samaritan to meet that call (U.S. Senate 1948, 35).

Senator Wiley again talks of 'Americans' as if all are unified in their opinions. Additionally, Marshall posits the U.S. as a good Samaritan helping those in need.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, is posited as the anti-thesis to the United States in every form. The discourse conveys imagery of the USSR as bad, the enemy, and trying to spread 'tyranny' over the world. First, the Soviet Union is posited as the binary to the U.S.'s good Samaritan. For example, Secretary Marshall states that:

> This [economic problem of Europe] would exist even though it were not complicated by the ideological struggles in Europe between those who want to live as freemen and those small groups who aspire to dominate by the method of police states. The solution would be much easier, of course, if all the nations of Europe were cooperating. But they are not. Far from cooperating, the Soviet Union and the Communist parties have proclaimed their determined opposition to a plan of European economic recovery. Economic distress is to be employed to further political ends (U.S. Senate 1948, 4).

Secretary Marshall posits the USSR as hindering progress, stopping cooperation, and making a 'solution' for the economic recovery of Europe harder. Marshall also conveys a message of the USSR being selfish and wanting economic peril in Europe just to take advantage of European states. This is in contrast to the imagery Marshall conveyed of the U.S. as being willing to sacrifice in order to be the world's good Samaritan. Consequently, I believe that through the discourse, the United States is being posited as 'good', whereas the Soviet Union is posited as the binary opposite, 'bad'. The Othering the USSR as the anti-thesis to the United States helps create the subjectivity of the U.S.

Not only does the discourse of the Congressional hearings essentialize the United States, and Others the USSR, and Europe, it also genders the U.S. To begin, the ERP is an essential part of the post-war foreign policy of America. The policy is so interwoven into the imagery of the U.S., that gendering the policy, also genders the United States. While defending the European Recovery Program legislation in the Senate, Marshall evoked notions of being logical and practical, which convey a masculine gendered image. In the beginning of his statement to the U.S. Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations, Marshall stated:

> A nation in which the voice of its people directs the conduct of its affairs cannot embark on an undertaking of such magnitude and significance for light or purely sentimental reasons. Decisions of this importance are dictated by the highest considerations of national interest.... In the deliberation of the coming weeks, I

ask that the European recovery program be judged in these terms and on this basis (U.S. Senate 1948, 1).

The system of dichotomies that are seen as mutually exclusive can be interpreted as stemming from or being closely related to a gendered system. The logic and rationality characteristics are examples that correlate to masculine coded imagery, which are valued because they are masculine (Cohn 1987, 1993). Feminist authors, like Carol Cohn, Cynthia Enloe, and Ann Tickner, have shown that national security interests, which the Marshall Plan was based in, are clearly based on characteristics that conjure masculine imagery, such as logic, rationality, and intelligence (Cohn 1987, 1993; Cohn and Enloe 2003; Tickner 1992). By opening his statement to the Senate by pleading for the ERP not to be "judged on purely sentimental reasons," Marshall distanced the ERP from the feminine coded imagery of sentimentality. Marshall tried to dissociate the ERP from any form of feminine 'sentimental reasons' so as to distance the policy and the country from conveying feminine imagery.

Instead, Secretary Marshall coded the ERP as logical and thus masculine by repeatedly using 'sound foreign policy' and referencing all the economic and political logical arguments in favor of the Marshall Plan. Marshall stated several times that the ERP was practical and that it was designed by the most intelligent men in both the U.S. and Europe. Marshall actually stated that his "main concern was to make certain that [he] had the best minds available working on the problem…" (U.S. Senate 1948, 39). Marshall continued to say that he was charged with the mandate to see that "…the people who [created the ERP] were capable people, and that the procedure they followed was a practical, cooperative, efficient procedure" (U.S. Senate 1948, 39). Furthermore, the term 'sound' was used fourteen times in different contexts within the first day of testimony (U.S. Senate 1948). 'Sound' was used in order to convey a message of the masculine coded imagery of logic. For example, the men in the Senate hearings used the phrase, inter alia, "sound basis", "sound and practical arrangement", "sound foreign policy aid and assistance", "sound basic

39

organization", and "economically sound" (U.S. Senate 1948, 5, 24,and 34). Marshall even

stated: "In my judgment, the organizational proposals which have been put forward represent

a sound and practical arrangement of functions and a framework for successful

administration" (U.S. Senate 1948, 9).

Moreover, in my opinion several quotes show the participants of the discourse using

words that convey masculine imagery, such as vigorous, taking action, a leader, strong,

brave, and having power and being productive. For example, Marshall stated at the hearing

in the House of Representatives:

> The situation in Europe has not yet developed to the point where the grim progression from economic uncertainty to tyranny is probable. But without the United States support of European self-help, this progression may well become inevitable. Therefore, it is proposed that *our Nation take vigorous* action now to assist in setting in motion the processes of recovery in the second most productive area in the world (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 29; italics added).

Additionally, Marshall stated:
> The United States is the only nation with the strength to lend vital support to such a movement [referring to economic recovery] (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 31).

And he continued to say:
> We want peace. We want security. We want to see the world return to normal as quickly as possible. We are in a position of leadership by force of circumstance. A great crisis has to be met. Do we meet the situation with action or do we step aside and allow other forces to settle the matter of future European civilization? (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 32).

In the three quotes, Secretary Marshall conveys masculine images of the United States as

vigorous, taking action as opposed to being passive, the only nation with enough strength,

and as a leader in the world. Moreover, asking a rhetorical question of 'do we meet the

situation and act' invokes the image of the U.S. as being strong and brave and facing the

challenge, as opposed to 'or step aside' as being cowardly and weak. According to R.W.

Connell, the leading scholar in masculinities, activity is often connected with masculinity and

passivity with femininity (Connell 1995, 68). Thus, Marshall is provoking the Senate to take

action to affirm the masculinity of the United States.

Additionally, the discourse posits the United States as strong, which evokes masculine

imagery. An example is the following:

> Mr. JUDD: You will agree that we cannot do this without weakening ourselves, putting great strains on ourselves, and therefore it is hard to ask the people to weaken the United States even temporarily unless they are reasonably sure that out of that effort will come a compensating increase in the strength of the free democratic peoples.
> Secretary MARSHALL: I think that is about it, sir. I do not like the word "weaken," because I am inclined to believe that we are not going to weaken ourselves (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 88).

This, from my perspective, distances the United States from any imagery of femininity.

Instead, Marshall insists that the U.S. is not weak and will not be weak. Given the binary

structure that is often present in discourse-although understandstandibly that it is not as

simple as a binary-saying that America is not weak implies that the U.S. is strong. Or stated

in another way, insisting that the U.S. is not feminine implies that it is in fact masculine.

Marshall continues to talk of the strength, power, and productivity of the United

States. He says:

> "Why must the United States carry so great a load in helping Europe?" The answer is simple. The United States is the only country in the world today which has the economic power and productivity to furnish the needed assistance (U.S. Senate 1948, 4).

And:

> We happen to be, very fortunately for ourselves, the strongest nation in the world today, certainly economically, and I think in most other respects (U.S. Senate 1948, 10).

Although Secretary Marshall uses over simplification in the concept of power (which I

previously criticized in chapter 2), he nonetheless conveys a message of a strong, powerful,

productive, masculine United States.

As illustrated in this section, Others can be numerous (as they are here), but Othering still

functions to create the identity of the Subject. In this instance, the discourse of the

Congressional hearings essentialize and Others the USSR and Europe, which helps shape the

identity of the United States. Moreover, the discourse also posits the U.S. using positive and

masculine imagery. For example, those taking place in the discourse talk of America as

vigorous, a leader, strong, taking action against an 'enemy', productive and powerful, and the strongest nation. These words and characteristics all conjure imagery of masculinity that is attached to the United States.

5.1.2 You, the Othered and Gendered Europe and Soviet Union

As I have shown in the previous section, in my opinion, the discourse in the Congressional hearings on the Marshall Plan shaped the consciousness of the United States by Othering the Soviet Union and Europe. Additionally, my reading of the discourse presents a gendered version of the U.S. that is 'masculine'. Through my analysis of the transcripts of the hearings, I found that the discourse also genders Europe. In the following section I present quotes that I find to gender Europe as a subordinate masculinity.

To begin, the gendering of Europe involves different forms of masculinity and their relationships. Connell writes that hegemonic masculinity "…is not a fixed character type, always and everywhere the same. It is, rather, the masculinity that occupies the hegemonic position in a given pattern of gender relations, a position always contestable" (Connell 1995, 76). Additionally, Connell states that hegemonic masculinity relies on a combination of cultural ideas and institutional power and having authority is a key component of establishing hegemony. Also, since there are several masculinities present at a given moment in a society, the masculinities compete; hence, one masculinity is hegemonic, while others are subordinate. Consequently, the dominance and subordinance of masculinities keeps the hierarchy in place (Connell 1995, chapter 3).

My reading of the discourse of the ERP in the Congressional hearings portrays the U.S. as the hegemonic masculinity and Europe as the subordinate masculinity. Much of the discourse refers to Europe as a sick male patient that the United States must help to recovery. For example, in the House of Representatives, Secretary Marshall stated:

> The people in Europe and the people certainly in western Europe; are struggling
> with a very grave difficulty in establishing themselves in a strong position, and,

as the committee would understand better than I do, one of the difficulties is in resisting the demagogic appeals to the public who are suffering from lack of this and lack of that to a very marked degree. It is very easy to stir up dissension and it is very natural that those who lack greatly will turn to almost any leader who promises a better situation for them. It matters not whether the promise has any possibility of being carried out. They are, I think, mainly-certainly France and certainly Italy-in the situation of a man who is suffering illness, and the purpose of the program as proposed by the administration is to take action leading to the rehabilitation, you might say, for the patient until he is strong enough to take the necessary action for himself (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 42).

Marshall still codes European states as masculine because he does describe them as a 'man', yet it is a 'man who is suffering illness', which means that it is a man that is weakened. Moreover, Marshall subordinates Europe by hinting that European states are vying for power, yet they are struggling to do so. According to this example, the European states are not as strong as the U.S. and thus the masculinity of European states is also subordinate to the United States. Additionally, Europe is still passive because it is suffering, sick, and lacking basic needs. The U.S., on the other hand, is strong enough to take action against this illness when Europe cannot.

Another example of the subordinate masculinity of European states occurred in a banter between Secretary Marshall and Senator Wiley in the U.S. Senate hearings. Both men make medical references about Europe.

> Secretary MARSHALL: …This program, in effects, starts off by dealing with, we will say, sick people who are oppressed by their tribulations.
> Senator WILEY: You think this is a spiritual cocktail or a material cocktail?
> Secretary MARSHALL: I do not think it is a cocktail either way you take it. It is a very difficult problem, and one of vast consequence.
> Senator WILEY: I say that, Mr. Secretary, because I am very serious about this, and I follow your idea.
> Secretary MARSHALL: Will you allow me to finish this?
> Senator WILEY: Yes.
> Secretary MARSHALL: We are dealing with sick nations. Now, you do not get very much out of a sick man at the start. You first have to get him on his feet. You have got to get him started again. You have to give him a little faith in himself. That is what we started… (U.S. Senate 1948, 33).

Again, Marshall says that the people of Europe are sick and oppressed by their circumstance. Senator Wiley suggests a cocktail, which conveys the imagery of a cocktail of medical pills to cure the patient. Marshall then states that the U.S. is 'dealing with sick nations'. These

nations are weaker then the United States and need help. Additionally, Marshall equated

European states with a male patient that needs get back 'on his feet'. By equating European

states to male patients and saying that they are weak and need assistance to recover, Marshall

does two things. First, he genders European states as male and masculine. Second, he

subordinates the masculinity of European states by saying that they are weaker (but they have

potential).

Indeed, Marshall has the cure for Western Europe; the European Recovery Program.
Marshall stated once that:

> The aid suggested is designed to prevent the economic strangulation which now
> threatens western Europe and through that vital area endangers the free people of
> the world. This aid must cure the illness without impairing the integrity of the
> nations we wish to support. The challenge of our task is great (U.S. House of
> Representatives 1948, 29-30).

Marshall posits the U.S. as having the strength to 'cure' the problems of western Europe, and

that America is up to this great challenge. Marshall secures the hegemony of U.S.

masculinity by conveying a message of activity of the U.S. for the betterment of 'the free

people of the world'. Again, since activity conveys a sense of masculinity, Marshall is

positing the U.S. as a strong masculine state.

Moreover, in a statement in the House of Representatives, Marshall conveys a

message of European states subordination. Marshall states:

> …The western European countries, by their own efforts, have made a well-
> organized start toward recovery. *We have witnessed the unprecedented sight of
> 16 sovereign nations subordinating their diverse individual interest to a broader
> objective.* The work of the Committee for European Economic Cooperation is a
> demonstration of the will of those European nations to work out with our help
> their own salvation (U.S. House of Representatives 1948, 30; italics added).

In order for the European states to partake in the ERP, the states were required to relinquish

some sovereignty over their own nations. With the help of the United States, the countries

taking part in the ERP gave up some rights in order to reach health, salvation, and recovery.

Again, the European states are ranked under the United States in a masculine hierarchy.

In my opinion, the discourse of the European Recovery Program in the Congressional Others the Soviet Union and Europe. Additionally, the discourse also presents gendered versions of the United States and Europe. The discourse represents the United States as the hegemonic masculinity, and Europe, in contrast, is portrayed as a subordinate masculinity.

5.2 The Shaping of U.S. Cultural Knowledge

As I wrote in chapter 3, discourses in a particular society produces imagery that are used to transform interpretations into 'fact'. These facts, often universal and essentialized, become cultural knowledge, or the meaning of a concept that is produced and understood by a particular society. In the sections in this chapter I have argued that in my opinion, through the discourse of the Congressional hearings of the European Recovery Program, the U.S. shapes its own consciousness against that of Europe and the USSR via Othering. The discourse posits the U.S. as the center reference point (i.e. they are them-Europe and USSR- and we are Uncle Sam). The discourse then attaches human characteristics to the states discussed, which creates imagery of each. The discourse posits the USSR as the anti-thesis to the United States. The U.S. is depicted as the good Samaritan, the hegemonic masculinity, strong, vigor, and taking action. Europe is represented as a sick male patient in need of U.S. help, and consequently, as a subordinate masculinity.

As I have also previously stated, the international system in hierarchical. The imagery conveyed through the discourse ranks the U.S. and Europe, with America posits itself as the hegemonic masculinity and Europe as the subordinate masculinity. Consequently, the imagery conveyed in the discourse ranks the U.S. higher then Europe in the hierarchy of actors. As a result, the imagery shapes the cultural knowledge of the U.S. as ranked higher then Europe in a hierarchy of actors because the discourse sets up a binary gendered structure that posits the United States as the top tier of the ranking in a hierarchical structure.

5.3 Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter I analyzed the transcripts of two Congressional hearing on the European Recovery Program. I provided several quotes which I believe exemplifies the Othering, gendering, and ranking of the Soviet Union and Europe. I began this chapter by illustrating how I believed the essentialized discourse posits the United States as the center point and simultaneously Others Europe and the USSR. In believe the discourse posits the United States as a hegemonic masculinity with Europe being a subordinate masculinity. Finally, I have shown that, according to scholars, the imagery that is conveyed a discourse can shape the cultural knowledge of a country. I argued that the discourse of the Marshall Plan shapes cultural knowledge by positing the United States as superior to Europe in a hierarchy of actors in the international arena.

Chapter 6
Conclusion

I began this thesis by questioning how the discourse of the Marshall Plan shaped cultural knowledge in the United States. I focused on the Congressional hearing of the ERP in order to compliment the already existing literature on Cold War discourse. But first I placed the Marshall Plan in its historical context by outlining the dominant theory of International Relations of the time. I also explained the conception of the ERP. I then explained my use of gender as an analytical tool, and I describe how the process of conveying meaning to words can shape the meaning that is understood in cultures and societies. Furthermore, I examined Othering, gendering, and ranking of anthropomorphic states to argue that the discourse of IR places states in a social system that is gendered and ranked. Then, in the analysis chapter, I interpreted the discourse of the Congressional hearings on the Marshall Plan. My reading of the discourse illustrates the Othering, gendering, and ranking of the Soviet Union and Europe by the United States and I argue that this shaped U.S. cultural knowledge. My reading of the discourse of the Congressional hearings shows two consequences. First, the discourse creates Othering of the USSR and Europe in what seems to be dichotomous relationships. Second, discourse also genders the U.S. as a hegemonic masculinity and Europe as a subordinate masculinity. Consequently, this allows the discourse to posit the United States at the top of a hierarchical order of actors in the international system. This in turn creates an image of the U.S. as superior to the Others (i.e. USSR and Europe), which shapes U.S. cultural knowledge.

This thesis required the use of works from many feminist (and non-feminist) theorists from a myriad of academic disciplines. Consequently, the future research on such a topic could take several forms. For example, from a feminist Marxist perspective, the Marshall Plan could be

47

researched as a tool of American economic imperialism[5]. One could also add to the debate

between Wendt and Wight on anthropomorphic states from a gendered and/or feminist

perspective. It would be interesting to see what the consequences are of a discourse that

attaches human characteristics to states. For example, by focusing on states as a unitary actor

and personifying the state, whom or what other discourses are being silenced or marginalized.

Moreover, further research should include an investigation of how the same discourse shaped

the Soviet Union and European states. I wonder if the discourse also Others and genders?

Finally, the field of IR would benefit greatly by incorporating gender as something more than

simple female representation. Indeed, if states are 'created' in a social system that is

gendered, then it is imperative to examine the role of masculinity and femininity in the

international system. This may highlight hegemonic masculinity, competing masculinities,

inherent sexism, and homophobia on a grand scale.

---

[5] I am not the right scholar to do such research on American imperialism, as I cannot fully commit to a Marxist standpoint. Yet, given the documents that are now declassified and available to the public, I do believe there is evidence for such investigation.

Annex A:

U.S. Government Documents

Acheson, Dean. "The Requirements of Reconstruction." *Record of the Week: Department of State.* 1947. Truman Library Archives http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/index.php (accessed April 5, 2011).

Brookings Institution. *Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations United States Senate on Administration of United States Aid for a European Recovery Program.* January 22, 1948. Brookings Institution http://www.brookings.edu/comm/marshall/19480122cmtereport.pdf (accessed October 12, 2011).

European Recovery Program. "European Recovery Program Basic Document No. 1", October 31, 1947. Truman Library http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/documents/index.php?documentdate=1947-10-31&documentid=6-3&pagenumber=1 (accessed October 9, 2011).

Kennan, George F. *The Charge in the Soviet Union (Kennan) to the Secretary of State.* February 22, 1946. George Washington University http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm (accessed October 9, 2011).

Marshall, George. "European Initiative Essential to Economic Recovery", June 5, 1947. Harvard University. Truman Library Archives http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/index.php (accessed April 5, 2011).

"The Immediate Need for Emergency Aid to Europe." September 29, 1947. Truman Library Archives http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/index.php (accessed April 5, 2011).

Truman, Harry S. "President Harry S. Truman's Address Before a Joint Session of Congress, March 12, 1947." Yale University. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/trudoc.asp (accessed November 20, 2011).

U.S. Department of State. March-July 1947. "The Development of the Foreign Reconstruction Policy of the United States." Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. George Marshall Foundation. http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 25, 2011).

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Foreign Affairs. *Emergency Foreign Aid: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.* 80th Cong., 1st sess., November 10, 12,

13, 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 25, 1947. George Marshall Foundation.
http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 5, 2011).
---. Committee on Foreign Affairs. *United States Foreign Policy for a Post-War Recovery Program: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.* 80th Cong., 1st and 2nd sess., December 17, 1947, January 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 1948, February 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 1948. George Marshall Foundation. http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 5, 2011).

U.S. Senate. Committee on Foreign Relations. *Interim Aid for Europe: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations.* 80th Cong., 1st sess., November 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. 1947. George Marshall Foundation. http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 5, 2011).
---. *European Recovery Program: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations.* 80th Cong.,2nd sess., January 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 1948. George Marshall Foundation. http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 5, 2011).

Bibliography

Acheson, Dean. May 18, 1947. "The Requirements of Reconstruction." *Record of the Week: Department of State.* Truman Library Archives http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/index.php (accessed April 5, 2011).

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 1991.

Baxter, Judith. *Positioning Gender in Discourse: a Feminist Methodology*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2003.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by H.M. Parshley. London: Picador, 1988.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble" Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
---. "Imagination and Gender Insubordination". In *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, Henry Abelove, Michele Barale, David Halperin eds, 310-321. London: Routledge, 1993.

Carpenter, Charli R. "Gender Theory in World Politics: Contributions of a Nonfeminist Standpoint?" *International Studies Review*, vol.4, no. 3 (2002): 153-165.

Clark, Ian. *The Hierarchy of States: Reform and Resistance in the International Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Cohn, Carol. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, vol. 12, no. 4 (1987): 687-718.
--- . "War, Wimps, and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War." In *Gendering War Talk*, M. Cooke and A. Woollacott eds., 227-246. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
--- and Cynthia Enloe. "A Conversation with Cynthia Enloe: Feminists Look at Masculinity and Men Who Wage War." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28, no. 4 (2003): 1187-1207.

Connell, R.W. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Cranny-Francis, Anne, Wendy Waring, Pam Savropoulos, and Joan Kirkby. *Gender Studies: Terms and Debates*. New York: Palgrave MacMillian, 2003.

Elman, Colin. "Realism." In *Security Studies: an Introduction*, Paul Williams ed., 103-115. New York: Routledge, 2008.

European Recovery Program. "European Recovery Program Basic Document No. 1", October 31, 1947. Truman Library http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/documents/index.php?documentdate=1947-10-31&documentid=6-3&pagenumber=1 (accessed October 9, 2011).

European Union. "History of the European Union: 1945-1959." http://europa.eu/about-eu/eu-history/index_en.htm (accessed December 6, 2011).

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality Volume I: an Introduction*. New York: Pantheon, 1978.

George C. Marshall Foundation. "Congressional Testimonies." http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed December 6, 2011).
---. "About Marshall.: http://www.marshallfoundation.org/about/index.html (accessed December 6, 2001a).

Goodrich, Malinda. "Appendix B: The Council of Mutual Economic Assistance." In "A Country Study: Germany, East (Former)." Library of Congress http://memory.loc.gov/frd/cs/germany_east/gx_appnb.html (accessed October 9, 2011).

Guinnane, Timothy W. "Finacial *Vergangenheitsbewältigung*: the 1953 London Debt Agreement". Economic Growth Center, Yale University. Center Discussion Paper No. 880. January 2004. http://www.econ.yale.edu/growth_pdf/cdp880.pdf (accessed)ctober 9, 2011).

Hinds, Lynn Boyd and Theodore Otto Windt, Jr. *The Cold War as Rehtoric: the Beginnings, 1945-1950*. New York: Praeger, 1991.

Huntington, Samuel P. *Who are we?* New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004.

Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. "Forum Introduction. Is there State a Person? Why Should We Care?" *Review of International Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2 (2004): 255-258.
---. "Hegel's House, or 'People are states too'." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 30, no.2 (2004a): 281-287.

Judt, Tony. *Postwar: a History of Europe Since 1945*. New York: Penguin Press, 2005.

Kennan, George F. *The Charge in the Soviet Union (Kennan) to the Secretary of State*. February 22, 1946. George Washington University http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm (accessed October 9, 2011).

Leonard, Mark. *Why Europe Will Run the 21st Century*. London: Fourth Estate, 2005.

Marshall, George. "European Initiative Essential to Economic Recovery", June 5, 1947. Truman Library Archives http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/index.php (accessed April 5, 2011).

McCormick, John. *The European Superpower*. New York: Palgrave MacMillian, 2006.

Mearsheimer, John J. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2001.

Mee, Charles Jr. *The Marshall Plan: The Launching of the Pax Americana*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984.

Mizielinska, Joanna. *No Exit? The Problem of Exclusion and "Othering" within Feminist and Lesbian Subjectivity*. MA Thesis, Central European University, 1998.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Feminist Review*, vol. 30 (1988): 61-88.

Nye, Joseph. *Soft Power: the Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affair, 2004.

Osiander, Andreas. "Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth." *International Organization*, vol. 55, no. 2 (2001): 251-287.

Price, Harry Bayard. *The Marshall Plan and Its Meaning*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1955.

Reid, T.R. *The United States of Europe: the New Superpower and the End of American Supremacy*. New York: Penguin Press, 2004.

Rich, Adrienne. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence." *Signs*, vol. 5, no. 4 (1980): 631-660.

Scott, Joan W. "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis." *The American Historical Review*, vol. 19, no. 5 (1986): 1053-1075.
---. "On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History." *International Labor and Working-Class History*, no. 31 (1987): 1-13.
---. "The Evidence of Experience." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 17, no. 4 (Summer 1991): 773-797.
---. *Gender and the Politics of History*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1999.

Saull, Richard. *Rethinking Theory and History in the Cold War: The State, Military Power and Social Revolution*. London: Frank Cass, 2001.

See, Jennifer W. "Ideology." In Alexander DeConde et al., *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy: Volume 2*, 187-202. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2002.

Sibley, Katherine A.S. "Foreign Aid." In Alexander DeConde et al., *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy: Volume 2*, 93-109. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 2002.

Sieber, Sam. *Second-Rate Nation: from the American Dream to the American Myth*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers, 2005.

Sjoberg, Laura. "Introduction to *Security Studies*: Feminist Contributions." *Security Studies*, 18 (2009): 183-213.

Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll. "The Republican Gentleman: the Race to Rhetorical Stability in the new United States." In *Masculinities in Politics and War: Gendering Modern History*, Stefan Dudink, Karen Hagemann, and Josh Tosh eds., 61-76. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004.

"The Immediate Need for Emergency Aid to Europe." September 29, 1947. Truman Library Archives

http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/marshall/large/index.php
(accessed April 5, 2011).

Tickner, J. Ann. "Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism: a Feminist Standpoint." In *Gender and International Relations*, Rebecca Grand and Kathleen Newland eds., 27-40. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1991.
---. *Gender In International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1992.
---. *Gendering World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2001.

Titscher, Stefan, Michael Meyer, Ruth Wodak, and Eva Vetter. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. Translated by Bryan Jenner. London: Sage Publications, 2000.

Truman, Harry S. "President Harry S. Truman's Address Before a Joint Session of Congress, March 12, 1947." Yale University. http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/trudoc.asp (accessed November 20, 2011).

U.S. Department of State. March-July 1947. "The Development of the Foreign Reconstruction Policy of the United States." Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office. George Marshall Foundation. http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 25, 2011).

U.S. House of Representatives. Committee on Foreign Affairs. *United States Foreign Policy for a Post-War Recovery Program: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.* 80th Cong., 1st and 2nd sess., December 17, 1947, January 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 1948, February 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 1948. George Marshall Foundation. http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 5, 2011).

U.S. Senate. *European Recovery Program: Hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations.* 80th Cong.,2nd sess., January 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 1948. George Marshall Foundation. http://www.marshallfoundation.org/Database.htm (accessed April 5, 2011).

Van Dijk, Teun A. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen, and Heidi E. Hamilton, *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, 352-371. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Volgy, Thomas and Alison Bailin. *International Politics & State Strength*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2003.

Waylen, Georgina. "You Still Don't Understand: Why Troubled Engagements Continue Between Feminists and (critical) IPE." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 32 (2006): 145-164.

Weber, Cynthia. *International Relations Theory: an Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2001.

Weber, Katja. *Hierarchy Amidst Anarchy: Transaction Costs and Institutional Choice*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000.

Wendt, Alexander. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

---. "The State as a Person in International Theory." *Review of International Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2 (2004): 289-316.

Whitworth, Sandra. "Feminist Perspectives." In *Security Studies: an Introduction*, Paul Williams ed., 103-115. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Wight, Colin. "State Agency: Social Action without Human Activity?" *Review of International Studies*, vol. 30, no. 2 (2004): 269-280.

Wilcox, Laura. "Gendering the Cult of the Offensive." *Security Studies*, vol. 18 (2009): 214-240.