

How to Edit

Paper Guidelines

- Have an argument articulated in a thesis statement (1-3 sentences) in the first two paragraphs of the paper .
- This thesis then should be the basis for the paper's organization.
- The argument need not require outside research.

George Orwell

What is above all needed is to let the meaning choose the word, and not the other way about. In prose, the worst thing one can do with words is to surrender to them.

- i. Never use a metaphor, simile or other figure of speech which you are used to seeing in print.
- ii. Never use a long word where a short one will do.
- iii. If it is possible to cut a word out, always cut it out.
- iv. Never use the passive where you can use the active.
- v. Never use a foreign phrase, a scientific word or a jargon word if you can think of an everyday English equivalent.
- vi. Break any of these rules sooner than say anything outright barbarous.

Examples

- I cannot agree with this statement. The interpretation seemed to be strongly biased in favor of the United States and the Western ideology as is suggested by the fact it was used until the end of the Cold War. Since then more information has become available and it has become clear that Khrushchev got the promise of removal US nuclear weapons from Turkey and understood it was also in Kennedy's interest to keep that promise and not diminish US credibility in future negotiations with the USSR.
- I would also argue that Kennedy's position was adequate to the situation and in no way an overreaction. The US had local superiority and overall nuclear superiority, although they could not know it for certain at the time, and the threat of nuclear weapons so close to the US coast would mean rewriting the whole US strategy, while also probably prolonging the tense period of the Cold War. This was not at all compatible to the US long-term goals and also presented clear, immediate threat as well.
- To sum up there was not a clear winner or loser, but both sides have learned from this crisis. Unfortunately for Khrushchev it also meant the rise of strong opposition that plotted against him.
- 207 words

- There is a number of problems with the view that Kennedy was the one who took a strong position and Khrushchev the one who backed down. Instead I would say that both were not only willing to accept a compromise solution, but also actively searching for one.
- In fact at the beginning the initiative was on the USA's side, and they were the ones who had to do something. Looking at it from this perspective, it doesn't seem that Kennedy took a particularly strong stance, rather he opted for one of the milder options on their list. By imposing a blockade he showed his resolve if the Soviets push on, but he also showed that there are other paths. Kennedy also considered many other aspects to the problem as more or equally important to whether he is going to look weak. Most importantly, he placed the need to prevent war above all other interests. Although most members of his advisory group argued at one point for a tougher stance, he kept on searching for a more lenient solution.
- In regards to Khrushchev, I wouldn't say his reaction equals to backing down. He knew there was no way he could continue with his plan once the missiles were discovered, however he kept holding on to hope that he could gain something out of the situation, as he in the end did. In the end American missiles were removed from Turkey and the USA promised not to invade Cuba. Khrushchev didn't want to escalate the crisis, and so he opted for an agreement, but that doesn't make his approach significantly different from Kennedy's.

- **272 words**

- It is my belief that the Cuban Missile Crisis is no exception to the historic rule: that history is written by the 'winners'. In retrospect, there was no winner nor loser in this situation, but rather a heavily negotiated tie. However, in the end the USSR perished and the US remained- and sources to cover for the US stance on the crisis are abundant and accessible. The US sphere of influence on historical accounts surely are superior. The aforementioned interpretation does not hold up, mainly due to the time in which it was adopted. The Cold War was centred around manipulation of the current state of events and status, from both sides. The idea of Kennedy taking a strong position to which Khrushchev had to bow only favours the American interest of how history views the crisis. Any other narrative would have lowered American morale and threatened common the belief of superiority which fostered trust in the system. Besides, there would not have been an alternative scenario in which one or the other would not back down, nor follow through with the threat of nuclear retaliation. The cold war indeed was a heated and intense period of geopolitical altercation, which required measures previously uncalled for. This, however, does not imply that either side was insane enough to sacrifice themselves (and the rest of the world) for their ideological cause. I would argue that it is not too far off to consider this a case of two child-like figures playing pretence with extremely dangerous toys at their disposal.
- 256 words