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**Lobbying Campaign**

This unit covers years of great social and political turmoil. Imagine that you have decided to lobby for—convince government officials to support—a cause or issue that is important to you. Create a plan for lobbying in which you encourage others to support your point of view.

*Civil Rights March, 1965 by James Karales*
What were the achievements and challenges of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations?

In this chapter you will learn about President John F. Kennedy’s New Frontier and President Lyndon B. Johnson’s Great Society.

SECTION 1: Kennedy and the Cold War
Main Idea The Kennedy administration faced some of the most dangerous Soviet confrontations in American history.

SECTION 2: The New Frontier
Main Idea While Kennedy had trouble getting his ideas for a New Frontier passed, several goals were achieved.

SECTION 3: The Great Society
Main Idea The demand for reform helped create a new awareness of social problems, especially on matters of civil rights and the effects of poverty.

Scientific and technological advances in the early 1960s made possible the first American spacewalk during the Gemini 6 mission on June 3, 1965.
Against the backdrop of an intense space race between America and the Soviet Union, the 1960 presidential election approaches. The leading candidates are a young, charismatic senator and the ambitious, experienced vice president. The new president will face tremendous responsibilities. Abroad, the Soviet Union is stockpiling nuclear weapons. At home, millions suffer from poverty and discrimination.

**Explore the Issues**

- How can a leader motivate and influence the public?
- What skills are needed to persuade legislators?
- What enables a leader to respond to crises?
John F. Kennedy became the 35th president of the United States on a crisp and sparkling day in January 1961. Appearing without a coat in freezing weather, he issued a challenge to the American people. He said that the world was in “its hour of maximum danger,” as Cold War tensions ran high. Rather than shrinking from the danger, the United States should confront the “iron tyranny” of communism.

A PERSONAL VOICE  JOHN F. KENNEDY

“Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans, born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage, and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed. . . .

Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any . . . foe, in order to assure . . . the survival and the success of liberty.”

—Inaugural Address, January 20, 1961

The young president won praise for his well-crafted speech. However, his words were put to the test when several Cold War crises tried his leadership.

The Election of 1960

In 1960, as President Eisenhower’s second term drew to a close, a mood of restlessness arose among voters. The economy was in a recession. The USSR’s launch of Sputnik I in 1957 and its development of long-range missiles had sparked fears that the American military was falling behind that of the Soviets. Further setbacks including the U-2 incident and the alignment of Cuba with the Soviet Union had Americans questioning whether the United States was losing the Cold War.
The Democratic nominee for president, Massachusetts senator John Kennedy, promised active leadership “to get America moving again.” His Republican opponent, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, hoped to win by riding on the coattails of Eisenhower’s popularity. Both candidates had similar positions on policy issues. Two factors helped put Kennedy over the top: television and the civil rights issue.

**THE TELEVISION DEBATE AFFECTS VOTES** Kennedy had a well-organized campaign and the backing of his wealthy family, and was handsome and charismatic. Yet many felt that, at 43, he was too inexperienced. If elected, he would be the second-youngest president in the nation’s history.

Americans also worried that having a Roman Catholic in the White House would lead either to influence of the pope on American policies or to closer ties between church and state. Kennedy was able to allay worries by discussing the issue openly.

One event in the fall determined the course of the election. Kennedy and Nixon took part in the first televised debate between presidential candidates. On September 26, 1960, 70 million TV viewers watched the two articulate and knowledgeable candidates debating issues. Nixon, an expert on foreign policy, had agreed to the forum in hopes of exposing Kennedy’s inexperience. However, Kennedy had been coached by television producers, and he looked and spoke better than Nixon.

Kennedy’s success in the debate launched a new era in American politics: the television age. As journalist Russell Baker, who covered the Nixon campaign, said, “That night, image replaced the printed word as the natural language of politics.”

**KENNEDY AND CIVIL RIGHTS** A second major event of the campaign took place in October. Police in Atlanta, Georgia, arrested the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., and 33 other African-American demonstrators for sitting at a segregated lunch counter. Although the other demonstrators were released, King was sentenced to months of hard labor—officially for a minor traffic violation. The Eisenhower administration refused to intervene, and Nixon took no public position.

When Kennedy heard of the arrest and sentencing, he telephoned King’s wife, Coretta Scott King, to express his sympathy. Meanwhile, Robert Kennedy, his brother and campaign manager, persuaded the judge who had sentenced King to release the civil rights leader on bail, pending appeal. News of the incident captured the immediate attention of the African-American community, whose votes would help Kennedy carry key states in the Midwest and South.
The Camelot Years

The election in November 1960 was the closest since 1884; Kennedy won by fewer than 119,000 votes. His inauguration set the tone for a new era at the White House: one of grace, elegance, and wit. On the podium sat over 100 writers, artists, and scientists that the Kennedys had invited, including opera singer Marian Anderson, who had once been barred from singing at Constitution Hall because she was African American. Kennedy’s inspiring speech called for hope, commitment, and sacrifice. “And so, my fellow Americans,” he proclaimed, “ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.”

During his term, the president and his beautiful young wife, Jacqueline, invited many artists and celebrities to the White House. In addition, Kennedy often appeared on television. The press loved his charm and wit and helped to bolster his image.

The Kennedy Mystique

Critics of Kennedy’s presidency argued that his smooth style lacked substance. But the new first family fascinated the public. For example, after learning that JFK could read 1,600 words a minute, thousands of people enrolled in speed-reading courses. The first lady, too, captivated the nation with her eye for fashion and culture. It seemed the nation could not get enough of the first family. Newspapers and magazines filled their pages with pictures and stories about the president’s young daughter Caroline and his infant son John.

With JFK’s youthful glamour and his talented advisers, the Kennedy White House reminded many of a modern-day Camelot, the mythical court of King Arthur. Coincidentally, the musical Camelot had opened on Broadway in 1960. Years later, Jackie recalled her husband and the vision of Camelot.

A PERSONAL VOICE  JACQUELINE KENNEDY

“At night, before we’d go to sleep, Jack liked to play some records and the song he loved most came at the very end of [the Camelot] record. The lines he loved to hear were: ‘Don’t let it be forgot, that once there was a spot, for one brief shining moment that was known as Camelot.’ There’ll be great presidents again . . . but there’ll never be another Camelot again.”

—quoted in Life magazine, John F. Kennedy Memorial Edition

THE BEST AND THE BRIGHTEST

Kennedy surrounded himself with a team of advisers that one journalist called “the best and the brightest.” They included McGeorge Bundy, a Harvard University dean, as national security adviser; Robert McNamara, president of Ford Motor Company, as secretary of defense; and Dean Rusk, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, as secretary of state. Of all the advisers who filled Kennedy’s inner circle, he relied most heavily on his 35-year-old brother Robert, whom he appointed attorney general.
A New Military Policy

From the beginning, Kennedy focused on the Cold War. He thought the Eisenhower administration had not done enough about the Soviet threat. The Soviets, he concluded, were gaining loyalties in the economically less-developed third-world countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. He blasted the Republicans for allowing communism to develop in Cuba, at America’s doorstep.

**DEFINING A MILITARY STRATEGY** Kennedy believed his most urgent task was to redefine the nation's nuclear strategy. The Eisenhower administration had relied on the policy of massive retaliation to deter Soviet aggression and imperialism. However, threatening to use nuclear arms over a minor conflict was not a risk Kennedy wished to take. Instead, his team developed a policy of **flexible response**. Kennedy’s secretary of defense, Robert McNamara, explained the policy.

Kennedy increased defense spending in order to boost conventional military forces—nonnuclear forces such as troops, ships, and artillery—and to create an elite branch of the army called the Special Forces, or Green Berets. He also tripled the overall nuclear capabilities of the United States. These changes enabled the United States to fight limited wars around the world while maintaining a balance of nuclear power with the Soviet Union. However, even as Kennedy hoped to reduce the risk of nuclear war, the world came perilously close to nuclear war under his command as a crisis arose over the island of Cuba.

**Crises over Cuba**

The first test of Kennedy’s foreign policy came in Cuba, just 90 miles off the coast of Florida. About two weeks before Kennedy took office, on January 3, 1961, President Eisenhower had cut off diplomatic relations with Cuba because of a revolutionary leader named **Fidel Castro**. Castro openly declared himself a communist and welcomed aid from the Soviet Union.

**THE CUBAN DILEMMA** Castro gained power with the promise of democracy. From 1956 to 1959, he led a guerrilla movement to topple dictator Fulgencio Batista. He won control in 1959 and later told reporters, “Revolutionaries are not born, they are made by poverty, inequality, and dictatorship.” He then promised to eliminate these conditions from Cuba.

The United States was suspicious of Castro’s intentions but nevertheless recognized the new government. However, when Castro seized three American and British oil refineries, relations between the United States and Cuba worsened. Castro also broke up commercial farms into communes that would be worked by formerly landless peasants. American sugar companies,
which controlled 75 percent of the crop land in Cuba, appealed to the U.S. government for help. In response, Congress erected trade barriers against Cuban sugar.

Castro relied increasingly on Soviet aid—and on the political repression of those who did not agree with him. While some Cubans were taken by his charisma and his willingness to stand up to the United States, others saw Castro as a tyrant who had replaced one dictatorship with another. About 10 percent of Cuba’s population went into exile, mostly to the United States. Within the large exile community of Miami, Florida, a counterrevolutionary movement took shape.

THE BAY OF PIGS In March 1960, President Eisenhower gave the CIA permission to secretly train Cuban exiles for an invasion of Cuba. The CIA and the exiles hoped it would trigger a mass uprising that would overthrow Castro. Kennedy learned of the plan only nine days after his election. Although he had doubts, he approved it.

On the night of April 17, 1961, some 1,300 to 1,500 Cuban exiles supported by the U.S. military landed on the island’s southern coast at Bahia de Cochinos, the Bay of Pigs. Nothing went as planned. An air strike had failed to knock out the Cuban air force, although the CIA reported that it had succeeded. A small advance group sent to distract Castro’s forces never reached shore. When the main unit landed, it lacked American air support as it faced 25,000 Cuban troops backed up by Soviet tanks and jets. Some of the invading exiles were killed, others imprisoned.

The Cuban media sensationalized the defeat of “North American mercenaries.” One United States commentator observed that Americans “look like fools to our friends, rascals to our enemies, and incompetents to the rest.” The disaster left Kennedy embarrassed. Publicly, he accepted blame for the fiasco. Privately, he asked, “How could that crowd at the CIA and the Pentagon be this wrong.”

Kennedy negotiated with Castro for the release of surviving commandos and paid a ransom of $53 million in food and medical supplies. In a speech in Miami, he promised exiles that they would one day return to a “free Havana.” Although Kennedy warned that he would resist further Communist expansion in the Western Hemisphere, Castro defiantly welcomed further Soviet aid.

THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS Castro had a powerful ally in Moscow: Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, who promised to defend Cuba with Soviet arms. During the summer of 1962, the flow to Cuba of Soviet weapons—including nuclear missiles—increased greatly. President Kennedy responded with a warning that America would not tolerate offensive nuclear weapons in Cuba. Then, on October 14, photographs taken by American planes revealed Soviet missile bases in Cuba—and some contained missiles ready to launch. They could reach U.S. cities in minutes.

On October 22, Kennedy informed an anxious nation of the existence of Soviet missile sites in Cuba and of his plans to remove them. He made it clear that any missile attack from Cuba would trigger an all-out attack on the Soviet Union.
**GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER**

1. **Movement** About how long would it have taken for a missile launched from Cuba to reach New York?

2. **Human-Environment Interaction** Why do you think it may have been important for Soviet missiles to reach the U.S. cities shown above?
For the next six days, the world faced the terrifying possibility of nuclear war. In the Atlantic Ocean, Soviet ships—presumably carrying more missiles—headed toward Cuba, while the U.S. Navy prepared to quarantine Cuba and prevent the ships from coming within 500 miles of it. In Florida, 100,000 troops waited—the largest invasion force ever assembled in the United States. C. Douglas Dillon, Kennedy’s secretary of the treasury and a veteran of nuclear diplomacy, recalled those tension-filled days of October.

The first break in the crisis occurred when the Soviet ships stopped suddenly to avoid a confrontation at sea. Secretary of State Dean Rusk said, “We are eyeball to eyeball, and the other fellow just blinked.” A few days later, Khrushchev offered to remove the missiles in return for an American pledge not to invade Cuba. The United States also secretly agreed to remove missiles from Turkey. The leaders agreed, and the crisis ended. “For a moment, the world had stood still,” Robert Kennedy wrote years later, “and now it was going around again.”

The crisis severely damaged Khrushchev’s prestige in the Soviet Union and the world. Kennedy did not escape criticism either. Some people criticized Kennedy for practicing brinkmanship when private talks might have resolved the crisis without the threat of nuclear war. Others believed he had passed up an ideal chance to invade Cuba and oust Castro. (It was learned in the 1990s that the CIA had underestimated the numbers of Soviet troops and nuclear weapons on the island.)

The effects of the crisis lasted long after the missiles had been removed. Many Cuban exiles blamed the Democrats for “losing Cuba” (a charge that Kennedy had earlier leveled at the Republicans) and switched their allegiance to the GOP.

A PERSONAL VOICE
C. DOUGLAS DILLON

“The only time I felt a fear of nuclear war or a use of nuclear weapons was on the very first day, when we’d decided that we had to do whatever was necessary to get the missiles out. There was always some background fear of what would eventually happen, and I think this is what was expressed when people said they feared they would never see another Saturday.”

—quoted in On the Brink
Meanwhile, Castro closed Cuba’s doors to the exiles in November 1962 by banning all flights to and from Miami. Three years later, hundreds of thousands of people took advantage of an agreement that allowed Cubans to join relatives in the United States. By the time Castro sharply cut down on exit permits in 1973, the Cuban population in Miami had increased to about 300,000.

**Crisis over Berlin**

One goal that had guided Kennedy through the Cuban missile crisis was that of proving to Khruschev his determination to contain communism. All the while, Kennedy was thinking of their recent confrontation over Berlin, which had led to the construction of the Berlin Wall, a concrete wall topped with barbed wire that severed the city in two.

**THE BERLIN CRISIS** In 1961, Berlin was a city in great turmoil. In the 11 years since the Berlin Airlift, almost 3 million East Germans—20 percent of that country’s population—had fled into West Berlin because it was free from Communist rule. These refugees advertised the failure of East Germany’s Communist government. Their departure also dangerously weakened that country’s economy.

The “death strip” stretched like a barren moat around West Berlin, with patrols, floodlights, electric fences, and vehicle traps between the inner and outer walls.

Walls and other barriers 10–15 feet high surrounded West Berlin. The length of the barriers around the city totaled about 110 miles.

Guard dogs and machine guns dissuaded most people from crossing over illegally, yet some still dared.

The Berlin Wall was first made of brick and barbed wire, but was later erected in cement and steel.

**THE BERLIN WALL, 1961**

In 1961, Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet premier, ordered the Berlin Wall built to stop the flow of refugees from East to West Berlin. Most were seeking freedom from Communist rule. The wall isolated West Berlin from a hostile German Democratic Republic (GDR). Passing from East to West was almost impossible without the Communist government’s permission.

During the 28 years the wall was standing, approximately 5,000 people succeeded in fleeing. Almost 200 people died in the attempt; most were shot by the GDR border guards. In 1989, East Germany opened the Berlin Wall to cheering crowds. Today the few remnants of the wall are a reminder of Cold War tensions between East and West.
Khrushchev realized that this problem had to be solved. At a summit meeting in Vienna, Austria, in June 1961, he threatened to sign a treaty with East Germany that would enable that country to close all the access roads to West Berlin. When Kennedy refused to give up U.S. access to West Berlin, Khrushchev furiously declared, “I want peace. But, if you want war, that is your problem.”

After returning home, Kennedy told the nation in a televised address that Berlin was “the great testing place of Western courage and will.” He pledged “[W]e cannot and will not permit the Communists to drive us out of Berlin.”

Kennedy’s determination and America’s superior nuclear striking power prevented Khrushchev from closing the air and land routes between West Berlin and West Germany. Instead, the Soviet premier surprised the world with a shocking decision. Just after midnight on August 13, 1961, East German troops began to unload concrete posts and rolls of barbed wire along the border. Within days, the Berlin Wall was erected, separating East Germany from West Germany.

The construction of the Berlin Wall ended the Berlin crisis but further aggravated Cold War tensions. The wall and its armed guards successfully reduced the flow of East German refugees to a tiny trickle, thus solving Khrushchev’s main problem. At the same time, however, the wall became an ugly symbol of Communist oppression.

SEARCHING FOR WAYS TO EASE TENSIONS  Showdowns between Kennedy and Khrushchev made both leaders aware of the gravity of split-second decisions that separated Cold War peace from nuclear disaster. Kennedy, in particular, searched for ways to tone down his hard-line stance. In 1963, he announced that the two nations had established a hot line between the White House and the Kremlin. This dedicated phone enabled the leaders of the two countries to communicate at once should another crisis arise. Later that year, the United States and Soviet Union also agreed to a Limited Test Ban Treaty that barred nuclear testing in the atmosphere.
The New Frontier

**Main Idea**
While Kennedy had trouble getting his ideas for a New Frontier passed, several goals were achieved.

**Why It Matters Now**
Kennedy’s space program continues to generate scientific and engineering advances that benefit Americans.

**Terms & Names**
- New Frontier
- mandate
- Peace Corps
- Alliance for Progress
- Warren Commission

---

**On May 5, 1961,** American astronaut Alan Shepard climbed into Freedom 7, a tiny capsule on top of a huge rocket booster. The capsule left the earth’s atmosphere in a ball of fire and returned the same way, and Shepard became the first American to travel into space. Years later, he recalled his emotions when a naval crew fished him out of the Atlantic.

**A Personal Voice**

**ALAN SHEPARD**

“Until the moment I stepped out of the flight deck . . . I hadn’t realized the intensity of the emotions and feelings that so many people had for me, for the other astronauts, and for the whole manned space program. . . . I was very close to tears as I thought, it’s no longer just our fight to get ‘out there.’ The struggle belongs to everyone in America. . . . From now on there was no turning back.”

—Moon Shot: The Inside Story of America’s Race to the Moon

The entire trip—which took only 15 minutes from liftoff to splashdown—reaffirmed the belief in American ingenuity. John F. Kennedy inspired many Americans with the same kind of belief.

---

**The Promise of Progress**

Kennedy set out to transform his broad vision of progress into what he called the **New Frontier.** “We stand today on the edge of a New Frontier,” Kennedy had announced upon accepting the nomination for president. He called on Americans to be “new pioneers” and explore “uncharted areas of science and space, . . . unconquered pockets of ignorance and prejudice, unanswered questions of poverty and surplus.”

Kennedy had difficulty turning his vision into reality, however. He offered Congress proposals to provide medical care for the aged, rebuild blighted urban areas, and aid education, but he couldn't gather enough votes. Kennedy faced the same conservative coalition that had blocked President Truman’s Fair Deal.
ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

WHAT IS A RECESSION?
A recession is, in a general sense, a moderate slowdown of the economy marked by increased unemployment and reduced personal consumption. In 1961, the nation’s jobless rate climbed from just under 6 percent to nearly 7 percent. Personal consumption of several major items declined that year, as people worried about job security and, as a result, spent less money. Car sales, for example, dropped by more than $1 billion from the previous year, while fewer people took overseas vacations. Perhaps the surest sign that the country had entered a recession was the admission by government officials of how bleak the situation was. “We are in a full-fledged recession,” Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg declared in February of 1961.

What is a RECESSION?
A recession is, in a general sense, a moderate slowdown of the economy marked by increased unemployment and reduced personal consumption. In 1961, the nation’s jobless rate climbed from just under 6 percent to nearly 7 percent. Personal consumption of several major items declined that year, as people worried about job security and, as a result, spent less money. Car sales, for example, dropped by more than $1 billion from the previous year, while fewer people took overseas vacations. Perhaps the surest sign that the country had entered a recession was the admission by government officials of how bleak the situation was. “We are in a full-fledged recession,” Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg declared in February of 1961.

In his efforts to push his domestic reform measures through Congress, Kennedy showed little skill. Since he had been elected by the slimmest of margins, he lacked a popular mandate—a clear indication that voters approved of his plans. As a result, he often tried to play it safe politically. Nevertheless, Kennedy did persuade Congress to enact measures to boost the economy, build the national defense, provide international aid, and fund a massive space program.

STIMULATING THE ECONOMY
One domestic problem the Kennedy team tackled was the economy. By 1960 America was in a recession. Unemployment hovered around 6 percent, one of the highest levels since World War II. During the campaign, Kennedy had criticized the Eisenhower administration for failing to stimulate growth. The American economy, he said, was lagging behind those of other Western democracies and the Soviet Union.

Kennedy’s advisers pushed for the use of deficit spending, which had been the basis for Roosevelt’s New Deal. They said that stimulating economic growth depended on increased government spending and lower taxes, even if it meant that the government spent more than it took in.

Accordingly, the proposals Kennedy sent to Congress in 1961 called for increased spending. The Department of Defense received a nearly 20 percent budget increase for new nuclear missiles, nuclear submarines, and an expansion of the armed services. Congress also approved a package that increased the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour, extended unemployment insurance, and provided assistance to cities with high unemployment.

ADDRESSING POVERTY ABROAD
One of the first campaign promises Kennedy fulfilled was the creation of the Peace Corps, a program of volunteer assistance to the developing nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Critics in the United States called the program “Kennedy’s Kiddie Corps” because many volunteers were just out of college. Some foreign observers questioned whether Americans could understand other cultures.

Despite these reservations, the Peace Corps became a huge success. People of all ages and backgrounds signed up to work as agricultural advisers, teachers, or health aides or to do whatever work the host country needed. By 1968, more than 35,000 volunteers had served in 60 nations around the world.

A second foreign aid program, the Alliance for Progress, offered economic and technical assistance to Latin American countries. Between 1961 and 1969, the United States invested almost
$12 billion in Latin America, in part to deter these countries from picking up Fidel Castro's revolutionary ideas. While the money brought some development to the region, it didn’t bring fundamental reforms.

**RACE TO THE MOON** On April 12, 1961, Soviet cosmonaut Yuri A. Gagarin became the first human in space. Kennedy saw this as a challenge and decided that America would surpass the Soviets by sending a man to the moon.

In less than a month the United States had duplicated the Soviet feat. Later that year, a communications satellite called Telstar relayed live television pictures across the Atlantic Ocean from Maine to Europe. Meanwhile, America’s National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) had begun to construct new launch facilities at Cape Canaveral, Florida, and a mission control center in Houston, Texas. America’s pride and prestige were restored. Speaking before a crowd at Houston’s Rice University, Kennedy expressed the spirit of “the space race.”

---

**A PERSONAL VOICE** PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY

“...we choose to go to the moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win, and the others, too.”

—Address on the Nation’s Space Effort, September 12, 1962

Seven years later, on July 20, 1969, the U.S. would achieve its goal. An excited nation watched with bated breath as U.S. astronaut Neil Armstrong took his first steps on the moon.

As a result of the space program, universities expanded their science programs. The huge federal funding for research and development gave rise to new industries and new technologies, many of which could be used in business and industry and also in new consumer goods. Space- and defense-related industries sprang up in the Southern and Western states, which grew rapidly.
**ADDRESSING DOMESTIC PROBLEMS** While progress was being made on the new frontiers of space exploration and international aid, many Americans suffered at home. In 1962, the problem of poverty in America was brought to national attention in Michael Harrington’s book *The Other America*. Harrington profiled the 50 million people in America who scraped by each year on less than $1,000 per person. The number of poor shocked many Americans.

While Harrington awakened the nation to the nightmare of poverty, the fight against segregation took hold. Throughout the South, demonstrators raised their voices in what would become some of the most controversial civil rights battles of the 1960s. (See Chapter 21.) Kennedy had not pushed aggressively for legislation on the issues of poverty and civil rights, although he effected changes by executive action. However, now he felt that it was time to live up to a campaign promise.

In 1963, Kennedy began to focus more closely on the issues at home. He called for a “national assault on the causes of poverty.” He also ordered Robert Kennedy’s Justice Department to investigate racial injustices in the South. Finally, he presented Congress with a sweeping civil rights bill and a proposal to cut taxes by over $10 billion.

**Tragedy in Dallas**

In the fall of 1963, public opinion polls showed that Kennedy was losing popularity because of his advocacy of civil rights. Yet most still supported their beloved president. No one could foresee the terrible national tragedy just ahead.

**FOUR DAYS IN NOVEMBER** On the sunny morning of November 22, 1963, *Air Force One*, the presidential aircraft, landed in Dallas, Texas. President and Mrs. Kennedy had come to Texas to mend political fences with members of the state’s Democratic Party. Kennedy had expected a cool reception from the conservative state, but he basked instead in warm waves of applause from crowds that lined the streets of downtown Dallas.

Jacqueline and her husband sat in the back seat of an open-air limousine. In front of them sat Texas Governor John Connally and his wife, Nellie. As the car approached a state building known as the Texas School Book Depository, Nellie Connally turned to Kennedy and said, “You can’t say that Dallas isn’t friendly to you today.” A few seconds later, rifle shots rang out, and Kennedy was shot in the head. His car raced to a nearby hospital, where doctors frantically tried to revive him, but it was too late. President Kennedy was dead.

As the tragic news spread through America’s schools, offices, and homes, people reacted with disbelief. Questions were on everyone’s lips: Who had killed the president, and why? What would happen next?
During the next four days, television became “the window of the world.” A photograph of a somber Lyndon Johnson taking the oath of office aboard the presidential airplane was broadcast. Soon, audiences watched as Dallas police charged Lee Harvey Oswald with the murder. His palm print had been found on the rifle used to kill John F. Kennedy.

The 24-year-old ex-Marine had a suspicious past. After receiving a dishonorable discharge, Oswald had briefly lived in the Soviet Union, and he supported Castro. On Sunday, November 24, as millions watched live television coverage of Oswald being transferred between jails, a nightclub owner named Jack Ruby broke through the crowd and shot and killed Oswald.

The next day, all work stopped for Kennedy’s funeral as America mourned its fallen leader. The assassination and televised funeral became a historic event. Americans who were alive then can still recall what they were doing when they first heard about the shooting of their president.

**UNANSWERED QUESTIONS** The bizarre chain of events made some people wonder if Oswald was part of a conspiracy. In 1963, the *Warren Commission* investigated and concluded that Oswald had shot the president while acting on his own. Later, in 1979, a re-investigation concluded that Oswald was part of a conspiracy. Investigators also said that two persons may have fired at the president. Numerous other people have made investigations. Their explanations have ranged from a plot by anti-Castro Cubans, to a Communist-sponsored attack, to a conspiracy by the CIA.

What Americans did learn from the Kennedy assassination was that their system of government is remarkably sturdy. A crisis that would have crippled a dictatorship did not prevent a smooth transition to the presidency of Lyndon Johnson. In a speech to Congress, Johnson expressed his hope that “from the brutal loss of our leader we will derive not weakness but strength.” Not long after, Johnson drove through Congress the most ambitious domestic legislative package since the New Deal.

**Vocabulary**

**conspiracy:** an agreement by two or more persons to take illegal political action

**MAIN IDEA**

**Contrasting**

How did the Warren Commission’s findings differ from other theories?

---

**CRITICAL THINKING**

3. **ANALYZING MOTIVES**

Why do you think Congress was so enthusiastic about allocating funds for the space program but rejected spending in education, social services, and other pressing needs?

4. **MAKING INFERENCES**

Why do you think Kennedy lost popularity for supporting civil rights?

5. **EVALUATING LEADERSHIP**

Do you think President Kennedy was a successful leader? Explain your viewpoint. **Think About:**

- the reasons for his popularity
- the goals he expressed
- his foreign policy
- his legislative record
The Movement of Migrant Workers

The nation’s 2 million farm workers are responsible for harvesting much of the fruit and vegetables that families eat each day. Most field workers on United States farms remain in one place most of the year. Others are migrant workers, who move with their entire family from one region to the next as the growing seasons change. Nationally, migrant workers make up some 50 percent of hired farm workers, depending on the season and other factors.

As the map shows, there were three major streams of migrant worker movements in the 1960s: the Pacific Coast, the Midwest, and the Atlantic Coast. While these paths may have changed slightly since then, the movement of migrant workers into nearly every region of the nation continues today.

▼ THE PACIFIC COAST

The Pacific Coast region’s moderate climate allows for year-round harvesting. Most of California’s migrant farm workers work on large fruit farms for much of the year. About 65,000 workers make their way up to Washington each year to pick cherries, apples, and other crops.

▲ THE MIDWEST

Workers along the Midwest and East Coast streams, where crops are smaller, must keep moving in order to find work. These workers picking strawberries in Michigan will soon move on. For example, one family may travel to Ohio for the tomato harvest and then return to Michigan to pick apples before heading back to Texas for the winter months.
The map above shows the three major streams of migrant worker movements in the 1960s.

**THINKING CRITICALLY**

**CONNECT TO HISTORY**
1. **Analyzing Patterns** Retrace the movement of migrant workers in the three regions. Why do you think migrant workers have to keep moving?

**CONNECT TO TODAY**
2. **Creating a Database** Pose a historical question about the relationship between crops and planting seasons. For example, what types of crops are harvested in Michigan during the fall? Then research and create a database that answers this and other such questions.

**THE ATLANTIC COAST**

While some workers along the Atlantic Coast stream remain in Florida, others travel as far north as New Hampshire and New York, like the workers shown here harvesting onions. There, they work from March through September. Due to the winters, migrant workers in most of the Midwest and Atlantic regions can find work for only six months out of the year.
In 1966, family finances forced Larry Alfred to drop out of high school in Mobile, Alabama. He turned to the Job Corps, a federal program that trained young people from poor backgrounds. He learned to operate construction equipment, but his dream was to help people. On the advice of his Job Corps counselor, he joined VISTA—Volunteers in Service to America—often called the “domestic Peace Corps.”

Both the Job Corps and VISTA sprang into being in 1964, when President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Economic Opportunity Act. This law was the main offensive of Johnson’s “war on poverty” and a cornerstone of the Great Society.

VISTA assigned Alfred to work with a community of poor farm laborers in Robstown, Texas, near the Mexican border. There he found a number of children with mental and physical disabilities who had no special assistance, education, or training. So he established the Robstown Association for Retarded People, started a parents education program, sought state funds, and created a rehabilitation center. At age 20, Larry Alfred was a high school dropout, Job Corps graduate, VISTA volunteer, and in Robstown, an authority on people with disabilities. Alfred embodied Johnson’s Great Society in two ways: its programs helped him turn his life around, and he made a difference in people’s lives.

**LBJ’s Path to Power**

By the time Lyndon Baines Johnson, or LBJ, as he was called, succeeded to the presidency, his ambition and drive had become legendary. In explaining his frenetic energy, Johnson once remarked, “That’s the way I’ve been all my life. My daddy used to wake me up at dawn and shake my leg and say, ‘Lyndon, every boy in town’s got an hour’s head start on you.’”

**FROM THE TEXAS HILLS TO CAPITOL HILL** A fourth-generation Texan, Johnson grew up in the dry Texas hill country of Blanco County. The Johnsons never knew great wealth, but they also never missed a meal.
LBJ entered politics in 1937 when he won a special election to fill a vacant seat in the U.S. House of Representatives. Johnson styled himself as a “New Dealer” and spokesperson for the small ranchers and struggling farmers of his district. He caught the eye of President Franklin Roosevelt, who took Johnson under his wing. Roosevelt helped him secure key committee assignments in Congress and steer much-needed electrification and water projects to his Texas district. Johnson, in turn, idolized FDR and imitated his leadership style.

Once in the House, Johnson eagerly eyed a seat in the Senate. In 1948, after an exhausting, bitterly fought campaign, he won the Democratic primary election for the Senate by a margin of only 87 votes out of 988,000.

A MASTER POLITICIAN Johnson proved himself a master of party politics and behind-the-scenes maneuvering, and he rose to the position of Senate majority leader in 1955. People called his legendary ability to persuade senators to support his bills the “LBJ treatment.” As a reporter for the Saturday Evening Post explained, Johnson also used this treatment to win over reporters.

A PERSONAL VOICE STEWART ALSOP

“The Majority Leader [Johnson] was, it seemed, in a relaxed, friendly, reminiscent mood. But by gradual stages this mood gave way to something rather like a human hurricane. Johnson was up, striding about his office, talking without pause, occasionally leaning over, his nose almost touching the reporter’s, to shake the reporter’s shoulder or grab his knee... Appeals were made, to the Almighty, to the shades of the departed great, to the reporter’s finer instincts and better nature, while the reporter, unable to get a word in edgewise, sat collapsed upon a leather sofa, eyes glazed, mouth half open.”

—“The New President,” Saturday Evening Post, December 14, 1963

Johnson’s deft handling of Congress led to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, a voting rights measure that was the first civil rights legislation since Reconstruction. Johnson’s knack for achieving legislative results had captured John F. Kennedy’s attention, too, during Kennedy’s run for the White House. To Kennedy, Johnson’s congressional connections and his Southern Protestant background compensated for his own drawbacks as a candidate, so he asked Johnson to be his running mate. Johnson’s presence on the ticket helped Kennedy win key states in the South, especially Texas, which went Democratic by just a few thousand votes.

Johnson’s Domestic Agenda

In the wake of Kennedy’s assassination, President Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress. It was the fifth day of his administration. “All I have I would have given gladly not to be standing here today,” he began. Kennedy had inspired Americans to begin to solve national and world problems. Johnson urged Congress to pass the civil rights and tax-cut bills that Kennedy had sent to Capitol Hill.
As LBJ pushed through his domestic programs, the U.S. grew more interested in halting the spread of communism around the world. In Vietnam, anti-Communist nationalists controlled South Vietnam while Communist leader Ho Chi Minh had taken over North Vietnam. The Geneva Accords had temporarily provided peace, dividing Vietnam along the 17th parallel into two distinct political regions. Despite this treaty, the North was supporting Communist rebels who were trying to take over the South.

Though Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy had provided economic and military aid to South Vietnam, soon the U.S. would be directly involved in fighting the war.

In February 1964 Congress passed a tax reduction of over $10 billion into law. As the Democrats had hoped, the tax cut spurred economic growth. People spent more, which meant profits for businesses, which increased tax revenues and lowered the federal budget deficit from $6 billion in 1964 to $4 billion in 1966.

Then in July, Johnson pushed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 through Congress, persuading Southern senators to stop blocking its passage. It prohibited discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, and sex and granted the federal government new powers to enforce its provisions.

**THE WAR ON POVERTY** Following these successes, LBJ pressed on with his own agenda—to alleviate poverty. Early in 1964, he had declared “unconditional war on poverty in America” and proposed sweeping legislation designed to help Americans “on the outskirts of hope.”

In August 1964, Congress enacted the **Economic Opportunity Act** (EOA), approving nearly $1 billion for youth programs, antipoverty measures, small-business loans, and job training. The EOA legislation created:

- the Job Corps Youth Training Program
- VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America)
- Project Head Start, an education program for underprivileged preschoolers
- the Community Action Program, which encouraged poor people to participate in public-works programs.

**THE 1964 ELECTION** In 1964, the Republicans nominated conservative senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona to oppose Johnson. Goldwater believed the federal government had no business trying to right social and economic wrongs such as poverty, discrimination, and lack of opportunity. He attacked such long-established federal programs as Social Security, which he wanted to make voluntary, and the Tennessee Valley Authority, which he wanted to sell.

In 1964, most American people were in tune with Johnson—they believed that government could and should help solve the nation’s problems. Moreover, Goldwater had frightened many Americans by suggesting that he might use nuclear weapons on Cuba and North Vietnam. Johnson’s campaign capitalized on this fear. It produced a chilling television commercial in which a picture of a little girl counting the petals on a daisy dissolved into a mushroom cloud created by an atomic bomb. Where Goldwater advocated intervention in Vietnam, Johnson assured the American people that sending U.S. troops there “would offer no solution at all to the real problem of Vietnam.”

LBJ won the election by a landslide, winning 61 percent of the popular vote and 486 electoral votes, while Senator Goldwater won only 52. The Democrats also increased their majority in Congress. For the first time since 1938, a Democratic president did not need the votes of conservative Southern Democrats in order to get laws passed. Now Johnson could launch his reform program in earnest.
Building the Great Society

In May 1964, Johnson had summed up his vision for America in a phrase: the Great Society. In a speech at the University of Michigan, Johnson outlined a legislative program that would end poverty and racial injustice. But, he told an enthusiastic crowd, that was “just the beginning.” Johnson envisioned a legislative program that would create not only a higher standard of living and equal opportunity, but also promote a richer quality of life for all.

*A Personal Voice*  
**LYNDON B. JOHNSON**

“The Great Society is a place where every child can find knowledge to enrich his mind and to enlarge his talents. It is a place where leisure is a welcome chance to build and reflect, not a feared cause of boredom and restlessness. It is a place where the city of man serves not only the needs of the body and the demands of commerce but the desire for beauty and the hunger for community. It is a place where man can renew contact with nature. It is a place which honors creation for its own sake and for what it adds to the understanding of the race.”

—“The Great Society,” May 22, 1964

Like his idol FDR, LBJ wanted to change America. By the time Johnson left the White House in 1969, Congress had passed 206 of his measures. The president personally led the battle to get most of them passed.

**EDUCATION** During 1965 and 1966, the LBJ administration introduced a flurry of bills to Congress. Johnson considered education “the key which can unlock the door to the Great Society.” The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 provided more than $1 billion in federal aid to help public and parochial schools purchase textbooks and new library materials. This was the first major federal aid package for education in the nation’s history.
### Great Society Programs, 1964–1967

#### POVERTY
- **1964** Tax Reduction Act cut corporate and individual taxes to stimulate growth.
- **1964** Economic Opportunity Act created Job Corps, VISTA, Project Head Start, and other programs to fight the “war on poverty.”
- **1965** Medicare Act established Medicare and Medicaid programs.
- **1965** Appalachian Regional Development Act targeted aid for highways, health centers, and resource development in that economically depressed area.

#### CITIES
- **1965** Omnibus Housing Act provided money for low-income housing.
- **1965** Department of Housing and Urban Development was formed to administer federal housing programs.
- **1966** Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Area Redevelopment Act funded slum rebuilding, mass transit, and other improvements for selected “model cities.”

#### EDUCATION
- **1965** Elementary and Secondary Education Act directed money to schools for textbooks, library materials, and special education.
- **1965** Higher Education Act funded scholarships and low-interest loans for college students.
- **1965** National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities was created to financially assist painters, musicians, actors, and other artists.
- **1967** Corporation for Public Broadcasting was formed to fund educational TV and radio broadcasting.

#### DISCRIMINATION
- **1964** Civil Rights Act outlawed discrimination in public accommodations, housing, and jobs; increased federal power to prosecute civil rights abuses.
- **1964** Twenty-Fourth Amendment abolished the poll tax in federal elections.
- **1965** Voting Rights Act ended the practice of requiring voters to pass literacy tests and permitted the federal government to monitor voter registration.
- **1965** Immigration Act ended national-origins quotas established in 1924.

#### ENVIRONMENT
- **1965** Wilderness Preservation Act set aside over 9 million acres for national forest lands.
- **1965** Water Quality Act required states to clean up their rivers.
- **1965** Clean Air Act Amendment directed the federal government to establish emission standards for new motor vehicles.
- **1967** Air Quality Act set federal air pollution guidelines and extended federal enforcement power.

#### CONSUMER ADVOCACY
- **1966** Truth in Packaging Act set standards for labeling consumer products.
- **1966** National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act set federal safety standards for the auto and tire industries.
- **1966** Highway Safety Act required states to set up highway safety programs.
- **1966** Department of Transportation was created to deal with national air, rail, and highway transportation.

#### SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Charts

What did the Great Society programs indicate about the federal government’s changing role?

---

**HEALTHCARE** LBJ and Congress changed Social Security by establishing Medicare and Medicaid. **Medicare** provided hospital insurance and low-cost medical insurance for almost every American age 65 or older. **Medicaid** extended health insurance to welfare recipients.

**HOUSING** Congress also made several important decisions that shifted the nation’s political power from rural to urban areas. These decisions included appropriating money to build some 240,000 units of low-rent public housing and help low- and moderate-income families pay for better private housing; establishing the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); and appointing Robert Weaver, the first African-American cabinet member in American history, as Secretary of HUD.
When President Johnson signed the Medicare bill in 1965, only half of the nation’s elderly had health insurance. Today, thanks largely to Medicare, nearly all persons 65 years or older have medical coverage.

Experts have debated whether Medicare can be sustained as people live longer, health care costs increase, and the baby boomer generation reaches retirement age. Though most Americans are not in favor of cutbacks to Medicare, efforts have been made in the last few years to cut the growth in spending.

### IMMIGRATION

The Great Society also brought profound changes to the nation’s immigration laws. The Immigration Act of 1924 and the National Origins Act of 1924 had established immigration quotas that discriminated strongly against people from outside Western Europe. The Act set a quota of about 150,000 people annually. It discriminated against southern and eastern Europeans and barred Asians completely. The **Immigration Act of 1965** opened the door for many non-European immigrants to settle in the United States by ending quotas based on nationality.

### THE ENVIRONMENT

In 1962, *Silent Spring*, a book by Rachel Carson, had exposed a hidden danger: the effects of pesticides on the environment. Carson’s book and the public’s outcry resulted in the Water Quality Act of 1965, which required states to clean up rivers. Johnson also ordered the government to search out the worst chemical polluters. “There is no excuse . . . for chemical companies and oil refineries using our major rivers as pipelines for toxic wastes.” Such words and actions helped trigger the environmental movement in the United States. (See Chapter 24.)

### CONSUMER PROTECTION

Consumer advocates also made headway. They convinced Congress to pass major safety laws, including a truth-in-packaging law that set standards for labeling consumer goods. Ralph Nader, a young lawyer, wrote a book, *Unsafe at Any Speed*, that sharply criticized the U.S. automobile industry for ignoring safety concerns. His testimony helped persuade Congress to establish safety standards for automobiles and tires. Precautions extended to food, too. Congress passed the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. “Americans can feel a little safer now in their homes, on the road, at the supermarket, and in the department store,” said Johnson.

### Reforms of the Warren Court

The wave of liberal reform that characterized the Great Society also swept through the Supreme Court of the 1960s. Beginning with the 1954 landmark decision *Brown v. Board of Education*, which ruled school segregation unconstitutional, the Court under Chief Justice Earl Warren took an activist stance on the leading issues of the day.

Several major court decisions in the 1960s affected American society. The **Warren Court** banned prayer in public schools and declared state-required loyalty oaths unconstitutional. It limited the power of communities to censor books and films and said that free speech included the wearing of black armbands to school by antiwar students. Furthermore, the Court brought about change in federal and state reapportionment and the criminal justice system.

### CONGRESSIONAL REAPPORTIONMENT

In a key series of decisions, the Warren Court addressed the issue of **reapportionment**, or the way in which states redrew election districts based on the changing number of people in them. By 1960, about 80 percent of Americans lived in cities and suburbs. However, many states had failed to change their congressional districts to reflect this development; instead, rural districts might have fewer than 200,000 people, while some urban districts had more than 600,000. Thus the voters in rural areas had more representation—and also more power—than those in urban areas.
Baker v. Carr (1962) was the first of several decisions that established the principle of “one person, one vote.” The Court asserted that the federal courts had the right to tell states to reapportion—redivide—their districts for more equal representation. In later decisions, the Court ruled that congressional district boundaries should be redrawn so that districts would be equal in population, and in Reynolds v. Sims (1964), it extended the principle of “one person, one vote” to state legislative districts. (See Reynolds v. Sims, page 774.) These decisions led to a shift of political power throughout the nation from rural to urban areas.

**RIGHTS OF THE ACCUSED** Other Warren Court decisions greatly expanded the rights of people accused of crimes. In Mapp v. Ohio (1961), the Court ruled that evidence seized illegally could not be used in state courts. This is called the exclusionary rule. In Gideon v. Wainwright (1963), the justices required criminal courts to provide free legal counsel to those who could not afford it. In Escobedo v. Illinois (1964), the justices ruled that an accused person has a right to have a lawyer present during police questioning. In 1966, the Court went one step further in Miranda v. Arizona, where it ruled that all suspects must be read their rights before questioning. (See Miranda v. Arizona, page 694.)

These rulings greatly divided public opinion. Liberals praised the decisions, arguing that they placed necessary limits on police power and protected the right of all citizens to a fair trial. Conservatives, however, bitterly criticized the Court. They claimed that Mapp and Miranda benefited criminal suspects and severely limited the power of the police to investigate crimes. During the late 1960s and 1970s, Republican candidates for office seized on the “crime issue,” portraying liberals and Democrats as being soft on crime and citing the decisions of the Warren Court as major obstacles to fighting crime.

**Counterpoint**

Defenders of the Great Society contend that it bettered the lives of millions of Americans. Historian John Morton Blum notes, “The Great Society initiated policies that by 1985 had had profound consequences: Blacks now voted at about the same rate as whites, and nearly 6,000 blacks held public offices; almost every elderly citizen had medical insurance, and the aged were no poorer than Americans as a whole; a large majority of small children attended preschool programs.”

Attorney Margaret Burnham argues that the civil rights gains alone justify the Great Society: “For tens of thousands of human beings . . . giving promise of a better life was significant . . . . What the Great Society affirmed was the responsibility of the federal government to take measures necessary to bring into the social and economic mainstream any segment of the people [who had been] historically excluded.”

**Main Idea**

What were the differing reactions to the Warren Court decisions on the rights of the accused?

**Thinking Critically**

1. **Evaluating** Do you think the Great Society was a success or a failure? Explain.

   SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R17.

2. **Analyzing Social Problems** Research the most pressing problems in your own neighborhood or precinct. Then propose a social program you think would address at least one of those problems while avoiding the pitfalls of the Great Society programs.
Impact of the Great Society

The Great Society and the Warren Court changed the United States. People disagree on whether these changes left the nation better or worse, but most agree on one point: no president in the post–World War II era extended the power and reach of the federal government more than Lyndon Johnson. The optimism of the Johnson presidency fueled an activist era in all three branches of government, for at least the first few years.

The “war on poverty” did help. The number of poor people fell from 21 percent of the population in 1962 to 11 percent in 1973. However, many of Johnson’s proposals, though well intended, were hastily conceived and proved difficult to accomplish.

Johnson’s massive tax cut spurred the economy. But funding the Great Society contributed to a growing budget deficit—a problem that continued for decades. Questions about government finances, as well as debates over the effectiveness of these programs and the role of the federal government, left a number of people disillusioned. A conservative backlash began to take shape as a new group of Republican leaders rose to power. In 1966, for example, a conservative Hollywood actor named Ronald Reagan swept to victory in the race for governor of California over the Democratic incumbent.

Thousands of miles away, the increase of Communist forces in Vietnam also began to overshadow the goals of the Great Society. The fear of communism was deeply rooted in the minds of Americans from the Cold War era. Four years after initiating the Great Society, Johnson, a peace candidate in 1964, would be labeled a “hawk”—a supporter of one of the most divisive wars in recent U.S. history.

As this cartoon points out, President Johnson had much to deal with at home and abroad. This autographed copy was presented to President Johnson by the cartoonist.

Identifying Problems

What events and problems may have affected the success of the Great Society?

MAIN IDEA

CRITICAL THINKING

TERMS & NAMES For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
- Lyndon Baines Johnson
- Economic Opportunity Act
- Great Society
- Medicare and Medicaid
- Immigration Act of 1965
- Warren Court
- reapportionment

List four or more Great Society programs and Warren Court rulings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Great Society Programs</th>
<th>Warren Court Rulings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Choose one item and describe its lasting effects.

As this cartoon points out, President Johnson had much to deal with at home and abroad. This autographed copy was presented to President Johnson by the cartoonist.

MAIN IDEA

CRITICAL THINKING

EVALUATING LEADERSHIP

Explain how Lyndon Johnson’s personal and political experiences might have influenced his actions as president. Think About:
- his family’s background and education
- his relationship with Franklin Roosevelt
- his powers of persuasion

ANALYZING VISUAL SOURCES

Look at the political cartoon above. What do you think the artist was trying to convey about the Johnson administration?
MIRANDA v. ARIZONA (1966)

ORIGINS OF THE CASE  In 1963, Ernesto Miranda was arrested at his home in Phoenix, Arizona, on charges of kidnapping and rape. After two hours of questioning by police, he signed a confession and was later convicted, largely based on the confession. Miranda appealed. He claimed that his confession was invalid because it was coerced and because the police never advised him of his right to an attorney or his right to avoid self-incrimination.

THE RULING  The Court overturned Miranda’s conviction, holding that the police must inform criminal suspects of their legal rights at the time of arrest and may not interrogate suspects who invoke their rights.

LEGAL REASONING

Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote the majority opinion in Miranda v. Arizona. He based his argument on the Fifth Amendment, which guarantees that an accused person cannot be forced “to be a witness against himself” or herself. Warren stressed that when suspects are interrogated in police custody, the situation is “inherently intimidating.” Such a situation, he argued, undermines any evidence it produces because “no statement obtained from the defendant [while in custody] can truly be the product of his free choice.”

For this reason, the Court majority found that Miranda’s confession could not be used as evidence. In the opinion, Chief Justice Warren responded to the argument that police officials might find this requirement difficult to meet.

“Not only does the use of the third degree [harassment or torture used to obtain a confession] involve a flagrant violation of law by the officers of the law, but it involves also the dangers of false confessions, and it tends to make police and prosecutors less zealous in the search for objective evidence.”

LEGAL SOURCES

U.S. CONSTITUTION

U.S. CONSTITUTION, FIFTH AMENDMENT (1791)

“No person . . . shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law.”

RELATED CASES

MAPP v. OHIO (1961)

The Court ruled that prosecutors may not use evidence obtained in illegal searches (exclusionary rule).

GIDEON v. WAINWRIGHT (1963)

The Court said that a defendant accused of a felony has the right to an attorney, which the government must supply if the defendant cannot afford one.

ESCOBEDO v. ILLINOIS (1964)

The Court held that a suspect has the right to an attorney when being questioned by police.
THINKING CRITICALLY

CONNECT TO HISTORY
1. Drawing Conclusions Critics charged that Miranda incorrectly used the Fifth Amendment. The right to avoid self-incrimination, they said, should only apply to trials, not to police questioning. Do you agree or disagree? Why?

CONNECT TO TODAY
2. Visit the links for Historic Decisions of the Supreme Court to research laws and other court decisions related to Mapp and Miranda. Then, prepare a debate on whether courts should or should not set a guilty person free if the government broke the law in establishing that person’s guilt.
Chapter 20

Assessment

Terms & Names
For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the Kennedy and Johnson administrations.

1. John F. Kennedy
2. Fidel Castro
3. Berlin Wall
4. hot line
5. New Frontier
6. Peace Corps
7. Warren Commission
8. Great Society
9. Medicare and Medicaid
10. Warren Court

Main Ideas
Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

Kennedy and the Cold War (pages 670–678)
1. Explain the factors that led to Kennedy’s victory over Nixon in the 1960 presidential campaign.
2. What were the most significant results of the Cuban missile crisis?

The New Frontier (pages 679–683)
3. What was Kennedy’s New Frontier? Why did he have trouble getting his New Frontier legislation through Congress?
4. What two international aid programs were launched during the Kennedy administration?
5. How did Kennedy’s assassination affect the public?

The Great Society (pages 686–693)
6. Describe ways that Great Society programs addressed the problem of poverty.
7. How did the courts increase the political power of people in urban areas and those accused of crimes?

Critical Thinking
1. Using Your Notes Use a Venn diagram to show the major legislative programs of the New Frontier and the Great Society.

2. Making Generalizations John F. Kennedy said, “[M]y fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.” Do you agree with his view about the relationship between individuals and the country? Explain your opinion.

3. Evaluating Do you think the Great Society helped people achieve their hopes of making life better for themselves and their children? Explain.

Visual Summary: The New Frontier and The Great Society

JFK
- Peace Corps
- new “flexible response” strategy for Cold War
- Cuban missile crisis
- Bay of Pigs
- race to the moon
- boosted the economy by increasing government spending
- increased minimum wage to $1.25
- extended unemployment insurance
- provided assistance to cities with high unemployment
- supported civil rights

LBJ
- Great Society reform legislation and federal assistance programs
- war on poverty
- increased protection of individual rights
- pushed civil rights bill through Congress
- EOA, VISTA, Project Head Start
- established Medicare and Medicaid
- changed immigration laws to open doors for many non-European immigrants
- furthered environmental movement
- cut taxes but increased budget deficit
Use the quotation and your knowledge of United States history to answer questions 1 and 2.

“...It is our purpose to win the Cold War, not merely wage it in the hope of attaining a standoff... [I]t is really astounding that our government has never stated its purpose to be that of complete victory over the tyrannical forces of international communism... We need a declaration that our intention is victory... And we need an official act, such as the resumption of nuclear testing, to show our own peoples and the other freedom-loving peoples of the world that we mean business.”

—Senator Barry Goldwater, address to the U.S. Senate, July 14, 1961

1. Based on the quotation, it is reasonable to infer that Senator Goldwater probably opposed —
   A the space race.
   B the Bay of Pigs invasion.
   C the Tax Reduction Act.
   D the Limited Test Ban Treaty.

2. Lyndon Johnson helped to bring about all of the following except —
   F the Voting Rights Act.
   G Head Start.
   H Social Security.
   J Medicare.

3. Which of the following is true about the graph?
   A Johnson’s war on poverty failed.
   B Poverty began to rise again after 1969.
   C Poverty decreased throughout the 1960s.
   D In 1960, the poverty level was about 12%.

INTERACT WITH HISTORY

Recall the issues that you explored at the beginning of the chapter. Then write a job description for “U.S. President.” Include sections on “Responsibilities” and “Requirements” that list necessary traits and experience.

Think About:
• Kennedy’s and Johnson’s (and Nixon’s) background and style
• the role of the media
• the challenges each leader faced and how he dealt with them
• the American public’s tastes and preferences

FOCUS ON WRITING

Imagine that the year is 1964. President Johnson has introduced a series of programs as a part of his vision for a Great Society. Write a persuasive letter to your congressional representative telling him or her to either support or oppose the new programs.

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING

It is June 1963, and President Kennedy announces his intention to negotiate with the Soviets to limit or halt nuclear testing. What is your reaction to this plan—do you approve or disapprove? Working with a partner, design and create a poster that supports or criticizes President Kennedy’s proposal.
The Cuban missile crisis was perhaps the most dangerous event of the Cold War period. For several days in October 1962, the United States and the Soviet Union stood on the brink of nuclear war. The crisis began when the Soviet Union sent weapons, including nuclear missiles, to Cuba. It deepened when the United States blockaded Cuba to prevent the Soviets from delivering more missiles. With Soviet ships sailing toward the blockade, a confrontation seemed inevitable. However, at the last moment, the Soviet ships turned back and war was averted.

Explore the development and resolution of the Cuban missile crisis online. You can find a wealth of information, video clips, primary sources, activities, and more at hmhsocialstudies.com.
Crisis Averted?
Watch the video to see how the Cuban missile crisis brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of nuclear war.

Getting Ready for War
Watch the video to see how the missiles in Cuba created tension between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Prelude to Crisis
Watch the video to learn about the buildup to the Cuban missile crisis.

Lessons Learned
Watch the video to learn about the impact of the Cuban missile crisis.

Crisis Averted?
Watch the video to see how the Cuban missile crisis brought the United States and the Soviet Union to the brink of nuclear war.
Essential Question

In what ways did African Americans fight discrimination during the civil rights era?

What You Will Learn

In this chapter you will explore how African Americans rose up against the treatment they had endured for decades and demanded civil rights.

SECTION 1: Taking on Segregation

Main Idea Activism and a series of Supreme Court decisions advanced equal rights for African Americans in the 1950s and 1960s.

SECTION 2: The Triumphs of a Crusade

Main Idea Civil rights activists broke through racial barriers. Their activism prompted landmark legislation.

SECTION 3: Challenges and Changes in the Movement

Main Idea Disagreements among civil rights groups and the rise of black nationalism created a violent period in the fight for civil rights.

Civil Rights activists lead the 1965 voting rights march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama.
The year is 1960, and segregation divides the nation’s people. African Americans are denied access to jobs and housing and are refused service at restaurants and stores. But the voices of the oppressed rise up in the churches and in the streets, demanding civil rights for all Americans.

**Explore the Issues**
- Are all Americans entitled to the same civil rights?
- What are the risks of demanding rights?
- Why might some people fight against equal rights?
Jo Ann Gibson Robinson drew back in self-defense as the white bus driver raised his hand as if to strike her. “Get up from there!” he shouted. Robinson, laden with Christmas packages, had forgotten the rules and sat down in the front of the bus, which was reserved for whites.

Humiliating incidents were not new to the African Americans who rode the segregated buses of Montgomery, Alabama, in the mid-1950s. The bus company required them to pay at the front and then exit and reboard at the rear. “I felt like a dog,” Robinson later said. A professor at the all-black Alabama State College, Robinson was also president of the Women’s Political Council, a group of professional African-American women determined to increase black political power.

On December 1, 1955, police arrested an African-American woman for refusing to give up her seat on a bus. Robinson promptly sent out a call for all African Americans to boycott Montgomery buses.

The Segregation System

Segregated buses might never have rolled through the streets of Montgomery if the Civil Rights Act of 1875 had remained in force. This act outlawed segregation in public facilities by decreeing that “all persons . . . shall be entitled to the full and equal enjoyment of the accommodations . . . of inns, public conveyances on land or water, theaters, and other places of public amusement.” In 1883, however, the all-white Supreme Court declared the act unconstitutional.
**PLESSY V. FERGUSON** During the 1890s, a number of other court decisions and state laws severely limited African-American rights. In 1890, Louisiana passed a law requiring railroads to provide “equal but separate accommodations for the white and colored races.” In the *Plessy v. Ferguson* case of 1896, the Supreme Court ruled that this “separate but equal” law did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment, which guarantees all Americans equal treatment under the law.

Armed with the *Plessy* decision, states throughout the nation, but especially in the South, passed what were known as Jim Crow laws, aimed at separating the races. These laws forbade marriage between blacks and whites and established many other restrictions on social and religious contact between the races. There were separate schools as well as separate streetcars, waiting rooms, railroad coaches, elevators, witness stands, and public restrooms. The facilities provided for blacks were always inferior to those for whites. Nearly every day, African Americans faced humiliating signs that read: “Colored Water”; “No Blacks Allowed”; “Whites Only!”

**SEGREGATION CONTINUES INTO THE 20TH CENTURY**

After the Civil War, some African Americans tried to escape Southern racism by moving north. This migration of Southern African Americans speeded up greatly during World War I, as many African-American sharecroppers abandoned farms for the promise of industrial jobs in Northern cities. However, they discovered racial prejudice and segregation there, too. Most could find housing only in all-black neighborhoods. Many white workers also resented the competition for jobs. This sometimes led to violence.

**APARTHEID—SEGREGATION IN SOUTH AFRICA**

In 1948, the white government of South Africa passed laws to ensure that whites would stay in control of the country. Those laws established a system called apartheid, which means “apartness.” The system divided South Africans into four segregated racial groups—whites, blacks, coloreds of mixed race, and Asians. It restricted what jobs nonwhites could hold, where they could live, and what rights they could exercise. Because of apartheid, the black African majority were denied the right to vote.

In response to worldwide criticism, the South African government gradually repealed the apartheid laws, starting in the late 1970s. In 1994, South Africa held its first all-race election and elected as president Nelson Mandela, a black anti-apartheid leader whom the white government had imprisoned for nearly 30 years.

These photos of the public schools for white children (top) and for black children (above) in a Southern town in the 1930s show that separate facilities were often unequal in the segregation era.
A DEVELOPING CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT In many ways, the events of World War II set the stage for the civil rights movement. First, the demand for soldiers in the early 1940s created a shortage of white male laborers. That labor shortage opened up new job opportunities for African Americans, Latinos, and white women.

Second, nearly one million African Americans served in the armed forces, which needed so many fighting men that they had to end their discriminatory policies. Such policies had previously kept African Americans from serving in fighting units. Many African-American soldiers returned from the war determined to fight for their own freedom now that they had helped defeat fascist regimes overseas.

Third, during the war, civil rights organizations actively campaigned for African-American voting rights and challenged Jim Crow laws. In response to protests, President Roosevelt issued a presidential directive prohibiting racial discrimination by federal agencies and all companies that were engaged in war work. The groundwork was laid for more organized campaigns to end segregation throughout the United States.

Challenging Segregation in Court

The desegregation campaign was led largely by the NAACP, which had fought since 1909 to end segregation. One influential figure in this campaign was Charles Hamilton Houston, a brilliant Howard University law professor who also served as chief legal counsel for the NAACP from 1934 to 1938.

THE NAACP LEGAL STRATEGY In deciding the NAACP’s legal strategy, Houston focused on the inequality between the separate schools that many states provided. At that time, the nation spent ten times as much money educating a white child as an African-American child. Thus, Houston focused the organization’s limited resources on challenging the most glaring inequalities of segregated public education.

In 1938, he placed a team of his best law students under the direction of Thurgood Marshall. Over the next 23 years, Marshall and his NAACP lawyers would win 29 out of 32 cases argued before the Supreme Court.

Several of the cases became legal milestones, each chipping away at the segregation platform of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. In the 1946 case *Morgan v. Virginia*, the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional those state laws mandating segregated seating on interstate buses. In 1950, the high court ruled in *Sweatt v. Painter* that state law schools must admit black applicants, even if separate black schools exist.

*BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION* Marshall’s most stunning victory came on May 17, 1954, in the case known as *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*. (See page 708.) In this case, the father of eight-year-old Linda Brown had charged the board of education of Topeka, Kansas, with violating Linda’s rights by denying her admission to an all-white elementary school four blocks from her house. The nearest all-black elementary school was 21 blocks away.

In a landmark verdict, the Supreme Court unanimously struck down segregation in schooling as an unconstitutional violation of the Fourteenth Amendment’s Equal Protection

**KEY PLAYER**

**THURGOOD MARSHALL 1908–1993**

Thurgood Marshall dedicated his life to fighting racism. His father had labored as a steward at an all-white country club, his mother as a teacher at an all-black school. Marshall himself was denied admission to the University of Maryland Law School because of his race.

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy nominated Marshall to the U.S. Court of Appeals. Lyndon Johnson picked Marshall for U.S. solicitor general in 1965 and two years later named him as the first African-American Supreme Court justice. In that role, he remained a strong advocate of civil rights until he retired in 1991.

After Marshall died in 1993, a copy of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision was placed beside his casket. On it, an admirer wrote: “You shall always be remembered.”

**Developing Historical Perspective**

How did events during World War II lay the groundwork for African Americans to fight for civil rights in the 1950s?
Clause. Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote that, “[I]n the field of public education, the doctrine of separate but equal has no place.” The Brown decision was relevant for some 12 million schoolchildren in 21 states.

**Reaction to the Brown Decision**

Official reaction to the ruling was mixed. In Kansas and Oklahoma, state officials said they expected segregation to end with little trouble. In Texas the governor warned that plans might “take years” to work out. He actively prevented desegregation by calling in the Texas Rangers. In Mississippi and Georgia, officials vowed total resistance. Governor Herman Talmadge of Georgia said “The people of Georgia will not comply with the decision of the court. . . . We’re going to do whatever is necessary in Georgia to keep white children in white schools and colored children in colored schools.”

**RESISTANCE TO SCHOOL DESEGREGATION** Within a year, more than 500 school districts had desegregated their classrooms. In Baltimore, St. Louis, and Washington, D.C., black and white students sat side by side for the first time in history. However, in many areas where African Americans were a majority, whites resisted desegregation. In some places, the Ku Klux Klan reappeared and White Citizens Councils boycotted businesses that supported desegregation.

To speed things up, in 1955 the Supreme Court handed down a second ruling, known as Brown II, that ordered school desegregation implemented “with all deliberate speed.” Initially President Eisenhower refused to enforce compliance. “The fellow who tries to tell me that you can do these things by force is just plain nuts,” he said. Events in Little Rock, Arkansas, would soon force Eisenhower to go against his personal beliefs.

**CRISIS IN LITTLE ROCK** In 1948, Arkansas had become the first Southern state to admit African Americans to state universities without being required by a court order. By the 1950s, some scout troops and labor unions in Arkansas had quietly ended their Jim Crow practices. Little Rock citizens had elected two men to the school board who publicly backed desegregation—and the school superintendent, Virgil Blossom, began planning for desegregation soon after Brown.

However, Governor Orval Faubus publicly showed support for segregation. In September 1957, he ordered the National Guard to turn away the “Little Rock Nine”—nine African-American students who had volunteered to integrate Little Rock’s Central High School as the first step in Blossom’s plan. A federal judge ordered Faubus to let the students into school.

NAACP members called eight of the students and arranged to drive them to school. They could not reach the ninth student, Elizabeth Eckford, who did not have a phone, and she set out alone. Outside Central High, Eckford faced an abusive crowd. Terrified, the 15-year-old made it to a bus stop where two friendly whites stayed with her.
The crisis in Little Rock forced Eisenhower to act. He placed the Arkansas National Guard under federal control and ordered a thousand paratroopers into Little Rock. The nation watched the televised coverage of the event. Under the watch of soldiers, the nine African-American teenagers attended class.

But even these soldiers could not protect the students from troublemakers who confronted them in stairways, in the halls, and in the cafeteria. Throughout the year African-American students were regularly harassed by other students. At the end of the year, Faubus shut down Central High rather than let integration continue.

On September 9, 1957, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the first civil rights law since Reconstruction. Shepherded by Senator Lyndon B. Johnson of Texas, the law gave the attorney general greater power over school desegregation. It also gave the federal government jurisdiction—or authority—over violations of African-American voting rights.

Making Inferences
What effect do you think television coverage of the Little Rock incident had on the nation?

The face-to-face confrontation at Central High School was not the only showdown over segregation in the mid-1950s. Impatient with the slow pace of change in the courts, African-American activists had begun taking direct action to win the rights promised to them by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution. Among those on the frontline of change was Jo Ann Robinson.

BOYCOTTING SEGREGATION Four days after the Brown decision in May 1954, Robinson wrote a letter to the mayor of Montgomery, Alabama, asking that bus drivers no longer be allowed to force riders in the “colored” section to yield their seats to whites. The mayor refused. Little did he know that in less than a year another African-American woman from Alabama would be at the center of this controversy, and that her name and her words would far outlast segregation.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks, a seamstress and an NAACP officer, took a seat in the front row of the “colored” section of a Montgomery bus. As the bus filled up, the driver ordered Parks and three other African-American passengers to empty the row they were occupying so that a white man could sit down without having to sit next to any African Americans. “It was time for someone to stand up—or in my case, sit down,” recalled Parks. “I refused to move.”

As Parks stared out the window, the bus driver said, “If you don’t stand up, I’m going to call the police and have you arrested.” The soft-spoken Parks replied, “You may do that.”

News of Parks’s arrest spread rapidly. Jo Ann Robinson and NAACP leader E. D. Nixon suggested a bus boycott. The leaders of the African-American community, including many ministers, formed the Montgomery Improvement Association to organize the boycott. They elected the pastor of the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, 26-year-old Martin Luther King, Jr., to lead the group. An ordained minister since 1948, King had just earned a Ph.D. degree in theology from Boston University. “Well, I’m not sure I’m the best person for the position,” King confided to Nixon, “but if no one else is going to serve, I’d be glad to try.”
During the bus boycott, Montgomery’s black citizens relied on an efficient car pool system that ferried people between more than forty pickup stations like the one shown.

Walking for Justice  On the night of December 5, 1955, Dr. King made the following declaration to an estimated crowd of between 5,000 and 15,000 people.

A Personal Voice  MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

“There comes a time when people get tired of being trampled over by the iron feet of oppression. . . . I want it to be known—that we’re going to work with grim and bold determination—to gain justice on buses in this city. And we are not wrong. . . . If we are wrong—the Supreme Court of this nation is wrong. If we are wrong—God Almighty is wrong. . . . If we are wrong—justice is a lie.”

—quoted in Parting the Waters: America in the King Years, 1954–63

King’s passionate and eloquent speech brought people to their feet and filled the audience with a sense of mission. African Americans filed a lawsuit and for 381 days refused to ride the buses in Montgomery. In most cases they had to find other means of transportation by organizing car pools or walking long distances. Support came from within the black community—workers donated one-fifth of their weekly salaries—as well as from outside groups like the NAACP, the United Auto Workers, Montgomery’s Jewish community, and sympathetic white southerners. The boycotters remained nonviolent even after a bomb ripped apart King’s home (no one was injured). Finally, in 1956, the Supreme Court outlawed bus segregation.

Martin Luther King and the SCLC

The Montgomery bus boycott proved to the world that the African-American community could unite and organize a successful protest movement. It also proved the power of nonviolent resistance, the peaceful refusal to obey unjust laws. Despite threats to his life and family, King urged his followers, “Don’t ever let anyone pull you so low as to hate them.”

Changing the World with Soul Force  King called his brand of nonviolent resistance “soul force.” He based his ideas on the teachings of several people. From the teachings of Jesus, he learned to love one’s enemies. From writer Henry David Thoreau he took the concept of civil disobedience—the refusal to obey an unjust law. From labor organizer A. Philip Randolph he learned to organize massive demonstrations. From Mohandas Gandhi, the leader who helped India throw off British rule, he learned to resist oppression without violence.

“We will not hate you,” King said to white racists, “but we cannot . . . obey your unjust laws. . . . We will soon wear you down by our capacity to suffer. And in winning our freedom, we will so appeal to your heart and conscience that we will win you in the process.”
King held steadfast to his philosophy, even when a wave of racial violence swept through the South after the Brown decision. The violence included the 1955 murder of Emmett Till—a 14-year-old African-American boy who had allegedly flirted with a white woman. There were also shootings and beatings, some fatal, of civil rights workers.

FROM THE GRASSROOTS UP After the bus boycott ended, King joined with ministers and civil rights leaders in 1957 to found the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). Its purpose was “to carry on nonviolent crusades against the evils of second-class citizenship.” Using African-American churches as a base, the SCLC planned to stage protests and demonstrations throughout the South. The leaders hoped to build a movement from the grassroots up and to win the support of ordinary African Americans of all ages. King, president of the SCLC, used the power of his voice and ideas to fuel the movement’s momentum.

The nuts and bolts of organizing the SCLC was handled by its first director, Ella Baker, the granddaughter of slaves. While with the NAACP, Baker had served as national field secretary, traveling over 16,000 miles throughout the South. From 1957 to 1960, Baker used her contacts to set up branches of the SCLC in Southern cities. In April 1960, Baker helped students at Shaw University, an African-American university in Raleigh, North Carolina, to organize a national protest group, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, or SNCC, pronounced “snick” for short.

It had been six years since the Brown decision, and many college students viewed the pace of change as too slow. Although these students risked a great deal—losing college scholarships, being expelled from college, being physically harmed—they were determined to challenge the system. SNCC hoped to harness the energy of these student protesters; it would soon create one of the most important student activist movements in the nation’s history.

The Movement Spreads

Although SNCC adopted King’s ideas in part, its members had ideas of their own. Many people called for a more confrontational strategy and set out to reshape the civil rights movement.

DEMONSTRATING FOR FREEDOM The founders of SNCC had models to build on. In 1942 in Chicago, the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) had staged the first sit-ins, in which African-American protesters sat down at segregated lunch counters and refused to leave until they were served. In February 1960, African-American students from North Carolina’s Agricultural and Technical College staged a sit-in at a whites-only lunch counter at a Woolworth’s store in Greensboro. This time, television crews brought coverage of the protest into homes throughout the United States. There was no denying the ugly face of racism. Day after day, news reporters captured the scenes of whites beating, jeering at, and pouring food over students who refused to strike back. The coverage sparked many other sit-ins across the South. Store managers called
in the police, raised the price of food, and removed counter seats. But the movement continued and spread to the North. There, students formed picket lines around national chain stores that maintained segregated lunch counters in the South.

By late 1960, students had descended on and desegregated lunch counters in some 48 cities in 11 states. They endured arrests, beatings, suspension from college, and tear gas and fire hoses, but the army of nonviolent students refused to back down. “My mother has always told me that I’m equal to other people,” said Ezell Blair, Jr., one of the students who led the first SNCC sit-in in 1960. For the rest of the 1960s, many Americans worked to convince the rest of the country that blacks and whites deserved equal treatment.

- Sit-in demonstrators, such as these at a Jackson, Mississippi, lunch counter in 1963, faced intimidation and humiliation from white segregationists.

---

1. **TERMS & NAMES** For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.

- Thurgood Marshall
- *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*
- Rosa Parks
- Martin Luther King, Jr.
- Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC)
- Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)
- Sit-in

2. **MAIN IDEA**

2. **TAKING NOTES** Fill in a spider diagram like the one below with examples of tactics, organizations, leaders, and Supreme Court decisions of the civil rights movement up to 1960.

3. **CRITICAL THINKING**

3. **EVALUATING**

Do you think the nonviolence used by civil rights activists was a good tactic? Explain. **Think About:**

- the Montgomery bus boycott
- television coverage of events
- sit-ins

4. **CONTRASTING**

How did the tactics of the student protesters from SNCC differ from those of the boycotters in Montgomery?

5. **DRAWING CONCLUSIONS**

After the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* ruling, what do you think was the most significant event of the civil rights movement prior to 1960? Why? **Think About:**

- the role of civil rights leaders
- the results of confrontations and boycotts
- the role of grassroots organizations
LEGAL REASONING

While the correctness of the Brown ruling seems obvious today, some justices had difficulty agreeing to it. One reason was the force of legal precedent. Normally, judges follow a policy of stare decisis, “let the decision stand.” The Plessy v. Ferguson decision endorsing segregation (see page 290) had stood for over 50 years. It clearly stated that “separate but equal” facilities did not violate the Fourteenth Amendment.

Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP lawyer who argued Brown, spent years laying the groundwork to chip away at Jim Crow—the local laws that required segregated facilities. Marshall had recently won two Supreme Court decisions in 1950 (McLaurin and Sweatt; see Legal Sources at right) that challenged segregation at graduate schools. Then in 1952, the Supreme Court agreed to hear the Browns’ case. The Court deliberated for two years deciding how to interpret the Fourteenth Amendment.

In the end, Chief Justice Earl Warren carefully sidestepped Plessy, claiming that segregated schools were not and never could be equal. On Monday, May 17, 1954, Warren read the unanimous decision:

“Does segregation of children in public schools . . . deprive children of . . . equal opportunities? We believe it does. . . . To separate them . . . solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority . . . that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone.”

—Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka

RELATED CASES

PLESSY v. FERGUSON (1896)

• Upheld Louisiana’s laws requiring that train passengers be segregated by race.

• Established the doctrine of “separate but equal.”

MCLAURIN v. OKLAHOMA STATE (1950)

Ruled that Oklahoma State University violated the Constitution by keeping its one “Negro” student in the back of the class and the cafeteria.

SWEATT v. PAINTER (1950)

Required the University of Texas to admit an African-American student to its previously all-white law school.

U.S. CONSTITUTION

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT,
EQUAL PROTECTION CLAUSE (1868)

“No state shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.”

LEGAL SOURCES

Linda Brown’s name headed a list of five school desegregation cases heard by the Supreme Court.
WHY IT MATTERED

The Court’s decision in Brown had an immediate impact on pending rulings. In a series of cases after Brown, the Supreme Court prohibited segregation in housing, at public beaches, at recreation facilities, and in restaurants. Later decisions extended equal access to other groups, including women and resident aliens.

The decision encountered fierce resistance, however. It awakened the old battle cry of states’ rights. Directly following Brown, some Congress members circulated the “Southern Manifesto,” claiming the right of the states to ignore the ruling. In taking a stand on a social issue, they said, the Court had taken a step away from simply interpreting legal precedents. Critics charged that the Warren Court had acted as legislators and even as sociologists.

The Brown case strengthened the Civil Rights movement, however, and paved the way for the end of Jim Crow. The NAACP had fought and won the legal battle and had gained prestige and momentum. Americans got the strong message that the federal government now took civil rights seriously.

HISTORICAL IMPACT

Three of the parties involved in Brown—Delaware, Kansas, and the District of Columbia—began to integrate schools in 1954. Topeka County informed the Court that 123 black students were already attending formerly all-white schools. Even so, the Supreme Court was well aware that its decision would be difficult to enforce. In a follow-up ruling, Brown II (1955), the Court required that integration take place with “all deliberate speed.” To some this meant quickly. Others interpreted deliberate to mean slowly.

Only two Southern states even began to integrate classrooms in 1954: Texas and Arkansas opened one and two districts, respectively. By 1960, less than one percent of the South’s students attended integrated schools. Many school districts were ordered to use aggressive means to achieve racial balance. Courts spent decades supervising forced busing, a practice that often pitted community against community.

Still, despite the resistance and the practical difficulties of implementation, Brown stands today as a watershed, the single point at which breaking the “color barrier” officially became a federal priority.

CONNECT TO HISTORY

1. Analyzing Primary Sources Legal precedents are set not only by rulings but also by dissenting opinions, in which justices explain why they disagree with the majority. Justice John Marshall Harlan was the one dissenting voice in Plessy v. Ferguson. Read his opinion and comment on how it might apply to Brown.

   SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R22.

CONNECT TO TODAY 21st CENTURY

2. Visit the links for Historic Decisions of the Supreme Court to research the Supreme Court’s changing opinions on civil rights. Compile a chart or time line to present the facts—date, plaintiff, defendant, major issue, and outcome—of several major cases. Then give an oral presentation explaining the Supreme Court’s role in civil rights.

hmhsocialstudies.com  INTERNET ACTIVITY
The Triumphant
of a Crusade

MAIN IDEA
Civil rights activists broke through racial barriers. Their activism prompted landmark legislation.

WHY IT MATTERS NOW
Activism pushed the federal government to end segregation and ensure voting rights for African Americans.

Terms & Names
- freedom riders
- James Meredith
- Civil Rights Act of 1964
- Freedom Summer
- Fannie Lou Hamer
- Voting Rights Act of 1965

One American’s Story

In 1961, James Peck, a white civil rights activist, joined other CORE members on a historic bus trip across the South. The two-bus trip would test the Supreme Court decisions banning segregated seating on interstate bus routes and segregated facilities in bus terminals. Peck and other freedom riders hoped to provoke a violent reaction that would convince the Kennedy administration to enforce the law. The violence was not long in coming.

At the Alabama state line, white racists got on Bus One carrying chains, brass knuckles, and pistols. They brutally beat African-American riders and white activists who tried to intervene. Still the riders managed to go on. Then on May 4, 1961—Mother’s Day—the bus pulled into the Birmingham bus terminal. James Peck saw a hostile mob waiting, some holding iron bars.

A PERSONAL VOICE  JAMES PECK

“I looked at them and then I looked at Charles Person, who had been designated as my team mate. . . . When I looked at him, he responded by saying simply, ‘Let’s go.’ As we entered the white waiting room, . . . we were grabbed bodily and pushed toward the alleyway . . . and out of sight of onlookers in the waiting room, six of them started swinging at me with fists and pipes. Five others attacked Person a few feet ahead.”

—Freedom Rider

The ride of Bus One had ended, but Bus Two continued southward on a journey that would shock the Kennedy administration into action.

Riding for Freedom

In Anniston, Alabama, about 200 angry whites attacked Bus Two. The mob followed the activists out of town. When one of the tires blew, they smashed a window and tossed in a fire bomb. The freedom riders spilled out just before the bus exploded.
NEW VOLUNTEERS  The bus companies refused to carry the CORE freedom riders any farther. Even though the determined volunteers did not want to give up, they ended their ride. However, CORE director James Farmer announced that a group of SNCC volunteers in Nashville were ready to pick up where the others had left off.

When a new band of freedom riders rode into Birmingham, policemen pulled them from the bus, beat them, and drove them into Tennessee. Defiantly, they returned to the Birmingham bus terminal. Their bus driver, however, feared for his life and refused to transport them. In protest, they occupied the whites-only waiting room at the terminal for eighteen hours until a solution was reached. After an angry phone call from U.S. Attorney General Robert Kennedy, bus company officials convinced the driver to proceed. The riders set out for Montgomery on May 20.

ARRIVAL OF FEDERAL MARSHALS  Although Alabama officials had promised Kennedy that the riders would be protected, a mob of whites—many carrying bats and lead pipes—fell upon the riders when they arrived in Montgomery. John Doer, a Justice Department official on the scene, called the attorney general to report what was happening. “A bunch of men led by a guy with a bleeding face are beating [the passengers]. There are no cops. It’s terrible. There’s not a cop in sight. People are yelling. ‘Get ‘em, get ‘em.’ It’s awful.”

The violence provoked exactly the response the freedom riders wanted. Newspapers throughout the nation and abroad denounced the beatings.

President Kennedy arranged to give the freedom riders direct support. The Justice Department sent 400 U.S. marshals to protect the riders on the last part of their journey to Jackson, Mississippi. In addition, the attorney general and the Interstate Commerce Commission banned segregation in all interstate travel facilities, including waiting rooms, restrooms, and lunch counters.

Standing Firm

With the integration of interstate travel facilities under way, some civil rights workers turned their attention to integrating some Southern schools and pushing the movement into additional Southern towns. At each turn they encountered opposition and often violence.

INTEGRATING OLE MISS  In September 1962, Air Force veteran James Meredith won a federal court case that allowed him to enroll in the all-white University of Mississippi, nicknamed Ole Miss. But when Meredith arrived on campus, he faced Governor Ross Barnett, who refused to let him register as a student.

President Kennedy ordered federal marshals to escort Meredith to the registrar’s office. Barnett responded with a heated radio appeal: “I call on every Mississippian to keep his faith and courage. We will never surrender.” The broadcast turned out white demonstrators by the thousands.

On the night of September 30, riots broke out on campus, resulting in two deaths. It took thousands of soldiers, 200 arrests, and 15 hours to stop the rioters. In the months that followed, federal officials accompanied Meredith to class and protected his parents from nightriders who shot up their house.
HEADING INTO BIRMINGHAM The trouble continued in Alabama. Birmingham, a city known for its strict enforcement of total segregation in public life, also had a reputation for racial violence, including 18 bombings from 1957 to 1963.

Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, head of the Alabama Christian Movement for Human Rights and secretary of the SCLC, decided something had to be done about Birmingham and that it would be the ideal place to test the power of non-violence. He invited Martin Luther King, Jr., and the SCLC to help desegregate the city. On April 3, 1963, King flew into Birmingham to hold a planning meeting with members of the African-American community. “This is the most segregated city in America,” he said. “We have to stick together if we ever want to change its ways.”

After days of demonstrations led by Shuttlesworth and others, King and a small band of marchers were finally arrested during a demonstration on Good Friday, April 12th. While in jail, King wrote an open letter to white religious leaders who felt he was pushing too fast.

A PERSONAL VOICE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

“I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say, ‘Wait.’ But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize and even kill your black brothers and sisters; . . . when you see the vast majority of your twenty million Negro brothers smothering in the air-tight cage of poverty; . . . when you have to concoct an answer for a five-year-old son asking: . . . ‘Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?’ . . . then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait.”

—“Letter from a Birmingham Jail”

On April 20, King posted bail and began planning more demonstrations. On May 2, more than a thousand African-American children marched in Birmingham. Police commissioner Eugene “Bull” Connor’s men arrested 959 of them. On May 3, a second “children’s crusade” came face to face with a helmeted police force. Police swept the marchers off their feet with high-pressure fire hoses, set attack dogs on them, and clubbed those who fell. TV cameras captured all of it, and millions of viewers heard the children screaming.

Continued protests, an economic boycott, and negative media coverage finally convinced Birmingham officials to end segregation. This stunning civil rights victory inspired African Americans across the nation. It also convinced President Kennedy that only a new civil rights act could end racial violence and satisfy the demands of African Americans—and many whites—for racial justice.
ERNEST WITHERS
Born in Memphis in 1922, photographer Ernest Withers believed that if the struggle for equality could be shown to people, things would change. Armed with only a camera, he braved violent crowds to capture the heated racism during the Montgomery bus boycott, the desegregation of Central High in Little Rock, and the 1968 Memphis sanitation workers strike (below) led by Martin Luther King, Jr. The night before the Memphis march, Withers had helped make some of the signs he photographed.

“G. C. Brown printed those ‘I AM A MAN’ signs right over there. . . . I had a car and it was snowing, so we went and rented the saw and came back that night and cut the sticks.”

Withers had to be careful about his involvement in groups like the NAACP and COME (Community On the Move for Equality), for he had a wife and children to support. He went to several meetings a night, sometimes taking pictures, other times offering a suggestion. “I always had FBI agents looking over my shoulder and wanting to question me. I never tried to learn any high-powered secrets.”

SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Visual Sources
1. What do the signs tell you about African Americans’ struggle for civil rights?
2. What kind of treatment do you suppose these men had experienced? Why do you think so?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R23.
“I say, Segregation now! Segregation tomorrow! Segregation forever!”

GEORGE WALLACE, ALABAMA GOVERNOR, 1963

KENNEDY TAKES A STAND On June 11, 1963, the president sent troops to force Governor George Wallace to honor a court order desegregating the University of Alabama. That evening, Kennedy asked the nation: “Are we to say to the world—and much more importantly, to each other—that this is the land of the free, except for the Negroes?” He demanded that Congress pass a civil rights bill.

A tragic event just hours after Kennedy’s speech highlighted the racial tension in much of the South. Shortly after midnight, a sniper murdered Medgar Evers, NAACP field secretary and World War II veteran. Police soon arrested a white supremacist, Byron de la Beckwith, but he was released after two trials resulted in hung juries. His release brought a new militancy to African Americans. Many demanded, “Freedom now!”

Marching to Washington

The civil rights bill that President Kennedy sent to Congress guaranteed equal access to all public accommodations and gave the U.S. attorney general the power to file school desegregation suits. To persuade Congress to pass the bill, two veteran organizers—labor leader A. Philip Randolph and Bayard Rustin of the SCLC—summoned Americans to a march on Washington, D.C.

THE DREAM OF EQUALITY On August 28, 1963, more than 250,000 people—including about 75,000 whites—converged on the nation’s capital. They assembled on the grassy lawn of the Washington Monument and marched to the Lincoln Memorial. There, people listened to speakers demand the immediate passage of the civil rights bill.

When Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., appeared, the crowd exploded in applause. In his now famous speech, “I Have a Dream,” he appealed for peace and racial harmony.

A PERSONAL VOICE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

“I have a dream that one day this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed: ‘We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal.’ . . . I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. . . . I have a dream that one day the state of Alabama . . . will be transformed into a situation where little black boys and black girls will be able to join hands with little white boys and white girls and walk together as sisters and brothers.”

—“I Have a Dream”

MORE VIOLENCE Two weeks after King’s historic speech, four young Birmingham girls were killed when a rider in a car hurled a bomb through their church window. Two more African Americans died in the unrest that followed.

A tragic event just hours after Kennedy’s speech highlighted the racial tension in much of the South. Shortly after midnight, a sniper murdered Medgar Evers, NAACP field secretary and World War II veteran. Police soon arrested a white supremacist, Byron de la Beckwith, but he was released after two trials resulted in hung juries. His release brought a new militancy to African Americans. Many demanded, “Freedom now!”

Two months later, an assassin shot and killed John F. Kennedy. His successor, President Lyndon B. Johnson, pledged to carry on Kennedy’s work. On July 2, 1964, Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited discrimination because of race, religion, national origin, and gender. It gave all citizens the right to enter libraries, parks, washrooms, restaurants, theaters, and other public accommodations.
In the summer of 1964, college students volunteered to go to Mississippi to help register that state’s African-American voters.

Fighting for Voting Rights

Meanwhile, the right of all African Americans to vote remained elusive. In 1964, CORE and SNCC workers in the South began registering as many African Americans as they could to vote. They hoped their campaign would receive national publicity, which would in turn influence Congress to pass a voting rights act. Focused in Mississippi, the project became known as Freedom Summer.

**FREEDOM SUMMER** To fortify the project, civil rights groups recruited college students and trained them in nonviolent resistance. Thousands of student volunteers—mostly white, about one-third female—went into Mississippi to help register voters. For some, the job proved deadly. In June of 1964, three civil rights workers disappeared in Neshoba County, Mississippi. Investigators later learned that Klansmen and local police had murdered the men, two of whom were white. Throughout the summer, the racial beatings and murders continued, along with the burning of businesses, homes, and churches.

**A NEW POLITICAL PARTY** African Americans needed a voice in the political arena if sweeping change was to occur. In order to gain a seat in Mississippi’s all-white Democratic Party, SNCC organized the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party (MFDP). Fannie Lou Hamer, the daughter of Mississippi sharecroppers, would be their voice at the 1964 Democratic National Convention. In a televised speech that shocked the convention and viewers nationwide, Hamer described how she was jailed for registering to vote in 1962, and how police forced other prisoners to beat her.

**A PERSONAL VOICE** **FANNIE LOU HAMER**

“...The first [prisoner] began to beat [me], and I was beat by the first until he was exhausted. . . . The second [prisoner] began to beat. . . . I began to scream and one white man got up and began to beat me in my head and tell me to ‘hush.’ . . . All of this on account we want to register, to become first-class citizens, and if the Freedom Democratic Party is not seated now, I question America.”

—quoted in *The Civil Rights Movement: An Eyewitness History*

In response to Hamer’s speech, telegrams and telephone calls poured in to the convention in support of seating the MFDP delegates. President Johnson feared losing the Southern white vote if the Democrats sided with the MFDP, so his administration pressured civil rights leaders to convince the MFDP to accept a compromise. The Democrats would give 2 of Mississippi’s 68 seats to the MFDP, with a promise to ban discrimination at the 1968 convention.

When Hamer learned of the compromise, she said, “We didn’t come all this way for no two seats.” The MFDP and supporters in SNCC felt that the leaders had betrayed them.
On January 24, 1964, South Dakota became the 38th state to ratify the Twenty-fourth Amendment to the Constitution. The key clause in the amendment reads: “The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election . . . shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.”

Poll taxes were often used to keep poor African Americans from voting. Although most states had already abolished their poll taxes by 1964, five Southern states—Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia—still had such laws on the books. By making these laws unconstitutional, the Twenty-fourth Amendment gave the vote to millions who had been disqualified because of poverty.

THE SELMA CAMPAIGN At the start of 1965, the SCLC conducted a major voting rights campaign in Selma, Alabama, where SNCC had been working for two years to register voters. By the end of 1965, more than 2,000 African Americans had been arrested in SCLC demonstrations. After a demonstrator named Jimmy Lee Jackson was shot and killed, King responded by announcing a 50-mile protest march from Selma to Montgomery, the state capital. On March 7, 1965, about 600 protesters set out for Montgomery.

That night, mayhem broke out. Television cameras captured the scene. The rest of the nation watched in horror as police swung whips and clubs, and clouds of tear gas swirled around fallen marchers. Demonstrators poured into Selma by the hundreds. Ten days later, President Johnson presented Congress with a new voting rights act and asked for its swift passage.

On March 21, 3,000 marchers again set out for Montgomery, this time with federal protection. Soon the number grew to an army of 25,000.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965 That summer, Congress finally passed Johnson’s Voting Rights Act of 1965. The act eliminated the so-called literacy tests that had disqualified many voters. It also stated that federal examiners could enroll voters who had been denied suffrage by local officials. In Selma, the proportion of African Americans registered to vote rose from 10 percent in 1964 to 60 percent in 1968. Overall the percentage of registered African-American voters in the South tripled.

Although the Voting Rights Act marked a major civil rights victory, some felt that the law did not go far enough. Centuries of discrimination had produced social and economic inequalities. Anger over these inequalities led to a series of violent disturbances in the cities of the North.

1. TERMS & NAMES For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
   - freedom riders
   - James Meredith
   - Civil Rights Act of 1964
   - Freedom Summer
   - Fannie Lou Hamer
   - Voting Rights Act of 1965

2. TAKING NOTES In a graphic like the one shown, list the steps that African Americans took to desegregate buses and schools from 1962 to 1965.

3. ANALYZING ISSUES What assumptions and beliefs do you think guided the fierce opposition to the civil rights movement in the South? Support your answer with evidence from the text. Think About:
   - the social and political structure of the South
   - Mississippi governor Ross Barnett’s comment during his radio address
   - the actions of police and some white Southerners

4. ANALYZING PRIMARY SOURCES Just after the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed, white Alabama governor George Wallace said,

   “It is ironical that this event occurs as we approach the celebration of Independence Day. On that day we won our freedom. On this day we have largely lost it.”

What do you think Wallace meant by his statement?
Challenges and Changes in the Movement

**MAIN IDEA**
Disagreements among civil rights groups and the rise of black nationalism created a violent period in the fight for civil rights.

**WHY IT MATTERS NOW**
From the fight for equality came a resurgence of racial pride for African Americans, a legacy that influences today’s generations.

**Terms & Names**
- de facto segregation
- de jure segregation
- Malcolm X
- Nation of Islam
- Stokely Carmichael
- Black Power
- Black Panthers
- Kerner Commission
- Civil Rights Act of 1968
- affirmative action

**One American’s Story**

Alice Walker, the prize-winning novelist, became aware of the civil rights movement in 1960, when she was 16. Her mother had recently scraped together enough money to purchase a television.

**A PERSONAL VOICE ALICE WALKER**

“Like a good omen for the future, the face of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was the first black face I saw on our new television screen. And, as in a fairy tale, my soul was stirred by the meaning for me of his mission—at the time he was being rather ignominiously dumped into a police van for having led a protest march in Alabama—and I fell in love with the sober and determined face of the Movement.”

—In Search of Our Mothers’ Gardens

The next year, Walker attended the all-black Spelman College. In 1963, Walker took part in the March on Washington and then traveled to Africa to discover her spiritual roots. After returning home in 1964, she worked on voter registration, taught African American history and writing, and wrote poetry and fiction.

Walker’s interest in her heritage was part of a growing trend among African Americans in the mid-1960s. But millions of African Americans were still living in poverty. Angry and frustrated over the difficulty in finding jobs and decent housing, some participated in riots that broke out between 1964 and 1966.

**African Americans Seek Greater Equality**

What civil rights groups had in common in the early 1960s were their calls for a newfound pride in black identity and a commitment to change the social and economic structures that kept people in a life of poverty. However, by 1965, the
leading civil rights groups began to drift apart. New leaders emerged as the movement turned its attention to the North, where African Americans faced not legal segregation but deeply entrenched and oppressive racial prejudice.

**NORTHERN SEGREGATION** The problem facing African Americans in the North was **de facto segregation**—segregation that exists by practice and custom. De facto segregation can be harder to fight than **de jure** (dē jōor′ē) segregation, or segregation by law, because eliminating it requires changing people’s attitudes rather than repealing laws. Activists in the mid-1960s would find it much more difficult to convince whites to share economic and social power with African Americans than to convince them to share lunch counters and bus seats.

De facto segregation intensified after African Americans migrated to Northern cities during and after World War II. This began a “white flight,” in which great numbers of whites moved out of the cities to the nearby suburbs. By the mid-1960s, most urban African Americans lived in decaying slums, paying rent to landlords who didn’t comply with housing and health ordinances. The schools for African-American children deteriorated along with their neighborhoods. Unemployment rates were more than twice as high as those among whites.

In addition, many blacks were angry at the sometimes brutal treatment they received from the mostly white police forces in their communities. In 1966, King spearheaded a campaign in Chicago to end de facto segregation there and create an “open city.” On July 10, he led about 30,000 African Americans in a march on City Hall.

In late July, when King led demonstrators through a Chicago neighborhood, angry whites threw rocks and bottles. On August 5, hostile whites stoned King as he led 600 marchers. King left Chicago without accomplishing what he wanted, yet pledging to return.

**URBAN VIOLENCE ERUPTS** In the mid 1960s, clashes between white authority and black civilians spread like wildfire. In New York City in July 1964, an encounter between white police and African-American teenagers ended in the death of a 15-year-old student. This sparked a race riot in central Harlem. On August 11, 1965, only five days after President Johnson signed the Voting Rights Act, a race riot in Chicago was ignited by a dispute between white police and a group of black youths. The riot lasted for three days and resulted in at least 21 deaths and thousands of injuries.

Between 1964 and 1968, more than 100 race riots erupted in major American cities. The worst included Watts in Los Angeles in 1965 (top) and Detroit in 1967 (right). In Detroit, 43 people were killed and property damage topped $40 million.
Rights Act into law, one of the worst race riots in the nation’s history raged through the streets of Watts, a predominantly African-American neighborhood in Los Angeles. Thirty-four people were killed, and hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property was destroyed. The next year, 1966, saw even more racial disturbances, and in 1967 alone, riots and violent clashes took place in more than 100 cities.

The African-American rage baffled many whites. “Why would blacks turn to violence after winning so many victories in the South?” they wondered. Some realized that what African Americans wanted and needed was economic equality of opportunity in jobs, housing, and education.

Even before the riots in 1964, President Johnson had announced his War on Poverty, a program to help impoverished Americans. But the flow of money needed to fund Johnson’s Great Society was soon redirected to fund the war in Vietnam. In 1967, Dr. King proclaimed, “The Great Society has been shot down on the battlefields of Vietnam.”

**New Leaders Voice Discontent**

The anger that sent rioters into the streets stemmed in part from African-American leaders who urged their followers to take complete control of their communities, livelihoods, and culture. One such leader, Malcolm X, declared to a Harlem audience, “If you think we are here to tell you to love the white man, you have come to the wrong place.”

**AFRICAN-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY** Malcolm X, born Malcolm Little, went to jail at age 20 for burglary. While in prison, he studied the teachings of Elijah Muhammad, the head of the Nation of Islam, or the Black Muslims. Malcolm changed his name to Malcolm X (dropping what he called his “slave name”) and, after his release from prison in 1952, became an Islamic minister. As he gained a following, the brilliant thinker and engaging speaker openly preached Elijah Muhammad’s views that whites were the cause of the black condition and that blacks should separate from white society.

Malcolm’s message appealed to many African Americans and their growing racial pride. At a New York press conference in March 1964, he also advocated armed self-defense.

---

**A PERSONAL VOICE  MALCOLM X**

“Concerning nonviolence: it is criminal to teach a man not to defend himself when he is the constant victim of brutal attacks. It is legal and lawful to own a shotgun or a rifle. We believe in obeying the law. . . . [T]he time has come for the American Negro to fight back in self-defense whenever and wherever he is being unjustly and unlawfully attacked.”

—quoted in *Eyewitness: The Negro in American History*

The press gave a great deal of publicity to Malcolm X because his controversial statements made dramatic news stories. This had two effects. First, his call for armed self-defense frightened most whites and many moderate African Americans. Second, reports of the attention Malcolm received awakened resentment in some other members of the Nation of Islam.
**Ballots or Bullets?** In March 1964, Malcolm broke with Elijah Muhammad over differences in strategy and doctrine and formed another Muslim organization. One month later, he embarked on a pilgrimage to Mecca, in Saudi Arabia, a trip required of followers of orthodox Islam. In Mecca, he learned that orthodox Islam preached racial equality, and he worshiped alongside people from many countries. Wrote Malcolm, “I have [prayed] . . . with fellow Muslims whose eyes were the bluest of blue, whose hair was the blondest of blond, and whose skin was the whitest of white.” When he returned to the United States, his attitude toward whites had changed radically. He explained his new slogan, “Ballots or bullets,” to a follower: “Well, if you and I don’t use the ballot, we’re going to be forced to use the bullet. So let us try the ballot.”

Because of his split with the Black Muslims, Malcolm believed his life might be in danger. “No one can get out without trouble,” he confided. On February 21, 1965, while giving a speech in Harlem, the 39-year-old Malcolm X was shot and killed.

**Black Power** In early June of 1966, tensions that had been building between SNCC and the other civil rights groups finally erupted in Mississippi. Here, James Meredith, the man who had integrated the University of Mississippi, set out on a 225-mile “walk against fear.” Meredith planned to walk all the way from the Tennessee border to Jackson, but he was shot by a white racist and was too injured to continue.

Martin Luther King, Jr., of the SCLC, Floyd McKissick of CORE, and Stokely Carmichael of SNCC decided to lead their followers in a march to finish what Meredith had started. But it soon became apparent that SNCC and CORE members were quite militant, as they began to shout slogans similar to those of the black separatists who had followed Malcolm X. When King tried to rally the marchers with the refrain of “We Shall Overcome,” many SNCC workers—bitter over the violence they’d suffered during Freedom Summer—began singing, “We shall overrun.”

Police in Greenwood, Mississippi, arrested Carmichael for setting up a tent on the grounds of an all-black high school. When Carmichael showed up at a rally later, his face swollen from a beating, he electrified the crowd.

_A Personal Voice_ STOKELY CARMICHAEL

“This is the twenty-seventh time I have been arrested—and I ain’t going to jail no more! . . . We been saying freedom for six years—and we ain’t got nothin’. What we’re gonna start saying now is BLACK POWER.”

—quoted in _The Civil Rights Movement: An Eyewitness History_

Black Power, Carmichael said, was a “call for black people to begin to define their own goals . . . [and] to lead their own organizations.” King urged him to stop using the phrase because he believed it would provoke African Americans to violence and antagonize whites. Carmichael refused and urged SNCC to stop recruiting whites and to focus on developing African-American pride.

**Black Panthers** Later that year, another development demonstrated the growing radicalism of some segments of the African-American community. In Oakland, California, in October 1966, Huey Newton and Bobby Seale founded a political party known as the Black Panthers to fight police brutality in the ghetto. The party advocated self-sufficiency for African-American communities, as well as full employment and decent housing. Members maintained that African Americans should be exempt from military service because an unfair number of black youths had been drafted to serve in Vietnam.
Dressed in black leather jackets, black berets, and sunglasses, the Panthers preached self-defense and sold copies of the writings of Mao Zedong, leader of the Chinese Communist revolution. Several police shootouts occurred between the Panthers and police, and the FBI conducted numerous investigations of group members (sometimes using illegal tactics). Even so, many of the Panthers’ activities—the establishment of daycare centers, free breakfast programs, free medical clinics, assistance to the homeless, and other services—won support in the ghettos.

1968—A Turning Point in Civil Rights

Martin Luther King, Jr., objected to the Black Power movement. He believed that preaching violence could only end in grief. King was planning to lead a Poor People's March on Washington, D.C. However, this time the people would have to march without him.

KING’S DEATH Dr. King seemed to sense that death was near. On April 3, 1968, he addressed a crowd in Memphis, where he had gone to support the city’s striking garbage workers. “I may not get there with you but . . . we as a people will get to the Promised Land.” He added, “I’m not fearing any man. Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord.” The next day as King stood on his hotel balcony, James Earl Ray thrust a high-powered rifle out of a window and squeezed the trigger. King crumpled to the floor.

REATIONS TO KING’S DEATH The night King died, Robert F. Kennedy was campaigning for the Democratic presidential nomination. Fearful that King’s death would spark riots, Kennedy’s advisers told him to cancel his appearance in an African-American neighborhood in Indianapolis. However, Kennedy attended anyway, making an impassioned plea for nonviolence.

A PERSONAL VOICE ROBERT F. KENNEDY

“For those of you who are black—considering the evidence . . . that there were white people who were responsible—you can be filled with bitterness, with hatred, and a desire for revenge. We can move in that direction as a country, in great polarization—black people amongst black, white people amongst white, filled with hatred toward one another.

Or we can make an effort, as Martin Luther King did, to understand and comprehend, and to replace that violence, that stain of bloodshed that has spread across our land, with an effort to understand [with] compassion and love.”

—“A Eulogy for Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.”

Despite Kennedy’s plea, rage over King’s death led to the worst urban rioting in United States history. Over 100 cities exploded in flames. The hardest-hit cities included Baltimore, Chicago, Kansas City, and Washington, D.C. Then in June 1968, Robert Kennedy himself was assassinated by a Jordanian immigrant who was angry over Kennedy’s support of Israel.
On March 1, 1968, the Kerner Commission, which President Johnson had appointed to study the causes of urban violence, issued its 200,000-word report. In it, the panel named one main cause: white racism. Said the report: “This is our basic conclusion: Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal.” The report called for the nation to create new jobs, construct new housing, and end de facto segregation in order to wipe out the destructive ghetto environment. However, the Johnson administration ignored many of the recommendations because of white opposition to such sweeping changes. So what had the civil rights movement accomplished?

**CIVIL RIGHTS GAINS** The civil rights movement ended de jure segregation by bringing about legal protection for the civil rights of all Americans. Congress passed the most important civil rights legislation since Reconstruction, including the Civil Rights Act of 1968, which ended discrimination in housing. After school segregation ended, the numbers of African Americans who finished high school and who went to college increased significantly. This in turn led to better jobs and business opportunities.

Another accomplishment of the civil rights movement was to give African Americans greater pride in their racial identity. Many African Americans adopted African-influenced styles and proudly displayed symbols of African history and culture. College students demanded new Black Studies programs so they could study African-American history and literature. In the entertainment world, the “color bar” was lowered as African Americans began to appear more frequently in movies and on television shows and commercials.

In addition, African Americans made substantial political gains. By 1970, an estimated two-thirds of eligible African Americans were registered to vote, and a significant increase in African-American elected officials resulted. The number of African Americans holding elected office grew from fewer than 100 in 1965 to more than 7,000 in 1992. Many civil rights activists went on to become political leaders, among them Reverend Jesse Jackson, who sought the Democratic nomination for president in 1984 and 1988; Vernon Jordan, who led voter-registration drives that enrolled about 2 million African Americans; and Andrew Young, who has served as UN ambassador and Atlanta’s mayor.

**UNFINISHED WORK** The civil rights movement was successful in changing many discriminatory laws. Yet as the 1960s turned to the 1970s, the challenges for the movement changed. The issues it confronted—housing and job discrimination, educational inequality, poverty, and racism—involved the difficult task of changing people’s attitudes and behavior. Some of the proposed solutions, such as more tax monies spent in the inner cities and the forced busing of schoolchildren, angered some whites, who resisted further changes. Public support for the civil rights movement declined because some whites were frightened by the urban riots and the Black Panthers.

By 1990, the trend of whites fleeing the cities for the suburbs had reversed much of the progress toward school
integration. In 1996–1997, 28 percent of blacks in the South and 50 percent of blacks in the Northeast were attending schools with fewer than 10 percent whites. Lack of jobs also remained a serious problem for African Americans, who had a poverty rate three times that of whites.

To help equalize education and job opportunities, the government in the 1960s began to promote affir{}mative action. Affirmative-action programs involve making special efforts to hire or enroll groups that have suffered discrimination. Many colleges and almost all companies that do business with the federal government adopted such programs. But in the late 1970s, some people began to criticize affirmative-action programs as “reverse discrimination” that set minority hiring or enrollment quotas and deprived whites of opportunities. In the 1980s, Republican administrations eased affirmative-action requirements for some government contractors. The fate of affirmative action is still to be decided.

Today, African Americans and whites interact in ways that could have only been imagined before the civil rights movement. In many respects, Dr. King’s dream has been realized—yet much remains to be done.
Civil Rights

Thomas Jefferson asserted in the Declaration of Independence that “all men are created equal” and are endowed with the “unalienable rights” of “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” With these words, a new nation was founded on the principle that citizens have certain fundamental civil rights. These include the right to vote, the right to enjoy freedom of speech and religion, and others. For more than 200 years, the United States has stood as a worldwide example of a country committed to securing the rights of its people.

However, throughout the nation’s history, some Americans have had to struggle to obtain even the most basic civil rights. Laws or customs prevented certain people from voting freely, from speaking their minds on political issues, and from living and going where they wish. Over time, many of these barriers have been torn down.

In recent years, the United States has tried to promote human rights in other countries through its foreign policy. Even as it does so, the United States continues to struggle to fulfill for all Americans the lofty ideals established by the nation’s founders.

1791

**BILL OF RIGHTS**

During the Constitutional Convention, the question of a bill of rights arose, but none was included. During the process of ratification, many people argued that the Constitution needed to list the basic civil rights and liberties that the federal government could not take away from the people.

Accordingly, the nation ratified ten amendments to the Constitution—the Bill of Rights. It establishes such rights as freedom of speech, religion, and assembly, freedom of the press, and the right to a trial by jury. While these rights have been subject to interpretation over the nation’s history, the Bill of Rights serves as the cornerstone of American democracy.

1868

**THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT**

In the engraving above, a crowd of black and white Americans celebrates the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1866. This act recognized the citizenship of African Americans and granted the same civil rights to all people born in the United States except Native Americans.

The Fourteenth Amendment, ratified two years later, made these changes part of the Constitution. The Amendment declared that states cannot deny anyone “equal protection of the laws” and extended the right to vote to all 21-year-old males, including former slaves.

Despite these provisions, African Americans and other groups would still struggle to claim their full rights as U.S. citizens.
THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Despite the Fourteenth Amendment and later the Fifteenth Amendment, which forbade states from denying anyone the right to vote on account of race, African Americans continued to live as second-class citizens, especially in the South.

During the 1950s and 1960s, African Americans and other Americans led a powerful movement to fight for racial equality. The movement often met with strong resistance, such as in Birmingham, Alabama, where police sprayed demonstrators with high-pressure fire hoses (right). Nevertheless, it succeeded in securing for African Americans the civil rights promised by the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. The civil rights movement has also been the basis for other groups gaining equal rights, including other minorities, women, and people with disabilities.

HUMAN RIGHTS

President Jimmy Carter considered human rights an important foreign policy issue. Human rights are what Americans think of as their civil rights, including the right to vote and to receive a fair trial. The Carter administration tried to encourage greater freedom abroad by taking such steps as cutting off military aid to countries with poor human rights records.

While these efforts met with mixed results, the issue of human rights has continued to influence U.S. foreign policy. In the 1990s, for example, the U.S. government tried to push China toward increasing human rights while keeping alive its trade ties with that country.

As a private citizen, Jimmy Carter has also continued to champion human rights causes. In 1982, he and his wife, Rosalynn, founded the Carter Center, whose programs seek to end human rights abuses and promote democracy worldwide.
**TERMS & NAMES**

For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the civil rights movement.

1. *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*
2. Rosa Parks
3. Martin Luther King, Jr.
4. Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee
5. freedom rider
6. Civil Rights Act of 1964
7. Fannie Lou Hamer
8. de facto segregation
9. Malcolm X
10. Black Power

**MAIN IDEAS**

Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

**Taking on Segregation** (pages 700–707)

1. What were Jim Crow laws and how were they applied?
2. What were the roots of Martin Luther King, Jr.’s beliefs in nonviolent resistance?

**The Triumphs of a Crusade** (pages 710–716)

3. What was the significance of the federal court case won by James Meredith in 1962?
4. Cite three examples of violence committed between 1962 and 1964 against African Americans and civil rights activists.

**Challenges and Changes in the Movement** (pages 717–723)

5. What were some of the key beliefs advocated by Malcolm X?
6. Why did some civil rights leaders urge Stokely Carmichael to stop using the slogan “Black Power”?

**THINKING CRITICALLY**

1. **USING YOUR NOTES** On your own paper, draw a cluster diagram like the one shown below. Then, fill it in with four events from the civil rights movement that were broadcast on nationwide television and that you find the most compelling.

   ![Cluster Diagram Example]

2. **HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE** Overall, would you characterize the civil rights struggle as a unified or disunified movement? Explain.

3. **INTERPRETING MAPS** Look carefully at the map of U.S. school segregation on page 701. What regional differences do you think spurred civil rights activists to target the South before the North?
Use the diagram and your knowledge of United States history to answer question 1.

Civil Rights Strategies and Actions, 1954-1968

- SCLC
- SNCC
- April 15, 1965
- X
- Voter

1. The Venn diagram is partially filled in with the strategies of various civil rights groups in the 1960s. Which of the following could be added to the area of the diagram labeled X?
   A. provide social services to the needy
   B. boycotts
   C. nonviolent demonstrations
   D. armed self-defense

Use the quotation as well as your knowledge of United States history to answer question 2.

“An illegal attack, an unjust attack, and an immoral attack can be made against you by any one. Just because a person has on a [police] uniform does not give him the right to come and shoot up your neighborhood. No, this is not right, and my suggestion would be that as long as the police department doesn’t use those methods in white neighborhoods, they shouldn’t come . . . and use them in our neighborhood. . . .”


2. Which of the following events justifies Malcolm X’s concerns about police brutality?
   F. the Rosa Parks incident in 1955
   G. the 1963 Birmingham demonstrations
   H. the desegregation of Little Rock’s Central High in 1957
   J. the first sit-ins in 1942

INTERACT WITH HISTORY

Think about the issues you explored at the beginning of the chapter. Choose one participant in the civil rights movement. Write a speech from that person’s perspective in which you evaluate your role in the movement. Consider what civil rights you worked for, why those rights are important, how successful you were, and the costs of your struggle.

FOCUS ON WRITING

Imagine you are a leader of the civil rights movement. Write a persuasive speech urging citizens to support the movement, explaining why civil rights for all people are necessary. Support your argument by listing the benefits that civil rights provide for all citizens. Use vivid details and descriptive language.

COLLABORATIVE LEARNING

Working with a partner, use library or Internet sources to learn more about the Montgomery bus boycott. Then work together to create a pamphlet designed to teach others about the boycott and to encourage them to become involved. Consider what information you should include and how you should organize it to maximize your pamphlet’s effectiveness.
Essential Question
What were the military and political events of the Vietnam War and how did this conflict impact life in the United States?

What You Will Learn
In this chapter you will learn about the causes and impact of the war in Vietnam.

SECTION 1: Moving Toward Conflict
Main Idea: To stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia, the United States used its military to support South Vietnam.

SECTION 2: U.S. Involvement and Escalation
Main Idea: The United States sent troops to fight in Vietnam, but the war quickly turned into a stalemate.

SECTION 3: A Nation Divided
Main Idea: An antiwar movement in the U.S. pitted supporters of the government’s war policy against those who opposed it.

SECTION 4: 1968: A Tumultuous Year
Main Idea: An enemy attack in Vietnam, two assassinations, and a chaotic political convention made 1968 an explosive year.

SECTION 5: The End of the War and Its Legacy
Main Idea: President Nixon instituted his Vietnamization policy, and America’s longest war finally came to an end.

In 1965, America’s fight against communism has spread to Southeast Asia, where the United States is becoming increasingly involved in another country’s civil war. Unable to claim victory, U.S. generals call for an increase in the number of combat troops. Facing a shortage of volunteers, the president implements a draft.

Explore the Issues
• Should people who believe the war is wrong be forced to fight?
• Should people with special skills be exempt?
• How can a draft be made fair?

1970
- Communists capture Saigon; South Vietnam surrenders.
- Ferdinand Marcos declares martial law in the Philippines.

1975
- Gerald R. Ford becomes president after Richard M. Nixon resigns.
- United States signs cease-fire with North Vietnam and Vietcong.

1972
- Richard M. Nixon is reelected.
- Ohio National Guard kills four students at Kent State University.

1970
- Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert Kennedy are assassinated.
- U.S. troops begin their withdrawal from Vietnam.

1969
- Richard M. Nixon is elected president.
One American’s Story

On the morning of September 26, 1945, Lieutenant Colonel A. Peter Dewey was on his way to the Saigon airport in Vietnam. Only 28, Dewey served in the Office of Strategic Services, the chief intelligence-gathering body of the U.S. military and forerunner of the Central Intelligence Agency. Dewey was sent to assess what was becoming an explosive situation in Vietnam, a Southeast Asian country that had recently been freed from Japanese rule as a result of the allied victory in World War II. (See map on page 733.)

Before the war, France had ruled Vietnam and the surrounding countries; now it sought—with British aid—to regain control of the region. The Vietnamese had resisted Japanese occupation; now they were preparing to fight the French. Dewey saw nothing but disaster in France’s plan. “Cochinchina [southern Vietnam] is burning,” he reported, “the French and British are finished here, and we [the United States] ought to clear out of Southeast Asia.”

On his way to the airport, Dewey encountered a roadblock staffed by Vietnamese soldiers and shouted at them in French. Presumably mistaking him for a French soldier, the guards shot him in the head. Thus, A. Peter Dewey, whose body was never recovered, was the first American to die in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, Dewey would not be the last. As Vietnam’s independence effort came under communist influence, the United States grew increasingly concerned about the small country’s future. Eventually, America would fight a war to halt the spread of communism in Vietnam. The war would claim the lives of almost 60,000 Americans and more than 2 million Vietnamese. It also would divide the American nation as no other event since the Civil War.

America Supports France in Vietnam

America’s involvement in Vietnam began in 1950, during the French Indochina War, the name given to France’s attempt to reestablish its rule in Vietnam after World War II. Seeking to strengthen its ties with France and to help fight the spread of communism, the United States provided the French with massive economic and military support.
**FRENCH RULE IN VIETNAM** From the late 1800s until World War II, France ruled most of Indochina, including Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. French colonists, who built plantations on peasant land and extracted rice and rubber for their own profit, encountered growing unrest among the Vietnamese peasants. French rulers reacted harshly by restricting freedom of speech and assembly and by jailing many Vietnamese nationalists. These measures failed to curb all dissent, and opposition continued to grow.

The Indochinese Communist Party, founded in 1930, staged a number of revolts under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh. Although the French condemned Ho Chi Minh to death for his rebellious activity, he fled Vietnam and orchestrated Vietnam's growing independence movement from exile in the Soviet Union and later from China.

In 1940 the Japanese took control of Vietnam. The next year, Ho Chi Minh returned home and helped form the Vietminh, an organization whose goal it was to win Vietnam's independence from foreign rule. When the Allied defeat of Japan in August 1945 forced the Japanese to leave Vietnam, that goal suddenly seemed a reality. On September 2, 1945, Ho Chi Minh stood in the middle of a huge crowd in the northern city of Hanoi and declared Vietnam an independent nation.

**FRANCE BATTLES THE VIETMINH** France, however, had no intention of relinquishing its former colony. French troops moved back into Vietnam by the end of 1945, eventually regaining control of the cities and the country's southern half. Ho Chi Minh vowed to fight from the North to liberate the South from French control. “If ever the tiger pauses,” Ho had said, referring to the Vietminh, “the elephant [France] will impale him on his mighty tusks. But the tiger will not pause, and the elephant will die of exhaustion and loss of blood.”

In 1950, the United States entered the Vietnam struggle—despite A. Peter Dewey’s warnings. That year, President Truman sent nearly $15 million in economic aid to France. Over the next four years, the United States paid for much of France’s war, pumping nearly $1 billion into the effort to defeat a man America had once supported. Ironically, during World War II, the United States had forged an alliance with Ho Chi Minh, supplying him with aid to resist the Japanese. But by 1950, the United States had come to view its one-time ally as a communist aggressor.

**THE VIETMINH DRIVE OUT THE FRENCH** Upon entering the White House in 1953, President Eisenhower continued the policy of supplying aid to the French war effort. By this time, the United States had settled for a stalemate with the communists in Korea, which only stiffened America’s resolve to halt the spread of communism elsewhere. During a news conference in 1954, Eisenhower explained the domino theory, in which he likened the countries on the brink of communism to a row of dominoes waiting to fall one after the other. “You have a row of dominoes set up,” the president said. “You knock over the first one, and what will happen to the last one is the certainty that it will go over very quickly.”

Despite massive U.S. aid, however, the French could not retake Vietnam. They were forced to surrender in May of 1954, when the Vietminh overran the French outpost at Dien Bien Phu, in northwestern Vietnam.
From May through July 1954, the countries of France, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, the United States, China, Laos, and Cambodia met in Geneva, Switzerland, with the Vietminh and with South Vietnam’s anticommunist nationalists to hammer out a peace agreement. The **Geneva Accords** temporarily divided Vietnam along the 17th parallel. The Communists and their leader, Ho Chi Minh, controlled North Vietnam from the capital of Hanoi. The anticommunist nationalists controlled South Vietnam from the capital and southern port city of Saigon. An election to unify the country was called for in 1956.

**The United States Steps In**

In the wake of France’s retreat, the United States took a more active role in halting the spread of communism in Vietnam. Wading deeper into the country’s affairs, the Eisenhower and the Kennedy administrations provided economic and military aid to South Vietnam’s non-Communist regime.

**DIEM CANCELS ELECTIONS** Although he directed a brutal and repressive regime, Ho Chi Minh won popular support in the North by breaking up large estates and redistributing land to peasants. Moreover, his years of fighting the Japanese and French had made him a national hero. Recognizing Ho Chi Minh’s widespread popularity, South Vietnam’s president, **Ngo Dinh Diem** (n̪ɡoʊ dɪn dɪˈɛm ˈdiːm), a strong anti-Communist, refused to take part in the countrywide election of 1956. The United States also sensed that a countrywide election might spell victory for Ho Chi Minh and supported canceling elections. The Eisenhower administration promised military aid and training to Diem in return for a stable reform government in the South.

Diem, however, failed to hold up his end of the bargain. He ushered in a corrupt government that suppressed opposition of any kind and offered little or no land distribution to peasants. In addition, Diem, a devout Catholic, angered the country’s majority Buddhist population by restricting Buddhist practices.

By 1957, a Communist opposition group in the South, known as the **Vietcong**, had begun attacks on the Diem government, assassinating thousands of South Vietnamese government officials. Although the political arm of the group would later be called the National Liberation Front (NLF), the United States continued to refer to the fighters as the Vietcong.

Ho Chi Minh supported the group, and in 1959 began supplying arms to the Vietcong via a network of paths along the borders of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia that became known as the **Ho Chi Minh Trail**. (See map on page 733.) As the fighters stepped up their surprise attacks, or guerrilla tactics, South Vietnam grew more unstable. The Eisenhower administration took little action, however, deciding to “sink or swim with Ngo Dinh Diem.”

**KENNEDY AND VIETNAM** The Kennedy administration, which entered the White House in 1961, also chose initially to “swim” with Diem. Wary of accusations that Democrats were “soft” on communism, President Kennedy increased financial aid to Diem’s teetering regime and sent thousands of military advisers to help train South Vietnamese troops. By the end of 1963, 16,000 U.S. military personnel were in South Vietnam.

Meanwhile, Diem’s popularity plummeted because of ongoing corruption and his failure to respond to calls for land reform. To combat the growing Vietcong presence in the South’s countryside, the Diem administration initiated the strategic hamlet program, which meant moving all villagers to protected areas.
After parachuting into the mountains north of Dien Bien Phu, South Vietnamese troops await orders from French officers in 1953.

The swampy terrain of South Vietnam made for difficult and dangerous fighting. This 1961 photograph shows South Vietnamese Army troops in combat operations against Vietcong.

Rivers serve as places to work, bathe, and wash clothing.

**GEOGRAPHY SKILLBUILDER**

1. **Movement** Through which countries did the Ho Chi Minh Trail pass?
2. **Location** How might North Vietnam’s location have enabled it to get aid from its ally, China?
Many Vietnamese deeply resented being moved from their home villages where they had lived for generations and where ancestors were buried. Diem also intensified his attack on Buddhism. Fed up with continuing Buddhist demonstrations, the South Vietnamese ruler imprisoned and killed hundreds of Buddhist clerics and destroyed their temples. To protest, several Buddhist monks and nuns publicly burned themselves to death. Horrified, American officials urged Diem to stop the persecutions, but Diem refused.

It had become clear that for South Vietnam to remain stable, Diem would have to go. On November 1, 1963, a U.S.-supported military coup toppled Diem’s regime. Against Kennedy’s wishes, Diem was assassinated. A few weeks later, Kennedy, too, fell to an assassin’s bullet. The United States presidency—along with the growing crisis in Vietnam—now belonged to Lyndon B. Johnson.

President Johnson Expands the Conflict

Shortly before his death, Kennedy had announced his intent to withdraw U.S. forces from South Vietnam. “In the final analysis, it’s their war,” he declared. Whether Kennedy would have withdrawn from Vietnam remains a matter of debate. However, Lyndon Johnson escalated the nation’s role in Vietnam and eventually began what would become America’s longest war.

THE SOUTH GROWS MORE UNSTABLE  Diem’s death brought more chaos to South Vietnam. A string of military leaders attempted to lead the country, but each regime was more unstable and inefficient than Diem’s had been. Meanwhile, the Vietcong’s influence in the countryside steadily grew.

President Johnson believed that a communist takeover of South Vietnam would be disastrous. Johnson, like Kennedy, was particularly sensitive to being perceived as “soft” on communism. “If I . . . let the communists take over South Vietnam,” Johnson said, “then . . . my nation would be seen as an appeaser and we would . . . find it impossible to accomplish anything . . . anywhere on the entire globe.”

THE TONKIN GULF RESOLUTION  On August 2, 1964, a North Vietnamese patrol boat fired a torpedo at an American destroyer, the USS Maddox, which was patrolling in the Gulf of Tonkin off the North Vietnamese coast. The torpedo missed its target, but the Maddox returned fire and inflicted heavy damage on the patrol boat.
Two days later, the Maddox and another destroyer were again off the North Vietnamese coast. In spite of bad weather that could affect visibility, the crew reported enemy torpedoes, and the American destroyers began firing. The crew of the Maddox later declared, however, that they had neither seen nor heard hostile gunfire.

The alleged attack on the U.S. ships prompted President Johnson to launch bombing strikes on North Vietnam. He asked Congress for powers to take “all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression.” Congress approved Johnson’s request, with only two senators voting against it, and adopted the Tonkin Gulf Resolution on August 7. While not a declaration of war, it granted Johnson broad military powers in Vietnam.

Johnson did not tell Congress or the American people that the United States had been leading secret raids against North Vietnam. The Maddox had been in the Gulf of Tonkin to collect information for these raids. Furthermore, Johnson had prepared the resolution months beforehand and was only waiting for the chance to push it through Congress.

In February of 1965, President Johnson used his newly granted powers. In response to a Vietcong attack that killed eight Americans, Johnson unleashed “Operation Rolling Thunder,” the first sustained bombing of North Vietnam. In March of that year the first American combat troops began arriving in South Vietnam. By June, more than 50,000 U.S. soldiers were battling the Vietcong. The Vietnam War had become Americanized.

The Navy destroyer U.S.S. Maddox.
Tim O’Brien is a novelist who has written several books about his experience in Vietnam and its lasting effects. Drafted at the age of 21, O’Brien was sent to Vietnam in August 1968. He spent the first seven months of his nearly two-year duty patrolling the fields outside of Chu Lai, a seacoast city in South Vietnam. O’Brien described one of the more nerve-racking experiences of the war: walking through the fields and jungles, many of which were filled with land mines and booby traps.

A PERSONAL VOICE  TIM O’BRIEN
“...You do some thinking. You hallucinate. You look ahead a few paces and wonder what your legs will resemble if there is more to the earth in that spot than silicates and nitrogen. Will the pain be unbearable? Will you scream and fall silent? Will you be afraid to look at your own body, afraid of the sight of your own red flesh and white bone? . . .

It is not easy to fight this sort of self-defeating fear, but you try. You decide to be ultra-careful—the hard-nosed realistic approach. You try to second-guess the mine. Should you put your foot to that flat rock or the clump of weeds to its rear? Paddy dike or water? You wish you were Tarzan, able to swing on the vines. You trace the footprints of the men to your front. You give up when he curses you for following too closely; better one man dead than two.”


Deadly traps were just some of the obstacles that U.S. troops faced. As the infiltration of American ground troops into Vietnam failed to score a quick victory, a mostly supportive U.S. population began to question its government’s war policy.

Johnson Increases U.S. Involvement

Much of the nation supported Lyndon Johnson’s determination to contain communism in Vietnam. In the years following 1965, President Johnson began sending large numbers of American troops to fight alongside the South Vietnamese.
STRONG SUPPORT FOR CONTAINMENT  Even after Congress had approved the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, President Johnson opposed sending U.S. ground troops to Vietnam. Johnson’s victory in the 1964 presidential election was due in part to charges that his Republican opponent, Barry Goldwater, was an anti-Communist who might push the United States into war with the Soviet Union. In contrast to Goldwater’s heated, warlike language, Johnson’s speeches were more moderate, yet he spoke determinedly about containing communism. He declared he was “not about to send American boys 9 or 10,000 miles away from home to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves.”

However, in March of 1965, that is precisely what the president did. Working closely with his foreign-policy advisers, particularly Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, President Johnson began dispatching tens of thousands of U.S. soldiers to fight in Vietnam. Some Americans viewed Johnson’s decision as contradictory to his position during the presidential campaign. However, most saw the president as following an established and popular policy of confronting communism anywhere in the world. Congress, as well as the American public, strongly supported Johnson’s strategy. A 1965 poll showed that 61 percent of Americans supported the U.S. policy in Vietnam, while only 24 percent opposed.

There were dissenters within the Johnson administration, too. In October of 1964, Undersecretary of State George Ball had argued against escalation, warning that “once on the tiger’s back, we cannot be sure of picking the place to dismount.” However, the president’s closest advisers strongly urged escalation, believing the defeat of communism in Vietnam to be of vital importance to the future of America and the world. Dean Rusk stressed this view in a 1965 memo to President Johnson.

A PERSONAL VOICE  DEAN RUSK

“The integrity of the U.S. commitment is the principal pillar of peace throughout the world. If that commitment becomes unreliable, the communist world would draw conclusions that would lead to our ruin and almost certainly to a catastrophic war. So long as the South Vietnamese are prepared to fight for themselves, we cannot abandon them without disaster to peace and to our interests throughout the world.”

—quoted in In Retrospect

THE TROOP BUILDUP ACCELERATES  By the end of 1965, the U.S. government had sent more than 180,000 Americans to Vietnam. The American commander in South Vietnam, General William Westmoreland, continued to request more troops. Westmoreland, a West Point graduate who had served in World War II and Korea, was less than impressed with the fighting ability of the South Vietnamese Army, or the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN). The ARVN “cannot stand up to this pressure without substantial U.S. combat support on the ground,” the general reported. “The only possible response is the aggressive deployment of U.S. troops.” Throughout the early years of the war, the Johnson administration complied with Westmoreland’s requests; by 1967, the number of U.S. troops in Vietnam had climbed to about 500,000.
The United States entered the war in Vietnam believing that its superior weaponry would lead it to victory over the Vietcong. However, the jungle terrain and the enemy’s guerrilla tactics soon turned the war into a frustrating stalemate.

AN ELUSIVE ENEMY Because the Vietcong lacked the high-powered weaponry of the American forces, they used hit-and-run and ambush tactics, as well as a keen knowledge of the jungle terrain, to their advantage. Moving secretly in and out of the general population, the Vietcong destroyed the notion of a traditional front line by attacking U.S. troops in both the cities and the countryside. Because some of the enemy lived amidst the civilian population, it was difficult for U.S. troops to discern friend from foe. A woman selling soft drinks to U.S. soldiers might be a Vietcong spy. A boy standing on the corner might be ready to throw a grenade.

Adding to the Vietcong’s elusiveness was a network of elaborate tunnels that allowed them to withstand airstrikes and to launch surprise attacks and then disappear quickly. Connecting villages throughout the countryside, the tunnels became home to many guerrilla fighters. “The more the Americans tried to drive us away from our land, the more we burrowed into it,” recalled Nguyen Quoc, a major in the Vietcong army.

In addition, the terrain was laced with countless booby traps and land mines. Because the exact location of the Vietcong was often unknown, U.S. troops laid land mines throughout the jungle. The Vietcong also laid their own traps, and disassembled and reused U.S. mines. American soldiers marching through South
Vietnam’s jungles and rice paddies not only dealt with sweltering heat and leeches but also had to be cautious of every step. In a 1969 letter to his sister, Specialist Fourth Class Salvador Gonzalez described the tragic result from an unexploded U.S. bomb that the North Vietnamese Army had rigged.

**A PERSONAL VOICE  SALVADOR GONZALEZ**

“Two days ago 4 guys got killed and about 15 wounded from the first platoon. Our platoon was 200 yards away on top of a hill. One guy was from Floral Park [in New York City]. He had five days left to go [before being sent home]. He was standing on a 250-lb. bomb that a plane had dropped and didn’t explode. So the NVA [North Vietnamese Army] wired it up. Well, all they found was a piece of his wallet.”

—quoted in Dear America: Letters Home from Vietnam

**A FRUSTRATING WAR OF ATTRITION** Westmoreland’s strategy for defeating the Vietcong was to destroy their morale through a war of attrition, or the gradual wearing down of the enemy by continuous harassment. Introducing the concept of the body count, or the tracking of Vietcong killed in battle, the general believed that as the number of Vietcong dead rose, the guerrillas would inevitably surrender.

However, the Vietcong had no intention of quitting their fight. Despite the growing number of casualties and the relentless pounding from U.S. bombers, the Vietcong—who received supplies from China and the Soviet Union—remained defiant. Defense Secretary McNamara confessed his frustration to a reporter in 1966: “If I had thought they would take this punishment and fight this well, . . . I would have thought differently at the start.”

General Westmoreland would say later that the United States never lost a battle in Vietnam. Whether or not the general’s words were true, they underscored the degree to which America misunderstood its foe. The United States viewed the war strictly as a military struggle; the Vietcong saw it as a battle for their very existence, and they were ready to pay any price for victory.

**THE BATTLE FOR “HEARTS AND MINDS”** Another key part of the American strategy was to keep the Vietcong from winning the support of South Vietnam’s rural population. Edward G. Lansdale, who helped found the fighting unit known as the U.S. Army Special Forces, or Green Berets, stressed the plan’s importance. “Just remember this. Communist guerrillas hide among the people. If you win the people over to your side, the communist guerrillas have no place to hide.”

The campaign to win the “hearts and minds” of the South Vietnamese villagers proved more difficult than imagined. For instance, in their attempt to expose Vietcong tunnels and hideouts, U.S. planes dropped napalm, a gasoline-based bomb that set fire to the jungle. They also sprayed Agent Orange, a leaf-killing toxic chemical. The saturation use of these weapons often wounded civilians and left villages and their surroundings in ruins. Years later, many would blame Agent Orange for cancers suffered by Vietnamese civilians and American veterans.

U.S. soldiers conducted search-and-destroy missions, uprooting civilians with suspected ties to the Vietcong, killing their livestock, and burning villages. Many villagers fled into the cities or refugee camps, creating by 1967 more than 3 million refugees in the South. The irony of the strategy was summed up in February 1968 by a U.S. major whose forces had just leveled the town of Ben Tre: “We had to destroy the town in order to save it.”
SINKING MORALE The frustrations of guerrilla warfare, the brutal jungle conditions, and the failure to make substantial headway against the enemy took their toll on the U.S. troops’ morale. Philip Caputo, a marine lieutenant in Vietnam who later wrote several books about the war, summarized the soldiers’ growing disillusionment: “When we marched into the rice paddies . . . we carried, along with our packs and rifles, the implicit convictions that the Vietcong could be quickly beaten. We kept the packs and rifles; the convictions, we lost.”

As the war continued, American morale dropped steadily. Many soldiers, required by law to fight a war they did not support, turned to alcohol, marijuana, and other drugs. Low morale even led a few soldiers to murder their officers. Morale worsened during the later years of the war when soldiers realized they were fighting even as their government was negotiating a withdrawal.

Another obstacle was the continuing corruption and instability of the South Vietnamese government. Nguyen Cao Ky, a flamboyant air marshal, led the government from 1965 to 1967. Ky ignored U.S. pleas to retire in favor of an elected civilian government. Mass demonstrations began, and by May of 1966, Buddhist monks and nuns were once again burning themselves in protest against the South Vietnamese government. South Vietnam was fighting a civil war within a civil war, leaving U.S. officials confused and angry.

FULFILLING A DUTY Most American soldiers, however, firmly believed in their cause—to halt the spread of communism. They took patriotic pride in fulfilling their duty, just as their fathers had done in World War II.

Most American soldiers fought courageously. Particularly heroic were the thousands of soldiers who endured years of torture and confinement as prisoners of war. In 1966, navy pilot Gerald Coffee’s plane was shot down over North Vietnam. Coffee spent the next seven years—until he was released in 1973 as part of a cease-fire agreement—struggling to stay alive in an enemy prison camp.

A PERSONAL VOICE GERALD COFFEE
“My clothes were filthy and ragged. . . . With no boots, my socks—which I’d been able to salvage—were barely recognizable. . . . Only a few threads around my toes kept them spread over my feet; some protection, at least, as I shivered through the cold nights curled up tightly on my morguelike slab. . . . My conditions and predicament were so foreign to me, so stifling, so overwhelming. I’d never been so hungry, so grimy, and in such pain.”

—Beyond Survival

The Early War at Home

The Johnson administration thought the war would end quickly. As it dragged on, support began to waver, and Johnson’s domestic programs began to unravel.
THE GREAT SOCIETY SUFFERS  As the number of U.S. troops in Vietnam continued to mount, the war grew more costly, and the nation’s economy began to suffer. The inflation rate, which was less than 2 percent through most of the early 1960s, more than tripled to 5.5 percent by 1969. In August of 1967, President Johnson asked for a tax increase to help fund the war and to keep inflation in check. Congressional conservatives agreed, but only after demanding and receiving a $6 billion reduction in funding for Great Society programs. Vietnam was slowly claiming an early casualty: Johnson’s grand vision of domestic reform.

THE LIVING-ROOM WAR  Through the media, specifically television, Vietnam became America’s first “living-room war.” The combat footage that appeared nightly on the news in millions of homes showed stark pictures that seemed to contradict the administration’s optimistic war scenario.

Quoting body-count statistics that showed large numbers of communists dying in battle, General Westmoreland continually reported that a Vietcong surrender was imminent. Defense Secretary McNamara backed up the general, saying that he could see “the light at the end of the tunnel.”

The repeated television images of Americans in body bags told a different story, though. While communists may have been dying, so too were Americans—over 16,000 between 1961 and 1967. Critics charged that a credibility gap was growing between what the Johnson administration reported and what was really happening.

One critic was Senator J. William Fulbright, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Fulbright, a former Johnson ally, charged the president with a “lack of candor” in portraying the war effort. In early 1966, the senator conducted a series of televised committee hearings in which he asked members of the Johnson administration to defend their Vietnam policies. The Fulbright hearings delivered few major revelations, but they did contribute to the growing doubts about the war. One woman appeared to capture the mood of Middle America when she told an interviewer, “I want to get out, but I don’t want to give in.”

By 1967, Americans were evenly split over supporting and opposing the war. However, a small force outside of mainstream America, mainly from the ranks of the nation’s youth, already had begun actively protesting the war. Their voices would grow louder and capture the attention of the entire nation.

1. TERMS & NAMES  For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.

- Robert McNamara
- Dean Rusk
- William Westmoreland
- Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN)
- napalm
- Agent Orange
- search-and-destroy mission
- credibility gap

MAIN IDEA 2. TAKING NOTES
Re-create the chart below. Then, show key military tactics and weapons of the Vietcong and Americans.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactics</th>
<th>Vietcong</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Which weapons and tactics do you think were most successful? Explain.

CRITICAL THINKING 3. DRAWING CONCLUSIONS
Why did Americans fail to win the “hearts and minds” of the Vietnamese?

4. CONTRASTING
In a paragraph, contrast the morale of the U.S. troops with that of the Vietcong. Use evidence from the text to support your response.

5. FORMING GENERALIZATIONS
What were the effects of the nightly TV coverage of the Vietnam War? Support your answer with examples from the text. Think About:

- television images of Americans in body bags
- the Johnson administration’s credibility gap
In 1969, Stephan Gubar was told to report for possible military service in Vietnam. Gubar, 22, a participant in the civil rights movement, had filed as a conscientious objector (CO), or someone who opposed war on the basis of religious or moral beliefs. He was granted 1-A-O status, which meant that while he would not be forced to carry a weapon, he still qualified for noncombatant military duty. That year, Gubar was drafted—called for military service.

As did many other conscientious objectors, Gubar received special training as a medic. He described the memorable day his training ended.

---

**A PERSONAL VOICE STEPHAN GUBAR**

“The thing that stands out most was . . . being really scared, being in formation and listening to the names and assignments being called. The majority of COs I knew had orders cut for Vietnam. And even though I could hear that happening, even though I could hear that every time a CO’s name came up, the orders were cut for Vietnam, I still thought there was a possibility I might not go. Then, when they called my name and said ‘Vietnam,’ . . . I went to a phone and I called my wife. It was a tremendous shock.”

—quoted in Days of Decision

While many young Americans proudly went off to war, some found ways to avoid the draft, and others simply refused to go. The growing protest movement sharply divided the country between supporters and opponents of the government’s policy in Vietnam.

---

**The Working Class Goes to War**

The idea of fighting a war in a faraway place for what they believed was a questionable cause prompted a number of young Americans to resist going to Vietnam.

**A “MANIPULATABLE” DRAFT** Most soldiers who fought in Vietnam were called into combat under the country’s Selective Service System, or draft, which had been established during World War I. Under this system, all males had to register with their local draft boards when they turned 18. All registrants were screened, and unless they were excluded—such as for medical reasons—in the event of war, men between the ages of 18 and 26 would be called into military service.
As Americans’ doubts about the war grew, thousands of men attempted to find ways around the draft, which one man characterized as a “very manipulatable system.” Some men sought out sympathetic doctors to grant medical exemptions, while others changed residences in order to stand before a more lenient draft board. Some Americans even joined the National Guard or Coast Guard, which often secured a deferment from service in Vietnam.

One of the most common ways to avoid the draft was to receive a college deferment, by which a young man enrolled in a university could put off his military service. Because university students during the 1960s tended to be white and financially well-off, many of the men who fought in Vietnam were lower-class whites or minorities who were less privileged economically. With almost 80 percent of American soldiers coming from lower economic levels, Vietnam was a working-class war.

AFRICAN AMERICANS IN VIETNAM African Americans served in disproportionate numbers as ground combat troops. During the first several years of the war, blacks accounted for more than 20 percent of American combat deaths despite representing only about 10 percent of the U.S. population. The Defense Department took steps to correct that imbalance by instituting a draft lottery system in 1969.

Martin Luther King, Jr., had refrained from speaking out against the war for fear that it would divert attention from the civil rights movement. But he could not maintain that stance for long. In 1967 he lashed out against what he called the “cruel irony” of American blacks dying for a country that still treated them as second-class citizens.

**A PERSONAL VOICE** DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

"We were taking the young black men who had been crippled by our society and sending them eight thousand miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem. . . . We have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools.”

—quoted in America’s Vietnam War: A Narrative History

Racial tension ran high in many platoons, and in some cases, the hostility led to violence. The racism that gripped many military units was yet another factor that led to low troop morale in Vietnam.
WOMEN JOIN THE RANKS While the U.S. military in the 1960s did not allow females to serve in combat, 10,000 women served in Vietnam—most of them as military nurses. Thousands more volunteered their services in Vietnam to the American Red Cross and the United Services Organization (USO), which delivered hospitality and entertainment to the troops.

As the military marched off to Vietnam to fight against communist guerrillas, some of the men at home, as well as many women, waged a battle of their own. Tensions flared across the country as many of the nation’s youths began to voice their opposition to the war.

The Roots of Opposition

Even before 1965, students were becoming more active socially and politically. Some participated in the civil rights struggle, while others pursued public service. As America became more involved in the war in Vietnam, college students across the country became a powerful and vocal group of protesters.

THE NEW LEFT The growing youth movement of the 1960s became known as the New Left. The movement was “new” in relation to the “old left” of the 1930s, which had generally tried to move the nation toward socialism, and, in some cases, communism. While the New Left movement did not preach socialism, its followers demanded sweeping changes in American society.

Voicing these demands was one of the better-known New Left organizations, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), founded in 1960 by Tom Hayden and Al Haber. The group charged that corporations and large government institutions had taken over America. The SDS called for a restoration of “participatory democracy” and greater individual freedom.

In 1964, the Free Speech Movement (FSM) gained prominence at the University of California at Berkeley. The FSM grew out of a clash between students and administrators over free speech on campus. Led by Mario Savio, a philosophy student, the FSM focused its criticism on what it called the American “machine,” the nation’s faceless and powerful business and government institutions.

CAMPUS ACTIVISM Across the country the ideas of the FSM and SDS quickly spread to college campuses. Students addressed mostly campus issues, such as dress codes, curfews, dormitory regulations, and mandatory Reserved Officer
Training Corps (ROTC) programs. At Fairleigh Dickinson University in New Jersey, students marched merely as “an expression of general student discontent.”

With the onset of the Vietnam War, students across the country found a galvanizing issue and joined together in protest. By the mid-sixties, many youths believed the nation to be in need of fundamental change.

**The Protest Movement Emerges**

Throughout the spring of 1965, groups at a number of colleges began to host “teach-ins” to protest the war. At the University of Michigan, where only a year before President Johnson had announced his sweeping Great Society Program, teachers and students now assailed his war policy. “This is no longer a casual form of campus spring fever,” journalist James Reston noted about the growing demonstrations. As the war continued, the protests grew and divided the country.

**THE MOVEMENT GROWS** In April of 1965, SDS helped organize a march on Washington, D.C., by some 20,000 protesters. By November of that year, a protest rally in Washington drew more than 30,000. Then, in February of 1966, the Johnson administration changed deferments for college students, requiring students to be in good academic standing in order to be granted a deferment. Campuses around the country erupted in protest. SDS called for civil disobedience at Selective Service Centers and openly counseled students to flee to Canada or Sweden. By the end of 1969, SDS had chapters on nearly 400 campuses.

Youths opposing the war did so for several reasons. The most common was the belief that the conflict in Vietnam was basically a civil war and that the U.S. military had no business there. Some said that the oppressive South Vietnamese regime was no better than the Communist regime it was fighting. Others argued that the United States could not police the entire globe and that war was draining American strength in other important parts of the world. Still others saw war simply as morally unjust.

The antiwar movement grew beyond college campuses. Small numbers of returning veterans began to protest the war, and folk singers such as the trio Peter, Paul, and Mary, and Joan Baez used music as a popular protest vehicle. The number one song in September 1965 was “Eve of Destruction,” in which singer Barry McGuire stressed the ironic fact that in the 1960s an American male could be drafted at age 18 but had to be 21 to vote:

**The Eastern world, it is explodin’,
Violence flaring, bullets loadin’,
You're old enough to kill, but not for votin’,
You don't believe in war, but what's that gun you're totin’?**

**FROM PROTEST TO RESISTANCE** By 1967, the antiwar movement had intensified, with no sign of slowing down. “We were having no effect on U.S. policy,” recalled one protest leader, “so we thought we had to up the ante.” In the spring of 1967, nearly half a million protesters of all ages gathered in New York’s Central Park. Shouting “Burn cards, not people!” and “Hell, no, we won’t go!” hundreds tossed their draft cards into a bonfire. A woman from New Jersey told a reporter, “So many of us are frustrated. We want to criticize this war because we think it’s wrong, but we want to do it in the framework of loyalty.”
RESIST THE DRAFT OR SERVE YOUR COUNTRY?

As the fighting in Vietnam intensified, young men of draft age who opposed the war found themselves considering one of two options: register with the draft board and risk heading off to war, or find a way to avoid military service. Ways to avoid service included medical and educational deferments. But a great many men did not qualify for these. The choices that remained, such as fleeing the country, going to jail, or giving in and joining the ranks, came with a high price. Once a decision was made, there was no turning back.

1. Imagine you oppose the war and are called to serve in Vietnam. What decision would you make? Would you feel guilty if you avoided the draft? If you chose to serve, how would you view those who did not serve your country?

2. Do you think more young men would have been willing to serve had this been a different war? Explain.

DIFFICULT DECISIONS

This sign reflects the view of many Americans that the antiwar protests undermined the war effort in Vietnam.

Evaluating

Do you think it was right for the government to imprison draft resisters? Explain.

DIFFICULT DECISIONS

A PERSONAL VOICE DAVID HARRIS

“Theoretically, I can accept the notion that there are circumstances in which you have to kill people. I could not accept the notion that Vietnam was one of those circumstances. And to me that left the option of either sitting by and watching what was an enormous injustice . . . or [finding] some way to commit myself against it. And the position that I felt comfortable with in committing myself against it was total noncooperation—I was not going to be part of the machine.”

—quoted in The War Within

Draft resistance continued from 1967 until President Nixon phased out the draft in the early 1970s. During these years, the U.S. government accused more than 200,000 men of draft offenses and imprisoned nearly 4,000 draft resisters. (Although some were imprisoned for four or five years, most won parole after 6 to 12 months.) Throughout these years, about 10,000 Americans fled, many to Canada.

In October of 1967, a demonstration at Washington's Lincoln Memorial drew about 75,000 protesters. After listening to speeches, approximately 30,000 demonstrators locked arms for a march on the Pentagon in order “to disrupt the center of the American war machine,” as one organizer explained. As hundreds of protesters broke past the military police and mounted the Pentagon steps, they were met by tear gas and clubs. About 1,500 demonstrators were injured and at least 700 arrested.

WAR DIVIDES THE NATION

By 1967, Americans increasingly found themselves divided into two camps regarding the war. Those who strongly opposed the war and believed the United States should withdraw were known as doves. Feeling just as strongly that America should unleash much of its greater military force to win the war were the hawks.

Despite the visibility of the antiwar protesters, a majority of American citizens in 1967 still remained committed to the war. Others, while less certain about the proper U.S. role in Vietnam, were shocked to see protesters publicly criticize a war in which their fellow Americans were fighting and dying. A poll taken in December of 1967 showed that 70 percent of Americans believed the war protests were “acts of disloyalty.” A firefighter who lost his son in Vietnam articulated the bitter feelings a number of Americans felt toward the antiwar movement.

A PERSONAL VOICE

“I'm bitter. . . . It's people like us who give up our sons for the country. . . . The college types, the professors, they go to Washington and tell the government what to do. . . . But their sons, they don't end up in the swamps over there, in Vietnam. No sir. They're deferred, because they're in school. Or they get sent to safe places. . . . What bothers me about the peace crowd is that you can tell from their attitude, the way they look and what they say, that they don't really love this country.”

—a firefighter quoted in Working-Class War
Responding to antiwar posters, Americans who supported the government’s Vietnam policy developed their own slogans: “Support our men in Vietnam” and “America—love it or leave it.”

**JOHNSON REMAINS DETERMINED** Throughout the turmoil and division that engulfed the country during the early years of the war, President Johnson remained firm. Attacked by doves for not withdrawing and by hawks for not increasing military power rapidly enough, Johnson was dismissive of both groups and their motives. He continued his policy of slow escalation.

**A PERSONAL VOICE  LEYDON B. JOHNSON**

“There has always been confusion, frustration, and difference of opinion in this country when there is a war going on. . . . You know what President Roosevelt went through, and President Wilson in World War I. He had some senators from certain areas . . . that gave him serious problems until victory was assured. . . . We are going to have these differences. No one likes war. All people love peace. But you can’t have freedom without defending it.”

—quoted in *No Hail, No Farewell*

However, by the end of 1967, Johnson's policy—and the continuing stalemate—had begun to create turmoil within his own administration. In November, Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, a key architect of U.S. escalation in Vietnam, quietly announced he was resigning to become head of the World Bank. “It didn’t add up,” McNamara recalled later. “What I was trying to find out was how . . . the war went on year after year when we stopped the infiltration [from North Vietnam] or shrunk it and when we had a very high body count and so on. It just didn't make sense.”

As it happened, McNamara’s resignation came on the threshold of the most tumultuous year of the sixties. In 1968 the war—and Johnson’s presidency—would take a drastic turn for the worse.

---

**MAIN IDEA**

Evaluating

What were the key issues that divided America?

**TERMS & NAMES**

For each of the following, write a sentence explaining its significance.

- draft
- New Left
- Students for a Democratic Society (SDS)
- Free Speech Movement
- dove
- hawk

**CRITICAL THINKING**

3. DEVELOPING HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Imagine it is 1967. Do you think you would ally yourself with the hawks or the doves? Give reasons that support your position.

4. EVALUATING

Do you agree that antiwar protests were “acts of disloyalty”? Why or why not?

5. ANALYZING VISUAL SOURCES

This antiwar poster is a parody of the World War I Uncle Sam poster (shown on page 382), which states, “I want you for the U.S. Army.” Why might the artist have chosen this American character to express the antiwar message?
On June 5, 1968, John Lewis, the first chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, fell to the floor and wept. Robert F. Kennedy, a leading Democratic candidate for president, had just been fatally shot. Two months earlier, when Martin Luther King, Jr., had fallen victim to an assassin’s bullet, Lewis had told himself he still had Kennedy. And now they both were gone. Lewis, who later became a congressman from Georgia, recalled the lasting impact of these assassinations.

A PERSONAL VOICE  
JOHN LEWIS

“There are people today who are afraid, in a sense, to hope or to have hope again, because of what happened in . . . 1968. Something was taken from us. The type of leadership that we had in a sense invested in, that we had helped to make and to nourish, was taken from us. . . . Something died in all of us with those assassinations.”

—quoted in From Camelot to Kent State

These violent deaths were but two of the traumatic events that rocked the nation in 1968. From a shocking setback in Vietnam to a chaotic Democratic National Convention in Chicago, the events of 1968 made it the most tumultuous year of a turbulent decade.

The Tet Offensive Turns the War

The year 1968 began with a daring surprise attack by the Vietcong on numerous cities in South Vietnam. The simultaneous strikes, while ending in military defeat for the Communist guerrillas, stunned the American public. Many people with moderate views began to turn against the war.

A SURPRISE ATTACK January 30 was the Vietnamese equivalent of New Year’s Eve, the beginning of the lunar new year festivities known in Vietnam as Tet.
Throughout that day in 1968, villagers—taking advantage of a week-long truce proclaimed for Tet—streamed into cities across South Vietnam to celebrate their new year. At the same time, many funerals were being held for war victims. Accompanying the funerals were the traditional firecrackers, flutes, and, of course, coffins.

The coffins, however, contained weapons, and many of the villagers were Vietcong agents. That night the Vietcong launched an overwhelming attack on over 100 towns and cities in South Vietnam, as well as 12 U.S. air bases. The fighting was especially fierce in Saigon and the former capital of Hue. The Vietcong even attacked the U.S. embassy in Saigon, killing five Americans. The Tet offensive continued for about a month before U.S. and South Vietnamese forces re-gained control of the cities.

General Westmoreland declared the attacks an overwhelming defeat for the Vietcong, whose “well-laid plans went afoul.” From a purely military standpoint, Westmoreland was right. The Vietcong lost about 32,000 soldiers during the month-long battle, while the American and ARVN forces lost little more than 3,000.

**TET CHANGES PUBLIC OPINION** From a psychological—and political—standpoint, Westmoreland’s claim could not have been more wrong. The Tet offensive greatly shook the American public, which had been told repeatedly and had come to believe that the enemy was close to defeat. Now the Pentagon’s continued reports of favorable body counts—or massive Vietcong casualties—rang hollow. Daily, Americans saw the shocking images of attacks by an enemy that seemed to be everywhere.

In a matter of weeks, the Tet offensive changed millions of minds about the war. Despite the years of antiwar protest, a poll taken just before Tet showed that only 28 percent of Americans called themselves doves, while 56 percent claimed to be hawks. After Tet, both sides tallied 40 percent. The mainstream media, which had reported the war in a skeptical but generally balanced way, now openly criticized the war. One of the nation’s most respected journalists, Walter Cronkite, told his viewers that it now seemed “more certain than ever that the bloody experience of Vietnam is to end in a stalemate.”

Minds were also changing at the White House. To fill the defense secretary position left vacant by Robert McNamara’s resignation, Johnson picked Clark Clifford, a friend and supporter of the president’s Vietnam policy. However, after settling in and studying the situation, Clifford concluded that the war was unwinnable. “We seem to have a sinkhole,” Clifford said. “We put in more—they match it. I see more and more fighting with more and more casualties on the U.S. side and no end in sight to the action.”
“If I’ve lost Walter [Cronkite], then it’s over. I’ve lost Mr. Average Citizen.”
LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Following the Tet offensive, Johnson’s popularity plummeted. In public opinion polls taken at the end of February 1968, nearly 60 percent of Americans disapproved of his handling of the war. Nearly half of the country now felt it had been a mistake to send American troops to Vietnam.

War weariness eventually set in, and 1968 was the watershed year. Johnson recognized the change, too. Upon learning of Cronkite’s pessimistic analysis of the war, the president lamented, “If I’ve lost Walter, then it’s over. I’ve lost Mr. Average Citizen.”

Days of Loss and Rage

The growing division over Vietnam led to a shocking political development in the spring of 1968, a season in which Americans also endured two assassinations, a series of urban riots, and a surge in college campus protests.

JOHNSON WITHDRAWS Well before the Tet offensive, an anti-war coalition within the Democratic Party had sought a Democratic candidate to challenge Johnson in the 1968 primary elections. Robert Kennedy, John F. Kennedy’s brother and a senator from New York, decided not to run, citing party loyalty. However, in November of 1967, Minnesota senator Eugene McCarthy answered the group’s call, declaring that he would run against Johnson on a platform to end the war in Vietnam.

McCarthy’s early campaign attracted little notice, but in the weeks following Tet it picked up steam. In the New Hampshire Democratic primary in March 1968, the little-known senator captured 42 percent of the vote. While Johnson won the primary with 48 percent of the vote, the slim margin of victory was viewed as a defeat for the president. Influenced by Johnson’s perceived weakness at the polls, Robert Kennedy declared his candidacy for president. The Democratic Party had become a house divided.

In a televised address on March 31, 1968, Johnson announced a dramatic change in his Vietnam policy—the United States would seek negotiations to end the war. In the meantime, the policy of U.S. escalation would end, the bombing would eventually cease, and steps would be taken to ensure that the South Vietnamese played a larger role in the war.

The president paused and then ended his speech with a statement that shocked the nation. Declaring that he did not want the presidency to become “involved in the partisan divisions that are developing in this political year,” Lyndon Johnson announced, “Accordingly, I shall not seek, and I will not accept, the nomination of my party for another term as your president.” The president was stepping down from national politics, his grand plan for domestic reform done in by a costly and divisive war. “That . . . war,” Johnson later admitted, “killed the lady I really loved—the Great Society.”

VIOLENCE AND PROTEST GRIP THE NATION The Democrats—as well as the nation—were in for more shock in 1968. On April 4, America was rocked by the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. Violence ripped through more than 100 U.S. cities as enraged followers of the slain civil rights leader burned buildings and destroyed neighborhoods.

Just two months later, a bullet cut down yet another popular national figure. Robert Kennedy had become a strong candidate in the Democratic primary, drawing support from minorities and urban Democratic voters. On June 4, Kennedy won the crucial California primary. Just after midnight of June 5, he gave a victory
speech at a Los Angeles hotel. On his way out he passed through the hotel’s kitchen, where a young Palestinian immigrant, Sirhan Sirhan, was hiding with a gun. Sirhan, who later said he was angered by Kennedy’s support of Israel, fatally shot the senator.

Jack Newfield, a speechwriter for Kennedy, described the anguish he and many Americans felt over the loss of two of the nation’s leaders.

*A Personal Voice*  
Jack Newfield

“Things were not really getting better. . . . We shall not overcome. . . . We had already glimpsed the most compassionate leaders our nation could produce, and they had all been assassinated. And from this time forward, things would get worse: Our best political leaders were part of memory now, not hope.”

—quoted in *Nineteen Sixty-Eight*

Meanwhile, the nation’s college campuses continued to protest. During the first six months of 1968, almost 40,000 students on more than 100 campuses took part in more than 200 major demonstrations. While many of the demonstrations continued to target U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, students also clashed with university officials over campus and social issues. A massive student protest at Columbia University in New York City held the nation’s attention for a week in April. There, students protesting the university’s community policies took over several buildings. Police eventually restored order and arrested nearly 900 protesters.

Recalling the violence and turmoil that plagued the nation in 1968, the journalist and historian Garry Wills wrote, “There was a sense everywhere. . . . that things were giving way. That [people] had not only lost control of [their] history, but might never regain it.”

**A Turbulent Race for President**

The chaos and violence of 1968 climaxed in August, when thousands of antiwar demonstrators converged on the city of Chicago to protest at the Democratic National Convention. The convention, which featured a bloody riot between protesters and police, fractured the Democratic Party and thus helped a nearly forgotten Republican win the White House.

**TURMOIL IN CHICAGO**  
With Lyndon Johnson stepping down and Robert Kennedy gone, the 1968 Democratic presidential primary race pitted Eugene McCarthy against Hubert Humphrey, Johnson’s vice-president. McCarthy, while still popular with the nation’s antiwar segment, had little chance of defeating Humphrey, a loyal party man who had President Johnson’s support. During the last week of August, the Democrats met at their convention in Chicago, supposedly to choose a candidate. In reality, Humphrey’s nomination had already been determined, a decision that upset many antiwar activists.

As the delegates arrived in Chicago, so, too, did nearly 10,000 protesters. Led by men such as SDS veteran Tom Hayden, many demonstrators sought to pressure the Democrats into adopting an antiwar platform. Others came to voice their
displeasure with Humphrey’s nomination. Still others, known as Yippies (members of the Youth International Party), had come hoping to provoke violence that might discredit the Democratic Party. Chicago’s mayor, Richard J. Daley, was determined to keep the protesters under control. With memories of the nationwide riots after King’s death still fresh, Daley mobilized 12,000 Chicago police officers and over 5,000 National Guard. “As long as I am mayor,” Daley vowed, “there will be law and order.”

Order, however, soon collapsed. On August 28, as delegates cast votes for Humphrey, protesters were gathering in a downtown park to march on the convention. With television cameras focused on them, police moved into the crowd, sprayed the protesters with Mace, and beat them with nightsticks. Many protesters tried to flee, while others retaliated, pelting the riot-helmeted police with rocks and bottles. “The whole world is watching!” protesters shouted, as police attacked demonstrators and bystanders alike.

The rioting soon spilled out of the park and into the downtown streets. One nearby hotel, observed a New York Times reporter, became a makeshift aid station.

Disorder of a different kind reigned inside the convention hall, where delegates bitterly debated an antiwar plank in the party platform. When word of the riot filtered into the hall, delegates angrily shouted at Mayor Daley, who was present as a delegate himself. Daley returned their shouts with equal vigor. The whole world indeed was watching—on their televisions. The images of the Democrats—both inside and outside the convention hall—as a party of disorder became etched in the minds of millions of Americans.
**NIXON TRIUMPHS** One beneficiary of this turmoil was Republican presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon, who by 1968 had achieved one of the greatest political comebacks in American politics. After his loss to Kennedy in the presidential race of 1960, Nixon tasted defeat again in 1962 when he ran for governor of California. His political career all but dead, Nixon joined a New York law firm, but he never strayed far from politics. In 1966, Nixon campaigned for Republican candidates in congressional elections, helping them to win back 47 House seats and 3 Senate seats from Democrats. In 1968, Nixon announced his candidacy for president and won the party’s nomination.

During the presidential race, Nixon campaigned on a promise to restore law and order, which appealed to many middle-class Americans tired of years of riots and protests. He also promised, in vague but appealing terms, to end the war in Vietnam. Nixon’s candidacy was helped by the entry of former Alabama governor George Wallace into the race as a third-party candidate. Wallace, a Democrat running on the American Independent Party ticket, was a longtime champion of school segregation and states’ rights. Labeled the “white backlash” candidate, Wallace captured five Southern states. In addition, he attracted a surprisingly high number of Northern white working-class voters disgusted with inner-city riots and antiwar protests.

In the end, Nixon defeated Humphrey and inherited the quagmire in Vietnam. He eventually would end America’s involvement in Vietnam, but not before his war policies created even more protest and uproar within the country.
Alfred S. Bradford served in Vietnam from September 1968 to August 1969. A member of the 25th Infantry Division, he was awarded several medals, including the Purple Heart, given to soldiers wounded in battle. One day, Bradford’s eight-year-old daughter, Elizabeth, inquired about his experience in Vietnam. “Daddy, why did you do it?” she asked. Bradford recalled what he had told himself.

**A PERSONAL VOICE**  
ALFRED S. BRADFORD  
“Vietnam was my generation’s adventure. I wanted to be part of that adventure and I believed that it was my duty as an American, both to serve my country and particularly not to stand by while someone else risked his life in my place. I do not regret my decision to go, but I learned in Vietnam not to confuse America with the politicians elected to administer America, even when they claim they are speaking for America, and I learned that I have a duty to myself and to my country to exercise my own judgment based upon my own conscience.”

—quoted in *Some Even Volunteered*

The legacy of the war was profound; it dramatically affected the way Americans viewed their government and the world. Richard Nixon had promised in 1968 to end the war, but it would take nearly five more years—and over 20,000 more American deaths—to end the nation’s involvement in Vietnam.

**President Nixon and Vietnamization**

In the summer of 1969, newly elected president Richard Nixon announced the first U.S. troop withdrawals from Vietnam. “We have to get rid of the nightmares we inherited,” Nixon later told reporters. “One of the nightmares is war without end.” However, as Nixon pulled out the troops, he continued the war against North Vietnam, a policy that some critics would charge prolonged the “war without end” for several more bloody years.
THE PULLOUT BEGINS As President Nixon settled into the White House in January of 1969, negotiations to end the war in Vietnam were going nowhere. The United States and South Vietnam insisted that all North Vietnamese forces withdraw from the South and that the government of Nguyen Van Thieu, then South Vietnam’s ruler, remain in power. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong demanded that U.S. troops withdraw from South Vietnam and that the Thieu government step aside for a coalition government that would include the Vietcong.

In the midst of the stalled negotiations, Nixon conferred with National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger on a plan to end America’s involvement in Vietnam. Kissinger, a German emigrant who had earned three degrees from Harvard, was an expert on international relations. Their plan, known as Vietnamization, called for the gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops in order for the South Vietnamese to take on a more active combat role in the war. By August of 1969, the first 25,000 U.S. troops had returned home from Vietnam. Over the next three years, the number of American troops in Vietnam dropped from more than 500,000 to less than 25,000.

“PEACE WITH HONOR” Part of Nixon and Kissinger’s Vietnamization policy was aimed at establishing what the president called a “peace with honor.” Nixon intended to maintain U.S. dignity in the face of its withdrawal from war. A further goal was to preserve U.S. clout at the negotiation table, as Nixon still demanded that the South Vietnamese government remain intact. With this objective—and even as the pullout had begun—Nixon secretly ordered a massive bombing campaign against supply routes and bases in North Vietnam. The president also ordered that bombs be dropped on the neighboring countries of Laos and Cambodia, which held a number of Vietcong sanctuaries. Nixon told his aide H. R. Haldeman that he wanted the enemy to believe he was capable of anything.

A PERSONAL VOICE RICHARD M. NIXON

“I call it the madman theory, Bob . . . I want the North Vietnamese to believe I’ve reached the point where I might do anything to stop the war. We’ll just slip the word to them that ‘for God’s sake, you know Nixon is obsessed about Communists. We can’t restrain him when he’s angry—and he has his hand on the nuclear button’—and Ho Chi Minh himself will be in Paris in two days begging for peace.”

—quoted in The Price of Power

SKILLBUILDER Interpreting Graphs-

1. Examine the graph. How did the Vietnam conflict change over time?
2. Based on the chart, what type of war would you say was fought in Vietnam?
Trouble Continues on the Home Front

Seeking to win support for his war policies, Richard Nixon appealed to what he called the silent majority—moderate, mainstream Americans who quietly supported the U.S. efforts in Vietnam. While many average Americans did support the president, the events of the war continued to divide the country.

THE MY LAI MASSACRE  In November of 1969, Americans learned of a shocking event. That month, New York Times correspondent Seymour Hersh reported that on March 16, 1968, a U.S. platoon under the command of Lieutenant William Calley, Jr., had massacred innocent civilians in the small village of My Lai (mē’ lē’) in northern South Vietnam. Calley was searching for Vietcong rebels. Finding no sign of the enemy, the troops rounded up the villagers and shot more than 200 innocent Vietnamese—mostly women, children, and elderly men. “We all huddled them up,” recalled 22-year-old Private Paul Meadlo. “I poured about four clips into the group. . . . The mothers was hugging their children. . . . Well, we kept right on firing.”

The troops insisted that they were not responsible for the shootings because they were only following Lieutenant Calley’s orders. When asked what his directive had been, one soldier answered, “Kill anything that breathed.” Twenty-five army officers were charged with some degree of responsibility, but only Calley was convicted and imprisoned.

THE INVASION OF CAMBODIA  Despite the shock over My Lai, the country’s mood by 1970 seemed to be less explosive. American troops were on their way home, and it appeared that the war was finally winding down.

On April 30, 1970, President Nixon announced that U.S. troops had invaded Cambodia to clear out North Vietnamese and Vietcong supply centers. The president defended his action: “If when the chips are down, the world’s most powerful nation acts like a pitiful, helpless giant, the forces of totalitarianism and anarchy will threaten free nations . . . throughout the world.”

Upon hearing of the invasion, college students across the country burst out in protest. In what became the first general student strike in the nation’s history, more than 1.5 million students closed down some 1,200 campuses. The president of Columbia University called the month that followed the Cambodian invasion “the most disastrous month of May in the history of . . . higher education.”

VIOLENCE ON CAMPUS  Disaster struck hardest at Kent State University in Ohio, where a massive student protest led to the burning of the ROTC building. In response to the growing unrest, the local mayor called in the National Guard. On May 4, 1970, the Guards fired live ammunition into a crowd of campus protesters who were hurling rocks at them. The gunfire wounded nine people and killed four, including two who had not even participated in the rally.

Ten days later, similar violence rocked the mostly all-black college of Jackson State in Mississippi. National Guardsmen there confronted a group of antiwar demonstrators and fired on the crowd after several bottles were thrown. In the hail of bullets, 12 students were wounded and 2 were killed, both innocent bystanders.

In a sign that America still remained sharply divided about the war, the country hotly debated the campus shootings. Polls indicated that many Americans supported the National Guard; respondents claimed that the students “got what
History Through Photojournalism

KENT STATE
Photographer John Filo was a senior at Kent State University when anti-war demonstrations rocked the campus. When the National Guard began firing at student protesters, Filo began shooting pictures, narrowly escaping a bullet himself.

As he continued to document the horrific scene, a girl running to the side of a fallen student caught his eye. Just as she dropped to her knees and screamed, Filo snapped a photograph that would later win the Pulitzer Prize and become one of the most memorable images of the decade.

Mary Ann Vecchio grieves over the body of Jeffrey Glenn Miller, a student shot by National Guard troops at Kent State. In the original photograph, a fence post appeared behind the woman’s head. It is believed that someone manipulated the image in the early 1970s to make it more visually appealing.

SKILLBUILDER Analyzing Visual Sources
1. Why do you think this photograph remains a symbol of the Vietnam War era today? Explain your answer with specific details of the photograph.
2. What do you think is the most striking element of this photograph? Why?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R23.

MAIN IDEA
Analyzing Issues
B How did the campus shootings demonstrate the continued divisions within the country?

THE PENTAGON PAPERS
Nixon and Kissinger’s Cambodia policy, however, cost Nixon significant political support. By first bombing and then invading Cambodia without even notifying Congress, the president stirred anger on Capitol Hill. On December 31, 1970, Congress repealed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, which had given the president near independence in conducting policy in Vietnam.

Support for the war eroded even further when in June of 1971 former Defense Department worker Daniel Ellsberg leaked what became known as the Pentagon Papers. The 7,000-page document, written for Defense Secretary Robert McNamara in 1967–1968, revealed among other things that the government had drawn up plans for entering the war even as President Lyndon Johnson promised that he would not send American troops to Vietnam. Furthermore, the papers showed that there was never any plan to end the war as long as the North Vietnamese persisted.

For many Americans, the Pentagon Papers confirmed their belief that the government had not been honest about its war intentions. The document, while not particularly damaging to the Nixon administration, supported what opponents of the war had been saying.
In March of 1972, the North Vietnamese launched their largest attack on South Vietnam since the Tet offensive in 1968. President Nixon responded by ordering a massive bombing campaign against North Vietnamese cities. He also ordered that mines be laid in Haiphong harbor, the North’s largest harbor, into which Soviet and Chinese ships brought supplies. The Communists “have never been bombed like they are going to be bombed this time,” Nixon vowed. The bombings halted the North Vietnamese attack, but the grueling stalemate continued. It was after this that the Nixon administration took steps to finally end America’s involvement in Vietnam.

**“PEACE IS AT HAND”** By the middle of 1972, the country’s growing social division and the looming presidential election prompted the Nixon administration to change its negotiating policy. Polls showed that more than 60 percent of Americans in 1971 thought that the United States should withdraw all troops from Vietnam by the end of the year.

Henry Kissinger, the president’s adviser for national security affairs, served as Nixon’s top negotiator in Vietnam. Since 1969, Kissinger had been meeting privately with North Vietnam’s chief negotiator, Le Duc Tho. Eventually, Kissinger dropped his insistence that North Vietnam withdraw all its troops from the South before the complete withdrawal of American troops. On October 26, 1972, days before the presidential election, Kissinger announced, “Peace is at hand.”

**THE FINAL PUSH** President Nixon won reelection, but the promised peace proved to be elusive. The Thieu regime, alarmed at the prospect of North Vietnamese troops stationed in South Vietnam, rejected Kissinger’s plan. Talks broke off on December 16. Two days later, the president unleashed a ferocious bombing campaign against Hanoi and Haiphong, the two largest cities in North Vietnam. In what became known as the “Christmas bombings,” U.S. planes dropped 100,000 bombs over the course of eleven straight days, pausing only on Christmas Day.

At this point, calls to end the war resounded from the halls of Congress as well as from Beijing and Moscow. Everyone, it seemed, had finally grown weary of the war. The warring parties returned to the peace table, and on January 27, 1973, the United States signed an “Agreement on Ending the War and Restoring Peace in Vietnam.” Under the agreement, North Vietnamese troops would remain in South Vietnam. However, Nixon promised to respond “with full force” to any violation of the peace agreement. On March 29, 1973, the last U.S. combat troops left for home. For America, the Vietnam War had ended.

**THE FALL OF SAIGON** The war itself, however, raged on. Within months of the United States’ departure, the cease-fire agreement between North and South Vietnam collapsed. In March of 1975, after several years of fighting, the North Vietnamese launched a full-scale invasion against the South. Thieu appealed to the United States for help. America provided economic aid but refused to send troops. Soon thereafter, President Gerald Ford—who assumed the presidency after the Watergate scandal forced President Nixon to resign—gave a speech in which he captured the nation’s attitude toward the war:
“America can regain its sense of pride that existed before Vietnam. But it cannot be achieved by refighting a war that is finished as far as America is concerned.” On April 30, 1975, North Vietnamese tanks rolled into Saigon and captured the city. Soon after, South Vietnam surrendered to North Vietnam.

The War Leaves a Painful Legacy

The Vietnam War exacted a terrible price from its participants. In all, 58,000 Americans were killed and some 303,000 were wounded. North and South Vietnamese deaths topped 2 million. In addition, the war left Southeast Asia highly unstable, which led to further war in Cambodia. In America, a divided nation attempted to come to grips with an unsuccessful war. In the end, the conflict in Vietnam left many Americans with a more cautious outlook on foreign affairs and a more cynical attitude toward their government.

AMERICAN VETERANS COPE BACK HOME While families welcomed home their sons and daughters, the nation as a whole extended a cold hand to its returning Vietnam veterans. There were no brass bands, no victory parades, no cheering crowds. Instead, many veterans faced indifference or even hostility from an America still torn and bitter about the war. Lily Jean Lee Adams, who served as an army nurse in Vietnam, recalled arriving in America in 1970 while still in uniform.

A PERSONAL VOICE LILY JEAN LEE ADAMS

“In the bus terminal, people were staring at me and giving me dirty looks. I expected the people to smile, like, ‘Wow, she was in Vietnam, doing something for her country—wonderful.’ I felt like I had walked into another country, not my country. So I went into the ladies’ room and changed.”

—quoted in A Piece of My Heart

Many Vietnam veterans readjusted successfully to civilian life. However, about 15 percent of the 3.3 million soldiers who served developed post-traumatic stress disorder. Some had recurring nightmares about their war experiences, while many suffered from severe headaches and memory lapses. Other veterans became

Lieutenant Colonel Robert Stirm, a returning POW, receives a warm welcome from his family in 1973. The longest-held Vietnam POW was Lieutenant Everett Alvarez, Jr., of California. He was imprisoned for more than eight years.
In an effort to honor the men and women who served in Vietnam, the U.S. government unveiled the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C., in 1982. Many Vietnam veterans, as well as their loved ones, have found visiting the memorial a deeply moving, even healing, experience.

FURTHER TURMOIL IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The end of the Vietnam War ushered in a new period of violence and chaos in Southeast Asia. In unifying Vietnam, the victorious Communists initially held out a conciliatory hand to the South Vietnamese. “You have nothing to fear,” declared Colonel Bui Tin of the North Vietnamese Army. However, the Communists soon imprisoned more than 400,000 South Vietnamese in harsh “reeducation,” or labor, camps. As the Communists imposed their rule throughout the land, nearly 1.5 million people fled Vietnam. They included citizens who had supported the U.S. war effort, as well as business owners, whom the Communists expelled when they began nationalizing the country’s business sector.

Also fleeing the country was a large group of poor Vietnamese, known as boat people because they left on anything from freighters to barges to rowboats. Their efforts to reach safety across the South China Sea often met with tragedy; nearly 50,000 perished on the high seas due to exposure, drowning, illness, or piracy.

The people of Cambodia also suffered greatly after the war. The U.S. invasion of Cambodia had unleashed a brutal civil war in which a communist group known as the Khmer Rouge, led by Pol Pot, seized power in 1975. In an effort to transform the country into a peasant society, the Khmer Rouge executed professionals and anyone with an education or foreign ties. During its reign of terror, the Khmer Rouge is believed to have killed at least 1 million Cambodians.

Each year, over two million people visit the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. Many leave remembrances that are collected nightly by park rangers and stored in a museum. Inscribed on the memorial are over 58,000 names of Americans who died in the war or were then still listed as missing in action.
THE LEGACY OF VIETNAM  Even after it ended, the Vietnam War remained a subject of great controversy for Americans. Many hawks continued to insist that the war could have been won if the United States had employed more military power. They also blamed the antiwar movement at home for destroying American morale. Doves countered that the North Vietnamese had displayed incredible resiliency and that an increase in U.S. military force would have resulted only in a continuing stalemate. In addition, doves argued that an unrestrained war against North Vietnam might have prompted a military reaction from China or the Soviet Union. 

The war resulted in several major U.S. policy changes. First, the government abolished the draft, which had stirred so much antiwar sentiment. The country also took steps to curb the president's war-making powers. In November 1973, Congress passed the War Powers Act, which stipulated that a president must inform Congress within 48 hours of sending forces into a hostile area without a declaration of war. In addition, the troops may remain there no longer than 90 days unless Congress approves the president's actions or declares war.

In a broader sense, the Vietnam War significantly altered America's views on foreign policy. In what has been labeled the Vietnam syndrome, Americans now pause and consider possible risks to their own interests before deciding whether to intervene in the affairs of other nations.

Finally, the war contributed to an overall cynicism among Americans about their government and political leaders that persists today. Americans grew suspicious of a government that could provide as much misleading information or conceal as many activities as the Johnson and Nixon administrations had done. Coupled with the Watergate scandal of the mid-1970s, the war diminished the optimism and faith in government that Americans felt during the Eisenhower and Kennedy years.

1. TERMS & NAMES  For each term or name, write a sentence explaining its significance.
   - Richard Nixon
   - Henry Kissinger
   - Vietnamization
   - silent majority
   - My Lai
   - Kent State University
   - Pentagon Papers
   - War Powers Act

2. MAIN IDEA  Contrast the two viewpoints regarding the legacy of the Vietnam War.

3. CRITICAL THINKING  In your opinion, what was the main effect of the U.S. government’s deception about its policies and military conduct in Vietnam? Support your answer with evidence from the text. Think About:
   - the contents of the Pentagon Papers
   - Nixon’s secrecy in authorizing military maneuvers

4. MAKING INFERENCES  How would you account for the cold homecoming American soldiers received when they returned from Vietnam? Support your answer with reasons.

5. SYNTHESIZING  In the end, do you think the United States’ withdrawal from Vietnam was a victory for the United States or a defeat? Explain your answer.
Literature of the Vietnam War

Throughout history, soldiers as well as citizens have written about the traumatic and moving experiences of war. The Vietnam War, which left a deep impression on America’s soldiers and citizens alike, has produced its share of literature. From the surreal fantasy of *Going After Cacciato* to the grim realism of *A Rumor of War*, much of this literature reflects the nation’s lingering disillusionment with its involvement in the Vietnam War.

**GOING AFTER CACCIATO**

In *Going After Cacciato*, Vietnam veteran Tim O’Brien tells the story of Paul Berlin, a newcomer to Vietnam who fantasizes that his squad goes all the way to Paris, France, in pursuit of an AWOL soldier.

“How many days you been at the war?” asked Alpha’s [Alpha Company’s] mail clerk, and Paul Berlin answered that he’d been at the war seven days now.

The clerk laughed. “Wrong,” he said. “Tomorrow, man, that’s your first day at the war.”

And in the morning PFC [Private First Class] Paul Berlin boarded a resupply chopper that took him fast over charred pocked mangled country, hopeless country, green skies and speed and tangled grasslands and paddies and places he might die, a million possibilities. He couldn’t watch. He watched his hands. He made fists of them, opening and closing the fists. His hands, he thought, not quite believing. *His* hands.

Very quickly, the helicopter banked and turned and went down.

“How long you been at the war?” asked the first man he saw, a wiry soldier with ringworm in his hair.

PFC Paul Berlin smiled. “This is it,” he said. “My first day.”

INTERNET ACTIVITY

FALLEN ANGELS

Richie Perry, a 17-year-old Harlem youth, describes his harrowing tour of duty in Vietnam in Walter Dean Myers’s novel *Fallen Angels*.

The war was about us killing people and about people killing us, and I couldn’t see much more to it. Maybe there were times when it was right. I had thought that this war was right, but it was only right from a distance. Maybe when we all got back to the World and everybody thought we were heroes for winning it, then it would seem right from there. . . . But when the killing started, there was no right or wrong except in the way you did your job, except in the way that you were part of the killing.

What you thought about, what filled you up more than anything, was the being scared and hearing your heart thumping in your temples and all the noises, the terrible noises, the screeches and the booms and the guys crying for their mothers or for their wives.

—Walter Dean Myers, *Fallen Angels* (1988)

A RUMOR OF WAR

In *A Rumor of War*, considered to be among the best nonfiction accounts of the war, former marine Philip Caputo reflects on his years as a soldier in Vietnam.

At the age of twenty-four, I was more prepared for death than I was for life. . . . I knew how to face death and how to cause it, with everything on the evolutionary scale of weapons from the knife to the 3.5-inch rocket launcher. The simplest repairs on an automobile engine were beyond me, but I was able to field-strip and assemble an M-14 rifle blindfolded. I could call in artillery, set up an ambush, rig a booby trap, lead a night raid.

Simply by speaking a few words into a two-way radio, I had performed magical feats of destruction. Summoned by my voice, jet fighters appeared in the sky to loose their lethal droppings on villages and men. High-explosive bombs blasted houses to fragments, napalm sucked air from lungs and turned human flesh to ashes. All this just by saying a few words into a radio transmitter. Like magic.


FALLEN ANGELS

Richie Perry, a 17-year-old Harlem youth, describes his harrowing tour of duty in Vietnam in Walter Dean Myers’s novel *Fallen Angels*.

THINKING CRITICALLY

1. **Comparing** What similar views about war do you think these books convey?

   SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R8.

2. **Visit the links for American Literature to research personal accounts of the Vietnam War, such as interviews, letters, and essays. Copy several excerpts you find particularly interesting or moving and assemble them in a book. Write an introduction to your collection explaining why you chose them. Share your book with the class.**
VISUAL SUMMARY

THE VIETNAM WAR YEARS

1964
Congress passes the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, giving the president broad military powers in Vietnam.

1965
First major U.S. combat troops arrive in Vietnam to fight the Vietcong and North Vietnamese Army.

1966
Antiwar protests in the United States intensify.

1967
Paris peace talks begin in earnest; President Nixon announces Vietnamization of war—gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops.

1968
Vietcong launch massive Tet offensive on numerous South Vietnamese cities.

1969
President Nixon orders invasion of Cambodia to destroy enemy supply bases; American college campuses erupt in protest.

1970
President Nixon announces Vietnamization of war—gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops.

1972
Nixon unleashes “Christmas bombings” on North Vietnamese cities after peace talks break off.

1973
United States and North Vietnam sign a truce; the U.S. withdraws the last of its troops from Vietnam.

1974

1975

TERMS AND NAMES
For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the Vietnam War years.

1. Ho Chi Minh
2. Ngo Dinh Diem
3. Vietcong
4. William Westmoreland
5. napalm
6. Tet offensive
7. Robert Kennedy
8. Henry Kissinger
9. Vietnamization
10. Pentagon Papers

MAIN IDEAS
Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

Moving Toward Conflict  (pages 730–735)
1. How did the Tonkin Gulf Resolution lead to greater U.S. involvement in Vietnam?
2. What was President Eisenhower’s explanation of the domino theory?

U.S. Involvement and Escalation  (pages 736–741)
3. Why did so much of the American public and many in the Johnson administration support U.S. escalation in Vietnam?
4. Why did the war begin to lose support at home? What contributed to the sinking morale of the U.S. troops?

A Nation Divided  (pages 742–747)
5. What race-related problems existed for African-American soldiers who served in the Vietnam War?
6. Summarize the ways in which the United States was sharply divided between hawks and doves.

1968: A Tumultuous Year  (pages 748–753)
7. What circumstances set the stage for President Johnson’s public announcement that he would not seek another term as president?
8. What acts of violence occurred in the United States during 1968 that dramatically altered the mood of the country?

The End of the War and Its Legacy  (pages 754–761)
10. List the immediate effects and the more lasting legacies of America’s involvement in the Vietnam War.

CRITICAL THINKING


2. DEVELOPING HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE  Why do you think so many young Americans became so vocal in their condemnation of the Vietnam War?
Recall the issues that you explored at the beginning of the chapter. What lessons do you think can be learned from the ways in which Americans reacted to the draft? Write a paragraph expressing and giving reasons for your judgments. Think About:

- how the draft affected Americans’ views on the Vietnam War
- how the draft affected Americans’ participation in the Vietnam War
- how draft protests affected other Americans.

**INTERACT WITH HISTORY**

Organize two teams for debate. One team should argue for the side of the hawks, and the other team should argue on behalf of the doves. Research the arguments put forth by both sides and debate the issue before the class.

**FOCUS ON WRITING**

Imagine you are a television news journalist. Write a script for a brief news report on the events of the Tet Offensive or the Democratic National Convention.

2. During the Vietnam War, the term “credibility gap” referred to the American people’s lack of trust in —
   
   **A** Presidents Johnson and Nixon.
   **B** television news reporters.
   **C** antiwar protesters.
   **D** Ho Chi Minh.

3. What happened to Vietnam after the U.S. pullout in 1973?
   
   **A** The North and South remained divided and at peace.
   **B** The North and South remained enemies, separated by a United Nations-controlled demilitarized zone.
   **C** The North became a Chinese puppet state; the South experienced continual violent rebellions.
   **D** The North defeated the South and incorporated it under a communist government.

**STANDARDIZED TEST PRACTICE**

The Vietnam War Years

**Use the cartoon and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 1.**

In which of the following ways did the Vietnam War affect Americans’ attitudes towards their government?

- **A** Americans tried to change their government from representative democracy to Communism.
- **B** Americans lost confidence that those in government would tell the truth.
- **C** Americans took new pride in their country’s reputation abroad.
- **D** Americans worried that the United States would start another world war.

---

**Use the quotation and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 2.**

“Perhaps the place to start looking for a credibility gap is not in the offices of the government in Washington, but in the studios of the networks in New York.”

—Spiro T. Agnew

---

For additional test practice, go online for:

- Diagnostic tests
- Tutorials

hmhsocialstudies.com TEST PRACTICE
An Era of Social Change

Essential Question
Why did social protests and calls for change sweep across the United States in the 1960s?

What You Will Learn
In this chapter you will learn about the quest for radical change initiated by many groups in the 1960s.

SECTION 1: Latinos and Native Americans Seek Equality
Main Idea Latinos and Native Americans confronted injustices in the 1960s.

SECTION 2: Women Fight for Equality
Main Idea Through protests and marches, women confronted social and economic barriers in American society.

SECTION 3: Culture and Counterculture
Main Idea The ideals and lifestyle of the counterculture challenged the traditional views of Americans.

In this chapter you will learn about the quest for radical change initiated by many groups in the 1960s.

SECTION 1: Latinos and Native Americans Seek Equality
Main Idea Latinos and Native Americans confronted injustices in the 1960s.

SECTION 2: Women Fight for Equality
Main Idea Through protests and marches, women confronted social and economic barriers in American society.

SECTION 3: Culture and Counterculture
Main Idea The ideals and lifestyle of the counterculture challenged the traditional views of Americans.

1960
1962
1964
1966

1960
1962
1964
1966

USA
WORLD

Hippies gather in El Rito, New Mexico, at a Fourth of July parade in 1969.

1960
1962
1964
1966

1962 Chinese forces invade India.
1964 Lyndon B. Johnson is elected president.
1966 National Organization for Women (NOW) is formed.

1962 Chinese forces invade India.
1963 Civil war breaks out between Greeks and Turks on Cyprus.
1967 Six-Day War between Israel and Arab nations.
In the late 1960s, a new breed of youth known as the counterculture rejects the fashions, traditions, and morals of American society. Minority groups assert their equal rights, demanding changes to long-standing practices and prejudices. Women protest forms of oppression and male privileges that have “always,” it seems, been taken for granted. Many Americans begin to feel as if the whole nation has been turned on its side.

**Explore the Issues**

- Does every individual have a responsibility to follow the unwritten rules of society?
- What are the positive and negative aspects of change?
Latinos and Native Americans Seek Equality

**One American’s Story**

Jessie Lopez de la Cruz’s life changed one night in 1962, when César Chávez came to her home. Chávez, a Mexican-American farm worker, was trying to organize a union for California’s mostly Spanish-speaking farm workers. Chávez said, “The women have to be involved. They’re the ones working out in the fields with their husbands.” Soon Jessie was in the fields, talking to farm workers about the union.

*A Personal Voice  Jessie Lopez de la Cruz*

“Wherever I went to speak . . . I told them about . . . how we had no benefits, no minimum wage, nothing out in the fields—no restrooms, nothing. . . . I said, ‘Well! Do you think we should be putting up with this in this modern age? . . . We can stand up! We can talk back! . . . This country is very rich, and we want a share of the money those growers make [off] our sweat and our work by exploiting us and our children!’”

—quoted in *Moving the Mountain: Women Working for Social Change*

The efforts of Jessie Lopez de la Cruz were just part of a larger rights movement during the turbulent and revolutionary 1960s. As African Americans were fighting for civil rights, Latinos and Native Americans rose up to assert their own rights and improve their lives.

**The Latino Presence Grows**

Latinos, or Americans of Latin American descent, are a large and diverse group. During the 1960s, the Latino population in the United States grew from 3 million to more than 9 million. Today the Latino population includes people from several different areas, primarily Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Central America, and South America. Each of these groups has its own history, its
In the 1920s, thousands of Mexican people came to the U.S. and settled in barrios. Shown here, Hispanic men gather in a park in California.

own pattern of settlement in the United States, and its own set of economic, social, cultural, and political concerns.

**LATINOS OF VARIED ORIGINS** Mexican Americans, the largest Latino group, have lived mostly in the Southwest and California. This group includes descendants of the nearly 100,000 Mexicans who had lived in territories ceded by Mexico to the United States in 1848. Another million or so Mexicans came to the United States in the 1910s, following Mexico’s revolution. Still others came as *braceros*, or temporary laborers, during the 1940s and 1950s. In the 1960s close to half a million Mexicans immigrated, most in search of better paying jobs.

Puerto Ricans began immigrating to the United States after the U.S. occupation of Puerto Rico in 1898. As of 1960, almost 900,000 Puerto Ricans were living in the continental United States, including almost half a million on New York City’s West Side.

Large Cuban communities also formed in New York City and in Miami and New Jersey. This is because hundreds of thousands of Cubans, many of whom were academics and professionals, fled to the United States in 1959 to escape Fidel Castro’s Communist rule. In addition, tens of thousands of Salvadorans, Guatemalans, Nicaraguans, and Colombians immigrated to the United States after the 1960s to escape civil war and chronic poverty.

Wherever they had settled, during the 1960s many Latinos encountered ethnic prejudice and discrimination in jobs and housing. Most lived in segregated *barrios*, or Spanish-speaking neighborhoods. The Latino jobless rate was nearly 50 percent higher than that of whites, as was the percentage of Latino families living in poverty.

**Latinos Fight for Change**

As the presence of Latinos in the United States grew, so too did their demand for greater representation and better treatment. During the 1960s, Latinos demanded not only equal opportunity, but also a respect for their culture and heritage.
THE FARM WORKER MOVEMENT  As Jessie Lopez de la Cruz explained, thousands working on California’s fruit and vegetable farms did backbreaking work for little pay and few benefits. César Chávez believed that farm workers had to unionize, that their strength would come from bargaining as a group. In 1962, Chávez and Dolores Huerta established the National Farm Workers Association. Four years later, this group merged with a Filipino agricultural union (also founded by Huerta) to form the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC).

Chávez and his fellow organizers insisted that California’s large fruit and vegetable companies accept their union as the bargaining agent for the farm workers. In 1965, when California’s grape growers refused to recognize the union, Chávez launched a nationwide boycott of the companies’ grapes. Chávez, like Martin Luther King, Jr., believed in using nonviolence to reach his goal. The union sent farm workers across the country to convince supermarkets and shoppers not to buy California grapes. Chávez then went on a three-week fast in which he lost 35 pounds. He ended his fast by attending Mass with Senator Robert F. Kennedy. The efforts of the farm workers eventually paid off. In 1970, Huerta negotiated a contract between the grape growers and the UFWOC. Union workers would finally be guaranteed higher wages and other benefits long denied them.

CULTURAL PRIDE  The activities of the California farm workers helped to inspire other Latino “brown power” movements across the country. In New York, members of the Puerto Rican population began to demand that schools offer Spanish-speaking children classes taught in their own language as well as programs about their culture. In 1968, Congress enacted the Bilingual Education Act, which provided funds for schools to develop bilingual and cultural heritage programs for non-English-speaking children.

Young Mexican Americans started to call themselves Chicanos or Chicanas—a shortened version of “Mexicanos” that expressed pride in their ethnic heritage. A Chicano community action group called the Brown Berets formed under the leadership of David Sanchez. In 1968, the Brown Berets organized walkouts in East Los Angeles high schools. About 15,000 Chicano students walked out of class demanding smaller classes, more Chicano teachers and administrators, and programs designed to reduce the high Latino dropout rate. Militant Mexican-American students also won the establishment of Chicano studies programs at colleges and universities.

POLITICAL POWER  Latinos also began organizing politically during the 1960s. Some worked within the two-party system. For example, the Mexican American Political Association (MAPA) helped elect Los Angeles politician Edward Roybal to the House of Representatives. During the 1960s, eight Hispanic Americans served in the House, and one Hispanic senator was elected—Joseph Montoya of New Mexico.

Others, like Texan José Angel Gutiérrez, sought to create an independent Latino political movement. In 1970, he established La Raza Unida (The People United). In the 1970s, La Raza Unida ran Latino candidates in five states and won races for mayor, as well as other local positions on school boards and city councils.
Still other Latinos took on a more confrontational tone. In 1963, one-time evangelical preacher Reies Tijerina founded the Alianza Federal de Mercedes (Federal Alliance of Land Grants) to help reclaim U.S. land taken from Mexican landholders in the 19th century. He and his followers raided the Rio Arriba County Courthouse in Tierra Amarilla, New Mexico, in order to force authorities to recognize the plight of New Mexican small farmers. They were later arrested.

**Native Americans Struggle for Equality**

As are Latinos, Native Americans are sometimes viewed as a single homogeneous group, despite the hundreds of distinct Native American tribes and nations in the United States. One thing that these diverse tribes and nations have shared is a mostly bleak existence in the United States and a lack of autonomy, or ability to control and govern their own lives. Through the years, many Native Americans have clung to their heritage, refusing to assimilate, or blend, into mainstream society. Native American nationalist Vine Deloria, Jr., expressed the view that mainstream society was nothing more than “ice cream bars and heart trouble and . . . getting up at six o’clock in the morning to mow your lawn in the suburbs.”

**NATIVE AMERICANS SEEK GREATER AUTONOMY**

Despite their cultural diversity, Native Americans as a group have been the poorest of Americans and have suffered from the highest unemployment rate. They have also been more likely than any other group to suffer from tuberculosis and alcoholism. Although the Native American population rose during the 1960s, the death rate among Native American infants was nearly twice the national average, while life expectancy was several years less than for other Americans.

In 1954, the Eisenhower administration enacted a “termination” policy to deal with these problems, but it did not respect Native American culture. Native Americans were relocated from isolated reservations into mainstream urban American life. The plan failed miserably. Most who moved to the cities remained desperately poor.

In 1961, representatives from 61 Native American groups met in Chicago and drafted the Declaration of Indian Purpose, which stressed the determination of Native Americans to “choose our own way of life.” The declaration called for an end to the termination program in favor of new policies designed to create economic opportunities for Native Americans on their reservations. In 1968, President Lyndon Johnson established the National Council on Indian Opportunity to “ensure that programs reflect the needs and desires of the Indian people.”

**VOICES OF PROTEST**

Many young Native Americans were dissatisfied with the slow pace of reform. Their discontent fueled the growth of the American Indian Movement (AIM), an often militant Native American rights organization. While AIM began in 1968 largely as a self-defense group against police brutality, it soon branched out to include protecting the rights of large Native American populations in northern and western states.
For some, this new activism meant demanding that Native American lands, burial grounds, and fishing and timber rights be restored. Others wanted a new respect for their culture. Mary Crow Dog, a Lakota Sioux, described AIM’s impact.

**A Personal Voice Mary Crow Dog**

“My first encounter with AIM was at a pow-wow held in 1971. . . . One man, a Chippewa, stood up and made a speech. I had never heard anybody talk like that. He spoke about genocide and sovereignty, about tribal leaders selling out. . . . He had himself wrapped up in an upside-down American flag, telling us that every star in this flag represented a state stolen from the Indians. . . . Some people wept. An old man turned to me and said, ‘These are the words I always wanted to speak, but had kept shut up within me.’”

—Lakota Women

**Confronting the Government** In its early years, AIM, as well as other groups, actively—and sometimes violently—confronted the government. In 1972, AIM leader Russell Means organized the “Trail of Broken Treaties” march in Washington, D.C., to protest the U.S. government’s treaty violations throughout history. Native Americans from across the country joined the march. They sought the restoration of 110 million acres of land. They also pushed for the abolition of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), which many believed was corrupt. The marchers temporarily occupied the BIA building, destroyed records, and caused $2 million in property damage.

A year later, AIM led nearly 200 Sioux to the tiny village of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, where the U.S. cavalry had massacred a Sioux village in 1890. In protest against both tribal leadership and federal policies, the Sioux seized the town, taking hostages. After tense negotiations with the FBI and a shootout that left two Native Americans dead and others wounded, the confrontation ended with a government promise to reexamine Native American treaty rights.

**Native American Victories** Congress and the federal courts did make some reforms on behalf of Native Americans. In 1972, Congress passed the Indian Education Act. In 1975, it passed the Indian Self-Determination and Education
Latinos Native Americans Both Assistance Act. These laws gave tribes greater control over their own affairs and over their children’s education.

Armed with copies of old land treaties that the U.S. government had broken, Native Americans went to federal court and regained some of their rights to land. In 1970, the Taos of New Mexico regained possession of their sacred Blue Lake, as well as a portion of its surrounding forestland. Land claims by natives of Alaska resulted in the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971. This act gave more than 40 million acres to native peoples and paid out more than $962 million in cash. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Native Americans won settlements that provided legal recognition of their tribal lands as well as financial compensation.

While the 1960s and the early 1970s saw a wave of activism from the nation’s minority groups, another group of Americans also pushed for changes. Women, while not a minority group, were in many ways treated like second-class citizens, and many joined together to demand equal treatment in society.
LEGAL REASONING

Prior to Reynolds, the Court had already applied the “one person, one vote” principle to federal congressional elections (see Legal Sources). In Reynolds, Chief Justice Earl Warren extended this principle to state legislatures. He argued that when representation does not reflect population, some people’s votes are worth more than others’.

Warren concluded that Alabama’s apportionment scheme discriminated against people because of where they live.

For these reasons, the Court ruled that any acceptable apportionment plan must provide an equal number of legislative seats for equally populated areas. A plan that does not is unconstitutional because it denies some voters the equal protection of the laws.
WHY IT MATTERED
The voters who initiated the suit against Alabama’s apportionment were part of America’s tremendous urban growth in the 20th century. During and after World War II, tens of thousands of Americans—including large numbers of African Americans—moved from rural areas to cities and suburbs. Voters in Alabama’s more urban areas found that they were underrepresented. Likewise, before Reynolds, urban residents as a whole paid far more in taxes than they received in benefits. A great deal was at stake.

The “one person, one vote” principle increased the influence of urban residents by forcing legislatures to create new election districts in the cities to reflect their large populations. As more legislators representing urban and suburban needs were elected, they were able to change funding formulas, funneling more money into their districts. In addition, minorities, immigrants, and professionals, who tend to make up a large proportion of urban populations, gained better representation.

On the other hand, the power of farmers was eroded as election districts in rural areas were combined and incumbents had to campaign against each other for a single seat.

HISTORICAL IMPACT
The Warren Court’s reapportionment decisions in Baker v. Carr, Gray v. Sanders, Wesberry v. Sanders, and Reynolds were a revolution in U.S. politics. The lawsuit that culminated in the Reynolds decision was also part of a broader movement in the 1960s to protect voting rights. Largely because of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, voter registration among African Americans in Mississippi, for instance, climbed from 6.7 percent to 59.8 percent. Viewed together, the combination of increased protection of voting rights and acceptance of the “one person, one vote” principle brought the United States several steps closer to fulfilling its democratic ideals.

In the 1990s, the Court revisited reapportionment. A 1982 act of Congress had required states to create districts with “minority majorities” in order to increase the number of nonwhite representatives. As a result, following the 1990 census, a record number of African Americans were elected to Congress. But opponents contended that defining districts by race violated equal protection and “one person, one vote.” In a series of decisions, the Court agreed and abolished minority districting.

These two apportionment maps show Alabama’s 35 state senatorial districts in 1901 (left) and 1973 (right). The 1973 map shows how the districts were redrawn after the Reynolds decision, based on the 1970 census. Notice how the 1973 map reflects the growth of Alabama cities.

THINKING CRITICALLY

CONNECT TO TODAY
1. Analyzing Maps Obtain a map of the state legislative districts in your state. Then compare the map created following the 2000 census with the map based on the 1990 census. Study the differences in the size and location of the districts. Write a paragraph explaining which regions of the state gained representatives and which lost representatives.

CONNECT TO HISTORY
2. Visit the links for Historic Decisions of the Supreme Court to research minority redistricting decisions such as Shaw v. Hunt (1996). Write a summary of the rulings and how they have affected elections.

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R26.
Women Fight for Equality

Through protests and marches, women confronted social and economic barriers in American society.

The rise of the women’s movement during the 1960s advanced women’s place in the work force and in society.

One American's Story

During the 1950s, writer Betty Friedan seemed to be living the American dream. She had a loving husband, healthy children, and a house in the suburbs. According to the experts—doctors, psychologists, and women's magazines—that was all a woman needed to be fulfilled. Why, then, wasn't she happy? In 1957, after conducting a survey of her Smith College classmates 15 years after graduation, she found she was not alone. Friedan eventually wrote a book, The Feminine Mystique, in which she addressed this “problem that has no name.”

A PERSONAL VOICE

BETTY FRIEDAN

“The problem lay buried, unspoken. . . . It was a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning that women suffered in the middle of the twentieth century in the United States. Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night—she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question—‘Is this all?’”

—The Feminine Mystique

During the 1960s, women answered Friedan's question with a resounding “no.” In increasing numbers they joined the nation’s African Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans in the fight for greater civil rights and equality in society.

A New Women’s Movement Arises

The theory behind the women’s movement of the 1960s was feminism, the belief that women should have economic, political, and social equality with men. Feminist beliefs had gained momentum during the mid-1800s and in 1920 won women the right to vote. While the women's movement declined after this achievement, it reawakened during the 1960s, spurred by the political activism of the times.
**Women In the Workplace, 1950–2000**

**Working Women and Percent of Labor Force**

- 1950: 25%
- 1960: 40%
- 1970: 45%
- 1980: 47%
- 1990: 48%
- 2000: 50%

**Median Incomes for Working Women and Men**

- **1950**
  - Women: $953
  - Men: $2,570
- **1970**
  - Women: $2,237
  - Men: $6,670
- **2000**
  - Women: $25,532
  - Men: $33,592

**SKILLBUILDER** Interpreting Graphs

1. For each year shown, what percentage of men’s income did women make?
2. About how many more women were working in 1990 than in 1960?

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R28.

**WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE** In 1950, only one out of three women worked for wages. By 1960, that number had increased to about 40 percent. Still, during this time, certain jobs were considered “men’s work” and women were shut out. The jobs available to women—mostly clerical work, domestic service, retail sales, social work, teaching, and nursing—paid poorly.

The country largely ignored this discrimination until President Kennedy appointed the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women in 1961. In 1963, the commission reported that women were paid far less than men, even when doing the same jobs. Furthermore, women were seldom promoted to management positions, regardless of their education, experience, and ability. These newly publicized facts awakened many women to their unequal status in society.

**WOMEN AND ACTIVISM** Ironically, many women felt the sting of discrimination when they became involved in the civil rights and antiwar movements—movements that touted the ideological banner of protecting people’s rights. Within some of these organizations, such as SNCC and SDS, men led most of the activities, while women were assigned lesser roles. When women protested this arrangement, the men usually brushed them aside.

Such experiences led some women to organize small groups to discuss their concerns. During these discussions, or “consciousness-raising” sessions, women shared their lives with each other and discovered that their experiences were not unique. Rather, they reflected a much larger pattern of sexism, or discrimination based on gender. Author Robin Morgan delineated this pattern.

“A PERSONAL VOICE” ROBIN MORGAN

“It makes you very sensitive—raw, even, this consciousness. Everything, from the verbal assault on the street, to a ‘well-meant’ sexist joke your husband tells, to the lower pay you get at work (for doing the same job a man would be paid more for), to television commercials, to rock-song lyrics, to the pink or blue blanket they put on your infant in the hospital nursery, to speeches by male ‘revolutionaries’ that reek of male supremacy—everything seems to barrage your aching brain. . . . You begin to see how all-pervasive a thing is sexism.”

—quoted in Sisterhood Is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women’s Liberation Movement

SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R28.
**The Women’s Movement Emerges** The Feminine Mystique, which captured the very discontent that many women were feeling, quickly became a bestseller and helped to galvanize women across the country. By the late 1960s, women were working together for change. “This is not a movement one ‘joins,’” observed Robin Morgan. “The Women’s Liberation Movement exists where three or four friends or neighbors decide to meet regularly . . . on the welfare lines, in the supermarket, the factory, the convent, the farm, the maternity ward.”

**The Movement Experiences Gains and Losses**

As the women’s movement grew, it achieved remarkable and enduring political and social gains for women. Along the way, however, it also suffered setbacks, most notably in its attempt to ensure women’s equality in the Constitution.

**The Creation of NOW** The women’s movement gained strength with the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited discrimination based on race, religion, national origin, and gender and created the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to handle discrimination claims. By 1966, however, some women argued that the EEOC didn't adequately address women’s grievances. That year, 28 women, including Betty Friedan, created the National Organization for Women (NOW) to pursue women’s goals. “The time has come,” the founders of NOW declared, “to confront with concrete action the conditions which now prevent women from enjoying the equality of opportunity . . . which is their right as individual Americans and as human beings.”

NOW members pushed for the creation of child-care facilities that would enable mothers to pursue jobs and education. NOW also pressured the EEOC to enforce more vigorously the ban on gender discrimination in hiring. NOW’s efforts prompted the EEOC to declare sex-segregated job ads illegal and to issue guidelines to employers, stating that they could no longer refuse to hire women for traditionally male jobs.

**A Diverse Movement** In its first three years, NOW’s ranks swelled to 175,000 members. A number of other women’s groups sprang up around the country, too. In 1968, a militant group known as the New York Radical Women staged a well-publicized demonstration at the annual Miss America Pageant. The women threw bras, girdles, wigs, and other “women’s garbage” into a “Freedom Trash Can.” They then crowned a sheep “Miss America.” Around this time, Gloria Steinem, a journalist, political activist, and ardent supporter of the women’s liberation movement, made her voice heard on the subjects of feminism and equality. Steinem’s grandmother had served as president of the Ohio Woman’s Suffrage Association from 1908 to 1911; Steinem had inherited her passion and conviction. In 1971, Steinem helped found the National Women’s Political Caucus, a moderate group that encouraged women to seek political office. In 1972, she and other women created a new women’s magazine, Ms., designed to treat contemporary issues from a feminist perspective.

**Legal and Social Gains** As the women’s movement progressed, women began to question all sorts of gender-based distinctions. People protested that a woman’s physical
appearance was often considered a job qualification. Girls’ exclusion from sports such as baseball and football came into question. Some women began using the title Ms., instead of the standard Miss or Mrs., and refused to adopt their husband’s last name upon marriage.

These changes in attitude were paralleled by numerous legal changes. In 1972, Congress passed a ban on gender discrimination in “any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance,” as part of the Higher Education Act. As a result, several all-male colleges opened their doors to women. That same year, Congress expanded the powers of the EEOC and gave working parents a tax break for child-care expenses.

ROE v. WADE One of the more controversial positions that NOW and other feminist groups supported was a woman’s right to have an abortion. In 1973, the Supreme Court ruled in Roe v. Wade that women do have the right to choose an abortion during the first three months of pregnancy. Some thought the ruling might “bring to an end the emotional and divisive public argument. . . .” However, the issue still divides Americans today.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT (ERA) In what seemed at first to be another triumph for the women’s movement, Congress passed the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) in 1972. The amendment then needed ratification by 38 states to become part of the Constitution. First introduced to Congress in 1923, the ERA would guarantee that both men and women would enjoy the same rights and protections under the law. It was, many supporters said, a matter of “simple justice.”

The amendment scared many people, and a Stop-ERA campaign was launched in 1972. Conservative Phyllis Schlafly, along with conservative religious groups, political organizations, and many anti-feminists, felt that the ERA would lead to “a parade of horribles,” such as the drafting of women, the end of laws protecting homemakers, the end of a husband’s responsibility to provide for his family, and same-sex marriages. Schlafly said that radical feminists “hate men, marriage, and children” and were oppressed “only in their distorted minds.”

A PERSONAL VOICE Phyllis Schlafly

“The U.S. Constitution is not the place for symbols or slogans, it is not the proper device to alleviate psychological problems of personal inferiority. Symbols and slogans belong on bumper strips—not in the Constitution. It would be a tragic mistake for our nation to succumb to the tirades and demands of a few women who are seeking a constitutional cure for their personal problems.”

— quoted in The Equal Rights Amendment: The History and the Movement

THE NEW RIGHT EMERGES In order to combat the ERA and the pro-abortion supporters, conservatives built what they called a new “pro-family” movement. In the 1970s, this coalition—which focused on social, cultural, and moral problems—came to be known as the New Right. The New Right and the women’s movement debated family-centered issues such as whether the government should pay for daycare, which the New Right opposed. Throughout the 1970s, the New Right built grassroots support for social conservatism. It would later play a key role in the election of Ronald Reagan to the presidency in 1980.
The Movement’s Legacy

The New Right and the women’s movement clashed most dramatically over the ERA. By 1977 it had won approval from 35 of the 38 states needed for ratification, but the New Right gained strength. By June of 1982—the deadline for ratification—not enough states had approved the amendment. The ERA went down in defeat.

Despite ERA’s defeat, the women’s movement altered society in countless ways, such as by transforming women’s conventional roles and their attitudes toward career and family. Interviews with women graduates at Stanford University reflect the change. Of graduates in 1965, 70 percent planned not to work at all when their children were of preschool age. When the class of 1972 was surveyed, only 7 percent said they would stop working to raise children.

The women’s movement also succeeded in expanding career opportunities for women. For instance, as of 1970, 8 percent of all medical school graduates and 5 percent of all law school graduates were women. By 1998, those proportions had risen to 42 and 44 percent, respectively. Yet many women ran into a “glass ceiling”—an invisible, but very real, resistance to promoting women into top positions.

By 1983 women held 13.5 percent of elected state offices as well as 24 seats in the U.S. Congress. More importantly, as historian Sara Evans has noted, by 1980 “feminist concerns were firmly on the national political agenda and clearly there to stay.” Most of all, the women’s movement helped countless women open their lives to new possibilities. “For we have lived the second American revolution,” wrote Betty Friedan in 1976, “and our very anger said a ‘new YES’ to life.”

1. TERMS & NAMES
   - Betty Friedan
   - feminism
   - National Organization for Women (NOW)
   - Gloria Steinem
   - Equal Rights Amendment (ERA)
   - Phyllis Schlafly

2. TAKING NOTES
   Create a time line of key events relating to the women’s movement.

   1964 – 1973

   Explain which event you think best demonstrates progressive reform.

3. HYPOTHEZING
   What if the Equal Rights Amendment had been ratified? Speculate on how women’s lives might have been different. Use reasons to support your answer.

   Think About:
   - rights addressed by the amendment
   - legal support that the amendment might have provided
   - possible reactions from groups opposing the amendment

4. ANALYZING VISUAL SOURCES
   Examine the drawing on this 1972 cover of Ms. The woman shown has eight arms and is holding a different object in each hand. What do you think these objects symbolize in terms of women’s roles? What do you think this drawing says about women in the 1960s? Explain.
In 1966, Alex Forman left his conventional life in mainstream America and headed to San Francisco. Arriving there with little else but a guitar, he joined thousands of others who were determined to live in a more peaceful and carefree environment. He recalled his early days in San Francisco’s Haight-Ashbury district, the hub of hippie life.

**A Personal Voice  Alex Forman**

“It was like paradise there. Everybody was in love with life and in love with their fellow human beings to the point where they were just sharing in incredible ways with everybody. Taking people in off the street and letting them stay in their homes. . . . You could walk down almost any street in Haight-Ashbury where I was living, and someone would smile at you and just go, ‘Hey, it’s beautiful, isn’t it?’ . . . It was a very special time.”

—quoted in From Camelot to Kent State

Forman was part of the counterculture—a movement made up mostly of white, middle-class college youths who had grown disillusioned with the war in Vietnam and injustices in America during the 1960s. Instead of challenging the system, they turned their backs on traditional America and tried to establish a whole new society based on peace and love. Although their heyday was short-lived, their legacy remains.

**The Counterculture**

In the late 1960s, the historian Theodore Roszak deemed these idealistic youths the counterculture. It was a culture, he said, so different from the mainstream “that it scarcely looks to many as a culture at all, but takes on the alarming appearance of a barbarian intrusion.”
“TUNE IN, TURN ON, DROP OUT” Members of the counterculture, known as hippies, shared some of the beliefs of the New Left movement. Specifically, they felt that American society—and its materialism, technology, and war—had grown hollow. Influenced by the nonconformist beat movement of the 1950s, hippies embraced the credo of Harvard psychology professor and counterculture philosopher Timothy Leary: “Tune in, turn on, drop out.” Throughout the mid- and late 1960s, tens of thousands of idealistic youths left school, work, or home to create what they hoped would be an idyllic community of peace, love, and harmony.

HIPPIE CULTURE The hippie era, sometimes known as the Age of Aquarius, was marked by rock ‘n’ roll music, outrageous clothing, sexual license, and illegal drugs—in particular, marijuana and a new hallucinogenic drug called LSD, or acid. Timothy Leary, an early experimenter with the drug, promoted the use of LSD as a “mind-expanding” aid for self-awareness. Hippies also turned to Eastern religions such as Zen Buddhism, which professed that one could attain enlightenment through meditation rather than the reading of scriptures.

Hippies donned ragged jeans, tie-dyed T-shirts, military garments, love beads, and Native American ornaments. Thousands grew their hair out, despite the fact that their more conservative elders saw this as an act of disrespect. Signs across the country said, “Make America beautiful—give a hippie a haircut.”

Hippies also rejected conventional home life. Many joined communes, in which the members renounced private property to live communally. By the mid-sixties, Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco was known as the hippie capital, mainly because California did not outlaw hallucinogenic drugs until 1966.

DECLINE OF THE MOVEMENT After only a few years, the counterculture’s peace and harmony gave way to violence and disillusionment. The urban communes eventually turned seedy and dangerous. Alex Forman recalled, “There were ripoffs, violence . . . people living on the street with no place to stay.” Having dispensed with society’s conventions and rules, the hippies had to rely on each other. Many discovered that the philosophy of “do your own thing” did not provide enough guidance for how to live. “We were together at the level of peace and love,” said one disillusioned hippie. “We fell apart over who would cook and wash dishes and pay the bills.” By 1970, many had fallen victim to the drugs they used, experiencing drug addiction and mental breakdowns. The rock singer Janis Joplin and the legendary guitarist Jimi Hendrix both died of drug overdoses in 1970.

As the mystique of the 1960s wore off, thousands of hippies lined up at government offices to collect welfare and food stamps—dependent on the very society they had once rejected.
A Changing Culture

Although short-lived, some aspects of the counterculture—namely, its fine arts and social attitudes—left a more lasting imprint on the world.

ART  The counterculture's rebellious style left its mark on the art world. The 1960s saw the rise of pop art (popular art). Pop artists, led by Andy Warhol, attempted to bring art into the mainstream. Pop art was characterized by bright, simple, commercial-looking images often depicting everyday life. For instance, Warhol became famous for his bright silk-screen portraits of soup cans, Marilyn Monroe, and other icons of mass culture. These images were repeated to look mass-produced and impersonal, a criticism of the times implying that individual freedoms had been lost to a more conventional, “cookie-cutter” lifestyle.

ROCK MUSIC  During the 1960s, the counterculture movement embraced rock 'n' roll as its loud and biting anthem of protest. The music was an offshoot of African-American rhythm and blues music that had captivated so many teenagers during the 1950s. The band that, perhaps more than any other, helped propel rock music into mainstream America was the Beatles. The British band, made up of four youths from working-class Liverpool, England, arrived in America in 1964 and immediately took the country by storm. By the time the Beatles broke up in 1970, the four “lads” had inspired a countless number of other bands and had won over millions of Americans to rock 'n' roll.

One example of rock 'n' roll’s popularity occurred in August 1969 on a farm in upstate New York. More than 400,000 showed up for a music festival called “Woodstock Music and Art Fair.” This festival represented, as one songwriter put it, “the '60s movement of peace and love and some higher cultural cause.” For three days, the most popular bands and musicians performed, including Jimi Hendrix, Janis Joplin, Joe Cocker, Joan Baez, the Grateful Dead, and Jefferson Airplane. Despite the huge crowd, Woodstock was peaceful and well organized. However, Tom Mathews, a writer who attended the Woodstock festival, recalled his experience there as less than blissful.

A PERSONAL VOICE  TOM MATHEWS

“The last night of the concert I was standing in a narrow pit at the foot of the stage. I made the mistake of looking over the board fence separating the pit from Max Yasgur’s hillside. When I peered up I saw 400,000 . . . people wrapped in wet, dirty ponchos, sleeping bags and assorted, tie-dyed mufti slowly slipping toward the stage. It looked like a human mud slide. . . . After that night I couldn’t get out of there fast enough.”

—“The Sixties Complex,” Newsweek, Sept. 5, 1988

CHANGING ATTITUDES  While the counterculture movement faded, its casual “do your own thing” philosophy left its mark. American attitudes toward sexual behavior became more casual and permissive, leading to what became known as the sexual revolution. During the 1960s and 1970s, mass culture—including TV, books,
magazines, music, and movies—began to address subjects that had once been prohibited, particularly sexual behavior and explicit violence.

While some hailed the increasing permissiveness as liberating, others attacked it as a sign of moral decay. For millions of Americans, the new tolerance was merely an uncivilized lack of respect for established social norms. Eventually, the counterculture movement would lead a great many Americans to more liberal attitudes about dress and appearance, lifestyle, and social behavior; yet in the short run, it produced largely the opposite effect.
The Conservative Response

In the late 1960s, many believed that the country was losing its sense of right and wrong. Increasingly, conservative voices began to express people’s anger. At the 1968 Republican convention in Miami, candidate Richard M. Nixon expressed that anger.

CONSERVATIVES ATTACK THE COUNTERCULTURE Nixon was not the only conservative voice expressing alarm. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover issued a warning that “revolutionary terrorism” was a threat on campuses and in cities. Other conservative critics warned that campus rebels posed a danger to traditional values and threatened to plunge American society into anarchy. Conservatives also attacked the counterculture for what they saw as its decadent values. In the view of psychiatrist Bruno Bettelheim, student rebels and members of the counterculture had been pampered in childhood; as young adults, they did not have the ability for delayed gratification. According to some conservative commentators, the counterculture had abandoned rational thought in favor of the senses and uninhibited self-expression.

The angry response of mainstream Americans caused a profound change in the political landscape of the United States. By the end of the 1960s, conservatives were presenting their own solutions on such issues as lawlessness and crime, the size of the federal government, and welfare. This growing conservative movement would propel Nixon into the White House—and set the nation on a more conservative course.

A PERSONAL VOICE RICHARD NIXON

“As we look at America we see cities enveloped in smoke and flame. We hear sirens in the night. . . . We see Americans hating each other . . . at home. . . . Did we come all this way for this? . . . die in Normandy and Korea and in Valley Forge for this?”

—Speech at Republican convention, 1968

MAIN IDEA

Why were conservatives angry about the counterculture?

CRITICAL THINKING

3. DEVELOPING HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

A stereotype is a generalization made about a group. What stereotype do you think hippies might have formed about mainstream Americans? What stereotype do you think mainstream Americans might have formed about hippies? Why? Think About:

- Alex Forman’s comments in “A Personal Voice” (page 781)
- hippies’ values and lifestyle
- mainstream Americans’ values and lifestyle

4. MAKING INFERENCES

In your opinion, why didn’t the hippies succeed?

5. ANALYZING ISSUES

What role did the counterculture and antiwar movement play in helping Richard Nixon win the presidency?
Signs of the Sixties

The wave of social change that swept across America during the 1960s affected everyone, but especially the nation’s teenagers. Abandoning the conservative and “clean-cut” look of the 1950s, many teens experimented with new and different appearances. In a declaration of their individuality and desire for more freedom, they also embraced a variety of new music and films during the 1960s.

FASHION: A NEW LOOK

During the 1960s, many youths wore a wide range of unconventional clothing. While most Americans did not adopt the outlandish look of hippies, many came out of the sixties wearing longer hair and blue jeans, which became a staple in nearly every wardrobe. Bright colors and psychedelic patterns also became wildly popular.

THE RISE OF SOUL MUSIC

African-American soul artists, whose music had inspired the more popular white rock ‘n’ roll performers of the 1950s, grew widely popular themselves during the 1960s. During this decade, Detroit’s Motown label produced the most popular and successful African-American artists, including Marvin Gaye, Stevie Wonder, and the Supremes (left).

A DIVERSE MUSIC SCENE

Scores of teenagers also tuned to surf music, a harmonic, light sound made popular by a California band, the Beach Boys. Other teens listened to the poetic and socially conscious lyrics of folk rock. Heavy, or psychedelic, rock, sung by bands such as the Doors (whose 1967 concert advertisement appears to the right), also found its way into many album collections. In the later part of the decade, musicians like Jimi Hendrix (far right) took rock ‘n’ roll in a new direction.
GOING TO THE SHOW
As the nation’s movie industry grew, more and more teenagers flocked to the cinema. Teens took in such diverse films as the counterculture classic *Easy Rider* and the science fiction classic *2001: A Space Odyssey* (above), which tells the story of HAL, a spaceship computer that develops a mind of its own.

POP ART
Andy Warhol created this image of movie actress and popular icon Marilyn Monroe. A leader of the pop art movement, Warhol attempted to criticize the conventional lifestyle of the mass culture through commercial-looking images that depicted the loss of individuality.

POPULAR SONGS
- “Blowin’ in the Wind” (1962)
- “Surfin’ USA” (1963)
- “Where Did Our Love Go?” (1964)
- “California Dreamin’” (1966)
- “Light My Fire” (1967)
- “Mrs. Robinson” (1967)
- “Aquarius/Let the Sunshine In” (1968)
- “Come Together” (1969)
- “Everyday People” (1968)

POPULAR TV SHOWS
- The Dick Van Dyke Show (1962–1966)
- The Beverly Hillbillies (1962–1971)
- Green Acres (1965–1971)
- The Addams Family (1964–1966)
- Laugh-In (1968–1973)
- Bonanza (1959–1973)

CONNECT TO HISTORY
1. Drawing Conclusions
   What conclusions can you draw about teenagers in the 1960s from the images and information in this feature?

   SEE SKILLBUILDER HANDBOOK, PAGE R18.

CONNECT TO TODAY
2. The Role of Culture
   Do the arts merely reflect social change, or can art, music, fashion, etc. help to bring about social change? Think about how music and fashions affect your actions and opinions. Discuss your thoughts with a small group of classmates.
**TERMS & NAMES**

For each term or name below, write a sentence explaining its connection to the 1960s.

1. César Chávez
2. La Raza Unida
3. American Indian Movement (AIM)
4. feminism
5. Betty Friedan
6. Equal Rights Amendment (ERA)
7. Phyllis Schlafly
8. counterculture
9. Haight-Ashbury
10. Woodstock

**MAIN IDEAS**

Use your notes and the information in the chapter to answer the following questions.

**Latinos and Native Americans Seek Equality** (pages 768–773)

1. What strategies did both César Chávez and the UFWOC use to achieve their goals? How did they successfully apply these tactics?
2. What were the demands of the American Indian Movement (AIM) organizers who staged “The Trail of Broken Treaties” march on Washington in 1972?

**Women Fight for Equality** (pages 776–780)

3. Name three changes that members of the National Organization of Women (NOW) advocated.
4. What was the Supreme Court’s decision in the Roe v. Wade case?

**Culture and Counterculture** (pages 781–785)

5. Briefly explain the role Timothy Leary played in the counterculture movement.
6. What unintended impact did the counterculture have on many mainstream Americans?

**CRITICAL THINKING**

1. **USING YOUR NOTES** Re-create the diagram shown below. Then fill in the appropriate areas with key individual and shared achievements of Latinos, Native Americans, and feminists.

2. **DEVELOPING HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE** Consider the organizations that Latinos, Native Americans, and women formed during the 1960s. Which do you think was the most influential? Why?

3. **ANALYZING PRIMARY SOURCES** Reread the song lyrics of Bob Dylan’s “The Times They Are A-Changin’” on page 784. How do you think this song captured the main message of the counterculture movement?

**VISUAL SUMMARY**

**An Era of Social Change**

**POLITICAL**
- protests against Vietnam War
- NOW fuels feminism
- the New Right emerges
- ERA defeated
- Roe v. Wade
- more women in the work force
- AIM wins reforms and land rights
- La Raza Unida and MAPA fight for more rights for Latinos
- bilingual education
- Latino farm workers unionize

**SOCIAL**
- hippies reject mainstream society
- more communal living
- new fashion trends reflect freedom of expression
- traditional forms of worship rejected in favor of Eastern religious teachings
- more drug use
- women and minorities seek equality
- more permissive sexual behavior
- books, magazines, and movies show explicit violence

**ART AND FASHION**
- pop art movement
- long hair as rebellion
- hippies popularize bright, colorful clothing, beads, and blue jeans

**MUSIC**
- music as political expression
- Motown label produces African-American artists
- rock music; the Beatles; Woodstock festival

**CHANGES BROUGHT ABOUT BY THE COUNTERCULTURE**

- more drug use
- women and minorities seek equality
- more permissive sexual behavior
- books, magazines, and movies show explicit violence

- pop art movement
- long hair as rebellion
- hippies popularize bright, colorful clothing, beads, and blue jeans

- music as political expression
- Motown label produces African-American artists
- rock music; the Beatles; Woodstock festival

- protests against Vietnam War
- NOW fuels feminism
- the New Right emerges
- ERA defeated
- Roe v. Wade
- more women in the work force
- AIM wins reforms and land rights
- La Raza Unida and MAPA fight for more rights for Latinos
- bilingual education
- Latino farm workers unionize
Use the flowchart and your knowledge of U.S. history to answer question 1.

1. UFWOC organizes a boycott of grapes.
2. Growers lose money.
3. UFWOC signs new contracts with growers.

1. Which event accurately completes the cause-and-effect chain?
   A. EEOC rules that unhealthful working conditions amount to illegal discrimination.
   B. UFWOC disbands.
   C. Grape boycott is extended to apricots and olives.
   D. Working conditions for migrant farm workers are improved.

2. In the 1960s, women fought in Congress, in the courts, and in their everyday lives for treatment as political and social equals. Today, job discrimination against women is illegal because of —
   F. the Fourteenth Amendment.
   G. the ERA.
   H. the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
   J. the Roe v. Wade decision.

3. Which of the following statements is a fact?
   A. Hippies believed that everyone should love each other.
   B. Hippies spoiled the Woodstock festival.
   C. The hippie movement failed because the hippies’ beliefs were too radical.

4. The women’s rights movement largely grew out of——
   F. the counterculture movement.
   G. the civil rights movement.
   H. the movement to organize farm workers.
   J. reaction to the Warren Court decisions.

INTERACT WITH HISTORY
Think about the issues you explored at the beginning of the chapter. Write a script in which five characters—a Latino activist, a Native American activist, a member of the women’s movement, a member of the counterculture, and a conservative politician who wants to preserve the status quo—debate the following question: How much can a society change?

FOCUS ON WRITING
César Chávez received the Presidential Medal of Honor in 1994. Imagine that you have been asked to introduce Chávez at the presentation ceremony. Write a short speech highlighting his achievements as a labor organizer and Latino activist. You may wish to do additional research to help you.