

Butter Battle Book and the First Step of the Arms Race

Strap on your boots soldier...General Bloom wants to know:

1. Remember (Recall Facts)

- a. What were the key technological advancements in weapons development between 1949 and 1955?
- b. How did the development of nuclear weapons influence military strategy during this time period?
- c. What was the purpose of the USS Nautilus, and why was it a significant advancement?

2. Understand (Explain Concepts)

- a. How did the arms race between the U.S. and the Soviet Union reflect the broader tensions of the Cold War?
- b. In what ways did new military technologies from 1949-1955 shift military doctrine and global power balance?
- c. Why do you think both sides felt the need to continue escalating their military capabilities even after nuclear deterrence was established?

3. Apply (Use Information in a New Way)

- a. If you were a military strategist in 1955, how would you advise your country to respond to Soviet advancements?
- b. How does The Butter Battle Book use metaphor to explain the Cold War arms race? Give specific examples.
- c. Based on what you learned about Cold War weapons, what parallels can you draw between real-world military developments and the events in The Butter Battle Book?

4. Analyze (Break Down Information)

- a. How did the introduction of nuclear propulsion and jet technology change military logistics and strategy?
- b. Compare and contrast NATO's and the Soviet Union's approach to weapons development during this period. Which seemed more effective in 1955?
- c. What are the ethical considerations of escalating an arms race? How do these concerns appear in both history and The Butter Battle Book?

5. Evaluate (Justify a Decision or Position)

- a. In hindsight, do you think the massive investment in arms between 1949-1955 made the world safer or more dangerous? Defend your answer.
- b. If you had been in charge of arms policy in 1955, would you have focused more on nuclear deterrence or conventional weapons? Why?
- c. Was the arms race an inevitable consequence of Cold War politics, or could a different approach have been taken? Explain your reasoning.