1.1.5 How and why did the USA and USSR create spheres of interest?
- Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe
- "Iron Curtain"
- Civil War in Greece, Turkey and Iran
- Iran
- Policy of Containment
- Truman Doctrine and its consequences
- Marshall Plan
- Cominform and Comecon

1.1.6 How and why did Berlin become a focal point of the Cold War?
- First Berlin Crisis (airlift), 1948-1949
- Second Berlin Crisis (demonstrations in East Berlin & East Germany), 1953
- Third Berlin Crisis (Khrushchev demands surrender of Berlin), 1958
- Fourth Berlin Crisis (Berlin Wall), 1961

1.1.7 How did the conflict between the USA and USSR result in Europe being divided into two armed camps?
- NATO, 1949
- Warsaw Pact, 1955
- U-2 spy plane incident
- Arms race and Space race
- Significance and implications for East-West relations and the world

1.1.8 What impact did the revolts in Eastern Europe have on the Cold War?
- Poland
- Hungary
- Czechoslovakia

1.1.9 How did the Cold War influence events in other parts of the world?
- The role of China
- The Vietnam War, 1965 - 1973
- Bay of Pigs Invasion and the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962
- Civil War in Angola, 1975
- The Middle East Conflict, 1967-1973

1.1.10 What role did the UN and other multi-lateral organisations play in attempting to mediate conflict?
- UNO
- OAU
- NAM

1.1.11 Conclusion: what impact did the Cold War have in forming the world as it was in the 1960s?

OUTCOMES FOR THIS CHAPTER

KNOWLEDGE

At the end of this chapter you will know about ...
- The world in the 1960s
- The origins of the Cold War
- The reasons for mistrust and tension between West and East
- US and Soviet involvement in Europe after World War Two
- US and Soviet involvement in other parts of the world in the 1960s
- The role multi-lateral organisations played in mediating conflict

SKILLS

At the end of this chapter you will be able to ...
- Interpret issues related to the Cold War
- Engage with appropriate sources of information
- Extract information from sources
- Categorise sources and information
- Analyse, interpret and evaluate information and data
- Engage with and analyse historical sources
- Explain historical concepts such as communism, capitalism and democracy
- Compare and contrast various interpretations and perspectives of East-West relations during the Cold War
- Plan and construct an original argument using evidence
- Examine the dynamics of changing power relations during the Cold War

VALUES AND ATTITUDES

At the end of this chapter you will appreciate ...
- What the world was like in the 1960s
- How economic wealth and political power shape history
- Why different ideologies and beliefs breed mistrust and tension
- How our world has been shaped by the Cold War

1.1.1 INTRODUCTION: WHAT WAS THE WORLD LIKE IN THE 1960s?

Let us first consider what the world was like in the 1960s

The 1960s refers to the decade 1960 to 1969 in the world's history and has also come to refer to the cultural and political events of this time, which occurred in western countries such as Britain, France, the United States of America and West Germany. It is considered to be a period of social upheaval and is often referred to as the "Swinging Sixties" because of the liberal attitudes that emerged during this decade.

Many of the trends and attitudes of the 1960s were due to demographic changes brought about by the "baby boom" generation (this generation refers to the children born between 1945 - 1960. Returning soldiers got married and had families very soon after returning from war), the tension of the Cold War and the end of European colonial empires. The 1960s saw a rise in social revolution, civil rights movements, human rights movements, and anti-war movements. Many believe the Sixties to be a "Western" phenomenon, but most of the ideas and trends of the Sixties spread far beyond the borders of the USA and Western Europe. Overall the Sixties affected almost the entire globe. Just as liberal attitudes dominated the social and cultural lives of people at this time, the Cold War dominated the world political arena. In this chapter we will be looking at what impact the Cold War had on the world in the 1960s.

1.1.2 WHAT WAS THE COLD WAR?

The Cold War refers to a state of hostility between nations without actual fighting.
Let us investigate the meaning of the term Cold War.

Firstly, the term the "Cold War" comes from the title of a book by the political theorist Walter Lippmann and it refers to a state of hostility between nations without actual physical fighting. It has come to refer to the protracted economic and ideological struggle between the global superpowers of the United States and the Soviet Union, supported by their respective allies that emerged after the Second World War. The Cold War lasted four decades until the decline and eventual collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 is generally considered to mark the absolute end of the conflict.

As already mentioned, the struggle between these two superpowers and their allies did not involve direct armed conflict, but instead was waged by means of diplomatic manoeuvring, economic pressure, intimidation, propaganda, espionage and assassination. This period in history also witnessed the biggest arms race in history, leading to widespread global fears of a potential nuclear war. This tension shaped the lives of people around the world as much as actual fighting did.

Historical interpretations

What were the ideological differences between the two superpowers and their allies?

Historians hold different viewpoints and interpretations about the origins of the Cold War, but it is safe to say that due to ideological differences between the two superpowers, tension and a mutual mistrust developed between them and their allies. This period of tension and mistrust became known as the "Cold War". The USA had a democratic government and a capitalist economy, whereas the USSR had a communist political and economic system in place. These two systems of government, and therefore the societies that developed as a result, were organised around very different ideals. At times the tension between the USA and USSR increased drastically and the Cold War became "warm" and threatened to develop into a full scale "hot" war. However, one of the two powers always backed down at the last minute and thus the Cold War continued.

So, how would you explain the concepts communism, capitalism and democracy?

Communism

It is a doctrine (belief) that advocates a classless society in which private ownership has been abolished and the means of production belong to the community. Communist countries are often one-party states in which industry and agriculture are controlled by the state. The government controls most aspects of a person's life and there is strong censorship of what is written and said.

Capitalism

Capital is money that is used to make more money. A capitalist is one who has capital, for example the mine owner or industrialist. He therefore owns the "means of production" i.e. the mines, tools, machines and other equipment. He thereafter employs labour (workers and managers) and pays them low wages. The capitalist thereafter sells his goods, which are produced by the workers, at a huge profit. These profits are not shared by the workers. The main concern of capitalists is to make the highest possible profit. These profits are re-invested in other businesses and lead to the "rich becoming richer".

Democracy

A system of government based on the will of the people. It is a government for the people by the people in the form of their elected representatives. It therefore means the citizens of a country have the ability to choose their representatives and to effectively take part in the decisions made on issues that affect them and society in general.

It is thus evident that the Americans and the Russians had two completely different economic and political systems in place that were directly opposed to one another.

1.1.3. WHAT WERE THE ORIGINS OF THE COLD WAR?

Background information: Ideological Differences

Let us trace the roots of the Cold War.

The origins of the Cold War are widely regarded to lie directly within the period immediately after World War Two which ended in 1945. However, events preceding World War Two, and extending as far back as the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the subsequent Russian Civil War, are considered by some historians as the long term reasons for the mistrust between the US and other Western countries and the USSR.

In 1917 Lenin led the Bolshevik Revolution, which established a communist government in Russia. The new Bolshevik government planned to remove the concept of private ownership based on the philosophy of Karl Marx. This was in stark contrast to the American economic system based on capitalism. The Americans feared the spread of communism and its belief in the elimination of private wealth and ownership. This fear continued throughout the period of the Great Depression in the world, as well as during and after World War Two.

Tensions before World War Two

Tensions between the West and USSR had increased long before the start of World War Two. The reasons for this tension and mistrust may be summed up in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for the West's mistrust of the USSR</th>
<th>Reasons for Soviet mistrust of the West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communism threatened Western values and way of life.</td>
<td>Communists believed the capitalist system was wrong because rich people prospered at the expense of the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During World War Two, the Bolshevik government had desert ed Russia's allies by making peace with Germany.</td>
<td>After the Bolsheviks had seized power in 1917, the Western powers sent aid to the &quot;White&quot; army who fought against the Bolsheviks (Red Army) in the Civil War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They disliked the totalitarian policies of Stalin, which led to forced labour, public trials, deaths and the purges of the 1930s.</td>
<td>In 1919 the Allies, as a result of the Paris Peace Conference, gave away Russian lands to other countries e.g. Poland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalin signed the Nazi-Soviet Non-aggression Pact in August 1939.</td>
<td>In the 1930s Stalin distrusted the policy of appeasement, suspecting that Britain and France saw the Soviet Union as the real enemy, not Nazi Germany. This suspicion was strengthened when the Soviets were excluded from the Munich Conference in 1938.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.4. HOW DID WORLD WAR TWO INTENSIFY THE COLD WAR?

An uneasy alliance

What was the relationship like between the USA and USSR during the war?

The USA and the USSR temporarily set aside their differences and mutual distrust when the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union in 1941. The USA together with Britain and the Soviet Union formed what became known as the Grand Alliance to defeat Hitler and Nazi Germany. However, a more accurate description might be “the marriage of convenience”. What brought them together was a desire to defeat their common enemy, Nazi Germany. As they had little else in common. The USA, through the Lend-Lease system, provided both Britain and the USSR with weapons and supplies. But, even before the end of the war and the defeat of Germany, tensions began to surface within the alliance. In public, tributes were made to the war efforts of their allies, but behind the scenes there was constant bickering between the Soviet Union and her two Western allies.

So, why did tensions develop within the Grand Alliance?

- From 1941 onwards the USSR carried the main burden in the fight against the Nazis and as a result, Soviet casualties began to mount. Two years went by before the Americans opened up a second front by invade Normandy, France in July 1944. Stalin viewed this delay as a deliberate attempt to weaken the USSR.
- The USA ended the Lend-Lease programme that was providing essential supplies to the Soviet people.
- Stalin grew more suspicious over Western secrecy of the atomic bomb. Although the bomb had been developed in the USA during the war, Stalin was only informed about its existence after the Nazi defeat, when the USA began to consider it necessary to use it to end the war against the Japanese in the Pacific.

How did the wartime conferences change the relationship between the Soviet Union and her allies?

The Cold War can be most directly traced back to several wartime conferences held during World War II by the “Big Three”, the USA, Britain and the USSR.

Teheran Conference, November 1943

At Teheran the Big Three decided that there would be no Anglo-American invasion of Germany through the Balkans. This left only Soviet troops and those from the Balkan nations to clear Eastern Europe of Nazi forces. By recognising Soviet supremacy in Eastern Europe, the Teheran Conference limited the West’s participation in the post-war political affairs in this area. It also encouraged Stalin to believe that he had a free hand in Eastern Europe as a result of the agreements he negotiated with Churchill. This also convinced him that the West would accept Soviet control in these areas. The post-war situation in Eastern Europe, however, was to cause major mistrust and tension between the West and the Soviet Union.

Yalta Conference, February 1945

As the war drew to a close and the defeat of Germany became increasingly probable, the ideological differences between the USSR and the Western allies began to resurface. When Stalin of the USSR, Churchill of Great Britain and Roosevelt of the USA, met at Yalta in February 1945 to plan the post-war settlement, there was great tension behind the official cordiality. As a result, the agreements reached ended up being only temporary compromises that did not settle the bigger issues.

So, what decisions were made at the Yalta conference?

- Germany would be divided into four zones of occupation, to be administered by the USA, the USSR, Britain and France, but no understanding was reached on a uniform system of government in the zones.
- It was agreed that the German capital, Berlin, which was situated deep in the Soviet zone, would also be divided into 4 zones of occupation.
- As a result of the war the USSR had occupied Poland and had installed a pro-Soviet provisional government. At Yalta, Stalin promised that free democratic elections would be held there in the future.
- A joint “Allied Declaration on Liberated Europe” formally committed the USSR to pursue a policy of democracy in the countries it occupied in Eastern Europe i.e. Eastern European countries were to be allowed to hold free elections to choose how they would be governed. However, Stalin’s interpretation of democracy was very different from that of the other allies.
- They would join the United Nations whose aim it was to keep peace after the war.
- The USSR agreed to join the war against Japan after the war in Europe was over.
- Stalin was determined to create a large buffer against any future German aggression because they had suffered terrible losses during the war. The Big Three agreed that Eastern Europe would be a “Soviet sphere of influence”.

What issues did the Big Three disagree on?

- No agreements were reached on the scale of the German payment of reparations. Stalin wanted a fixed sum, which the Western allies thought too large.
- Stalin wanted the border of the Soviet Union to move westwards into Poland. He believed that the Polish border could, in turn, move westwards into Germany.

Potsdam Conference, July-August 1945

The Potsdam Conference that began in July 1945 was really a continuation of the Yalta Conference. By this time, however, the war in Europe was over and the conference was organised to discuss the post-war settlement. The issues that were discussed were the same: Germany, reparations, Eastern Europe and Japan. These discussions also highlighted the differences between the Western allies and the Soviet Union. In fact the relations between them seemed to be more strained. Stalin was even more uncompromising and
both the USA and Britain had new leaders. Truman had replaced Roosevelt and Atlee was the new British leader.

So, what were the main decisions made at the Potsdam Conference?

- Regarding Germany, the details of the four zones of occupation were finalised.
- Each power was to collect its reparations from its zone of occupation. Since the Soviet zone was mainly rural, the USSR was to receive additional reparations from the other zones.
- Poland’s western border was to be along a line created by the Oder and Neisse rivers.
- Germans living in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary were to return to Germany.

But, what did the powers not agree upon?

- Stalin proposed that Germany be crippled, whereas Truman did not want a repetition of the Treaty of Versailles.
- They could not agree upon the issue of reparations. Stalin hoped to be compensated for the death of 20 million Russians, while Truman did not want to make the same mistakes that were made at the end of World War One.
- Although it had been agreed at Yalta that pro-Soviet governments could be set up in Eastern Europe, Truman was totally opposed to this.

Many historians have emphasised Stalin’s refusal to consider German re-unification and his refusal to give up wartime gains in Eastern Europe as major factors in creating the Cold War. It has been suggested that Stalin never fully understood the Western position, however it is also true to say that the West never fully understood the Soviet perspective. Therefore the misunderstanding was a two-way process.

Activity 1.1: Group LO 1/AS 1; LO 2/AS 1, 2, 3; LO 3/AS 2.3.4

What happened at the Yalta Conference?

Read the information below and then attempt the activity:

When Churchill (Great Britain), Stalin (USSR) and Roosevelt (USA) met in February 1945 at Yalta in the Soviet Union to discuss a post-war settlement, it was evident that there were cracks in the Grand Alliance. What would it have been like to attend such a conference?

- The class should be divided into groups of three. Each group member will play one of the following roles: Churchill, Stalin or Roosevelt.
- Learners will then be given time to consider the following points from the point of view of their particular country:
  - Germany
  - Berlin
  - Poland
  - Eastern Europe
  - United Nations
  - War against Japan

1.1.5. How and Why Did the USA and Soviet Union Create Spheres of Interest?

Soviet expansion into Eastern Europe

Let us look at the Soviet Union’s territorial gains in Eastern Europe.

A map showing the Russian takeover of Eastern Europe. Adapted from Russia: A Modern History.

When Germany attacked Poland in 1939, the Soviet Union occupied a large part of eastern Poland as one of the terms of the Non-Aggression Pact. When the war was over, and while Europe concerned itself with the rehabilitation of their devastated countries, the USSR made significant territorial advances into Eastern Europe. Having freed much of Europe from the Nazis, the Red Army remained in occupation and communist governments closely controlled by Moscow were established in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria and East Germany. These countries became known as Soviet satellite states.

So, what were the reasons for the Soviet Union’s takeover of Eastern Europe?

- Despite the Russian victory over Nazi Germany and the emergence of Stalin as an outstanding world statesman, the USSR still felt vulnerable to the West. Stalin still believed that the West could be a threat to the USSR. This fear was intensified by the knowledge that the USA had the atomic bomb. Stalin thus felt it was necessary to protect the USSR behind a defensive barrier, provided by the wartime acquisition of various states in Eastern Europe.
- Despite advances that had been made under Stalin, the strain of the war had completely exhausted the Russian economy. This is the reason why Stalin was adamant that they would extract reparations from Germany.
Germany thus became the new front line in the defensive system. This explains why Stalin was so unco-operative on the German issue at Yalta and Potsdam. He regarded any suggestions for settlement as a wedge being driven into Soviet security. In the tense atmosphere that existed between the West and the Soviets, the Western allies interpreted Soviet defensive moves as a desire for expansion. They came to this conclusion as a result of the way in which the communists took control of the governments in Eastern Europe.

Initially, coalition governments, which included non-communists, were established in the liberated territories of Eastern Europe. It was not long before non-communists began to be persecuted and the communists took control of key posts in these governments and were able to assert Russian dominance. This was followed by the elimination of non-communists. Eastern Europe was thus under Russian control.

So, to sum up, why was Stalin so interested in Eastern Europe?

- He wanted it to act as a buffer between Germany and the USSR, to prevent another invasion of the Soviet Union.
- He saw it as vital to the development of the Soviet economy. These countries would be a source of cheap goods and raw materials. They would also be forced to trade with the Soviet Union.
- Some historians believe that Stalin's interest in Eastern Europe was part of a pattern of conquest.
- Others believe that Stalin would have been happy to allow coalition governments to continue, but hostility from the West forced him to impose a harsh regime in this area.

"Iron Curtain"

What was the reaction of the West to the situation in Eastern Europe?

- The West grew increasingly alarmed at the situation in Eastern Europe. They saw Stalin as a dictator who had eliminated his opposition. This type of power and control in Eastern Europe prompted Winston Churchill to make his famous speech in Fulton, Missouri (USA) in March 1946. In it he declared that "an iron curtain" had descended across Europe from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic. He basically stated that Europe was now divided into separate halves by Soviet policy. On the one hand in the West, there were free democratic states, while in the East, behind the "Iron Curtain", were the countries under communist domination subject to the Soviet Union. He called for a Western alliance to combat the threat of communism.

- Stalin was angered by this speech and accused Churchill of trying to stir up war against the Soviet Union. This speech certainly widened the gap between the USSR and the West, but did little to combat communist expansion in Eastern Europe.
Let us look at what impact the local situations in Greece, Turkey and Iran had on East-West relations.

It was events in Greece, Turkey and Iran that prompted the USA into taking action to combat the spread of communism, as the US feared that the Eastern Mediterranean would also fall to the communists. Their policy was one of containment, which simply means that they wanted to stop the spread of communism.

What happened in Greece, Turkey and Iran to prompt US action?

**Greece**

When the Nazis retreated from Greece in 1944 the communists and monarchists (supporters of the king) vied for power, plunging the country into a state of civil war. The British who had liberated the Greeks from the Nazis were unable to contain the Greek communists who had the support of the neighbouring communist states of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria and Albania. They could also not afford a long civil war in Greece and so they appealed to the Americans for assistance. It was in these circumstances that President Truman stepped in, as he believed if one country fell to communism, those close by would also be at risk. This became known as the “domino theory”, that is, a chain reaction. In March of 1947 Truman announced that America would “support free people who are resisting subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures”. To achieve this, massive arms supplies and other necessities were made available to Greece and as a result, the communists were defeated.

**Turkey**

Turkey was in a similar situation to Greece. In 1945-6 Stalin demanded the return of certain provinces, which the Turks had gained from the Russians at the end of the First World War. The Turks appealed to the Western powers for help and so Turkey also received aid from the US. The U.S.A. had made it very clear that they would not tolerate Soviet aggression. Altogether $400 million had been given to Greece and Turkey to fend off communist revolutions.

**Iran**

During the war both Britain and the Soviet Union had stationed troops in Iran. After the war ended the British withdrew their troops within six months, as promised, but the Soviet troops remained. They were only withdrawn after protests from the Iranian government. Even after this, some Soviet troops continued to stay in the Iranian province of Azerbaijan to help the pro-communist guerrillas who were fighting for independence. Firm pressure from the British and the Americans forced Stalin to withdraw his troops.

---

**Activity 1.2: Pairs**

How did mistrust develop between East and West?

Study Sources 1A to 1D and then answer the questions that follow:

(a) With reference to Source A.  
(i) What was the “Iron Curtain” Churchill makes reference to in his speech?  
(ii) Why does Churchill see communism as a “peril to Christian Civilisation”?  
(iii) What does Churchill mean when he says “If they [Western democracies] become divided catastrophe may overwhelm us all”?

(b) Study Source B.  
(i) In the source Stalin accuses Churchill of being a “war-monger”. What does he mean by this?  
(ii) What reasons does Stalin give for ensuring “that governments loyal to the Soviet Union should exist in these countries”?

(c) According to Sources A and B, Stalin and Churchill’s view of events in Eastern Europe are very different. Explain the impact of Churchill’s speech on US-Soviet relations.

(d) Consult Source C and comment on the accuracy of the cartoonist’s view of the situation in Eastern Europe.

(e) What comment is the cartoonist making regarding US-Soviet relations in the post-world war era in Source D?

(f) Using Sources C and D and your own knowledge, write a paragraph of about 100 words describing the situation in Europe in 1946 and its implications for the rest of the world.
Policy of Containment

Let us now sum up America's involvement in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The USA had adopted a policy of "containment", which meant that they would support nations in danger of a communist takeover and that the USSR would not be allowed to spread her influence beyond the territories she had occupied in 1945. This support would be in the form of economic and military aid. Truman outlined this policy in a speech he made in March 1947. This American intervention became known as the Truman Doctrine of Containment.

Truman Doctrine and its consequences

What were the consequences of the Truman Doctrine?

- The communists in Greece and Turkey were defeated.
- Soviet troops withdrew from Iran.
- Hostility between the USA and the USSR increased.
- The USA was committed to a policy of Containment.
- Cominform (Communist Information Bureau) was set up in September 1947 to link communist parties around the world in common action, in strict obedience to the Soviet Union, and to ensure they received no aid from the West.

To follow through with Truman's policy of Containment the Marshall Plan was born. Truman believed that communism flourished in countries where people were poverty-stricken, as was the case in post-war Europe. He feared that even countries in Western Europe like France and Italy might fall prey to the communists as a result of their poor economic situations. The plan to prevent this was announced by the US Secretary of State, General George Marshall, in June 1947.

Marshall Plan

The Marshall Plan was the USA's response to Europe's economic needs. The USA offered money, equipment and goods to states in order to aid "free people seeking to preserve their independence and democratic institutions and human freedoms against totalitarian pressures, either internal or external". Marshall also stated that this move was "not directed against any country or doctrine but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos". It should be noted however, that the nations receiving aid had to agree to remove trade barriers and to co-operate economically with each other.

What were the consequences of the Marshall Plan?

- By September 1947, sixteen European countries had applied for Marshall Aid: Britain, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Italy, Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, West Germany, Portugal, Austria, Switzerland, Greece, Turkey, Iceland and Norway.
- These 16 countries set up OEEC, the Organisation for European Economic Co-operation to put the Marshall Plan into action.
- Under the Marshall Plan, US Congress approved spending 12 billion dollars to help rebuild Europe.
- By 1950 the USA had provided 17 billion dollars to help these countries rebuild their economies.

The plan was a success both economically and politically. Malnutrition disappeared in countries involved, industrial output increased and by 1953 Western Europe was flourishing and Communist parties had weakened. Tension increased between East and West thus intensifying the Cold War.

Profile: Harry S. Truman

Truman was born in Lamar, Missouri, in 1884. He grew up in independence and farmed for twelve years. He went to France during World War One as a captain in the Field Artillery and when he returned he married Elizabeth Virginia Wallace, he had to promote twice, and opened a general store in Kansas City. Truman active in the Democratic Party and was elected a judge of Jackson County Court, an administrative position, in 1922. He became a Senator in 1934 and during World War Two he helped the Senate War Investigating Committee. Truman was elected as the thirty-third President of the USA in 1945 and as President he made some of the most crucial decisions in history. He was the president who ordered atomic bombs to be dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki resulting in the Japanese surrender and the Allied victory in World War Two. In 1947 Truman asked the United States Congress to aid Greece and Turkey in their fight against communism resulting in the Truman Doctrine, which was followed by the Marshall Aid Plan. When the Russians blocked the western sectors of Berlin in 1948, Truman created a massive airlift to supply Berliners until the Russians backed down. After these and many other crucial decisions, Truman retired to independence at the age of 88 and died on 26 December 1972.

Source 1E: A German poster from The Americans - A History, showing how American money played a central role in European reconstruction. Translated, the German words read "An open road for the Marshall Plan". The Zoll/Grenze means customs border.


"The United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos. Its purpose should be the revival of a working economy in the world so as to permit the emergence of political and social conditions in which free institutions can exist."
Source 1G: An extract from a statement Truman made in 1948.

The Marshall Plan will go down in history as one of America's greatest contributions to the peace of the world. I think that the world now realises that without the Marshall Plan it would have been difficult for Western Europe to remain free from the tyranny of communism. Russia was caught off guard by the Marshall Plan. Moscow soon realised that when the Marshall Plan began to function the opportunity to communise Western Europe would be lost.

Source 1H: A bar graph adapted from Essential Modern World History showing Marshall Plan aid to Western Europe.

Cominform and Comecon

How and why did the Soviet Union use the Cominform and Comecon to react to the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan?

- Stalin, who could not afford to offer this type of aid to the nations he controlled, saw the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan as threats and denounced them as part of an "imperialist plot" by the USA to dominate Europe.
- The Soviets were concerned about the impact Marshall Aid would have on their Eastern satellite states.
- The USSR accused the Americans of "dollar diplomacy" or "dollar imperialism", implying that the Americans were using the plan for their own selfish monetary interests i.e. extending their support base by making countries financially dependent on them.
- The Soviet Union therefore forbade her Eastern satellite states from participating in the plan.
- To act as a countermeasure to the Marshall Plan, Stalin set up Cominform, in 1947, as already mentioned. In addition the USSR introduced the Molotov Plan, named after Russia's foreign minister, in 1949. This plan, similar to the Truman Doctrine, created the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance or Comecon, to assist the Russian satellite states economically.

Activity 1.3: Individual

LO 1/AS 3; LO 2/AS 1,3; LO 3/AS 2,3,4

What was the aim of the Marshall Plan?

(a) With reference to Source E, explain this viewpoint of the Marshall Plan.

(b) Refer to Source F.
   (i) What reasons does Marshall give for the implementation of the Marshall Plan?
   (ii) Marshall states that "Our policy is not directed against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos." Do you agree with this statement? Explain your answer.

(c) Sources F and G both comment on the Marshall Plan. Do they give the same reasons for the implementation of the plan? Substantiate your answer by making reference to both sources.

(d) Refer to Source H.
   (i) What do you notice about the countries that accepted Marshall Aid?
   (ii) Which European countries did not receive Marshall Aid? Why not?

(e) Using the information from the various sources, as well as your own knowledge, explain the impact of the Marshall Aid Plan.

NEW GENERATION HISTORY GRADE 12
1.1.6. HOW AND WHY DID BERLIN BECOME A FOCAL POINT IN THE COLD WAR?

First Berlin Crisis (airlift), 1948 - 1949

Let us consider the background of the First Berlin Crisis.

- By 1948, the Cold War had become a clearly defined diplomatic conflict between West and East. Another major issue between these two blocs was the question of German reunification. At Yalta, the Allies had agreed to divide Germany into four zones of occupation, but did not reach an agreement on how to treat Germany. The Soviet Union, whose land had been invaded and devastated twice in the last thirty years, wanted Germany to remain weak and divided. The other Allied powers disagreed as they believed a happy Germany would mean a stable Europe.

A map adapted from Essential Modern World History, showing the German zones of occupation.

- The issue of reparations was not settled at Yalta and at Potsdam it was agreed that each occupying power could remove property and reparations from their own zone, however not in a way that would sabotage Germany's economic stability. Since most of Germany's industry was located in the West, the USSR was to receive 25% of the dismantled industrial equipment from the Western zones. The USSR would also exchange industrial equipment for food supplies, which were predominantly in the East. This caused further tension between the Soviet Union and the Western powers, as in reality they could not agree on the relative value of industrial equipment and food.

- Faced with severe food shortages and economic chaos in the Western zones, the Western Allies decided to join the three western zones within Germany in 1948. They also reformed the German currency and with the help of Marshall Aid, there was definite evidence that the Western parts of Germany were recovering. Stalin felt that they had gone against the terms of the Yalta Conference. In a show of power, the Soviets responded by cutting off all surface (roads, rail, canal, etc.) traffic into West Berlin in an attempt to stamp their authority on Berlin and force the Western powers to reconsider.

So how did the Western powers respond to the Berlin Blockade?

The Soviets' response to the currency reform in West Berlin was to blockade all road, rail and canal links between West Germany and West Berlin. The aim was to prevent the import of provisions, food and fuel supplies in an attempt to force West Berlin to submit to Soviet control. This can be seen as the first 'hot point' in the Cold War.

The Western powers had three options available to them. These options can be summed up as follows:

- Ignore the airlift and drive through the blockade
- Pull out of Berlin
- Airdrop supplies to West Berlin

Each of these options had advantages and disadvantages.

- West Berlin's approximately 2.1 million inhabitants had only enough food for 36 days and coal for 45 days. The Americans and British gambled on an airlift of supplies to overcome the blockade. The question, however, was whether or not the Soviets would shoot down their aeroplanes. The West calculated that the Soviets would not risk this as the Cold War would then become a 'hot' war.

- Over the following 327 days (approximately eleven months) 277,000 flights and 2.5 million tons of supplies were airdropped to relieve the West Berliners. These supplies were dropped by parachute on a daily basis and included everything from food, fuel and medicine to Christmas presents the planes' crew members bought with their own money. Despite food shortages and hardships, West Berliners supported the Western Allies by rejecting Soviet pressure to become part of one city under communist control. By May 1949 the Soviets admitted they were beaten and on 12 May they lifted the blockade.

Activity 1.4: Pairs

How was the Berlin Blockade viewed?

Study the sources below and then complete the activity that follows:

Source 1: This is an American cartoon depicting the Berlin Blockade as a 'bear hug'.

Source 1: This cartoon reflects the Soviet view of the Berlin Blockade.
Fourth Berlin Crisis, 1961

Why was the Berlin Wall built and how did it reflect the situation between the superpowers?

A recent photograph, taken from The Great Power Conflict, showing off part of the Berlin Wall.

Berlin continued to be a source of conflict between the Soviet Union and the West. In 1961 John F. Kennedy became the new American president and his inexperience seemed to give Krushchev the opportunity for a foreign policy success. He immediately set out to test Kennedy. In June 1961 they met in Vienna where Krushchev demanded a settlement of the Berlin problem.

In 1961 it was clear that West Berlin, controlled by the Western powers, was much wealthier than East Berlin, which was under Soviet control. East Berliners, because of the poor conditions in their part of the city, had begun escaping to the West via West Berlin. By June of that year they were escaping at a rate of 500 a day and 30,000 defected to the West during July. This was an embarrassment to Krushchev who saw West Berlin as a capitalist infection in the heart of East Germany.

He was determined to stop East Berliners from escaping and so on Sunday, 13 August 1961, East German troops sealed off West Berlin with road blocks and barbed wire. They then began to construct a concrete wall around the Western zones of the city. This was a huge, fortified wall that was manned 24 hours a day by machine-gun posts and searchlights. As a result of these actions, Berlin was divided into two and its citizens were cut off from family, friends and jobs overnight.

The Berlin Wall stood as a symbol of the divide between West and East, between democracy and communism and led to further tension between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. The Western Powers were afraid that the Soviets were planning to seize West Berlin by force and President Kennedy made it very clear that they would fight to protect West Berlin. The building of the wall solved Krushchev's problem of East Berliners defecting to the West, but his policy of peaceful co-existence with the West was destroyed.

Second Berlin Crisis, 1953

Why did Berlin continue to be a focal point of the Cold War?

Berlin did not only highlight tensions between East and West, but also highlighted the different living and working conditions of those living in Soviet-controlled East Berlin and those living in West Germany, which was controlled by the Western powers. It is evident that there was much unhappiness in East Berlin amongst those living under Soviet control.

In 1953, following Stalin's death, workers in East Berlin who were unhappy with the situation started demonstrations in which they demanded greater political and economic freedom, union with West Berlin, the end of communism and the withdrawal of Soviet troops. These demonstrations spread to East Germany, where protesters also demanded union with West Germany. This uprising was harshly suppressed by the Soviets who executed over six hundred demonstrators. This however did not stop thousands of East Germans from fleeing to the West in the hope of a better life and once again highlighted the differences between East and West.

Third Berlin Crisis, 1958

In 1958, Berlin once again became the focus of the Cold War. The new Soviet leader, Nikita Krushchev, demanded the West hand over Berlin, which lay in the heart of the Soviet zone, to East Germany. The Western powers, however, refused to give in to these demands and Krushchev did nothing to enforce them. Although, not a major crisis, this incident indicated that Berlin, because of its positioning and the differences in the way it was controlled, could continue to be a bone of contention (source of conflict) between East and West.

Fourth Berlin Crisis, 1961

Why was the Berlin Wall built and how did it reflect the situation between the superpowers?

A recent photograph, taken from The Great Power Conflict, showing off part of the Berlin Wall.

Berlin continued to be a source of conflict between the Soviet Union and the West. In 1961 John F. Kennedy became the new American president and his inexperience seemed to give Krushchev the opportunity for a foreign policy success. He immediately set out to test Kennedy. In June 1961 they met in Vienna where Krushchev demanded a settlement of the Berlin problem.

In 1961 it was clear that West Berlin, controlled by the Western powers, was much wealthier than East Berlin, which was under Soviet control. East Berliners, because of the poor conditions in their part of the city, had begun escaping to the West via West Berlin. By June of that year they were escaping at a rate of 500 a day and 30,000 defected to the West during July. This was an embarrassment to Krushchev who saw West Berlin as a capitalist infection in the heart of East Germany.

He was determined to stop East Berliners from escaping and so on Sunday, 13 August 1961, East German troops sealed off West Berlin with road blocks and barbed wire. They then began to construct a concrete wall around the Western zones of the city. This was a huge, fortified wall that was manned 24 hours a day by machine-gun posts and searchlights. As a result of these actions, Berlin was divided into two and its citizens were cut off from family, friends and jobs overnight.

The Berlin Wall stood as a symbol of the divide between West and East, between democracy and communism and led to further tension between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. The Western Powers were afraid that the Soviets were planning to seize West Berlin by force and President Kennedy made it very clear that they would fight to protect West Berlin. The building of the wall solved Krushchev's problem of East Berliners defecting to the West, but his policy of peaceful co-existence with the West was destroyed.
1.1.7. HOW DID THE CONFLICT BETWEEN THE USA AND THE USSR RESULT IN EUROPE BEING DIVIDED INTO TWO ARMED CAMPS?

NATO, 1949

Let us now consider the reasons for the establishment of NATO.

The Soviet takeover of Czechoslovakia, as well as the Berlin Blockade led to the formation of a Western defensive military alliance called the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation or NATO. By 1948 President Truman had come to the conclusion that it would be necessary to keep large numbers of American troops in Western Europe to counteract what he saw as a Soviet threat. As early as March 1948, a military initiative was undertaken by Britain, France, Belgium, Holland and Luxemburg for their mutual protection. This was then extended to include the USA, Canada, Portugal, Ireland, Italy, Norway and Denmark, to form NATO in April 1949. In the west, this was represented as a defensive alliance, freely entered into by the nations of Western Europe and North America for their mutual protection.

The member states agreed to the following:

- military co-operation
- they would fight only if attacked
- an attack on a member state would be regarded as an attack on all member states
- all member states would contribute to the military complement of NATO troops
- military force would be used to defend the interests and sovereignty of member states in the North Atlantic region
- a joint NATO Command Organisation would be set up. General Dwight Eisenhower of the US was appointed the first Commander in Chief.

Wарsaw Pact, 1955

What was the Soviet response to NATO?

To the USSR, NATO was a further step in the spread of American militarism and imperialism after the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. It worsened relations between West and East. In response the USSR formed its own military alliance in the Eastern Bloc, called the Warsaw Pact in 1955. This proved Stalin's decision to develop the Soviet Union's own atomic bomb was a wise one. The Warsaw Pact member countries were the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania, Albania and East Germany. A joint command structure was set up under the Soviet Supreme Commander and member states were expected to support each other if attacked. The Soviet Union also had the right to station troops in member countries and thus was able to strengthen its hold over its satellite states. This became an effective instrument in suppressing revolts in many Eastern European countries.

What was the significance of NATO and the Warsaw Pact?

Tension and hostility between the West and East had worsened and these two regional defences systems hardened the divisions in Europe creating two opposing power blocs. Each bloc was armed and politically hostile towards the other. Europe now served as the centre stage for the Cold War between the two superpowers, the USA and the USSR.
the one hand, you had NATO which represented democracy and capitalism, under the leadership of the USA, and on the other hand, you had the Warsaw Pact which represented communism, under the leadership of the USSR.

U-2 spy plane incident

What was the U-2 spy plane incident and how did it affect East-West relations?

- By the late 1950s Stalin had died and the Soviet Union had a new leader, Nikita Krushchev. He adopted a much softer approach to the West, opting for peaceful co-existence. He even made plans to reduce Soviet expenditure on arms. In May 1960 a Paris summit was to have been held between the leaders of the USSR, the USA, Britain and France as a step towards improving East-West relations following Krushchev's visit to the USA in 1959. However, an incident that occurred in early 1960 not only resulted in the summit being abandoned, but also in increased rivalry between East and West.
- On 1 May, a U-2 American spy plane, flown by Gary Powers, was shot down over the Urals. Powers was captured, and films and tapes were recovered. Several days later the Soviets announced the shoot-down of the plane. However, the Americans denied it was spying. The Soviets announced that Powers would be put on trial for spying and Eisenhower was forced to admit the plane was on a spying mission.
- As a result Krushchev refused to attend the Paris summit unless all U-2 flights were cancelled and Eisenhower apologised. The U-2 flights were cancelled but Eisenhower refused to apologise and so Krushchev walked out of the summit and it was abandoned.
- East-West relations were further strained as a result of this incident, resulting in further mistrust between the superpowers.

A Soviet cartoon from Essential Modern World History showing President Eisenhower painting a U-2 spy plane.

Arms race and space race

Let us now focus on the arms race and space race.

This diagram is adapted from a diagram in The World Since 1914, showing comparative numbers of American and Soviet military capabilities.

In the hostile atmosphere that existed between the two superpowers, the arms race became an aspect of the Cold War, in which the USA and the USSR competed to have greater military force than the other. The arms race had two fronts, nuclear weaponry and conventional military weapons.

In August 1945 the Americans had dropped two atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki to end the war with the Japanese. Although it brought the war in the East to an end, it completely devastated the two Japanese cities and changed the way wars would be fought in the future. It also created further hostility between the West and the Soviet Union. It was not long before the Soviets had a nuclear weapon of their own. In the same year that the Berlin Blockade was lifted, 1949, the Soviet Union tested its first atomic bomb. In 1952, the USA announced that it had a Hydrogen bomb (H-bomb), many times more powerful than the atomic bomb. A year later the Soviets detonated their first H-bomb.

The two superpowers were now both nuclear powers and in direct opposition to each other. Fear of what the other superpower might have led to nuclear rivalry which led to a long line of increasingly deadlier weapons. Obsession with nuclear stockpiling left behind a legacy of danger stemming from the very weapons that were created to protect. As a result, the world would never be the same again. Ever since 1945 and the end of World War Two, the USA had been secure in the belief that they held an edge against the USSR in technology. This illusion was
shattered in 1957 when the Soviets launched the first satellite known as Sputnik. The launch proved to be a significant victory for the Soviets. The possibility of spying on the USA or launching long-range missiles with nuclear warheads further increased tension between East and West. This prompted what became known as the space race.

Significance and implications for East-West relations and the world

- Not wanting to live in the shadow of Sputnik, the USA began its own quest for success in space travel. In 1958, the USA achieved its own goal of having one of their own satellites orbit the earth. The space race did not end here, as several years later, President John F. Kennedy of the USA set what was thought at that time to be an unachievable goal, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. On 20 July 1969 the world stood still as the Americans successfully landed on the moon. On this occasion, the astronaut Neil Armstrong who took the first step on the surface of the moon, stated that this was a "giant leap for mankind". This landing, and those that were to follow, represented an American victory over the Soviets as well as a technological triumph.

1.1.8. WHAT IMPACT DID THE REVOLTS IN EASTERN EUROPE HAVE ON THE COLD WAR?

Let us look at the impact Stalin’s death had on the Soviet Union’s control of its satellite states.

- When Stalin died in 1953, the USSR still had an iron grip on its Eastern European satellite states. Most of these states were experiencing economic hardships as they had been forbidden by Stalin to accept Marshall Aid. All except President Tito of Yugoslavia had listened to him.
- Nikita Krushchev, who emerged as the new Soviet leader in 1955, adopted a completely different approach to his predecessor. He adopted a more moderate approach to the West, opting rather for peaceful coexistence. He also planned to reduce Soviet expenditures on arms and to improve the living standards of the ordinary citizens of the USSR, as well as those living in the Eastern European satellite states. It soon became clear, however, that this softer approach did not mean he would give more independence to the Eastern European satellite states.
- Krushchev wanted to establish his own authority and control once he became leader of the USSR and so he embarked on a policy of de-Stalinisation. Stalin’s death and Krushchev’s criticisms of him created an expectation of change in Eastern Europe. We’ve already discussed the demonstrations in Berlin in 1953, and although East Berlin was not allowed to become part of West Germany, Krushchev halted reparations and agreed to pay the COMECON countries more for the goods that they sold to the USSR. He even released some political prisoners and re-established friendly relations with Yugoslavia. However, it was soon to be seen just how genuine this new policy of Krushchev’s really was. In May of 1955, the USSR and her satellite states had signed a defensive pact known as the Warsaw Pact. This, however, did not mean that the Soviet Union and all her satellite states were on friendly terms. In many of these states there existed opposition to Soviet dominance, which in certain states resulted in revolts against Soviet control. Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia will be discussed as case studies.

Let us now examine three case studies that demonstrate uprisings against the USSR. Poland

A photograph of the Soviet leader Nikita Krushchev taken from Russia: A Modern History.
Case Study Two: The Hungarian Uprising in 1956

- A similar uprising occurred in Hungary in 1956, but while Poland wanted to establish their own brand of communism, the Hungarian Uprising threatened the existence of the Communist Party. In June 1956, the Soviets allowed the Hungarians to dismiss their unpopular Stalinist leader Rakosi. Gero, his successor, however, was unable to contain the Hungarian peoples' demands for greater freedom. In October of that year fighting broke out in Budapest, the Hungarian capital, between those wanting reform and Soviet troops. The Soviets, in an attempt to defuse a potentially dangerous situation, agreed that Gero should be replaced by Imre Nagy, who was a more liberal and popular Communist. Nagy then set up a new government that included two non-Communists.

- The population was, however, not satisfied with these changes and demanded free elections and the withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact. Nagy and his government decided on 1 November to give in to these demands. The Soviets response to the situation was to send in troops on 4 November. The Hungarians were crushed by the Red Army. The clashes resulted in the deaths of approximately 7000 Soviets' troops and 30,000 Hungarians. Thousands were imprisoned and thousands more fled Hungary to the West. Nagy was captured and imprisoned and later executed by the Soviets. A new government was set up by the Soviets under the leadership of Janos Kadar whom they believed would be loyal to the Soviet Union.

- After the revolution, Kadar did introduce some reforms and Hungary began to follow its own communist path. In the long term the Hungarian people did benefit from the uprising as the economic situation improved. However, the uprising reduced Khrushchev's support in the Soviet Union as the crushing of the uprising had been very costly. The Western Powers, although sympathetic to the Hungarian people, did not intervene, as they believed doing so would make them at risk of a nuclear war and they were at that time also pre-occupied with the Suez Crisis in the Middle East.

Czechoslovakia

Case Study Three: Uprising in Czechoslovakia in 1968

In 1968, Alexander Dubcek became the leader of the Communist Party in Czechoslovakia. He aimed to reform the Communist Party and the Czech government. He allowed the Czech people the freedom to criticise the government, sparking them the hope of reforms, perhaps more than he intended. He also allowed non-communists to form groups and associations. This new era of reform became known in the West as the "Prague Spring". These developments alarmed the Soviets who were afraid that they would threaten the Warsaw Pact. Czechoslovakia bordered Western Europe and its withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact would mean Eastern Europe would be divided and this would make Soviet strategy more complicated in the event of a war. In the middle of July the USSR and the other members of the Warsaw Pact sent a letter to the Czech government making it clear to the Czech government that Dubcek's reforms were seen as a threat to the Warsaw Pact. Dubcek insisted that he had no intention of withdrawing from the Warsaw Pact, but the Soviets, who still recalled the uprising in Hungary in 1956, feared that Dubcek might be forced into further reforms by public opinion. Thus on August 1968, Warsaw Pact troops invaded and occupied Czechoslovakia. Dubcek and his colleagues were arrested and taken to Moscow. Soviet domination in Eastern Europe was reinforced. Yugoslavia, under President Tito, was the only Eastern European state free from Soviet domination.

Due to the fact that there was little resistance and that there was nobody prepared to replace him, Dubcek was allowed to return as President. However, the "Prague Spring" was over and any reforms that had been introduced were abolished. In 1969, Dubcek was replaced by Husak, a leading Czech Communist whom the Soviets trusted.

A photograph, taken from Studies in Twentieth Century World History, showing Soviet tanks in Prague in 1968.
As a result of the situation in Czechoslovakia, Brezhnev, the new Soviet leader, issued what became known as the “Brezhnev Doctrine”. According to this statement, all satellite states were to follow the Soviet Doctrine of communism, which was based on a one-party system and membership of the Warsaw Pact. He believed that this was necessary, because if Czechoslovakia ceased to be a communist state, then the Warsaw Pact states would be threatened. The Western Powers condemned the invasion but again did not intervene.

**Activity 1.6: Individual**

**LO 1/AS 1, 2, 3, 4; LO 3/AS 2, 3, 4**

Why were there uprisings in the Soviet satellite states?

Using the case studies on the satellite states, as well as conducting research, undertake the following:

- Select one of the uprisings mentioned in this chapter, i.e. Poland, Hungary or Czechoslovakia, for research purposes.
- Design a pamphlet for an underground resistance movement whose aim is to rid the country of Soviet control.
- Your pamphlet should make reference to the negative aspects of Soviet control as well as the reasons for wanting an independent government.

1.1.9. HOW DID THE COLD WAR INFLUENCE EVENTS IN OTHER PARTS OF THE WORLD?

**The Role of China**

*Let us look at the relationship between the Soviet Union and Communist China.*

- The Communists under Mao Tse Tung came to power in China in 1949 and this news was welcomed in Moscow. It was logical for the USSR to think that it had a major ally in its Cold War struggle with the West. This is exactly what the West had feared, the formation of a huge Soviet-dominated communist power bloc that stretched eastwards from Europe to the Pacific. However, appearances are deceiving, as in fact there was no real harmony between the USSR and China. The relationship between these two communist countries was not to be an easy one. The main issue of contention was whether it was the USSR or China that was the real leader of the communist world.
- At first Krushchev, the Soviet leader who succeed Stalin, enjoyed good relations with the Chinese Communist government and in 1954 gave the Chinese economic aid on a scale more generous than Stalin had done. However, these friendly relations, did not last, because of the following circumstances:
  - Krushchev’s de-Stalinisation policy and his move towards a more peaceful policy of co-existence with the West led the Chinese Communist government to be suspicious of Krushchev.
  - China believed the USSR was departing from the true doctrines of Marxist-Leninism.
  - Mao believed that the Soviet Union was no longer fit to lead the world communist movement and that China should assume this leadership role.

**So, why did the Soviet Union and China disagree?**

Despite the occasional appearances of understanding, there was increased tension between China and the USSR throughout the 1950s.

Mao acknowledged that the Soviet Union had played a significant role in the struggle of the proletariat (workers) but he clearly stated that he felt the Soviets present attitude towards the West was too soft. The World Communist Conference held in Moscow in 1960 did not manage to heal the rift between the Soviet Union and China. In fact, by the end of 1960 the Soviets had cut off aid to China and "a war of words" started between the two capitals, Moscow and Peking. This resulted in many Communist parties in other countries dividing into either pro-Soviet Union or pro-Chinese factions.

Major disagreements over foreign policy and Marxist ideology were deepened over territorial disputes. In the late 1950s and 1960s, both the Soviet Union and China stationed troops along their common border in central Asia. In 1962 as a result of a border war between China and India, the gap between these two communist countries was widened further, as the Soviet Union unofficially supported the Indian cause. This gap grew larger in 1962 when China criticised the Soviet Union’s handling of the Cuban Missile Crisis. Their relationship deteriorated further in 1963 when China refused to sign the Test-Ban Treaty with the Soviets and the Americans. To add to this, Mao and Krushchev had developed a deep dislike for each other.

**Let us examine the implications of Sino (Chinese)-Soviet relations for the Cold War**

Instead of the USSR and China developing into a strong power bloc in the East, there was a serious battle taking place for domination of the communist world. International communism had become a divided force and the USSR and China became involved in a competition to win or retain the loyalty and support of the rest of the communist world.

The public arguments and disharmony between the Soviet Union and China were factors in Krushchev’s weakening position in the USSR and his fall from power in 1964. His attempts at peaceful co-existence with the West had been unsuccessful. The increasing battle of words between the Soviet Union and China resulted in the USSR refusing to deliver atomic bombs to China and to set up a joint naval base in the Pacific. If this had been achieved, control of the Cold War would certainly have been tipped towards the Communist bloc.

In 1969, fighting in a border conflict nearly brought the Soviet Union and China to an all-out war. As a result of this crisis, the two countries sought to isolate each
The Vietnam War, 1965-1973

So how did the Vietnam War become part of the greater Cold War conflict?

The 1960s saw a further increase in tensions between the USSR and the USA. In 1960, the United States sent 15 advisors to help prevent a Communist takeover of South Vietnam. Over the next twelve years, four American presidents, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon tried unsuccessfully to achieve this goal. To the Americans the Vietnam War represented a fear that if one nation fell prey to communism, then soon neighboring countries would become communist too.

An illustration showing the "Domino Effect"—if one country fell prey to communism, then soon neighboring countries would become communist too.

The Vietnam War did not only mean a physical confrontation between communists and non-communists, but it would also cause many problems for the Americans on the home front as American society was deeply divided over the conflict.

Let us look at the backdrop of the Vietnam War.

- After World War Two the French tried, without success, to regain their colonial empire in South East Asia, which had been occupied by the Japanese during the war. The French, however, were forced to withdraw from the area after being defeated by a Vietnamese army at Dien Bien Phu in 1954. After this a conference was held in Geneva where Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia were granted independence. At this conference Vietnam was also temporarily divided, along the 17th parallel, into North Vietnam, controlled by the Communist Vietminh and South Vietnam, which was backed by the Americans and the French. It was intended that after elections, which were to be held in 1956, North and South Vietnam should be reunited under one government.

South Vietnam was ruled by Ngo Dinh Diem, who was very unpopular. He was a tyrannical Catholic leader who brutally persecuted the Buddhist majority and refused to implement reforms in the South, particularly regarding land ownership. On top of this, he refused to hold the proposed elections which angered the majority of the people in South Vietnam. In 1960 the National Liberation Front (NLF) who opposed Ngo Dinh Diem was formed. It demanded a democratic national coalition government, which would in turn introduce reforms and negotiate for a united Vietnam. Diem refused to give in to their demands and the NLF, which was communist in orientation, began a guerrilla campaign in South Vietnam, plunging the country into civil war. The NLF's own guerrilla force was known as the Vietcong.

Buddhism is a religious teaching put forward by Buddha and his followers, which declares that by destroying greed, hatred and delusion, which are the causes of all human suffering, human beings can achieve perfect enlightenment.

Did you know?

Diem was overthrown and executed in a South Vietnamese army coup in 1963 only to be replaced by a number of military rulers who were also corrupt and therefore had little support from the Vietnamese people. The Vietcong took advantage of the problems in South Vietnam but actually became popular in the rural areas because it gave land to the peasants and provided necessary infrastructure to the local community e.g. schools. The Vietcong won the support of the local people because they treated them well. The Vietcong were backed by the Chinese and the Soviets. The Vietcong received supplies, weapons, food and even troops via North Vietnam, through the route known as the Ho Chi Minh Trail. This trail was a series of jungle paths that led from north to south by way of Laos and Cambodia. These supply lines were vital to the Vietcong.
Let us consider the reasons why the Americans got involved in the Vietnam War

- The fact that the local people in South Vietnam were turning to support the Vietcong alarmed the Americans who, as already mentioned, feared the spread of communism as a result of the "Domino Effect".
- The USA wanted to contain the spread of communism.

So, how did the Americans aid the South Vietnamese?

- Until 1954 the Americans supported the French against the Vietminh with money and equipment.
- Between 1954 and 1960 the USA sent aid, equipment and military advisors to assist the South Vietnamese. President Kennedy (1961-1963) also introduced the "safe village" system in which peasants were moved into fortified villages in an attempt to isolate the Vietcong outside. This policy did not prove successful as most of the Vietcong were peasants and just continued to work from within the villages. After President Kennedy was assassinated in 1963, US policy in Vietnam changed radically.
- Lyndon B. Johnson, who succeeded Kennedy, took a completely different approach to American involvement in Vietnam. He believed that the war could be won quickly with a huge increase in American involvement but he would have to justify this to the American Congress.
- By 1963 the Vietcong had managed to take over about 40% of the rural areas in South Vietnam and seemed to have the upper hand. By this stage they had over 100,000 fighters in the South and the American government thus believed the survival of Vietnam was at stake. They were afraid that communism would spread throughout south-east Asia.
- In 1964, when an American ship was torpedoed in North Vietnamese waters by a North Vietnamese torpedo boat, Johnson was able to justify to the US Congress the need for increased American involvement. By 1967, there were approximately 500,000 American troops fighting in Vietnam.
- President Johnson believed that in order to defeat the Vietcong they needed to cut them off from their supplies, which came from North Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh Trail. He therefore launched a bombing offensive against North Vietnam known as "Operation Rolling Thunder" in April 1965. It aimed to cut off the Vietcong from their support in the North by destroying ports, army bases and supply lines without committing American troops to the war on the ground. Although the American commander in Vietnam believed the war would be over soon, he was proved wrong. It did not weaken the economy of North Vietnam or weaken the Vietcong's will to fight and it did not stop the flow of men and supplies along the Ho Chi Minh Trail.


J.F. Kennedy Richard Nixon

Did you know?

The US airforce dropped more bombs on North Vietnam than all the bombs dropped by both sides in World War Two. 860,000 tons of bombs were dropped, killing 52,000 Vietnamese civilians.

- Despite the US bombing of the Vietcong supply lines, the Vietcong were still able to launch a surprise guerilla attack on major South Vietnamese towns and American bases in February 1968. This offensive became known as the "Tet Offensive" as it was launched during the Tet religious festival, the Vietnamese equivalent of New Year.
- Tuesday evening, 30 January 1968 was the Vietnamese equivalent of New Year's Eve. The next day was Tet, the start of the lunar New Year. In many of the cities in South Vietnam, the streets began filling up with young people and farmers who were apparently arriving in the cities to celebrate New Year. There was also an unusually high number of funerals taking place with the traditional flutes, firecrackers and coffins. The coffins were used as a camouflage to carry weapons for the farmers, who belonged to special Vietcong units. Using these weapons, the Vietcong launched a massive attack that night on about a hundred towns and cities including Saigon, as well as twelve US air bases.
- The Vietcong suffered heavy casualties and it had failed to deliver a knockout blow. This was also a blow to the Americans as the Vietcong were able to capture nearly 80% of all towns and villages. It showed that the Vietcong had the capacity to strike the centre of American-held territory, thus negatively affecting the morale of the American armed forces and rendering them ineffective.
- This offensive also indicated to the American public that they could not win the war. Even some of the president's associates, who had previously supported American involvement in Vietnam, began calling for the USA to cut its losses and pull out.

A photograph from *Making History* showing a US soldier with Vietcong "suspects". 
So why did the American public turn against the war?

- In fact, the Tet Offensive played a significant role in turning the American public against the war. American society became deeply divided over the conflict, so much so that President Johnson did not even stand for re-election. By this stage many Americans were beginning to have serious doubts about their nation’s involvement in the war. Television news reports, newspapers and magazines carried stories and footage of incidents where Vietnamese civilians were massacred by American troops and as a result, anti-war movements developed. Anti-war demonstrations took various forms, such as anti-war musicals, protest marches and bumper stickers that read “Make Love Not War”. Young Americans burned their draft cards (conscription) and by 1968 about ten thousand Americans had emigrated to Canada in order to avoid serving in what they considered an “immoral war”.

Did you know?

In 1968, an American platoon launched an assault on a South Vietnamese village known as My Lai. The platoon had been told that there was a Vietcong headquarters in this area. The platoon therefore launched an attack on the village killing anybody who tried to escape, raping women, slaughtering livestock and burning houses. After the attack it became evident that in fact there was no evidence of any Vietcong in My Lai. The platoon, led by Lieutenant William Calley Jr, then opened fire on the defenceless survivors. Photographs of this massacre appeared in Life Magazine and as a result, an investigation was called for. The revelations about My Lai shocked the American people and increasing numbers began to turn against the war. Those against the war became known as the “doves” and those who supported America’s involvement in Vietnam were known as the “hawks”.

Many movies and DVDs are available on the Vietnam War and you will find films such as Platoon very interesting.

NEW GENERATION HISTORY GRADE 12

Why then did the Americans withdraw from Vietnam?

- Richard Nixon was elected President of the United States in 1968. He had assured voters that “we will end this war and win the peace” and planned to obtain “peace with honour” in Vietnam. His plan was a policy of “Vietnamisation”. He aimed to spend more money arming and training the South Vietnamese and gradually withdrawing US ground troops and letting the South Vietnamese do their own fighting.
- In actual fact, he started heavier bombing of North Vietnam and in 1970 even ordered the bombing of Laos and Cambodia in order to cut off supplies from the Ho Chi Minh Trail. The North Vietnamese responded by invading Laos and Cambodia, both of which ended up with communist governments in place. The US was unable to stop the Vietcong who were as active as ever.
- By this stage the war was extremely unpopular in the United States and the US Congress refused to vote for the money needed to carry on. In 1973 a ceasefire was agreed upon by the USA, North and South Vietnam and the Vietcong and the last US troops were withdrawn from Vietnam.
- Despite the ceasefire the war continued in Vietnam and the United States continued to send supplies to Vietnam for the next two years. The South Vietnamese army (ARVN) were still unable to defeat the Vietcong.
- In 1975, the Communist Vietcong were victorious in the South and captured Saigon. In 1976, Vietnam was united under communist rule into a single republic. The United States had been unsuccessful in their mission of saving South Vietnam from falling prey to the Communists.

Let us now consider some of the results of the Vietnam War.

- The South Vietnamese were defeated by the Vietcong.
- North and South Vietnam were reunited as a Communist country.
- Relations between the USA and Vietnam remained hostile.
- Communist takeovers had occurred in Laos and Cambodia, but not Thailand.
- The USA had thus failed to stop the spread of Communism, and as a result, President Nixon announced the end of the Truman Doctrine.
- Approximately 700 000 American veterans suffered negative psychological effects from fighting in the war.
- Some 12 million people had lost their homes and relatives in Indo-China.
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Choose one of the two activities below:

**Activity 1.7: Pairs**

**Research Assignment**

What were the consequences of the My Lai Massacre?

- Imagine that you are a correspondent for "Time Magazine" and have recently got hold of photographs of the massacre at My Lai. Your editor has asked you to do research into the incident and then to write an article about it for the next edition of the magazine. Your article should either support the actions of the platoon or condemn them. Your article should be approximately two pages in length. It should include at least one photograph as well as first-hand evidence from a survivor of the massacre or from a member of the platoon that destroyed the village.
- In order to do this activity you will need to do research into the My Lai massacre mentioned in this chapter. Suggestions include your school library or research centre, your local or town library and, if possible, the Internet.

**Activity 1.8: Pairs**

**Research Assignment**

What was the extent of American involvement in the Vietnam War?

The USA's involvement in Vietnam was very costly, financially and in terms of lives lost. Imagine that you are a member of a Commission of Enquiry that has been set up in the USA, after the Tet Offensive in 1968, to decide whether or not the USA should continue to fight in Vietnam.

- Investigate the reasons for the USA's initial involvement in Vietnam.
- Look at reasons for and against continued involvement in the war.
- Write a report explaining whether you think the USA should have become involved.
- Find at least 3 primary sources to substantiate your argument and include them in your report.
- Present your report to the class.

The Bay of Pigs Invasion and the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962

What was the Bay of Pigs Invasion and how did it affect US-Soviet relations?

- In 1959 Cuba, a small island only 90 miles from the United States of America, became Communist. The revolutionary leader Fidel Castro overthrew dictator Fulgencio Batista and put in place a Communist government. The American government were obviously not happy with the situation as they saw a Communist controlled government so close to American soil as a threat to United States security.
- The American president at the time, President Eisenhower, supported a Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) plan to train Cuban exiles and send them to Cuba to invade and start a rebellion. The plan was set in motion but was never executed.

J.F. Kennedy, who succeeded Eisenhower, went along with the plan and sent in exiled Cubans. The invasion, which became known as the "Bay of Pigs Invasion", was an embarrassing failure. The group of 1500 exiles who landed at the Bay of Pigs on 17 April 1961, were easily defeated and the anticipated uprising of the Cuban population did not occur. American involvement in the incident was exposed and their international image was tarnished as a result.

This aggressive action by the USA also intensified anti-American feeling in Cuba and Castro turned more and more to the Soviet Union for economic and diplomatic support. Soviet arms flooded into Cuba and by 1962, Cuba had the best equipped army in Latin America. The USA did not object to this but did warn the Soviet Union not to place nuclear missiles in Cuba. The Soviet Union did assure the Americans that it had no intention of putting nuclear missiles in Cuba.

A map adapted from The Great Power Conflict, showing the Caribbean island of Cuba, which is located 90 miles south of the mainland of the USA.

Did you know? Fidel Castro came to power in Cuba in 1959 by overthrowing Batista. In 2006 he was still in power and had been president for 47 years!
What was the Cuban Missile Crisis and what impact did it have on East-West relations?

- On 14 October 1962, American spy planes flying over Cuba took photographs of missile sites in Cuba. From the photographs it was evident that these missile sites had the capability of setting off nuclear missiles that were within easy range of a number of the USA's largest cities. It was also evident that the Soviets were supplying the missiles to Castro. Added to this, Soviet ships that may have been carrying nuclear missiles were heading towards Cuba. This created great alarm in the United States and resulted in a crisis that nearly turned the Cold War into a "hot war." This crisis became known as the Cuban Missile Crisis and it pushed the world to the brink of nuclear war. President Kennedy had several options available to him, but he had to decide with caution. His decision could lead to a nuclear war between the US and the USSR which would have devastating consequences.

- Kennedy ultimately, despite the opinion of some of his advisors, ordered a blockade of Cuba. He demanded that the Soviet ships turn around and that any missiles in Cuba be removed and he ordered US ships to intercept Soviet ships that might have been carrying nuclear weapons. For a few days the world held its breath while Kennedy and Kruschev were contemplating who would back down. Kruschev finally backed down and agreed to withdraw the missiles if the United States would end the blockade and promise not to invade Cuba. He also insisted that the USA remove all missiles from Turkey. Turkey belonged to NATO and bordered the USSR in the south. Kennedy was happy to accept the first two conditions but not the third. Kruschev, not willing to risk a nuclear war with the United States agreed to back down regarding the third condition. The Cuban Missile Crisis was over and a nuclear war had been averted.

Let us investigate the consequences of the Cuban Missile Crisis regarding the Cold War.

- Both sides learned lessons from the Cuban Missile Crisis as both Kennedy and Kruschev realised that such a crisis was actually a threat to world peace.
- Kennedy’s reputation was enhanced as he had won the test of strength between himself and Kruschev and was commended for his “brinkmanship”. i.e. he was able to control a dangerous situation in order to win an advantage over a threatening enemy.
- The crisis also showed that neither of the superpowers was willing to risk a nuclear war. It actually helped thaw relations between the two countries as steps were taken to improve communications between them by setting up a “hot line” between them in 1963 to help prevent similar situations in the future. This “hot line” was a direct telephonic link between the Kremlin (USSR) and the White House (USA).
- In 1963, a Test Ban Treaty was signed by the two countries in which both promised not to test nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, under water or in outer space. Although Kruschev was seen by some as a responsible peacemaker, in the eyes of many at home, he was an embarrassing failure and this ultimately cost him his career.
- This crisis led Kruschev to begin a new policy of peaceful co-existence. He claimed the USSR and USA could live together in peace. This policy did not last long however, as his support in the Politburo (USSR parliament) ended as many regarded his caution as weakness. He was forced to step down in 1964.

A photograph from The Great Power Conflict, showing missile sites being built on Cuba.

Activity 1.9: Individual

LO 1/AS 2, 3; LO2/AS 2,3; LO3/AS 2, 3, 4

What was the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis?

Refer to the information below and then attempt the activity.

The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 nearly turned the Cold War into a "hot war. President Kennedy was faced with several options but had to tread very carefully and he also faced pressure from several groups within his government to act as they desired.

- Learners are each given one of the following roles for this activity:
  - President J.F. Kennedy (Blockade of Cuba)
  - Dean Acheson - former US Secretary of State (Swift military action)
  - Robert McNamara - US Secretary for Defence (Naval Blockade of Cuba)
  - Adlai Stevenson - US Ambassador to the United Nations (Talks with the USSR)
- Each person must prepare and present an argument on what course of action the United States should take regarding the Cuban Missile Crisis, including both the advantages and disadvantages of that particular action.
Civil War in Angola

How did the civil war in Angola become a battleground for the Cold War?

A map showing African states during the Cold War.

Let us first trace the background to the conflict.

- In the climate of the Cold War the two superpowers as well as Red China made concerted attempts to win favour and gain influence in Africa. The USA, continuing its policy of containment, attempted to gain allies in order to stop the spread of communism. They did this by providing financial and technical assistance to African states particularly those that were very underdeveloped and had pro-Western governments, such as Chad and Zaire. This was also done in order to protect trade links. After the US defeat in Vietnam, however, they were reluctant to get involved using their military forces. Many African states, that had either gained their independence or were fighting for it, were suspicious of the motives of Western countries like the USA who still maintained economic links with apartheid South Africa.
- The Soviet Union’s interest in Africa was similar to that of the USA, but the USSR also believed that it had a role in helping African states overthrow their colonial governments. They did this by supplying arms and ammunition to countries involved in revolutionary struggles, in the hope that the newly independent states would embrace communism. The aid sent to Africa was often accompanied by troops and technicians, who came from Cba rather than the Soviet Union. On occasion, the Soviet Union provided financial and technical assistance to speed up the development of some African states in the hope of gaining allies. The Soviets won friends in many parts of Africa by supplying military aid, but for strategic reasons they took particular interest in two areas - the “Horn of Africa” and southern Africa. We will be looking at their involvement in Angola in more detail in Chapters 2 and 4.

Let us look at the reasons for the civil war in Angola and how the superpowers got involved.

- When Portuguese colonial rule ended in April 1974, newly independent Angola descended into a civil war that had devastating consequences and was to become Africa’s longest running conflict. It officially came to an end in 2002 and it is estimated that 500,000 people were killed and thousands more were displaced in the civil war which lasted 27 years.
- The conflict in Angola involved three main factions: the Marxist-Leninist Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) under Jose dos Santos, the tribal-based National Liberation Front of Angola (FNLA) and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) under Jonas Savimbi. From the early 1980s elements of these movements fought against Portuguese colonial rule. In 1974, a coup d’etat in Portugal established a military government, which promptly put an end to the war in Angola and agreed to hand over power to a coalition of the three movements. This did not bring peace to the Angolan people as the coalition broke down and the country was plunged into a civil war.
- When civil war broke out in Angola the USA, Zaire and South Africa intervened in favour of the FNLA and UNITA. They wanted to remove the strong Cuban military presence in the region. South Africa’s Bureau of State Security (BOS) and the CIA provided support in the form of arms, ammunition, mercenaries and intelligence to UNITA.
The Communists, who saw an opportunity to get involved in southern Africa and thereby gain influence there, intervened in favour of the MPLA. The Cubans, backed by the Soviet Union, thus sent military aid to the MPLA. The USSR went on to sign a Friendship Treaty with the revolutionary left-wing MPLA. The Soviets sent them aid which included a force of 20,000 Cuban "military advisors". In 1976, as a result of Soviet and Cuban aid the MPLA were able to defeat the UNITA forces and dominate most of Angola. The South African forces withdrew from the area and the US Congress barred further military involvement in Angola.

The civil war between UNITA and the MPLA continued until January 1989 when Cuba began withdrawing its forces. A ceasefire was brokered which led to the Lusaka Accord in 1991, which spelled out an electoral process for a democratic Angola under the supervision of the United Nations. The first presidential election, held in 1992, did not bring peace to Angola as UNITA's Jonas Savimbi called the election fraudulent and returned to war. However, it was only in 2002, after the failed Lusaka Protocol, and after the death of Savimbi in a military operation, that UNITA and the MPLA agreed to a ceasefire. Angola is currently at a fragile peace under the leadership of the MPLA and dos Santos.

Let us now consider the significance of the Angolan War regarding the Cold War.

- The civil war in Angola had become a hotspot in the Cold War and a continuation of the Cold War in Africa.
- It highlighted American-Soviet competition for winning allies in the Third World.
- Their involvement here intensified decades of fighting and this had a negative impact on the people of Angola.

The Middle East Conflict, 1956 - 1973

How did conflict in the Middle East become a stage for Cold War rivalry?

A map adapted from Making History, showing the area of conflict.
and the Middle East remained a troubled and embittered part of the world in which the increased influence of the key players of the Cold War, the USA and the USSR becomes evident.

In October 1956, Israeli troops, prompted by the British and the French, invaded the Sinai Peninsula near Egypt. The attack was an attempt to maintain freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal and to bring about the downfall of Gamal Abdel Nasser, the Arab ruler of Egypt. He was not a Communist, but he did not like American interference in the Middle East and their support of Israel in their conflict with the Arab nations of the Middle East. Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal in 1956 and so doing antagonised the British and the French, who owned the canal. Kruschev, the Soviet leader at the time, supported the nationalisation and condemned Britain, France and Israel for their attacks on Egypt earlier that year.

After the Suez Crisis, the Soviets re-equipped the Egyptian armed forces and gave them economic and technical aid. Soviet engineers also worked on the building of the Aswan High Dam and Kruschev continued to support Nasser despite his anti-communist speeches. In the 1960s the Soviet Union's continuing support of the Egyptians paid off. The Soviets, who had armed the Egyptians after their defeat in the 1967 Six Day War (5-10 June) with Israel, were given the use of naval and air bases in Egypt. This would give them the advantage over the Americans.

This advantage was short lived as, after Nasser's death in 1970, the new leader of Egypt, Anwar Sadat was not satisfied with the relationship between the USSR and Egypt. Despite the Friendship Treaty between the two countries, in which the Soviets promised to defend Egypt if she was attacked, Sadat was frustrated that the Soviets would not give them enough military aid to ensure the defeat of Israel.

Brezhnev, who replaced Kruschev, knew that the United States would never allow the defeat of Israel and it suited him to keep the crisis in the Middle East simmering so that the Arabs would continue to rely on Soviet aid. Sadat launched the Yom Kippur War against Israel in 1973 without consulting the USSR. Brezhnev was upset about this but nevertheless supported the Egyptians and even suggested that Soviet troops interpose themselves between the Egyptian and Israeli armies. This idea obviously alarmed the Americans to such an extent that President Nixon put the USA's nuclear forces on Stage Three Alert. The war was won by Israel. In 1976, Sadat tore up the Friendship Treaty and expelled the Soviets from their bases in Egypt and forged closer relations with the Americans. The Soviet Union was forced to look for allies amongst the more militant Arab governments in countries such as Iraq, Syria and Libya.

What was the impact of the Middle East conflict on the Cold War?

- The Communist bloc led by the Soviet Union, started to arm certain countries in the Middle East. The West then increased aid to Israel and aided other countries like Saudi Arabia.
- This meant that local wars in the Middle East could escalate into an East-West conflict.
- The West, led by the United States, aimed to curb the expansion of Bolshevism or Soviet influence in the Middle East.
- This competition between the West and the Communist bloc to gain allies in the Middle East tended to divide the Arab world into pro-West and pro-Communist states.
- Countries such as Morocco, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and Iran (until 1979) which were monarchies had a pro-Western outlook and received American aid, while countries which followed revolutionary or socialist policies tended to be anti-Western and received aid from the Communist bloc, for example, Egypt (until 1973), Iraq (1959-1979) and Libya (from 1971).

Activity 1.10: Group

L01 A5 1,2,3,4; LO 2 A5 1,3; LO3 A5 2,3,4

What were the implications of the Suez Crisis of 1956?

Read the information below and then attempt the activity.

(a) The crisis in 1956 over the Suez Canal was a grave threat to world peace. It was in fact debated in many sessions of both the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations Organisation. In this activity you will have the opportunity to investigate the crisis further and to look at it as it was seen by some of the countries involved.

For this activity the class should be divided into groups of 5.

- Group members in each group will play the role of the following personalities:
  - Dag Hammarskjold - Secretary General of the United Nations
  - Abba Eban - Israeli representative at the UN
  - Cabot Lodge - US representative at the UN
  - Omar Loutfi - Egyptian representative at the UN
  - Pierson Dixon - British representative at the UN

- The Secretary General should do the following:
  - Prepare a report on events in the Middle East since 26 July 1956 i.e. Suez Crisis.
  - Find a map of the area, which shows the boundaries of Israel and Egypt at the start of the crisis, the position of the Suez Canal and the Sinaï Desert. It should also show the positions of Israeli, British and French troops on 2 November and the withdrawal lines proposed by Britain and France.
  - Present the report to the UN General Assembly, which is due to meet on the 2 November.

- Each representative should research and prepare a policy brief on their government's position with regard to the crisis and be able to clarify their position regarding the following points:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declaration</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel is fighting an aggressive war.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel's actions are an attempt to stop Egyptian attacks which have been taking place over a long period of time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel and Egypt should accept the Franco-British proposal that they withdraw their forces 16km either side of the canal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli troops should withdraw behind Israel's existing border.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain and France are using their armed forces in an attempt to bring peace to the Middle East.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Suez Canal is an international waterway which should be open to all nations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fighting in the Middle East is a threat to world peace and Britain and France are justified in using force.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.1.10. WHAT ROLE DID THE UNO AND OTHER MULTI-LATERAL ORGANISATIONS PLAY IN ATTEMPTING TO MEDIATE CONFLICT?

The United Nations Organisation (UNO)

A plan adapted from Making History, showing the structure of the United Nations Organisation.

- After the preperation is complete, the 4 representatives should meet with the UN Secretary General to discuss the crisis and the way forward. Once all delegates have put their points of view across, the Security General should close the meeting by allowing the representatives to vote on a solution to the problem.

(b) Extended writing

Using the information from the text and your findings from the previous activity, explain why the 1956 Suez Crisis was a grave threat to world peace.

So, what is the UNO and why was it established?

- The UNO is an international organisation that was formed to effectively enforce world peace. It was mainly an American idea as President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the USA believed peace could be kept by the major allied powers of the war or the "Big Five" as they came to be known - The USA, USSR, Britain, France and China. In Roosevelt's view they would become the world's "policemen".

- In 1945, as World War Two was drawing to an end representatives of fifty countries met in San Francisco to discuss plans for a new international organisation to take the place of the League of Nations. Their aim, as expressed in Article 1 of the Charter was "To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion." They were anxious not to repeat earlier mistakes and to ensure international peace and co-operation and to be more effective than the League of Nations in preventing war.

- Under the UN Charter, the Security Council is granted the power to "take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore inter-

national peace and security." Today the Security Council consists of 15 nations including the five wartime allied powers. The "Big Five" are permanent members of the Council and each of these countries has veto power (by voting "no" any one of these countries can stop the Security Council from acting in a particular situation.) Other UNO members take turns in filling the remaining ten seats on the Security Council, but these countries do not have veto power. Therefore in order to act against threats to world peace the "Big Five" must all agree or at least not exercise the veto.

So, how effective was the UNO in maintaining peace and mediating conflicts during the Cold War period?

- In 1945, the year World War Two ended, it was assumed that the five major allies would continue to work together on the Security Council to ensure world peace. This assumption, however, was proved wrong. As the Cold War between West and East developed, most of the countries of the world found themselves divided into two camps - either with the Western powers led by the USA or with the Communist powers, led by the USSR. Some countries which were not aligned to either camp, were mainly from the Third World i.e. the developing nations of Africa and Asia.

- The effectiveness of the United Nations in keeping peace during the period of the Cold War was rather limited as it became a battleground of the Cold War. As both the USA and USSR held veto power, the Security Council could not act without their joint permission. This obviously limited UN peacekeeping efforts to situations where the national interests of the USA and USSR were not in conflict, for example, in 1948 when fighting erupted between Arabs and Jews after the United Nations partitioned Palestine and the state of Israel was created. A ceasefire between the two sides was negotiated by Ralph Bunche, an American working as a UN diplomat.

- On one occasion, in June 1950, the Security Council did act against Soviet interests when Communist North Korea attacked South Korea. The Security Council granted President Truman of the USA authority to send American troops to defend South Korea. This only happened because at the time the USSR was boycotting the Security Council and therefore did not exercise their veto.

- On another occasion, in 1956, the USA and USSR actually teamed up against Britain and France during the Suez Crisis. As already mentioned in this chapter, Nasser, the Egyptian leader seized the Suez Canal. To get the canal back Britain, France and Israel invaded Egypt. In a rare case of Cold War unity, the USA and Soviet Union voted for a Security Council resolution calling for the immediate withdrawal of British, French and Israeli troops. Britain and France, however, vetoed this resolution. The US then took the unusual step of submitting the withdrawal resolution to the General Assembly of the UN. Here no country had veto power and
Every UN member had one vote. The resolution to withdraw troops from Egypt was passed overwhelmingly and therefore the British, French and Israeli troops were withdrawn from the canal.

- However, due to conflicting interests of the superpowers there were limits on UNO action. The UNO therefore played a rather insignificant role in some of the most dangerous threats to world peace. In 1962 the UNO took no action when the Cuban Missile Crisis occurred and during the Vietnam War the Security Council reached a stalemate (deadlock). Other examples include the Soviet invasions of Hungary (1956) and Czechoslovakia (1968) and the Falkland War between Britain and Argentina (1982). Hence, the United Nations remains powerless to fulfill its role as a world peace-keeping body unless its member countries are willing to co-operate.

**Activity 1.11: Group LO3/AS 4**

**What was the role of the United Nations Security Council?**

Read the information below and then attempt the activity.

When World War Two came to an end, the five victorious allies from the war: the USA, Soviet Union, China, France and Great Britain, were selected as the permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations Organisation. Each of these powers has a veto. Do you think that these powers should still belong to the Security Council and have the veto? Imagine that your class is the United Nations General Assembly and you are going to vote on which countries deserve to be members of the five-member Security Council.

- The class should be divided into groups of three or four.
- Each group will represent one of the following countries:
  - South Africa, Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Russia, United States of America.
- Each group should write a proposal on why their country deserves to be a member of the Security Council.
- Each group should select a spokesperson to present their argument.
- After each spokesperson has presented their argument, the class may pose questions.
- Finally, there should be a vote on which of the ten countries should join the Security Council.

**The Organisation of African Unity (OAU)**

**Let us look the formation of the OAU.**

- The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) was formed by African countries to deal with African concerns and challenges. It has its origins in the concept of unity of all Africans, in Africa, after World War Two. As African countries gained independence they turned to this idea of African unity. There were differences in opinion as to what form this union would take, which resulted in the emergence of two groups. Such differences resulted in many political and economic clashes between independent African states. It was clear to the leaders of African countries that there was a huge need to ensure greater co-operation and a sense of unity among the independent African states.

As a result, Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia convened a meeting in Addis Ababa in May 1963 to try and unite the two different blocs. At this meeting, after discussions, a compromise was reached and the OAU was established as a broad union of African states which would represent African opinion more effectively.

**Did you know?**

The OAU was officially launched and its charter was adopted on 25 May 1963. 25 May, is celebrated as African Freedom Day today by member countries.

**So what were the aims of the OAU Charter?**

- To promote a sense of solidarity and unity.
- To foster co-operation to improve the standard of living of African citizens.
- To respect the sovereign independent status of each state.
- To remove all forms of colonialism.
- To encourage meaningful international relations in keeping with the Charter of the UNO.

The independence of African states did not mean the end of foreign involvement in Africa. Some of the former colonial powers, as well as the superpowers, became involved in African affairs both directly and indirectly. The involvement of the superpowers in Africa meant the Cold War was also brought to Africa. Note that the OAU is covered in detail in Chapter 2.

**What position did the OAU adopt regarding the Cold War?**

- The OAU adopted a position of neutrality in the struggle between West and East during the Cold War years that engulfed the world after World War Two. This meant that African states were able to obtain aid and support from both the communist and capitalist power blocks.
- The OAU itself also had some serious problems, which meant it was often ineffective in mediating conflicts. Perhaps the most critical was that one of its principles was "non-interference in the internal affairs of member states."
- This meant that at times OAU was unable to interfere where major conflict was occurring.
- Another reason for the inaction by the OAU was internal conflict within the organisation. In many cases of internal conflict the OAU took no action because different groupings within the organisation couldn't agree on what to do.

**The Non Aligned Movement (NAM)**

**So, what is NAM?**

- The origin of the Non-Aligned Movement can be traced to a conference hosted in Bandung, Indonesia in 1955. The conference was convened upon the invitation of
the Prime Ministers of Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and Pakistan who brought together the leaders of 29 states, mostly former colonies from the continents of Africa and Asia. The purpose was to discuss common concerns and to develop joint policies in international relations. At this meeting the leaders of these Third World countries shared their similar problems of resisting the pressures of the world’s major powers and maintaining their independence and opposing any form of colonialism or domination. These countries declared themselves “non-aligned” and expressed their desire not to become involved in the West-East ideological conflict of the Cold War. Following the Bandung meeting, a preparatory meeting was held for the First NAM Summit Conference, in Cairo in June 1961. This was followed in September 1961 by the First NAM Summit held in Belgrade. The Non-Aligned Movement which was then formed attempted to create an independent path in world politics that would not result in member states becoming pawns in the struggles between the superpowers. As a result, a large part of NAM’s history was influenced by the tension created by the Cold War.

So, how successful was NAM in mediating conflict?

Achievements

- NAM achieved its most significant impact at the UNO where, since the late 1960s, the non-aligned countries formed a majority in the General Assembly. Through the UNO they were able to influence the process of decolonisation and opposed the build-up of arms at the height of the Cold War.
- Non-Aligned countries became a new voice in the East-West conflict of the Cold War

Deficiencies and challenges

- Many NAM countries disrespected their own principles, for example, non-alignment and disarmament.
- The Third World countries, through organisations such as NAM, failed to become an effective force in world politics.
- No substantial outcomes were reached in mediating the East-West conflict.
- There were limitations to NAM’s diplomatic influence.
- Economic problems prevented some of these states acting independently of the West or East, as they were dependent on their aid and trade.

The Non-Aligned Movement had many good ideas and intentions, however the countries that represented were not powerful enough to make any significant contribution to mediating Cold War conflicts. Their contribution was thus minimal.

1.1.11. CONCLUSION: WHAT IMPACT DID THE COLD WAR HAVE IN FORMING THE WORLD AS IT WAS IN THE 1960s?

After having a closer look at the world in the 1960s it is evident that the world was shaped by the dominant political powers of that time, namely the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Their differing ideologies and mistrust led to Europe and, in fact, much of the globe becoming aligned to one of these powers. The “Cold War” between West and East had an enormous impact on countries involved, socially, politically and economically.

The fears and mistrust between the superpowers and their allies resulted in new technology being developed. Propaganda, the war of words, also became an important weapon used in the Cold War. Every form of mass media was used, as well as secretive methods such as surveillance and international spying. It was however the destructive power of nuclear weapons and increased tensions that became a vital factor in relations between the superpowers.

Various incidents, such as the Berlin Crisis, Cuban Missile Crisis, and Vietnam War, which took place in the 1960s became flash points in the Cold War between the USA and the Soviet Union and resulted in increased tension between the superpowers and their allies.

On more than one occasion the world was left in suspense wondering if the Cold War would turn into a “hot” war. In the decade of the 1960s and thereafter, both sides in the Cold War had nuclear weapons and the intercontinental missiles to deliver them. A war between West and East would have meant a nuclear war and this would have been disastrous, not only for them, but the entire world.

The tension between the USA and the Soviet Union dominated world politics during this period and many people in numerous countries around the globe were affected, as minor local conflicts turned into battlegrounds for the superpowers. The arms race and space race, which developed as result of Cold War tension certainly had a huge impact on society at the time. It is evident that the Cold War became a worldwide conflict, which affected the lives of millions of people. Today there is no longer a “Cold War” between West and East, mainly because Russia is no longer a communist state and its status as a world power has been drastically reduced. The USA, on the other hand, projects the image of being a leading power in the world and therefore, continues to try and play a dominating role in international politics.

A photograph taken from The Sixties, showing Kennedy and Krushchev meeting in Vienna in 1961.
**Self Assessment Checklist**

Have you understood this chapter? Test yourself by answering the following questions. If you can answer the question, tick in the appropriate box, if not, go back to the relevant section and try to find the answer there.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>What does the term “Cold War” refer to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>What were the origins of the Cold War?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>How did World War Two intensify the Cold War?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What are the differences between a communist and capitalist economy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What does the term “Iron Curtain” refer to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Why did the USSR create a sphere of interest in Eastern Europe?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Can you explain the aims of the Truman Doctrine?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>What was the significance of the First Berlin Crisis i.e. The Berlin Blockade?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Why was a wall built between East and West Berlin in 1961?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What does NATO refer to and what did it aim to do?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>What does the term “Domino Effect” refer to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Why was the Cuban Missile Crisis a danger to world peace?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What role did China play in the Cold War?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>How did the Cold War influence the Civil War in Angola?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>How did the Cold War impact on the Middle East conflict between 1956 and 1973?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>What role did the UNO play in attempting to mediate the Cold War conflict?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>What do the OAU and NAM refer to?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>What role did the OAU and NAM play in attempting to mediate the Cold War conflict?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SELF STUDY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES**

1. **KEY QUESTION:** What was the impact of the Cold War in forming the world as it was in the 1960s? [LO1/AS 1,2,3; LO 2/AS 1,2,3; LO 3/AS 2,3,4]

   Study the sources below and then answer the questions which follow.

**SOURCE A**

A Soviet cartoon titled “Churchill and his predecessors”, which comments on Winston Churchill’s speech made at Fulton, Missouri, USA in 1946.

**SOURCE B**

This is a British cartoon showing a Soviet leader claiming that the countries of Eastern Europe had free elections after 1945.
SOURCE C
This is an extract from President Truman's speech, 12 March 1947.

The seeds of totalitarian regimes are nurtured by misery and want. They spread and grow in the evil soil of poverty and strife. They reach their full growth when the hope of a people for a better life has died.
We must keep that hope alive. The free peoples of the world look to us for support in maintaining their freedoms.
If we fail in our leadership, we may endanger the peace of the world – we shall surely endanger the welfare of our own nation.

SOURCE D
This is an extract from an article written by a Russian historian.

The next step along the road of worsening relations with the USSR was the "Truman Doctrine", which meant in reality the rearmament of Greece and Turkey and building bases in these countries for American strategic bombers. These actions were screened, of course, by pompous pronouncements about defending democracy and peace.

SOURCE E
This is an extract from an article, which appeared in the "Pionerskaya Pravda", a Soviet youth newspaper. It was published for the first time in 1947.

President Truman has announced the following principles of American foreign policy: the United States will everywhere support with weapons and money reactionaries, Fascists who are hateful to their own people but who on the other hand are ready to place their country under American control. Two countries suitable for this were found at once: Greece and Turkey. Now they both have in fact come under American domination. Americans are building their military bases there. American capitalists are opening businesses and buying up all that seems to them profitable. For this the Greek and Turkish reactionaries, who are power, are receiving from the Americans money and weapons for the struggle against their own people. But Greece and Turkey are too small, and American appetites are great. American expansionists are dreaming of all Europe, or at least Western Europe. Directly to propose that the European countries become American colonies such as Greece and Turkey is somewhat inconvenient. And so the "Marshall Plan" emerges in America. It was announced that the United States wanted "to help" the European countries to reconstruct their war-destroyed economies. Many believed this. But it was soon evident that the "Marshall Plan" was simply a cunning way of subjecting all Europe to American capital.

1.1. Consult Source A:
(a) What position did Churchill occupy at the time?
(b) Identify the two figures in the background of the cartoon.
(c) What action of Churchill prompted the cartoonist to draw this cartoon?
(d) What comment is the cartoonist making regarding Churchill's actions?
(e) Explain how objective the cartoonist is with reference to Churchill's actions in 1946.
(f) Examine how Churchill's actions affected East-West relations

1.2. Study Source B:
(a) Explain why this is referred to as the "Iron Curtain".
(b) What comment is the Soviet leader making regarding the countries in Eastern Europe?
(c) Explain whether you agree with the comment made by the Soviet leader.
(d) What do you think is the central message of the cartoon?
(e) Using the source, as well as your own knowledge, write a paragraph of 10 lines explaining Soviet intentions in Eastern Europe.
1.3. Refer to Source C:
   (a) What reasons does Truman provide for the implementation of the
       Truman Doctrine? Explain your answer by making reference to
       the source.

1.4. Consult Source D:
   (a) What do you understand by the Truman Doctrine as mentioned in this
       source?
   (b) Does the author of Source D agree with Truman's explanation for the
       need for American aid? Substantiate your answer by making reference
       to the sources.

1.5. Refer to Source E:
   (a) Explain in your own words the purpose of the "Marshall Plan"?
   (b) Explain how accurate you think Source E is as a view of the Truman
       Doctrine and Marshall Aid.

1.6. Study Source F:
   (a) What does the source show about the effects of the Truman Doctrine?
   (b) Explain whether you agree with the comment the cartoonist is trying to
       make?

1.7. (a) Using the information in Sources C, D, E and F and your own knowl-
       edge, explain and account for the differing views of the Truman
       Doctrine.
   (b) Using Sources C, D, E and F as well as your own knowledge, explain
       how the Truman Doctrine affected American - Soviet relations.

1.8. Explain how useful Sources C to F are to a historian researching this period.

1.9. Extended Writing
   (a) Using the information from the various sources or pieces of evidence
       in this chapter, in a report of two pages, analyse the effect the Truman
       Doctrine and Marshall Aid had on East-West relations during the Cold
       War.
   (b) Using the information from Sources A to F as well as your own knowl-
       edge about this particular period, how far do you agree with the analy-
       sis that the "Truman Doctrine, advertised as a plan to "save peace"
       was essentially aimed at uniting bourgeois countries on an anti-Soviet
       basis.?

KEY QUESTION FOR THIS CHAPTER:
2.1 How was uhuru realised in Africa in the 1960s and 1970s?

CONTENT/KNOWLEDGE FOCUS AREAS
- Introduction: what was uhuru and why was it favoured?
- Colonisation
  - Effects of colonisation
- What were the ideas that influenced the emergence of independent states?
  - African nationalism
  - Pan-Africanism
  - Impact of World War Two
CHAPTER THREE
CIVIL SOCIETY PROTEST
BETWEEN 1960 AND 1990

KEY QUESTION FOR THIS CHAPTER:
3.1 What forms of civil society protest emerged from the 1960s up to 1990?

CONTENT/KNOWLEDGE FOCUS AREAS
3.1.1 Introduction: what is meant by civil society protest?
3.1.2 How did civil society protest bring about change in the 1960s?
   - The Swinging Sixties and the change in social norms
   - Student Protest
   - Civil Rights Movement in the USA
   - Black Power Movement
   - Peace Movements
   - Disarmament
   - Women's Movements
3.1.3 What was the role of Black Consciousness in South Africa during the 1970s?
   - Origins and ideology of Black Consciousness
   - The role of Steve Biko
   - 1976 Soweto Uprising
   - Consequences of the Soweto Uprising
3.1.4 What forms did protest take in South Africa in the 1980s?
   - Strategy of the National Party and the Triangulation Parliament System
   - Internal protest by the church, civil society, trade unions, youth, the United
   Democratic Front and township insurrection
   - Role played by ANC in supporting internal protest
   - Protest by white South Africans

3.1.5 How civil protest changed Eastern Europe in the 1980s
   - Poland and the role of Solidarity
   - Reforms introduced by Mikhail Gorbachev
   - The collapse of the Berlin Wall and
   the liberation of Eastern Europe
3.1.6 Conclusion

OUTCOMES FOR THIS CHAPTER

KNOWLEDGE
At the end of this chapter you will know about ...
   - The role played by students in civil protests
   - Political and social changes that resulted from protests in the 1960s
   - How Black people struggled for and won civil rights in the United States of America
   - The protests against the possession of nuclear arms
   - Women's actions to bring about equality
   - The Black Consciousness Movement in South Africa
   - The 1976 Soweto uprising and its consequences
   - Civil protest against apartheid in South Africa during the 1980s
   - Protest against communist rule in Eastern Europe during the 1980s

SKILLS
At the end of this chapter you will be able to ...
   - Extract relevant information and data from sources
   - Analyse the information and data gathered from a variety of sources
   - Evaluate the sources of information provided to assess the appropriateness
     of the sources for the task
   - Interpret and evaluate information and data from sources
   - Explain the dynamics of changing power relationships within societies
   - Compare and contrast different interpretations and perspectives of events,
     peoples' actions and changes
   - Reach conclusions based on the data examined
   - Sustain and defend a coherent and balanced argument
   - Identify controversial interpretations of statistics and engage critically with
     the conclusions presented by the data

VALUES AND ATTITUDES
At the end of this chapter you will appreciate ...
   - The reasons why civil society protest is necessary
   - The impact of peace movements
   - How African Americans overcame discrimination and injustice
   - The challenges that the majority of South Africans faced in the 1970s and
     1980s
   - How Black Consciousness contributed to the establishment of a democratic
     South Africa
   - The impact of the struggle against apartheid
   - The role of civil society protest in changing political and economic dynamics
3.1.1 INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS MEANT BY CIVIL SOCIETY PROTEST?

Civil society protest has played a central role in effecting change and transformation in many countries throughout the world. What then does civil society protest actually involve? It may be described as follows:

Civil Society Protest

Civil society protest (civil protest) happens when ordinary citizens take action against government policies or situations that they consider unfair or unjust. This action can be in the form of protest marches, demonstrations, civil disobedience (deliberately breaking laws) or strikes. In most cases civil society protest involves non-violent action undertaken to put pressure on authorities or influence public opinion. Ordinary people have been very successful in opposing authority and agitating for change.

Let us consider why people find it necessary to engage in civil protest.

- People engage in civil society protest in order to make themselves heard and to change aspects of society they consider wrong. Societies in the United States of America and Western Europe became disillusioned with democratic institutions of government in the 1960s. Some of the reasons for their dissatisfaction are as follows:
  - The United Nations Charter of Human Rights, drawn up after World War Two, states that all human beings, regardless of race, colour, sex or religion, are born free and have equal rights. Some groups of civil society felt that their rights were being ignored, if not violated.
  - There was a marked decline in the 1980s in the public's willingness to believe that the government in the West was acting in their best interests. It seemed that the institutions of democracy supported by the police and local government no longer had a meaningful link with the people who had voted for them.
  - There was a real desire for social change as the war in Vietnam, environmental issues, feminism, disarmament and the civil rights of Black Americans became issues that concerned ordinary people. Hence, pressure groups were formed and adopted civil protest as a means of getting their concerns across to the government.

- In countries that did not have democratic governments, civil society protest was often the only means people had of getting their message across. Since governments in these countries were often oppressive, people took great risks when they embarked on civil protest campaigns. Protesters were arrested, detained without trial, sent to prison camps or even executed by the state. Protest action continued and in South Africa, for example, there was increased civil protest between 1960 and 1990 and this played a central role in the dismantling of apartheid. Civil society protest was common during the 1980s in Eastern European countries and brought about a change from communism to democracy.
3.1.2 HOW DID CIVIL PROTEST BRING ABOUT CHANGE IN THE 1960s?

Let us examine why the 1960s was a period of great social change.

- The 1950s had been a conservative period in Western Europe and North America. It was a time in which young people had dressed like their parents and embraced adult values. The 1960s was a decade of remarkable change as people became concerned about social and political issues. Various factors led to the increase in civil society protest during this decade, for instance:
  - The West had become prosperous as economies had recovered from the effect of World War Two and most Western European states had established social welfare systems to address poverty. People felt secure enough to experiment with new ideas and examined social and political issues more closely.
  - Increased industrialisation had created the problem of industrial waste and environmental degradation. The negative effects of pollution were becoming more and more apparent.
  - The Cold War heightened political tensions and made the possession of nuclear arms by both the Western and Eastern blocs seem very threatening. The war in Vietnam escalated and thousands of American men were drafted as soldiers to fight in this conflict.

The 1960s saw advances in telecommunications and transport that drastically changed people's perceptions of the world. The 'global village' was created as the launch of satellites and use of computers made instant communication possible and the use of jet aircraft made long-distance travel available to ordinary people.

The Swinging Sixties and the change in social norms

There was a 'youth revolution' as young people challenged their parents' ideas about dress, music, religion, sex and politics. As a reaction to the growing violence of the decade, young people rejected the values of conventional society and formed an alternative society or counter culture of flower children often called 'hippies.' The hippies believed in communal living, free experimentation with sex and drugs, and a commitment to peace and love. Many people who were not fully hippies were influenced by their ideas and fashions, especially the styles of dress and anti-war beliefs.

The young people in the photograph above are hippies. The hippies refused to conform to the norms and values of their parents, for instance:
- They dressed in a style that defied the conventional dress code of the West. Long skirts, kaftans, bell-bottom jeans, beads and sandals were popular items of clothing throughout the sixties. Hippies believed that flowers symbolised peace and called themselves "flower children." Boys began to grow their hair long which irritated older people.
- Hippies rejected the materialism of their parents' generation and refused to take part in the "rat race" for jobs and money. They embraced Eastern religions and experimented with mind-altering drugs like LSD and heroin.
- The hippies rejected all forms of violence and objected to war very strongly. The peace symbol was popular at this time and was used on badges, posters and even as pendants.
- Rock and roll music was very popular and the music of the 1960s was dominated by groups like the Doors, the Beatles and the Rolling Stones. Artists like Bob Dylan, Joan Baez and Jimi Hendrix used the lyrics of their songs as a form of protest. Conservative parents refused to allow their children to listen to such music.
Thanks to their parents’ affluence (wealth), young people in the West had a great deal of money to spend and manufacturers began to make records, clothes, and other goods especially for them. The old adult standards of quiet, neat dress, gentle music and restrained behaviour were swept aside as young people embraced the rebellious mood of the ‘Swinging Sixties.’ Fashions changed rapidly as mass-produced, ready-to-wear clothing was produced. Styles became informal and the mini-skirt made its appearance.

Did you know?

Nearly half a million young Americans gathered in an open field near Woodstock, New York for a music festival in 1967. This rock festival was a celebration of the hippie’s alternate lifestyle mixed with a strong element of anti-war protest. A movie entitled “Woodstock” was made and became very popular in the late 1960s.

Activity 3.2: Pairs

LO 1/AS 3, 4; LO 2/AS 2, 3.

How was society changing in the 1960s?

Bob Dylan wrote “The Times They Are A-Changin’” in 1963. The words of this song together with the record album cover are in Source 3D below. Study the words to the song and then answer the questions that follow:

Source 3D

Come gather young people wherever you roam
And admit that the waters around you have grown,
And accept it that soon you’ll be drenched to the bone
If your time to you is worth swimming
Or you’ll sink like a stone
For the times they are a changing.

Come senators and critics who prophesy with your pens
And keep your eyes open the chance won’t come again
And don’t speak too soon the wheels still in spin
And there’s no telling who that’s naming
Oh the loser now will be later to win
For the times they are a changing.

Come mothers and fathers all over the land
And don’t criticize what you can’t understand
Your sons and your daughters are beyond your command
Your old rule is rapidly aging
Please get out of the new one
If you can’t lend a hand
For the times they are a changing.

(a) How has the attitude of the youth towards government policy-makers been portrayed in the second verse of this song?

(b) Explain, in your own words, the song’s advice to parents and the older generation.

(c) Which line of the song hints that the young people have rejected their parents’ authority?

(d) Explain how useful this song would be to a historian researching the social changes that took place in the 1960s?

(e) The title of this song states that the times were changing. Using your own knowledge, write an extended piece on how social trends changed in the 1960s.

Student protest

Let’s look at how young people were involved in civil protest in the USA. The main focus of their protest was against the war in Vietnam.

The way young people dressed and the way in which they refused to conform to the norms and standards of society was in itself a form of protest. They believed that the world their parents’ generation had created was materialistic and violent and that their counter culture would bring about change. The slogan “Make love, not war” summed up their political ideals.

Did you know?

Young adults in the 1960s were known as baby-boomers as the soldiers who returned from World War Two had immediately started homes and families. This resulted in a large number of babies being born in the period 1945 to 1958, the baby boom generation, and, because young people were so numerous, their protests could not be ignored by the authorities.

- The American baby-boomers grew to adulthood at the time when the United States of America increased its involvement in the Vietnam War which has already been covered in Chapter 1. When Lyndon B Johnson became president of the USA in 1964, he committed his country to direct involvement in the Vietnam conflict. 200,000 American troops were sent to South Vietnam in 1965 and the US Air Force began dropping bombs on North Vietnam at a rate unequalled in history. The government stated that the United States’ involvement in Vietnam was necessary to defend freedom, stop aggression and to prevent the spread of communism.

- Young people were directly affected by this decision as the average age of American soldiers sent to Vietnam was 19. Since not enough men volunteered for the American army, it was necessary to have a draft and all American men had to register with the Select Services when they turned 18. A national draft lottery was held in which a computer selected random birthdays and numbers which then determined which men would be drafted into the military. College students selected could have their draft deferred (postponed) if they wished. Young people became very active in civil-rights protests against the use of nuclear weapons and the war in Vietnam. Young people, both the hippies and college students, had “radical ideas” for that time and felt that civil protest was the only means they had of getting their message across. They protested in the following ways:
  - Students began to defy orders to report to the Select Services or burned
their draft cards. The penalty for this civil disobedience was five years in jail or a 10,000 dollar fine.

Students held teach-ins where they skipped classes in favour of speaking out about what they felt was happening in Vietnam.

A photograph taken from *Causes and Consequences of the Vietnam War* by D. Wright showing an anti-war demonstration outside the Pentagon, Washington DC, in 1967.

An anti-war statement made in 1967.

"We demand that no more American youth be sent to fight in a war that is helping neither them nor the Vietnamese people. We have learned lessons from Nazi Germany and will not go along with the aggressive war-making policies of any government, even if it happens to be our own."

Let us examine civil protest against the Vietnam War in greater detail.

- President Johnson’s decision to become directly involved in the Vietnam conflict was very popular at first but this attitude changed. When the bombing of North Vietnam began in 1965, an anti-war protest held on Boston Common was attended by one hundred people. Four years later, in October 1969, over 100,000 people gathered at the same venue to voice their protest against the Vietnam War. The Vietnam War has been called the “the war on the evening news” for the following reasons:
  - It was the first war to be televised and night after night, news broadcasts showed the American people the horrors of the war.
  - Images of rocket attacks, firefights, villages burning, children screaming and American soldiers being dragged out of the jungle by their buddies changed the way American people viewed their government’s decision to send troops to Vietnam.
  - Journalist Marshall McLuhan summed up the power of the media in the following statements: “Television has brought the brutalities of war into the comfort of the living room. Vietnam was lost in the living rooms of America, not on the battlefields.”

- By the late 1960s the American people began to have serious doubts about US involvement in Vietnam and civil protest grew. As the number of American troops deployed in Vietnam escalated into hundreds of thousands, the number of casualties increased. Half a million American soldiers were killed in Vietnam in 1966 and more than 30,000 injured. Protestors chanted: “Hey, hey, LBJ. How many kids did you kill today?” (LBJ refers to President Lyndon B. Johnson)

The war was confusing for the American troops in Vietnam. They were thousands of kilometres from home fighting people with whom they had no argument. Since the Vietcong was a guerrilla army, the enemy was actually ordinary people who farmed during the day and hid deadly booby traps at night. Conditions in the jungle were a nightmare for American soldiers, many of whom were very young. The weather was hot and humid, it was difficult to see the enemy in the thick foliage and there was an ever-present danger of booby traps such as the propped stakes or trip wires. The Vietcong hid in specially constructed underground bunkers and were helped by local people.

Leroy Thomson described his experience of fighting in the jungle: “The South East Asia jungle has many smells, most bad … The perspiration coursed down my face and arms while the festering insect bites which covered my body began to itch in unison … The standard issue clothing became filthy and stiff, and during the monsoon it went sodden and chafed against the skin. Jungle sores, small cuts and insect bites would not heal. In the jungle the smell of death soon became mixed with the smell of stagnant pools, rotting vegetation and our unwashed bodies.”

Did you know?

- The Vietcong set booby traps in the jungle that either killed or maimed American soldiers. Some examples of these include:
  - The punji trap was a faceless, smeared spike buried in the soil. If a soldier stepped on this spike, it would penetrate his boot and the wound would soon become infected and even gangrenous.
  - Trip wires could easily be concealed in the dense jungle. These wires could be attached to explosive devices or form part of a Vietcong ambush.
  - The toe-popper was a round of ammunition in a bamboo sleeve that was partially buried in the ground. If you stepped on a toe-popper, your foot would be blown off.

The attacks by the Vietcong on Saigon during the 1968 Tet Offensive, showed how little support the USA had in Vietnam. The American public became aware that the USA might not be able to win the war and expressed their frustration with President Johnson’s policy by means of massive anti-war demonstrations in Washington DC. Johnson did not stand for re-election and the new president, Richard Nixon, pledged that he would get the United States out of Vietnam. Newspaper and TV reporting had deeply influenced the outcome of the war in Vietnam. The cost of the war in money and lives had worried the American public who made their feelings clear by means of civil protest. The anti-war movement that developed in the USA between 1964 and 1972 played a crucial role in bringing the war to an end.
The following article appeared in the *Sunday Tribune* on 6 June 1973. Pham Thi Kim Phuc was just nine years old when the picture she was hiding in was hit by a napalm bomb. Her clothes were set on fire and the image of her running naked from her devastated village was captured on film by Nick Ut. The photograph he took was reprinted around the world and won him a Pulitzer Prize (journalism award). Pham Thi Kim Phuc ran for half an hour before she was taken to hospital. She had suffered burns to her left arm, back and neck and she was in a coma for six months. Nick Ut’s shocking photograph helped to turn American public opinion against the war and this article looks at how Pham Thi Kim Phuc has coped with what happened to her.

**Activity 3.3: Individual**

**LO 1/AS 3; LO 2/AS 3; LO 3/AS 3**

**How did the press influence Americans to embark on anti-war protests?**

Use the newspaper article on the napalm girl and your own knowledge to answer the following questions.

(a) Discuss, in your own words, what you can learn about the Vietnam War from this article.

(b) Explain whether the photograph on the left article illustrate the futility of war.

(c) How do you think that the photograph on the left influenced public opinion?

(d) What is Kim Phuc’s attitude to responsible for what happened to her?

(e) Explain whether or not you consider this a reliable source for a historian researching events in the Vietnam War?

(f) Using your own knowledge, explain how the photograph of a nine-year old girl “helped American public opinion against the war.”

---

**Environmentalists became concerned about the ecological damage as areas of jungle were destroyed in Vietnam during the war. The Americans used a herbicide nicknamed “Agent Orange” which caused trees to drop their leaves. Agent Orange was dropped in vast quantities on the jungles to destroy the guerrillas’ hiding places. The long-term effects of this action are only making themselves felt today. It has been revealed that dioxin, a component of Agent Orange, causes cancer and birth defects.**

Many people, both Americans and Vietnamese, are still suffering the consequences of the use of this chemical. In 1987, an organisation called “Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW)” was formed. They demonstrated all over America. Many of them were in wheelchairs or on crutches. People watched on television as Vietnam veterans threw away the medals they had won fighting in the war. One shouted: “Here’s my medal badges for murder.” Another apologised to the Vietnamese people and claimed that: “I hope that someday I can return to Vietnam and help to rebuild that country we tore apart.”

When American troops were sent into Cambodia (a state adjacent to Vietnam), students at Kent State University, Ohio, held an anti-war demonstration on 4 May 1970. Hundreds of students threw stones and jeered at the National Guardmen (soldiers) who then opened fire on the crowd. Four students were killed and nine were wounded. This tragic incident shocked the nation and the peace movement became more aggressive. Anti-war sentiment compelled President Nixon to begin the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

---

**NEW GENERATION HISTORY**

**GRADE 12**
Young people were involved in civil protest all over the Western World. Let us look at what happened in Europe in 1968.

1968 was a year of student revolution in West Germany, France, Italy and Britain. Many students belonged to the New Left, a movement which consisted of various groups that aimed for some form of socialism in which workers really controlled industry and government. Members of the New Left had rejected conventional political action in favour of demonstrating, striking and occupying factories and universities. One of the best known incidents of student protest took place at the Sorbonne University in Paris, France. Events happened as follows:

- Students at the Sorbonne met on 3 May 1968 to protest against a restriction of visitation rights in the residences and the closure of another university in Paris. The Sorbonne administration called the police who surrounded the university and arrested students as they tried to leave the campus. When other students gathered to challenge the police actions, the riot police responded by using tear gas to disperse the crowd. This angered the students and more gathered outside the Sorbonne and the following resulted:
  - Students set up barricades in the Latin Quarter of the city when police brutally broke up their demonstrations on 6 May 1968.
  - Civil protest became violent as the students fought street battles with the police.
  - Police used tear gas to try and disperse the students who ripped up paving stones to hurl at the police. The following day 10 000 students marched through Paris and rioting continued on and off for four weeks.
  - Factory workers joined the students and, by 20 May, 120 factories were occupied by the workers. Two million workers were on strike for more pay and shorter hours.
  - On 30 May French President, Charles de Gaulle, called on the French army to surround Paris and announced an election for June. The strikes were called off and police succeeded in getting the students occupying the Sorbonne to leave the university premises.

- Thus, it was clear that students were prepared to engage in civil protest and challenge the authorities in order to safeguard their rights and to bring about change.

A photograph showing the violent conflict that took place in the Latin Quarter of Paris in May 1968. Students in the Rue St Jacques are hurling paving stones at the police while tear gas swirls in front of them.

Activity 3.4: Group

Research

How did civil protest influence change in the 1960s?

Use what you have learnt about anti-war protest in the 1960s and do some research in order to attempt the following activity:

The 1960s were a decade characterised by anti-war protest. Create a TV documentary in which the host interviews protestors and members of the government about events during this period. Prepare suitable questions and responses. Try to find out more about your topic by doing some research if you can.

Your documentary can deal with one of the following:

(a) The Vietnam War. In this documentary, the interviewees could include journalists who have been based in Saigon, Vietnam veterans, students, members of the public and government officials.

OR

(b) A documentary set in Paris in 1968. This would involve heated debate by angry students, workers and members of the police force.

Civil Rights Movement in the USA

Now we will examine one of the most remarkable protests of the 1960s: the Civil Rights Movement in the USA.

- The concept of civil rights encompasses the belief that human beings have basic rights and liberties that cannot be violated by others or by the state. The Declaration of Independence, signed by the original thirteen states of the USA proclaimed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." In 1776, when the declaration was signed, these rights were enjoyed by white, male, protestant property owners only. The rights of others were not considered at the time and in this chapter we focus on how African Americans and women struggled to achieve their rights.

A map showing the division between southern and northern states in the USA. The Southern states had been the ones where slavery was practised before the Civil War (1861-1865).
African Americans became free citizens of the United States of America when slavery was abolished by President Abraham Lincoln in 1863. However, American society was far from equal and most African Americans were denied their civil rights. Discrimination against African Americans was most severe in the Southern states of the USA because these had been the slave-owning states. African Americans who had moved to the northern states also encountered oppression and social injustice, "Let us examine the social problems faced by African Americans.

African Americans formed just over 10% of the population of the USA and were amongst the poorest citizens wherever they lived. Decades of social injustice and discrimination were challenged by the civil rights activists. Discrimination and oppression were most prevalent in the Southern states and were visible in the following ways:

- Racial segregation had resulted in separate schools, libraries, restaurants and buses for African Americans.
- The Ku Klux Klan, a racist organisation set up after the Civil War to prevent blacks gaining their rights, terrorised African Americans. This organisation committed acts of violence against black people and intimidated them. Although African Americans had the right to vote, this sort of intimidation prevented many of them from registering to vote.
- Government officials and police in the south were white and did little to stop attacks on African Americans. White juries almost always acquitted whites accused of killing African Americans.
- Southerners were not prepared to treat black people as equals. The harsh treatment received by black people in the South has been captured in movies such as "The Colour Purple" and the series "Roots."

A photograph of an African American drinking water at a coloured water fountain.

Did you know?

The laws passed during the late 19th century to segregate blacks from whites in the Southern states were known as 'Jim Crow' laws after a song called 'Jump Jim Crow.' The author of the song had been inspired by an elderly black in Kentucky who danced and sang to a song that ended with the chorus: "Wheel about and turn about and do jis so, Eb'ry time I wheel about I jump Jim Crow." Jim Crow became a figure of fun who was mocked by audiences.

Industrial expansion after World War One meant that there were many job opportunities in cities in the northern states. Between 1920 and 1930, more than eight hundred thousand African Americans moved from the South to the North where they could earn higher wages in the factories. Although segregation was not legal in the North, racism and discrimination were common and African Americans were usually given menial, low paid jobs. African Americans in the northern states lived in the inner-city ghettos where there was slum housing, high unemployment, poor schools and inadequate health care.

Now, let us look at how the Civil Rights Movement originated.

Black intellectuals had been arguing for civil rights since the beginning of the 20th century. Americans became more aware of the racial discrimination that existed in their country after World War Two.

What was the Civil Rights Movement?
The Civil Rights Movement is a term that refers to a massive campaign of civil disobedience and protest in the USA in the 1950s and 1960s. The aim of this movement was to gain constitutional rights denied to African Americans. African Americans, together with sympathetic whites, engaged in campaigns of civil protest that involved both passive (peaceful) and active (violent) resistance.

Organised civil protest was sparked off by an incident that happened in Montgomery, Alabama in 1955. After a long and tiring day, Rosa Parks, a seamstress, boarded a bus in Montgomery to go home. She sat down in the nearest available seat which happened to be in the front, a section for white passengers. When the driver asked her to move to the rear of the bus, Parks replied "I don't think I should have to move." She was arrested and fined.

This simple act of defiance launched the Civil Rights Movement. Under the leadership of a local minister, Martin Luther King Jnr, African Americans in Montgomery, Alabama, organised a boycott of the bus serv-
ice. The boycotters' slogan expressed their desire for social justice: "Don't ride the bus today. Don't ride it for freedom." The boycott caused great inconvenience in the following two ways:

- Boycotters had to walk to their destinations, make do with makeshift car-pools or accept lifts from volunteer drivers supporting the cause.
- The bus company lost about 65% of its business and had to cut services, lay off drivers and raise fares.

The Montgomery bus boycott continued until November 1956, when the Supreme Court ruled that the Montgomery bus company's policy of segregation violated the US Constitution. Bus passengers were integrated on 21 December 1956 and Black church leaders advised their members to sit wherever they wished but not to retaliate in response to violence.

The Montgomery bus boycott thrust Martin Luther King into a position of national leadership. King believed that non-violent protest was the best way to fight injustice. His charismatic personality and speeches inspired both black and white supporters of the Civil Rights Movement to use civil protest to bring about change.

**Activity 3.5: Individual**

**LO 1/AS 3; LO 2/AS 1**

How did Martin Luther King's speeches Inspire the Civil Rights Movement?

Read Source 3E and answer the questions that follow:

**Source 3E:** This is an extract from a speech made by King at the start of the bus boycott.

"We have known humiliation, we have known abuse language, we have been plunged into the abyss of oppression. And we decided to rise up only with the weapon of protest. It is one of the greatest stories of America that we have the right of protest. If we are arrested every day, if we are exploited every day, if we are trampled over every day, don't ever let anyone pull you so low as to hate them. We must use the weapon of love. We must have compassion and understanding for those who hate us. We must realize so many people are taught to hate us that they are not totally responsible for their hate. But we stand in life at midnight, we are always on the threshold of a new dawn.

(a) Comment on King's attitude to the American Constitution in this extract.
(b) List three hardships being experienced by African Americans referred to in this extract.
(c) Using evidence from Source 3E, explain, in your own words, how King expected civil protest to be conducted.
(d) Explain what you think is meant by the last line of the extract: "But we stand at... of a new dawn."
(e) Discuss whether or not you think that King's ideas have any relevance in post-apartheid South Africa? Give reasons for your answer.
(f) Write a report of about one and a half pages on racial discrimination in the USA in the 1950s that will be sent to an American Congressman.

**Profile: Martin Luther King Jr. (1929-1968)**

Martin Luther King was born on 15 January, 1929 in Atlanta, Georgia. His father was a Baptist minister and his mother, Alberta Williams King, was the second of three children. King obtained a bachelor's degree at Morehouse College and enrolled at Crozier Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania in 1948. While attending Boston University, he met Coretta Scott whom he married in June 1953. He was awarded a doctorate from Boston University in 1955.

King became a pastor at the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery. He was deeply influenced by Mahatma Gandhi's philosophy of non-violent strategies for social change, referred to as passive resistance or "Satyagraha." King believed in the basic goodness of people and had faith in American democracy. Urged by prominent Baptist ministers in the South to play a larger role in the Civil Rights Movement, he moved to Atlanta, Georgia where he became president of the newly formed Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Government harassment, the bombing of his home and hostility towards him and his family were all problems King had to face. Black militants challenged his ideas of non-violent protest and some white liberals turned against him when he criticised American involvement in Vietnam. King was arrested many times during his civil rights campaigns.

In recognition of his work and leadership, King was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize in 1964. This was a triumphant and historic moment as few people had believed that this honour would be given to an African American. King turned his attention to the plight of the poor and campaigned for jobs, education and better living conditions for everyone.

His death was sudden and tragic. While standing on the balcony of his hotel room in Memphis, Tennessee, King was shot and killed by an assassin's bullet on 4 April 1968.

The American nation mourned the man who had worked tirelessly to achieve his vision of a society in which all people were equal in the eyes of the law, no matter the colour of their skin.
Now let us focus our attention on some of the events of the civil rights movement.

Civil society protest took many forms and was engaged in by both African Americans and their white countrymen who supported their cause. Here are a few highlights from the events that took place in the 1960s:

- The protest actions of students in Greensboro, North Carolina, inspired the use of sit-ins as a form of protest against segregation and discrimination. Four black students went shopping on 1 February in Greensboro. Once they had completed their purchases, they sat down at a lunch counter where whites usually ate and ordered coffee. Refused service because of their race, the students sat silently at the counter until the store closed. The next day they returned to the store and resumed sitting at the lunch counter. Young people, both black and white, began sitting in segregated areas in protest. In the next twelve months, more than 50 000 people participated in such demonstrations and over 3 600 protestors were jailed.

- Students were crucial in organising the Civil Rights Movement in the Southern states. The Students Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) was set up and became involved in projects to register black voters in the Deep South. Volunteers organised courses on voting procedures and how to register to vote. Hundreds of students from the north, both black and white, came to help African Americans register to vote in spite of the fact that they faced intimidation and insults from racists.

- The so-called ‘Freedom Rides’ were organised by CORE (Congress of Racial Equality), a northern-based group dedicated to racial equality. Many Southern states had not obeyed the order to desegregate bus services after the Montgomery ruling in 1956. Blacks and whites travelled together on buses going through the South to protest against this segregation. These inter-racial teams were attacked on highways and in bus stations by angry whites in favour of segregationist policies.

- Martin Luther King led a demonstration in Birmingham, Alabama, on 3 April 1963. The demonstrators were demanding fair employment opportunities, the desegregation of public facilities and the creation of a committee to plan desegregation. Birmingham police attacked the marchers, unarmed men, women and children, with high-pressure water hoses, dogs, tear gas and even electric cattle prods. King and over 3,000 protestors were arrested. The police action made front-page news across the country and highlighted the issue of racial discrimination.

- On 28 August 1963, more than 250,000 people from many religious and ethnic backgrounds joined in a march on Washington DC to protest against the failure of the nation to address racism. This demonstration, the largest ever in the American capital, was held on the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation by President Lincoln. Martin Luther King addressed the crowd from the Lincoln Memorial. In a mesmerising speech entitled “I Have a Dream”, King outlined his hopes for a nation free from prejudice. He declared: “When we allow freedom to ring, when we let it ring from every village, from every hamlet, from every state and every city, we will be able to speed up the day when God’s children, black men and white men, Jews and Gentiles, Protestants and Catholics, will be able to join hands and sing in the words of the old Negro spiritual: “Free at last. Free at last. Thank God Almighty, we are free at last.”

What changes were achieved by the Civil Rights Movement?

The Civil Rights Movement took place at the time of the Cold War when the USA was portraying itself as a beacon of freedom in the world. The oppressive race relations within the United States were an embarrassment and American leaders were compelled to introduce social reforms like desegregation in order to maintain their country’s credibility on the world stage.

Democratic president, John F Kennedy, made a strong commitment to civil rights during his election campaign. Shocked by the Birmingham protests, the President made a televised speech on 11 June 1963 in which he identified the problem of racial disharmony as “a moral issue” and proclaimed: “Today we are committed to a worldwide struggle to promote and protect the rights of all who wish to be free. And when Americans are sent to Vietnam or West Berlin, we do not ask for whites only. It ought to be possible, therefore, for Americans of any colour to attend any public institution they elect without having to be backed by troops.”

Civil rights legislation was difficult to pass because of the opposition of the Southern states. The following laws addressed the issue of black civil rights:

- The 1964 Civil Rights Act made racial discrimination in employment, in hotels, restaurants or any body receiving government money illegal.

- The 1965 Voting Rights Act stopped racial discrimination with respect to the right to vote.

- The Supreme Court ruled that state laws forbidding inter-racial marriage were unconstitutional in 1967.

- The 1968 Fair Housing Act made racial discrimination in housing illegal.

Activity 3.6: Individual

LO 1/AS 1, 2; 3, 4; LO 2/AS 1, 2, 3; LO 3/AS 4

How was non-violent protest used during the Civil Rights Movement?

Using both the sources and your own knowledge, answer the questions which follow:

Source 3F: This is an account told by Ruby Doris Smith who was a seventeen year old student at Spelman College in Atlanta in 1960.

When the student committee was formed, I told my older sister to put me on the list. And when two hundred students were selected for the first demonstration, I was among them. I went through the food line in the restaurant at the State Capitol with six other students, but when we got to the cashier, she wouldn’t take our money. The Lieutenant-Governor came down and told us to leave. We didn’t and went to the county jail.

Source 3G: This photograph shows Freedom Riders on a bus in the south. The state troopers (soldiers) are on the bus to prevent mobs from beating them up.
Source 3H: A nineteen year old black student from Illinois, Carver Neblett, was helping African Americans to register to vote in 1963. In this extract, Neblett recounts an incident that he experienced in Terrell County, Georgia. Voters had to pass a literacy test in order to register. This test was to see whether voters could read and write but was really designed to stop blacks from registering.

"I talked with a blind man who is extremely interested in the civil rights movement. He has been keeping up with the movement from the beginning. Even though this man is blind he wants to learn all the questions on the literacy test. Imagine, while many are afraid that white men will burn our homes, shoot into them, or put us off their property, a blind man, seventy years old, wants to come to our meetings."

(a) Refer to Source 3F:
   (i) Why do you think that the cashier refused to take the students' money?
   (ii) What does this account reveal about the government's attitude to student protest against racism?

(b) Explain what the young people on the bus in Source 3G hoped to achieve.

(c) Read the account in Source 3H:
   (i) Using your own knowledge, explain why it was necessary for students to help black people in the South with voter registration.
   (ii) What does this source reveal about social tensions in Georgia?
   (ii) What does the writer admire about the blind man?

(d) How do you think the members of the crowd shown in Source 3I felt while gathered to hear Martin Luther King speak?

(e) Using all the sources, the text and your own knowledge, write a report for your school's history magazine on one aspect of the Civil Rights Movement. Your report should be about two pages long.

Black Power Movement

We have been examining the non-violent protest advocated by Martin Luther King. Now we are going to take a look at the more militant approach used by civil rights activists.

- Black nationalists in the USA believed that the use of force was justified in order to achieve equality and they thought that Martin Luther King's message of love and non-violence was naive and misguided. Frustration grew during the 1960s as the progress to achieve civil rights seemed too slow. Black unemployment remained twice as high as the national average and black schools and housing remained inferior. Frustration and bitterness led to a shift away from the moderate-approach of Martin Luther King and towards black militancy. Riots broke out in Alabama in February 1964 and spread to Mississippi the following month. Three civil rights workers, one black and two white, were arrested in Philadelphia, Mississippi, at this time. Having been released from jail late at night, they were beaten and then shot to death. The police denied any knowledge of what had happened.

The film Mississippi Burning is based on an incident that took place in Philadelphia, Mississippi in June 1964. Three civil rights workers, James Chansey, a young black Mississippian, and two white volunteers, Andrew Goodman and Michael Schwerner, were arrested on a speeding charge. They simply disappeared and many accused the police of a racial murder. Incidents like this increased racial tension.

If you have seen this film or your school has the facilities to show it to you, answer the following question: What can you learn about the Civil Rights Movement and the racist attitudes in the South from this film?

- Black tension erupted in August 1965 with rioting in Los Angeles that left 34 dead. African Americans began to adopt a more confrontational course of action known as 'black power'. Stokely Carmichael, a militant black leader summed up their attitude with these words: "I'm not going to beg the white man for anything I deserve - I'm going to take it. We need power - we need black power."

The next two years were marked by riots in practically every major US city. A paramilitary group, the Black Panthers, were formed in California. They wanted to make African Americans aware of their right to carry guns and believed that violent struggle was inevitable. They felt that peaceful protest had achieved very little and that more violent and radical protests were needed. Malcolm X was an eloquent spokesperson for Black Power. His life and philosophy had a great influence on the thinking of African Americans.

A photograph showing members of the Black Panthers.

A photograph of a protester in Los Angeles, California.
Profile: Malcolm X (1925-1965)

Born Malcolm Little, he spent most of his childhood in foster homes and state institutions. He was arrested at the age of 21 and given a 10-year sentence. While in prison, he became interested in the "Nation of Islam", a Black Muslim sect that believed in the separation of races.

Malcolm became leader of the movement in 1952 and adopted the name Malcolm X. As an act of defiance, members of the Nation of Islam replaced their surnames, which they called slave names, with the letter X. His speaking ability drew a strong following but his forceful personality led to disputes. Malcolm X was expelled from the Nation of Islam in 1963.

Malcolm X formed his own organisation and after a pilgrimage to Mecca, he modified his views and accepted the possibility of working with people of other ethnic backgrounds. He was assassinated in 1965 while making a speech in New York City.

Activity 3.7: Pairs

How did the ideas and methods of Martin Luther King and Malcolm X differ?

Using both Sources 3J and 3K below, as well as the evidence in Source 3E from Activity 3.5, compare the ideas of Dr King and Malcolm X according to the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHODS/IDEAS</th>
<th>MARTIN LUTHER KING</th>
<th>MALCOLM X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods of civil protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude to white Americans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious affiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision for change in the USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent of their influence on the nation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy of protest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source 3J: This is an extract from a speech made by Malcolm X in 1964.

"The political philosophy of black nationalism means: we must control the police and the politicians of our community. They must no longer take orders from outside forces. We will organise and sweep out of office all Negro politicians who are puppets for the outside forces...

... Whites can help us, but they can't join us. There can be no black-white unity until there is first black unity. There can be no workers' solidarity until there is some racial solidarity. We cannot think of uniting with others until we have first united among ourselves...

Concerning non-violence: 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 rifle. We believe in obeying the law."

Source 3K: This is an extract from Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" speech made in Washington on 28 August 1963.

"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 one day on the hills of Georgia the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at a table of brotherhood. I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, sweltering with the heat of injustice and oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice. I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the colour of their skin but by the content of their character."

Peace Movements

Let us focus on other peace movements during the 1960s.

Nuclear weapons were possessed by both the USSR and USA and many people feared that these weapons might be used in another war. This fear was fuelled by Cold War crises such as the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, the escalating war in Vietnam and conflict in the Middle East in 1967.

A Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) was formed in Britain in 1958. It advocated that nuclear weapons should be abolished, and in particular that Britain should give up the Bomb" immediately (unilateral disarmament). Significant CND activities included the following:

- Members of the CND organised protest marches to Aldermaston every Easter.
- The CND stood for ideas that were controversial and supporters claimed that a nuclear disaster might happen at any time. It used publicity and argument to try and convince people that nuclear weapons should be abolished.
- Between 1960 and 1968 a smaller group, the Committee of 100, advocated that more direct action was called for. They believed that it was necessary to break the law in order to pressure the government into giving up nuclear weapons. This group gained a lot of publicity but not much support.
- There were many 'Ban the Bomb' campaigns in Britain during the 1960s. Anti-nuclear protestors staged marches and sit-in demonstrations at the British Houses of Parliament in 1962.
- The CND lost support after the 1960s but its desire for peace, felt all over the world, has influenced many modern peace movements.

Did you know?

In the summer of 1981, a group of women marched from Wales to the US air base in Greenham Common (England), a base where the US had stationed Cruise Missiles. They set up a Women's Peace Camo outside the base and maintained a presence there for more than ten years. This protest was linked to the feminist movement that had gathered strength in the 1970s and 1980s.
The photograph on the left shows police removing a protester from Parliament Square in 1962. The CND group on the right are participating in a 'Ban the Bomb' march from London to Aldermaston in 1963.

Activity 3.8: Group

Enrichment

How can we protest against war?

Use what you have learnt in this chapter, as well as your own knowledge, to attempt the following activity:

Despite the efforts of protest groups in the 1960s, nations are still at war with each other. Your group is going to campaign against war. You may choose to direct your protest against the Vietnam War in the 1960s, any other conflict that is currently in the news or against war in general. A well-organised campaign which presents facts in a persuasive manner is the one most likely to succeed. This is what you are expected to produce:

(a) An anti-war poster advertising a meeting you will be holding.

(b) Pamphlets to hand out to the public to make them aware of the problem.

(c) A speech to deliver at the protest meeting.

Disarmament

Now that we have examined peace movements, let us consider disarmament.

Although the Cold War continued, relations between the United States of America and the Soviet Union improved in the 1960s. Both superpowers realised that nuclear war would ruin them and might even destroy the world. President Kennedy of the United States met with Nikita Khrushchev, leader of the Soviet Union, in Vienna in 1961. Neither leader wanted to embark on a nuclear war but they distrusted each other too much to reduce their arsenals of nuclear weapons. However, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed not to test nuclear bombs in the earth's atmosphere by signing the Partial Test-Ban Treaty in 1963. Five years later, the superpowers signed a Non-Proliferation Treaty to prevent the further spread of nuclear weapons.

The United States and her allies and the Soviet Union continued to accumulate nuclear weapons and spent billions of dollars on advanced military technology. The theory behind this amassing of weapons was that one side would not dare launch a nuclear invasion, knowing that the other side would cause just as much damage with its bombs. Despite the protests of peace movements in the 1950s, disarmament only began in the late 1980s.

Women's Movements

Finally, let's take a look at how women embarked on campaigns for their rights.

- The phrase 'women's liberation' was first used in an essay published by Simone de Beauvoir called The Second Sex. The roots of the women's liberation movement may be traced to earlier times in history when women in male-dominated societies have fought for their dignity and human rights. During World War Two, women had been given important jobs for higher wages as the men were away on military service. After the war ended, women were fired and their jobs given back to men. The 1950s was a particularly still time for women as society's image of women was that of housewife and mother. Women who did have jobs outside the home were restricted to the so-called pink collar jobs: waitress, nurse, primary school teacher, saleswoman or secretary. They were paid far less than men and were kept out of traditionally male occupations. There were very few women in the upper levels of politics, business or management.

- A women's liberation movement emerged in the USA in the 1960s and was born out of the Civil Rights Movement. Between 1963 and 1965, hundreds of young white women went south as members of the Congress of Racial Equality and the Students Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee. They gained valuable organisational experience but were often side-lined for leadership positions by their male colleagues. In addition, the Civil Rights Movement forced the passage of new laws. In particular, Clause VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 forbade job discrimination on the basis of race, colour, religion, sex, or national origin. The addition of sex (gender) to the Civil Rights Act was almost an afterthought, but it proved to have significant consequences.

The Feminine Mystique, a book written by Betty Friedan and published in 1963, had a tremendous impact on the women's movement. Friedan examined the age-old image of women as wives and mothers, giving up their own dreams to live through their husbands and children. She wrote: "The only way for a woman, as for a man, to find herself, to know herself as a person, is by creative work of her own."

Did you know?

In the early 1960s, the invention and distribution of the first reliable oral contraceptive, the birth control pill, opened a door in many women's trapped lives by giving them the power to plan or avoid pregnancies.
Women began to assert themselves and demanded the end to discrimination against them in all aspects of society. The American Women's Liberation Movement was not cohesive and there were class barriers. The National Organisation of Women (NOW), founded by Betty Friedan, had a membership that was predominantly white, middle class, college-educated and professional. The working class women had a more difficult struggle but organised themselves despite the obstacles they faced. Dorothy Baldwin, a laundry worker and mother of six in Atlanta, began organising women into the National Domestic Workers Union (NDWU) in 1968. In 1968 feminists adopted new tactics as follows:

- Tens of thousands of women were organised into small 'conscious-raising' discussion groups where they could share experiences and air grievances.
- A live sheep was crowned as 'Miss America' in protest against beauty pageants which were seen as demeaning to women.
- Freedom trash cans were set up where women could discard their bras, hair curlers and high-heeled shoes. It was said that these items were only worn by women to please men.
- Women invaded all-male bars and clubs.

The issues that concerned women worldwide and were addressed by women activists in the 1960s included equality in the workplace, the provision of childcare and the rights of women to control their reproductive capacity. Many of these issues have been dealt with, but in many parts of the world women still lack basic rights and issues concerning gender do not receive the necessary attention.

Activity 3.9: Pairs

**How did women fight for their rights?**

Sources 3K and 3L were published by British feminists in the 1970s. Examine these two posters and answer the questions that follow.

**Source 3K: A Women's Day poster.**

**Source 3L: A day in the life of a woman.**

Let us sum up what we have learnt about civil protest and change in the 1960s.

The 1960s was a decade which saw transformation in attitudes to authority, personal relationships, material standards, customs and behaviour. There were upheavals in class, race and family relationships. Civil protest challenged government policies on nuclear arms, war and education. African Americans and women won civil rights for themselves. People were influenced by popular culture that rejected the materialism of the consumer society and emancipated itself from old restraints. At the forefront of society were concerns for civil and personal rights and the environment. These ideas would influence world opinion and trends in the years to come.

**What civil protest was taking place in South Africa during the 1960s?**

During the 1960s the South African economy expanded at an average rate of 6.1% per year and the country became a modern, industrial nation. The availability of jobs led to urbanisation on an unprecedented scale. The number of African workers in the urban areas increased dramatically and these workers were denied basic human rights, including the right to form trade unions.

The Sharpeville Massacre of 21 March 1960 set the scene for a new era of civil protest even though the National Party introduced laws to restrict criticism of its policies and to repress any resistance. The powers of the security police were extended so that the police were able to crush resistance by almost any means. Police methods became more brutal and torture was used by them when questioning suspects. The Terrorism Act, 1967, allowed for indefinite detention without trial. Despite the prevailing atmosphere of repression and hopelessness, a new movement, Black Consciousness, was launched in 1969 and brought new hope to those suffering oppression and discrimination in South Africa.

### 3.1.3 WHAT ROLE DID THE BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS MOVEMENT PLAY IN SOUTH AFRICA DURING THE 1970S?

The 1970s brought about political renewal and revival in the struggle against apartheid in South Africa. African people shrugged off the political apathy and fear of the 1960s and
embarked on mass protest that eventually brought the white-minority government to its knees. This change was given impetus by the following:

- The decolonisation of African states which encouraged those who were oppressed.
- The 'Black Power' movement in the USA which inspired Black South Africans.
- A new philosophy, Black Consciousness, which brought about a new phase in the anti-apartheid struggle.

Origins and ideology of Black Consciousness

Let us investigate the origins and ideas of Black Consciousness that brought about change in South Africa during the 1970s.

What does the term Black Consciousness mean?

Black Consciousness (BC) was a philosophy based on the belief that liberation for Blacks would only be attained if they removed the shackles of inferiority and fear. Rather than waiting for whites to shape their destinies, black should conduct their own political campaigns and help each other gain freedom.

- Black Consciousness had its origins on the campuses of the ethnically-separated universities. The misnamed Extension of University Education Act of 1959 made it illegal for white universities to enrol black students without government approval. The law led to the creation of four new universities: the University of Zululand at Ngoye, the University of Durban-Westville for Indians, the University of the Western Cape for Coloureds and the University of the North at Turffontein. Fort Hare in the Eastern Cape, formerly a private university, was taken over by the government and restricted to isiXhosa speakers.

Students at these universities faced many restrictions, for instance:

- Their scholarships would be taken away if they engaged in political activities.
- All three African universities were situated in rural areas, far from each other and from major cities.
- Access to campuses was limited and the curricula, library material and campus organisations closely monitored.
- It was difficult to organise any protest action as telephone services were limited and transport was expensive.
- Black lecturers were punished for giving talks on unauthorised subjects.

The Role of Steve Biko

- The one avenue open to students to exercise any form of political consciousness was the elected Student Representative Councils. African students began to align themselves with the theoretically non-racial National Union of South African Students (NUSAS). Black delegates to the NUSAS conference held in Grahamstown in July 1967 discovered that they were to be given separate accommodation and eat in different venues from the white delegates. The white students in NUSAS had failed to observe non-racial principles and it seemed that the union could not defend or promote black interests. Led by Steve Biko, an organisation for black students (African, Indian and Coloured) was formed in 1969 and called the South African Students Organisation (SASO). This was the body from which Black Consciousness, a new ideology of black pride, emerged.

Profile: Steven Bantu Biko and the origin of SASO

Steve Biko was born into a poor but close-knit family in the township of Ginsberg near King William's Town in the Eastern Cape in 1946. His father, a policeman, died when he was four and his mother brought up and educated her four children on a domestic worker's wage. When Biko was 16, his brother, Khaya, was jailed and this was considered grounds for his expulsion from Lovedale College. In 1964 he was admitted to St Francis College at Marikana in Natal where he wrote matric. Biko began his medical training at the University of Natal Non-European section in Wentworth, Durban. He soon became active in student politics and became an eager participant in NUSAS activities.

Biko was a self-confident speaker whose leadership abilities were soon evident. He became disillusioned with NUSAS when he realised that this organisation could never lead the struggle for black emancipation. He was convinced that black students needed their own organisation in which they could speak for themselves instead of relying on liberal whites to help their cause.

Biko corresponded with black students throughout the country between 1967 and 1969. A consultative meeting was held at Marikana in December 1968 and plans were laid for the launching of the South African Students Organisation (SASO) at Turffontein in July 1969. SASO became a successful organisation because of the following factors:

- It was effectively organised and led.
- Resources were scarce but Students Representative Councils could obtain funds to subsidise sporting and cultural events and had access to office space, duplicating machines and telephones. Ironically, SASO was able to use all these resources to extend its networks.
- The ideology of Black Consciousness had great appeal among the youth. Biko believed that SASO should identify the interests of Indians and Coloureds with those of Africans and that it should reject any involvement by white liberals.

- A definition of Black Consciousness was set out for the first time in a SASO policy manifesto in 1971. An extract from Document 44 of this policy manifesto reads as follows:

(i) BLACK CONSCIOUSNESS is an attitude of mind, a way of life.
(ii) The basic tenet of Black Consciousness is that the Black man must reject all value systems that seek to make him a foreigner in the country of his birth and reduce his basic human dignity.
(iii) The Blackman must build up his own value systems; see himself as self-defined.

The message of Black Consciousness was simple and compelling. Biko believed that black people had lost confidence in themselves as a result of living in a white-dominated society. In order to gain freedom, blacks must regain their confidence and end their dependence on whites. Blackness became something to be proud of and worth fight-
ing for. Fear of whites and the government was replaced by a new courage as victims of apartheid discovered solidarity in the BC philosophy.

Let’s look at how Black Consciousness was put into action.

Biko set up Black Community Programmes in which blacks helped other blacks without white assistance. Black Consciousness ideas were put into action in the following ways:

- The Zanempilo Community Health Clinic was established near King William’s Town and run by Dr Mamphela Ramphele. This clinic was administered exclusively by African people.
- The Black Peoples’ Convention was formed in 1972 to give expression to BC ideas. It included a number of cultural, educational and religious organisations.
- Awareness of the emerging, but still illegal trade union movement, led to the establishment of the Black Allied Workers Union in 1973.

These projects empowered African people and gave them the confidence to determine their own future. The BC philosophy was flexible enough to accommodate a range of attitudes and BC gained support from Black intellectuals, small businessmen and other members of the community.

Activity 3.10: Individual LO 2/AS 1, 2; LO3/AS 4

How were young people inspired by Black Consciousness in this chapter, attempt the following activity:

You are a student on the campus of an ethnic university. Steve Biko held a meeting at your university recently and explained the ideas of BC to the students. Using what you have learnt, write a letter to a friend in the township telling him/her about the meeting and how you have been inspired by BC.

- The concept of Black Consciousness had special appeal for the youth and would result in one of the greatest incidents of civil protest in South African history, the events of 16 June 1976. Between 1950 and 1975 the number of African children at school rose from around one million to over 3.5 million and the proportion at secondary school from 3 per cent to 8 per cent. The following problems were created in schools because of the Bantu Education Act of 1953:
  - The state was spending approximately 15 times more on White than on Black learners.
  - Schools in Black areas were under-resourced so buildings and equipment were of a poor quality. There was a lack of sporting facilities, libraries and science laboratories.
  - A severe shortage of classrooms and teachers led to overcrowding. Class sizes averaged over 60 in Soweto and at times reached 100. Teachers were under-trained and found it difficult to cope without adequate resources. Corporal punishment was used excessively.
  - The curriculum and subject packages were very limited and emphasised manual labour for Black South Africans.

SASO began to have an influence in high schools and organised the establishment of debating societies or service clubs where political discussions could take place. The South African Students Movement (SASM) was set up in 1972 to build a national movement of high school students. Students were exposed to the ideas of BC and became mobilised to fight for their rights.

1976 Soweto Uprising

Let us take a closer look at the factors that led to the 1976 Soweto Uprising.

By 1970 the National Party felt confident that they had suppressed the liberation movements and began putting their homeland policy into effect. Although the international community condemned apartheid, there were still strong links between the South African government and the governments of major Western powers. The South African government stressed its opposition to communism and South African troops were stationed in Namibia to fight the South West African People’s Organisation (SWAPO).

The following factors created immense frustration amongst Black South Africans in the early 1970s, for instance:

- The soaring price of oil in 1973-1974 had a negative effect on the South African economy. The economic recession of the 1970s mainly affected Black workers who were retrenched. Inflation rose and the price of food increased rapidly. The poverty datum line for Soweto was estimated at R129.05 a month but the average Black family was only earning about R75 a month.
- In addition to the problems of poverty and unemployment, Africans faced the daily humiliations and injustices of the apartheid system, for instance:
  - Black townships such as Soweto were extremely overcrowded and there was inadequate provision of basic facilities such as transport, recreation, health and housing.
  - Influx control and forced removals led to arrests for pass law offences.
  - African trade unions remained unrecognised and strikes by African workers were considered illegal.
- In 1975 the Minister of Bantu Education, MC Botha, decided to force Black learners to learn half their subjects in Afrikaans. There was widespread opposition to this regulation because neither learners nor teachers were familiar with this language. Learners affected by this new policy showed poor exam results at the end of 1975.

Let us see how Black Consciousness influenced the Soweto students’ decision to protest.

By 13 June 1976, the South African Students’ Movement, inspired by Black Consciousness ideas, decided to hold a mass demonstration against the implementation of Afrikaans. An action committee called the Soweto Students Representative Council (SSRC) was formed.
and a one-day protest was planned for 16 June. The learners prepared themselves to engage in civil protest by making placards that read “Down with Afrikaans” and “To Hell with Bantu Education.” Their planned march was a well-kept secret and children went off to school on Wednesday 16 June as usual.

At 7 am the first group of chanting marchers set off towards Orlando Stadium. By 9am thousands of school children, waving placards, began to march from every corner of Soweto. Confronting the marchers at Vilakazi Street near Orlando West Junior Secondary School, police fired tear gas canisters into the crowd. Shots were fired and a huddle of children emerged out of the crowd carrying the body of 13 year old Hector Pietersen, the first learner to die in the violence. This ignited the fury of the marchers who began to rampage through the township smashing windows and setting fire to buildings. By the evening of 16 June, Soweto resembled a battle zone, and a new era in protest politics took root.

Photographs showing what happened in Soweto on 16 June 1976.

Activity 3.11: Individual

What happened on June 16, 1976?

Use the sources and your own knowledge to answer the questions that follow:

Source 3M: South African Jessica Sherman adapted a protest song by American songwriter Pete Seeger to reflect the situation in Soweto. Taken from A Different Kind of War by J Frederikse.

What did you learn in school today?
What did you learn in school today, Dear little child of mine?
We learnt that the West is always right,
And white is usually right,
And that rich and poor will always be,
And that's what makes us free.

And what did you learn in school today, Dear little child of mine?
That education brings opportunities,
In this advancing age,
But we'll end up working in factories,
For a measly weekly wage.

What did you learn in school today, Dear little child of mine?
We learnt that teargas burns the eyes,
We learnt how police dogs bite,
We learnt that batons break our bones,
And we're learning how to fight.

What did you learn in school today, Dear little child of mine?
That agitators stir us up,
And lead us all astray,
But we can think and we can see,
And we want change today.

Source 3O: This eyewitness account is by Priscilla Mseuyenye.

"During the day further incidents of unrest broke out. We heard gunshots from the direction of the Esso Garage and we rushed there to see what was happening. Trucks were stopped and looted, and police fired shots in an attempt to disperse the crowd. As the crowd was scattered, my aunt was shot, but we could not stop to find out how she was.

I ran home and hid under a van parked in our yard. The Boers [Afrikaners] came into the yard carrying guns. They grabbed some of the people who ran into our yard. I stayed under the truck, quietly, until they left. I stayed there until I was certain they were gone. By the time I came out, I could smell tear gas fumes in the air. I was terrified that the Boers would beat me up like they did those they grabbed in our yard.

When I emerged from under the van, things had quietened down a bit. I quickly ran into the house where I looked myself in the window. I could see police in armoured cars chasing people and beating them up."

Source 3O: This poster was issued by the National Party government.
Consequences of the Soweto Uprising

What were the consequences of 16 June 1976?

- The violence that began in Soweto spread to other townships and renewed a sense of the power of mass action amongst Black South Africans. A new generation of activists had shown great courage and resolve by being determined to fight apartheid whatever the cost. The consequences of the Soweto Uprising included the following:
  - A nation-wide uprising was set in motion as protests sparked by the Soweto Uprising occurred throughout the country, including the homelands. Coloured students from Cape Town and Indian students from the University of Durban-Westville became involved in the struggle as did a growing number of white supporters.
  - Thousands of South Africans fled into exile and joined the Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) and Pogo training camps. These were the underground armies of the ANC and PAC respectively. Within a few years the South African students who had joined these underground armies had undergone training in guerrilla warfare and they would be returning to South Africa to fight the apartheid system.
  - The international community was shocked that the South African police had shot at unarmed school children and they then imposed embargoes on arms and oil supplies to South Africa. Multi-national companies such as IBM, Pepsi and Peugeot withdrew their capital and such disinvestment led to the closure of industries and a rise in unemployment.
  - Business leaders like Harry Oppenheimer of Anglo-American and Anton Rupert of the Rembrandt Group tried to find a way to calm the intensifying violence which created problems for business. Their efforts resulted in the setting up of the Urban Foundation which aimed to promote opportunities for Africans in education, homeownership and economic development.

The Minister of Justice, Jimmy Kruger, banned 17 organisations including the Black Peoples Convention and SSRC. The police arrested and detained thousands of people during this period of heightened unrest and resistance.

The ruthlessness of the authorities was illustrated by the tragic events surrounding the death of Steve Biko in 1977. Biko was caught in a roadblock outside Grahamstown on 18 August 1977 and held without trial under the Terrorism Act. He was taken to police headquarters in Port Elizabeth where he was interrogated and beaten. When Biko became gravely ill, three doctors visited him and made up false diagnoses. Finally Biko was dumped, naked, into the back of a police vehicle and taken 1 628 kilometres to Pretoria where he died. In a statement, Justice Minister Kruger said of Biko's death: "I am not glad and I am not sorry about Mr Biko ... He leaves me cold."

Let us look at the effect of BC on workers and labour issues during the 1970s.

Cheap black labour had been the cornerstone of the South African economy since the discovery of minerals in the late 19th century. Most workers were migrant labourers and were denied any rights as Black trade unions were illegal. Denied the right to collective bargaining, African workers could be exploited by their employers. This impacted on the labour movement in various ways:

- The Black Consciousness Movement of the 1970s gave impetus to the revival of trade unionism and worker militancy, with a massive escalation of strike activity in 1973. Two thousand workers at the Coronation Brick and Tile plant in Durban...
met on a field in Durban on 9 January. They demanded higher wages and chanted “Filimuntu ufasakikiza” (the man is dead but his spirit lives on). Strike action spread to the textile mills in Pinetown and to the Durban Corporation workers. In most instances, the striking workers won pay increases and the police were unusually restrained.

- The significance of the 1973 Durban strikes was that they broke the mould of cheap, docile labour and gave workers a new sense of power. This became apparent when:
  - Workers organised themselves into unions that were committed to democratic grassroot unionism and had structures that enabled the workers to be part of the decision-making process.
  - The mounting strength of the as yet unofficial black trade unions and the threat of strike action provided the state with a dilemma. Both the state and employers urgently needed a new industrial relations framework and it was clear that labour reform was needed.

Let us see how the government reacted to the mounting pressures from black labour.

The government hoped to be able to isolate the organised working class from the wider political framework of the township politics. They set up two commissions:

- The Wiehahn Commission which investigated the industrial relations framework. This commission’s recommendations that Africans be allowed to form and join registered trade unions were accepted by the government and the Labour Relations Act was passed in 1979. This law granted Black workers the right to form registered trade unions and the right to embark on legal strikes.
- The Riskert Commission which was set up to address the issues of the skills shortage and manpower requirements. This commission’s recommendations that Africans who did qualify to stay in the cities have stronger rights as well as greater mobility between urban centres led to the eventual scrapping of the pass laws.

3.1.4 WHAT FORMS DID CIVIL PROTEST TAKE IN SOUTH AFRICA IN THE 1980s?

There was growing opposition to the policies of the National Party Government from various sectors of the South African population in the 1980s. Despite increased repression by the government, the challenges to apartheid intensified and civil protest played a major role in the liberation of the state.

Strategy of the National Party and the Tricameral Parliamentary System

Let us first examine the government of South Africa in the early 1980s.

The National Party Government faced many pressures in 1980 as the state faced continuing internal unrest as well as growing international condemnation.

The Prime Minister, PW Botha, tried to adapt and modernise apartheid in order to prevent black revolution and maintain white domination. The policy he adopted was known as Total Strategy and had a two-pronged approach to deal with the situation in South Africa.

- Firstly, the security forces were strengthened in order to counter the threat of MK attacks. The government told South Africans that the country faced a total onslaught by communists who were trying to infiltrate and take over southern Africa. The South African Defence Force (SADF) made regular raids on ANC bases in neighbouring states and expenditure on the military was increased to R 5 000 million a year by 1986.
- Secondly, the second strategy was to win the hearts and minds of ordinary people by doing away with petty apartheid restrictions. The idea of constitutional reform was central to Botha’s plans and he proposed a Tricameral Parliament in which Whites would share power with Indians and Coloureds.

Let us examine the introduction of the Tricameral Parliament.

Prime Minister PW Botha faced problems within his own party as the National Party was divided between the Verkramptes (conservatives) and the Verligtes (liberals). The verkrampte wing of the party considered any change to apartheid a betrayal while the verligtes were in favour of change as they realised that apartheid was no longer meeting the needs of the country. Neither wing of the National Party was prepared to abandon the principle of white power.

- Botha envisaged the reform of the parliamentary system whereby a Tricameral System of Parliament would be established in which Whites would share power with Coloureds and Indians but in such a manner that the Whites still retained control. Africans would be excluded from the Tricameral Parliament as they were expected to realise their political aspirations in the Bantu homeland states. There were diverse reactions when these proposals were tabled before parliament.
  - The Verkramptes led by Andries Treurnicht were totally opposed to the constitutional changes and Treurnicht and sixteen other members of parliament were expelled from the National Party. They formed the right wing Conservative Party (CP).
  - Dr Frederick van Zyl Slabbert, leader of the opposition Progressive Federal Party, argued against the proposals because they further entrenched apartheid. He said that the exclusion of Africans by the new constitution would enhance dissatisfaction and conflict.
- A referendum was held on 2 November 1983 to obtain the views of the White electorate about the constitutional changes. The Whites voted in favour of the change
and consequently the 1983 Constitution Act was passed. This act provided for the South African Parliament to comprise three legislative houses:

- House of Assembly for Whites (178 seats)
- House of Representatives for Coloureds (85 seats)
- House of Delegates for Indians (45 seats)

The whites still held the balance of power and PW Botha became the country’s first executive State President with greatly increased powers. The introduction of the Tricameral Parliament caused great anger and we will examine how resistance to the system caused unrest and revolt.

The prime minister had hopelessly misjudged the political climate of South Africa. The spirit of liberation evoked by the 1976 uprisings and their aftermath could not be quenched by the lifting of a few apartheid restrictions. Hundreds of thousands of South Africans were still victims of forced removals and subject to the infamous pass laws. None of Botha’s so-called reforms included giving all South Africans the vote or putting an end to the racial division of the land.

**Internal protest**

**Now we'll examine the internal forces of unrest that were active in the 1980s.**

The flow diagram below shows the main forces of internal protest. A detailed discussion on each of these aspects will follow.

![Flow Diagram of Internal Protest Forces](image)

1. **The churches**

   The church was an important component of civil society as the membership of churches in South Africa numbered millions of people and was predominantly African. Since most of the anti-apartheid leaders were in exile or imprisoned, the clergy were thrust into the forefront of the struggle. Church leaders who took an active stand against apartheid were Anglican Bishop Desmond Tutu, Allan Boesak, the Moderator of the Dutch Reformed Mission Church, Dr Beyers Naude who was a Dutch Reformed minister, and Frank Chikane of the Apostolic Faith Mission. The Churches became actively involved in the anti-apartheid struggle in the following ways:

   - Churches offered practical assistance to communities who wished to organise resistance by making church halls available for meetings, collecting food and funds for striking workers and by supporting the families of jailed workers.

Did you know? Archbishop Tutu became an international celebrity when he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 for his anti-apartheid activities.
Dr Beyers Naude, a Dutch Reformed Minister and member of the Broederbond, was an unlikely candidate for the anti-apartheid struggle. He began to question the morality of the apartheid philosophy and took up a post as Director of the Christian Institute in 1963. This institute was an anti-apartheid forum whose goal was to unite Christians of varying ethnic, denominational and linguistic backgrounds in South Africa. The Christian Institute was declared an illegal organisation in 1977 and Naude suffered government harassment. He succeeded Tutu as Secretary-General of the SACC in 1985. Naude's anti-apartheid stance led to him being rejected by his church and fellow Afrikaners and he received banning orders. This change of heart is explained by Beyers Naude in an extract from an interview which reads as follows: "... if we really want to achieve the ideal of a non-racial and democratic future, we, as Whites, have to be prepared to stand up, in a much greater solidarity with the Black community."

(2) Civic organisations

Civic organisations were formed in the townships to represent local communities. These so-called 'civics' were concerned with grassroots issues such as essential services and township grievances:

- Women, who were in the forefront of the struggles against rent increases and the demolition of shacks, played a prominent role in the civics.
- Long term projects such as health and education centres, creches and pre-schools, advice offices and culture clubs mobilised communities.
- Newspapers, newsletters and pamphlets were published by the civics to communicate with the communities who they served.

Community organisations challenged the state by means of campaigns, widespread publicity and effective mobilisation.

Countless South African women campaigners devoted their lives to the struggle against apartheid. Their involvement spanned every sphere of society from trade unions to church groups. See if you can identify the following women activists: Albertina Sisulu, Ruth First, Ray Alexander, Lilian Ngoyi, Ellen Khuzwayo and Fathima Meer.

(3) Trade unions

African workers' involvement in the trade unions allowed them an opportunity to participate in decision-making. The workers' experiences in the labour movement was used in the wider struggle for equality and freedom. The recognition of trade unions in 1979 led to a dramatic growth in trade union membership. The most prominent trade unions in the early 1980s included:

- The Federation of South African Trade Unions (FOSATU) which was launched in 1979 and was a non-racial body.
- The Council of Unions of South Africa (CUSA) which was established in 1980 and based on the principles of Black Consciousness.
- The National Union of Mineworkers (NUM) which was established in 1982.

Trade union members were awarded rights in the factories but lived in townships and communities where there were no comparable rights. This led to the politicisation of the unions and their involvement in township politics. Trade unions equipped their members with organisational skills, leadership accountability and democratic participation. These skills enabled the workers to aid civic organisations to mobilise consumer boycotts and other forms of civil society protest. A few examples of this co-operation between the trade unions and township residents included the following protest action:

- During a dispute at Fattis and Monis, the African Food and Canning Workers Union called for a community boycott of the firm's products. Activists went into supermarkets, filled trolleys with pasta and they left them at the checkout counter.
- A strike by meat workers in the Western Cape in 1980 led to a call for the boycott of red meat products. This meat boycott coincided with the school and bus boycotts leading to united strategies by students, unionists and community members.

Labour leader, Dr Neil Aggett, died in police custody in 1982. Aggett, who had tried to bring unity to the South Africa trade union movement, had been arrested by the security police in 1981. He was found dead, hanged from the barred door of his cell, on 5 November 1982. The security police said it was suicide but it was later revealed that Aggett had been held in solitary confinement, deprived of sleep and subjected to 60 hours of non-stop interrogation before he died. One hundred thousand black workers downed their tools for half an hour in factories all over South Africa to protest against Aggett's death in detention. On the day of his funeral, 5000 blacks and whites marched through the streets of Johannesburg in a show of trade union solidarity.

(4) Student protests

- Student movements are a normal part of the awakening of oppressed classes and people in modern history, but the prominent role played by Black student movements in South Africa is unique. The absence of leadership after the banning of the ANC and PAC and the imprisonment of Black political leaders created a situation
where students took the lead in protest against white oppression. Organisations that were formed to co-ordinate and lead the struggle included:

- COSAS (Congress of South African Students), established in 1979 by learners and students from technical and teacher training colleges.
- AZASO (Azanian Students Organisation), formed by university students in 1979.
- NECC (National Education Crisis Committee), launched in 1985 by representatives of students, parents, political groups and community organisations.

- School boycotts by Coloured learners in the Western Cape began in August 1980. These boycotts were an important turning point in the anti-apartheid struggle as they marked the re-emergence of organisations aligned with the ANC. Activists were prompted by the student boycotts to develop structures outside the schools and universities in the Western Cape and civic and residents organisations were formed. This helped to mobilise people in the fight against apartheid. Students played a central role in protest once again when tens of thousands of black students boycotted schools in 1984 and adopted the slogan “Liberation before Education.” Soon the unrest spread to other provinces and included Coloured and Indian schools as well as African ones.

- The government’s response to the boycotts was to close schools which turned many of the militant students into fulltime protestors. The South African youth paid a heavy price for their participation in civil protest: they were arrested, detained without trial and tortured, as well as forced to abandon their studies and thus many fled into exile.

(5) The United Democratic Front (UDF)

It was apparent to all anti-apartheid groups that national co-ordination was needed to oppose the new Tricameral System. This was achieved by the launch of the United Democratic Front at a mass rally in Mitchells Plain, Cape Town in August 1983. A thousand delegates of all races, representing 575 organisations, attended the launch and the ideal of the UDF was summed up by Allan Boesak in these three words “all, here and now... We want all our rights, we want them here and we want them now.”

How can we define the United Democratic Front?

The UDF was an umbrella body that consisted of affiliated members from trade unions, sporting bodies, women’s organisations, youth groups and community associations. Their aim was to co-ordinate internal opposition to apartheid and to create a true democracy in South Africa. It was to be a non-racial, non-violent organisation and it acknowledged the ideals in the Freedom Charter. The UDF attracted widespread support both within South Africa and internationally.

The first UDF campaign was to protest against the elections for the Tricameral Parliament. The “Don’t Vote Campaign” was launched to encourage Coloureds and Indians to boycott the elections for the Tricameral Parliament held in August 1984. This campaign was a great success as only two thirds of both communities registered to vote and 30% of registered Coloured voters went to the polls while a mere 20% of Indians had registered actually voted. This lack of participation proved that the majority of South Africans considered the

A photograph showing angry students in Soweto, 1980.

Tricameral Government as farcical and when the new constitution came into effect on 3 September 1984, there was tremendous unrest throughout the country.

The UDF inspired and motivated resistance during the popular revolt that broke out in the townships just days after the inauguration of the new government.

Activity 3.13: Individual

How did the UDF unite the anti-apartheid organisations?

Use the sources below and your own knowledge to answer the following questions:

Source 3P: This extract from The UDF by Jeremy Seekings describes the launch of the UDF in a community hall in Cape Town on 20 August 1983.

Ten thousand people attended - too many to fit in the hall, even though some resorted to sitting on the rafters (to the consternation of the organisers). Those who could not get into the hall were urged into a marquee, put up to circumvent state restrictions about open-air meetings. Here loudspeakers, and a large video screen relayed the proceedings from inside the hall. But the mood of the crowd was not dampened by these conditions, for there was a widespread belief that this was a pivotal event in the history of the struggle for freedom and democracy in South Africa.

Source 3Q: A poster advertising the launch of the UDF.

Source 3R: This photograph was taken in Hanover Park, Cape Town (a Coloured township).
Let us look at an incident of protest by UDF members that made international headlines.

Seven members of the UDF had been detained on the eve of the Indian elections in an effort to counteract the election boycott. These men were released by Pietermaritzburg Supreme Court on 7 September 1984. The Minister of Law and Order, Louis le Grange, ordered their arrest but six of the men evaded the police and sought refuge in the British Consulate in Durban.

Archie Gunedde, George Sewpersad, Billy Nair, Paul David, Mewa Ramgobin and Moorogolig Naidoo received much publicity and became known as the "Durban Six."

The Consulate staff made their six "guests" comfortable and diplomatic notes began flying between London and Pretoria. The South African government demanded that the Consulate expel the six but Britain refused to do so. The international press converged on Durban for one of the biggest stories of the year.

The six fugitives had made their protest very public and, although they were not allowed any press contacts, they managed to be interviewed over a two-way radio and shouted to journalists on the roof of a nearby building through the window. Conditions inside the building were difficult as there was no bathroom and the fugitives had to sleep on the floor. Ramgobin, Sewpersad and Naidoo left the building on 9 October and were immediately re-arrested. A crowd of six thousand people gathered outside the Consulate two days later when the remaining fugitives decided to leave following the withdrawal of their detention notices. Gumedde and David were arrested by the police as the door of the lift opened but Billy Nair was carried away from the building on the shoulders of his supporters.

What happened during the township uprising of the 1980s?

(6) Township revolts

A popular revolt began in the African townships in 1984, swept through schools and drew in the trade unions and civic associations. The UDF played a central role in the township protest as many of the organisations involved were affiliates of that organisation. The unrest began in the Vaal Triangle when residents of townships in the area demonstrated against rent increases. This resulted in the following:

- Rioters attacked black councillors whom they thought were government collaborators and the mayor of Sharpeville was killed on his doorstep.
- Militant youths ran toy taxi's through the streets and police stations, shops and government offices were set ablaze.
- The school boycotts were renewed and the violence increased.
- Vigilante groups set up people's courts and those identified as informers were punished by necklacing (a tyre doused with petrol was placed around the victim's neck and set alight).

The riots spread throughout the country and there was conflict between different political groups. UDF supporters and comrades belonging to black consciousness group AZAPO clashed. The violence was worst in Kwa-Zulu Natal (KZN) where the UDF suspected that the security police were secretly helping Inkatha (a Zulu nationalist group). Fierce fighting between black communities in KZN left hundreds of thousands homeless and continued until the 1990s. In some townships in the Eastern Cape, teenage comrades erected barricades and threw homemade petrol bombs and stones at the police.

Role of the ANC in supporting internal protest

Let us examine the role of the ANC in the liberation struggle of the 1980s.

- Although it was a political party in exile, the African National Congress (ANC) was closely involved with the civil society protest against apartheid. Despite not being involved in the township unrest of the 1980s, the ANC sent a message encouraging township residents to make the townships ungovernable and many groups displayed ANC colours during the unrest.
- At first it was almost impossible to launch guerrilla attacks from neighbouring countries as South Africa was surrounded by white buffer states. In 1975 both Mozambique and Angola became independent and Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) was able to set up guerrilla bases close to the South African border. The arrival of young exiles from South Africa after the 1976 Soweto Uprising further strengthened MK ranks and the ANC was able to absorb a substantial portion of the Black Consciousness Movement after 1980.
- MK underground networks within the country had been disrupted after 1964 and it was difficult for MK cadres to firstly, cross the well-guarded borders into South Africa and secondly, to organise attacks once in the country. Nevertheless, ANC leaders contacted representatives in Swaziland and received funds to buy minivans in which recruits were transported to South Africa from Mozambique by way of Swaziland. Between 1977 and 1982 there were at least 160 instances of violent activity instigated by the ANC. The most spectacular acts of sabotage committed by MK included the following:
  - A rocket attack on the SASOL Oil Refinery in 1989.
  - The disabling of the Koeberg Nuclear Plant in 1983.
  - The explosion of a car bomb outside the South African Air Force's headquarters in Church Street, Pretoria in May 1983.
- MK incursions were never a serious security threat but their propaganda value was immense. The internal struggle was boosted and the sabotage attacks made the state seem vulnerable. The ANC's diplomatic mission overseas was very successful and the international community regarded them as the "government-in-waiting".
Activity 3.14: Individual

What happened in Church Street, Pretoria, on 20 May 1983?

Study Source 35 and answer the questions that follow.

Source 35: An account of the Church Street Bomb, adapted from the Readers Digest Illustrated History of South Africa: The Real Story.

Church Street is a busy street in central Pretoria and office workers had begun to go home at 4.30 on Friday afternoon, 20 May 1983. Suddenly there was a thunderous explosion as the Nedbank Building that housed headquarters of the South African Airforce was blown up. The blast had been caused by a 60-kilogram bomb hidden in stolen car that detonated prematurely.

The owner of a coffee bar near the scene of the blast, told reporters the following: "Two passersby came into my shop and asked for soft drinks. As I bent down to pour their drinks, a blinding flash filled the shop. For a moment I thought there was a power cut, but then there was a thunderous explosion. The counter and soft drinks dispenser disintegrated and I was flung to the floor underneath them. As I lifted my head, I saw my two customers lying in a pool of blood." Another survivor described the aftermath of the blast as "a scene from hell."

The bomb blast had caused extensive damage to shop fronts in Church Street and people lay dead and wounded on the pavements and streets. Fire engines, police cars and ambulances rushed to the scene and by seven o'clock that evening the death toll has risen to more than a dozen and 180 people had been taken to hospitals. In retaliation, the South African Defence Force was given orders by Defence Minister, Magnus Malan, to launch pre-emptive attacks on ANC bases in Maputo on that same night. The Defence Force launched an attack on five alleged ANC bases in Maputo and claimed to have killed sixty four ANC members. Mozambique, on the other hand, claimed that six civilians had been killed in the attack.

Investigations into the bombing revealed that the two bombers, Bakayi Maseko and Freddy Shongwe, were connected to the ANC and both had died in the blast. An ANC statement from Lusaka (Zambia) claimed responsibility for the blast which had been intended for the South African Airforce offices and a spokesman expressed "regret" at the loss of civilian life.

Protest by White South Africans

So far we have examined civil protest by Black South Africans. Let us take a look at White protest against apartheid.

The white communities were kept ignorant of what was really happening in the townships by press censorship and government propaganda. Nevertheless, there were white South Africans who opposed the apartheid system, for example:

- Many students at the 'whites only' universities became involved in the anti-apartheid struggle in the 1980s. Progressive white students even stepped in and applied their skills and university resources to produce political pamphlets for black communities that lacked resources.

- The emergence of an Afrikaner counter-culture, the so-called Alternative Afrikaners, was spearheaded by singer-songwriters like Koos Kombuis and Johannes Kerkorrel.

- Helen Suzman, the Member of Parliament for the Progressive Party, maintained a relentless criticism of apartheid and was very effective in highlighting the government's violations of human rights and their disregard for the rule of law.

- The Black Sash, an organisation made up largely of white, middle-class women, protested against the injustices of apartheid by means of petitions, vigils and marches. They also ran offices to help those affected by apartheid laws and in the 1980s the Black Sash attempted to help parents find their children who had been detained by the police.
The End Conscription Campaign (ECC) was established in the 1980s to protest about the compulsory conscription of black men into the South African Defence Force once they turned 18. In 1977 the conscription period was extended to two years and men could be recalled for camps or commando duty. Troops were first deployed in the townships in 1984 and military conscripts, many of them still in their teens, found themselves ordered to fight black civilians. Those who refused to join the army faced imprisonment or were forced to leave the country.


"I had never previously gone into a black township. I would have liked to have gone there as a friend, but because I was called up for township duty, I went in wearing a uniform that was obviously hated by those people. I saw how the other side lived. After a while I started to understand what rent boycotts and school unrest were all about. I certainly would not pay rent for such piggies as they were forced to live in, and I would have revolted more as a teenager if I had been forced to go to school in the shadow of casspirs and shotguns. I really resent the fact that I had been part of that kind of maintenance of law and order."

**Activity 3.15: Individual**

**LO 1/ AS 1, 3, 4; LO 2/ AS 2, 3**

**Oral History**

What did South Africans experience during the 1980s?

The events of the 1980s in South Africa are still largely unrecorded history. As a historian, your task is to interview people who lived in South Africa in the 1980s to discover more about their experiences. If you can, interview two or three people of different race and gender so that you can compare their experiences and attitudes. Please bear in mind that this was a very traumatic period for some people and they might not want to talk about it, so it is important that you respect their privacy.

3.1.5 HOW DID CIVIL PROTEST CHANGE EASTERN EUROPE IN THE 1980s?

You have already been introduced to what happened in Eastern Europe after World War Two in Chapter One. Now let us examine the situation in the 1980s.

Civil society protest in the states of Eastern Europe was ruthlessly crushed by the Soviet Union in the 1950s and 1960s. People in the states dominated by the Soviet Union resented the following:

- They had no civil rights and anyone who criticised the government was imprisoned.
- Newspapers were censored and there was no freedom of speech.
- People were forbidden to travel to Western Europe.
- The economies of each satellite state were controlled by the Soviet Union which resulted in low wages as well as shortages of consumer goods and necessities.

The people in Eastern Europe began to resent the oppression of communist rule once more in the 1980s and the first indication of resistance occurred in Poland in 1980.

This map shows the Eastern European states that had been controlled by the Soviet Union since the end of World War Two.
Poland and the role of Solidarity

Let us focus on how Polish workers challenged the government of Poland.

- There had been regular protests in Poland throughout the years of Communist control. The Polish economy was in crisis by the late 1970s as massive foreign debt led to soaring prices, high inflation and a drop in the standard of living. Government propaganda tried to convince the workers that the economy was performing well when this was clearly false. Workers began to form small, independent trade unions as the official communist trade unions were ineffective.

Despite the Communist attempts to crush the Christian Churches in Eastern Europe, the Catholic Church had remained strong in Poland and almost all Polish people were Catholics. The election of a Polish cardinal as Pope John Paul II in 1978 was an event that brought about great rejoicing in Poland and boosted the national morale. A visit by Pope John Paul II to his home country in 1979 gave the people extra courage.

- In July 1980 the price of meat was increased and workers went on strike. Thousands of workers staged a sit-in strike at the Lenin Shipyard in the port of Gdansk on 14 August 1980. A trade union leader, Lech Walesa, climbed upon a bulldozer and addressed the government: "I have given the trust of the workers. We are occupying the shipyard until we have got what we want. This is a sit-in strike. I will be the last one to leave." The crowd cheered Walesa who became the co-ordinator and leader of the striking groups. An independent national trade union, Solidarity, was formed and confrontation between Solidarity and the Polish Government soon followed.

Profile: Lech Walesa and Solidarity

Walesa was born the son of a farmer in Popowa in 1943. He went to work as an electrician at the Lenin Shipyard in Gdansk in 1967. Walesa became active in trade unionism in 1970 and was one of the founders of the Baltic Committee for Free and Independent Trade Unions in 1978. With others, he set up Solidarity in 1980 and became its leader. Walesa was a skilled negotiator and won concessions from the government that were unprecedented in a communist state.

Walesa was imprisoned by the Polish Government in 1981. He became a symbol of the fight for freedom in Eastern Europe and was awarded the Nobel Peace prize in 1983. He led negotiations with the government in 1988 that ended Communist rule and was elected President of Poland in 1989. This independent trade union grew rapidly and more than a third of all Poland's workers were members by January 1981. Solidarity had the backing of the Catholic Church which gave it great influence. Many members saw the trade union as an alternative to the government and there were increasing signs that Solidarity was beginning to act as a political party.

Activity 3.16: Individual

LO 1/AS1, 2, 3, 4; LO 2/AS 2, 3; LO 3/AS 4

How was Poland affected by the events of December 1981?

Study the sources below and then attempt the activity that follows:


"Thousands of people were dragged from their beds and ferried through the freezing night to prisons and concentration camps while tanks patrolled the snow covered streets and stormtroopers were deployed in trouble spots. Communications were cut and a "State of War" declared."

Continued on pg 166
Let us look at the situation in the Soviet Union during the 1980s.

- Although the Communist regime in the Soviet Union appeared formidable, weaknesses became increasingly apparent in the 1980s. The stagnating economies in Communist states could be blamed on the fact that the production of goods was determined by a complex central plan. This meant that the supply and demand of goods were not regulated by market forces which resulted in the following:
  ➔ Unrealistic prices, shortages of consumer goods, and goods being of a poor quality.
  ➔ Work standards were slipping as people, guaranteed of jobs, had no incentive to work harder or better. Alcoholism in the USSR was reaching epidemic proportions and the life expectancy of Soviet men had declined, largely as a result of alcohol abuse.

Reforms introduced by Mikhail Gorbachev

Mikhail Gorbachev became leader of the Soviet Union in 1985 and introduced a reform programme to deal with the various crises affecting the Soviet bloc. His two key ideas were Glasnost (openness) and Perestroika (restructuring).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glasnost</th>
<th>Perestroika</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gorbachev called for open debate on government policies and honesty in facing up to problems.</td>
<td>This was a programme to restructure the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was hoped that an honest appraisal of cultural and historical problems would accelerate perestroika (economic reform).</td>
<td>Market forces were introduced into the Soviet economy and for the first time in 60 years it was legal to buy and sell for a profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater freedom of speech was allowed and press censorship relaxed.</td>
<td>Spending on defence was cut as it was a tremendous strain on the Soviet economy which was already in recession.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel restrictions were loosened and there was more contact with the West.</td>
<td>Soviet troops were withdrawn from Afghanistan where they had been sent to support the communist government in that state.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did Gorbachev's reforms change Eastern Europe?

- The removal of Soviet domination led to the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe:
  ➔ The Baltic States, Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia, took advantage of the spirit of glasnost to assert their rights to protect their environment and historical monuments. Later they claimed sovereignty and independence, with Latvia becoming the first Baltic republic to declare independence in 1990.
  ➔ Hungary removed its border restrictions with Austria in June, 1989. East German holidaymakers in Hungary discovered that they could drive into Austria and from there to West Germany where they had automatic rights to citizenship. Initially, 5,000 East Germans crossed the border daily.
  ➔ Free elections were held in Poland in June 1989 and Solidarity won almost all the seats.
  ➔ Perhaps the most dramatic indication of the collapse of Soviet control was the dismantling of the infamous Berlin Wall in November 1989.

The collapse of the Berlin wall and the liberation of Eastern Europe.

Let us examine the collapse of the Berlin Wall in more detail.

East Germany was plunged into crisis by the mass flight of its citizens via Hungary to the West. Huge anti-government demonstrations were held and the troops refused to fire on the demonstrators when ordered to do so. Gorbachev made it clear to the authorities in East Germany that the Soviet Union would not move in to “restore order.”
In November 1989 travel restrictions for East Germans were lifted and a promise of free elections was made. On 9 November all restrictions were lifted and jubilant crowds from both sides of Berlin passed through the abandoned checkpoints. The crowds clambered onto the wall, the symbol of a divided city, and began to break off chunks of concrete. Others arrived with sledge-hammers and the Berlin Wall was demolished. After years of separation, Berliners were at last free and united.

**Activity 3.17: Group**

**How did Germans react to the dismantling of the Berlin Wall?**

It is 10 November 1989 and the Berlin Wall, symbol of the Cold War, is no longer a barrier. For the first time since World War Two, Berlin is a unified city. You are required to undertake an on-the-spot report for a German television newscast.

(a) Try to find out more about what happened in November 1989 in Berlin by doing some research;

(b) Work out questions and responses for the people who will be interviewed for your report. Try to imagine the excitement and express the attitudes of different people at this time, for example:
   - East Berliners who have the opportunity to live in a capitalist democracy.
   - West Berliners who can visit relations in East Berlin freely.
   - Border guards and communist police who might be feeling confused and helpless.

**What were the consequences of the events in 1989 in Eastern Europe?**

Civil society protest in Eastern Europe had brought about the assertion of civil rights and human values as opposed to communist domination. The results of the events of 1989 were profound, for instance:

- The Cold War that had dominated international relations since World War Two ended and the empire created by Stalin vanished.
- The states of Eastern Europe held free elections in which the Communists were swept from power. Romania was the only state in which a communist leader, the dictator Ceausescu, had to be overthrown by force.
- The Soviet Union broke up in 1991 and became the Russian Federation.

**3.1.6 CONCLUSION**

Civil society protest brought about many changes between 1960 and 1990. Protesters believed that peaceful demonstrations would help them achieve their goals. Civil protest happened as a reaction against the escalating violence of the 1960s, especially the violence used by the United States of America against a peasant army in Vietnam which caused outrage. Many young people embraced the ideals of love and peace and sought to change the world by means of civil protests. The world became more aware of human rights as African Americans gained their civil rights and women’s rights were publicised. Oppressed societies in South Africa and Eastern Europe used civil society protest to gain freedom and democracy. The values and conventions of the period immediately following World War Two were called into question and undoubtedly civil protest aimed to make the world a better place in which to live.
SELF STUDY AND ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES

1.1 KEY QUESTION: Why did some Black nationalist groups advocate violent forms of protest in the United States of America?
[LO 1/ AS 1, 2, 3, 4; LO 2/ AS 2, 3; LO 3/ AS 3, 4]

Study the sources below and answer the questions that follow:

Source A: An extract from a speech by Malcolm X in which he promoted violence as a means of getting equal rights.

"I don't go along with any kind of non-violence unless everybody's going to be non-violent. If they make the Ku Klux Klan non-violent, I'll be non-violent, if they make the White Citizens' Council non-violent, I'll be non-violent. But as long as you've got somebody else not being non-violent, I don't want anybody coming to me talking any non-violent talk ....

You get freedom by letting your enemy know that you'll do anything to get your freedom; then you'll get it. It's they only way you'll get it ... fight them ... and then you'll get your freedom."

Source B: This photograph, taken from *Modern World History* by Ben Walsh, shows a protest in 1967 by members of the Black Panther Party against the arrest of one of their leaders, Huey Newton.

Source C: This account of race riots in the United States of America is taken from *Modern World History* by Ben Walsh.

From 1965 to 1967 American cities suffered a wave of race riots. The cause in most cases was poor relations between the police and black people. Most of the USA's cities were divided along race lines. Many black working-class people who lived in the inner cities felt that they did not get the same protection from crime as whites. They distrusted the police.

Many black rioters were influenced by the radical black nationalists. Others simply joined the riots as an expression of their frustration about the way they were treated in the USA. Major riots took place in most of the USA's cities, but the most serious were in the Watts area of Los Angeles in August 1965 and in Detroit in July 1967. President Johnson asked the Governor of Illinois to investigate the riots and his conclusion was that racism was the cause. He talked of two USAs, one black and one white.

1.1 Refer to Source A.
(a) Explain, in your own words, why Malcolm X did not believe in non-violent means of protest.
(b) How did Malcolm X think that African Americans would get their freedom?
(c) Explain whether or not you would have supported Malcolm X if you had been an African American teenager at this time. Write an argument of 8 to 10 lines to support your decision.

1.2 Use Source B.
(a) What image of the Black Panther group is portrayed in this photograph?
(b) How would this source have affected American public opinion on civil rights for black people?
(c) Explain the limitations of this source for someone wanting to know more about Black Panther Party.

1.3 Refer to Source C:
(a) What were the reasons for race riots in American cities between 1965 and 1967, according to this source?
(b) Explain how these riots might have been encouraged by the words of Malcolm X in Source A.

1.4 Extended Writing
(a) Your school is holding a special assembly to commemorate Human Rights. Using the sources and your own knowledge, write a speech of about a page on Malcolm X and his fight for freedom to deliver at this assembly.
(b) In Source C, we read of "two USAs, one black and one white." Using all the sources and your own knowledge, write an essay of 2 to 3 pages on race relations in the United States of America and the attempts of Black nationalists to gain freedom by violent means.
2. KEY QUESTION: Why did the introduction of a new constitution in 1983 lead to more civil society protest in South Africa?
[LO 1/ AS 1, 2, 3, 4; LO 2/ AS 2, 3; LO 3/ AS 3, 4]

Study the sources below and answer the questions that follow:

Source D: The proposed Tricameral System was condemned by the leader of the Progressive Federal Party, Dr Frederick van Zyl Slabbert. His ideas are expressed in this extract from one of his speeches:

"The tragedy for South Africa is that at a time when the voters have come to acknowledge the need for such reform, the National Party has come forward with a plan that is so defective and ill conceived that if implemented will set back the process of reform for at least a decade. What South Africa needs so urgently is not the National Party’s apartheid policy dressed up in the form of a constitutional plan, but a constitution for South Africa which can bridge the divisions that exist in our country and bring our people together in a great co-operative effort that will guarantee the future of all South Africans."

Source E: The township revolt began on 3 September 1984 in Sharpeville. Petrus Tom, a labour organiser and Sharpeville resident, described the first moments of this rebellion in his autobiography, My Life Struggle.

"Everybody was at home. There was nobody who was at work that day, on the third day of September. The children made the road blocks before they burnt those houses. They took old cars and burning tyres, and blocked the street. They were trying to stop the police from getting through. The places where they were burning. I think it was that day that the children decided to go to the administration offices. Everything was disrupted. The bottlosetores were broken into and burnt. There were no buses coming into the township, no taxis, nothing. The children didn’t even want to see a private car. Everything was at a standstill. On Wednesday they said everybody must go to the administration offices, we must go and protest there. Early in the morning I was told by my children that there were a lot of children with banners saying everybody must go to the offices. They were singing - a lot of children. I went to see what was happening ...

I found the Hippos [troop carriers] standing at the administrative offices together with the soldiers with television cameras. They were blocking the people from getting to the administrative board offices. They said we could only send delegates to talk with them, not all the people. People were delegated by those children to go and demand that we pay R30 rent and no more."

Source F: This photograph shows angry youth returning from a funeral in Pretoria.

Source G: Students at the University of Cape Town staged a protest against the actions of the South African Defence Force. This photograph is from Graham Leach’s book, South Africa.
2.1 Read Source D.
(a) What solution to the problems in South Africa does Van Zyl Slabbert suggest?
(b) Explain, using your own knowledge, what is meant by "the voters have come to acknowledge the need for such reform."
(c) Using your own knowledge, explain why the National Party's constitutional reform was defective (flawed).

2.2 Refer to Source E.
(a) Which group of people seems to be organizing the protest?
(b) According to this source, what issue led to people gathering at the [Bantu] administration offices?
(c) Identify acts of protest mentioned in this source.
(d) Explain whether or not you consider this account a reliable piece of historical evidence.

2.3 Both Sources F and G are photographs of youth protest. Compare these two photographs by contrasting the mood of the protestors, the issues that concern them and the banners they carry.

2.4 Explain, using your own knowledge, what is meant by the words "No to SADF murder" in Source G.

2.5 Study the cartoon, Source H and answer the following questions.
(a) Discuss how the cartoonist has portrayed the situation in South Africa in the 1980s.
(b) What is ironic about the father's words to his son?
(c) Explain whether or not the cartoonist supports the National Party Government.

2.6 Extended Writing
(a) Using these sources and your own knowledge, write a page on the involvement of the South African youth in civil protest in the 1980s. This report will be published in the local newspaper on 16 June as part of an article on Youth Day.
(b) "The new constitution of 1983 appeared to offer far-reaching reform of apartheid yet it initiated an era of the most sustained civil protest ever seen in South Africa." Respond to this statement by writing an essay of 3 to 4 pages on reaction to the Tricameral System by South Africans in the 1980s.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE IMPACT OF THE COLLAPSE OF THE USSR IN 1989

4.1. What was the impact of the collapse of the USSR in 1989?

KEY QUESTION FOR THIS CHAPTER:

4.1. What was the impact of the collapse of the USSR in 1989?
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- Gorbachev and reform
- The reaction to Gorbachev's reforms
- Reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union
- Impact of the collapse of the Soviet Union on the world

4.1.2 What was the impact of the collapse of the USSR on South Africa?
- South Africa's position regarding the Cold War
- The Communist threat - how real was it?
- The situation in South Africa in the 1980s
- The National Party's attempts at reform
- The reaction of the liberation movements to the government's reform policy
- The impact of foreign pressure on the situation in South Africa
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- The impact of the collapse of the USSR on South Africa
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SKILLS

At the end of this chapter you will be able to ...
- Identify issues related to the world after the Cold War
- Extract relevant information and data from sources
- Explain historical concepts such as communism, capitalism and democracy
- Categorise appropriate sources
- Analyse, interpret and evaluate information and data gathered from a variety of sources
- Evaluate sources to assess appropriateness of the sources for the task
- Use evidence to formulate an argument
- Use appropriate means of communicating knowledge
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VALUES AND ATTITUDES

At the end of this chapter you will appreciate ...
- What the world was like in the 1980s and 1990s
- How economic wealth and political power determine history
- How our world has been shaped by the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War
- What challenges confronted the world after the collapse of the USSR
- How the history of South Africa was influenced by the Cold War
4.1.1. INTRODUCTION: WHAT WAS THE WORLD LIKE BEFORE 1989?

The world before the collapse of the Soviet Union

Let us first consider what the world was like prior to 1989 and the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In the 1970s the Cold War still dominated international politics and world attention. Richard M. Nixon, president of the United States of America, was a staunch anti-communist who had promised to remove the USA from its involvement in Vietnam. Due to internal pressures and the mounting cost of the war the last US troops left South-East Asia in 1972. The USA had failed to achieve its objectives in this Cold War conflict. Nixon and the new Soviet President, Leonid Brezhnev, were bitter rivals but they both realised that a nuclear war would destroy both nations and so they entered a period known as détente (a cooling off period). During this period of détente, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I) was negotiated whereby both countries agreed to limit their nuclear weapons and the USA also sold 750 million dollars worth of grain to the Soviets. This demonstrated co-operative relations and thus, a shift away from the Cold War.

What does détente mean?
It is the relaxing or easing of tensions between nations. In this instance, it refers to the easing of tension between the two major Cold War rivals, the USA and USSR.

Activity 4.1: Individual

What was the US-Soviet relationship like in the 1970s?

Study the sources below and then attempt the activity, using information from the sources as well as your own knowledge.


(a) Refer to Source 4A.
(i) Explain the meaning of the term “détente” in the context of the Cold War.
(ii) What message is the cartoonist trying to convey in Source 4A?
(iii) Explain whether the attitude that shown towards the détente period is biased.
(iv) Examine the reliability of Source A as view of the situation that existed between the superpowers in 1972?

(b) Study Source 4B.
(i) Using your own knowledge, what do you understand by the acronym “SALT”?
(ii) What reasons, according to the cartoonist, motivated the SALT talks?
(iii) How effective is Source 4B in conveying its central message?
(iv) What agreement was reached during the SALT talks?
(v) Of what value is this source to a historian studying the Cold War?

(c) Compare Sources 4A and 4B and show the different ways in which the British and American cartoonists have portrayed the relationship between the USA and USSR in the 1970s.

The détente continued and peace between the two nations existed in varying levels through much of the 1970s. Konstantin Chernenko replaced Brezhnev as Soviet president who, in turn, was replaced by Yuri Andropov when he died. When Andropov died suddenly, the Politburo (the most powerful ruling body of the Communist Party) turned to the young Mikhail Gorbachev to fulfill the role of president.
Gorbachev and reform

Let us now focus on Gorbachev as the new president of the USSR.

He was not a hard-liner like the other communist leaders had been and he had new ideas that would later change world politics.

Profile: Mikhail Gorbachev

Mikhail Gorbachev was born into a family of poor farmers on 2 March 1931 near Stavropol, USSR. At age 13 he began working on the farm. He studied law at Moscow University in the 1950s and worked as a Communist Party official after he graduated. He was eventually promoted to become a member of the central committee of the Communist Party in 1971. In 1980, at the age of only 49 he became a member of the Politburo and served as deputy president under President Chernenko. When Chernenko died, Gorbachev became the new leader of the Communist Party at the age of 52 in March 1985. Almost from the start of his time in office, Gorbachev strove for significant reforms so that the communist system would work more efficiently and democratically, hence the two key phrases of the Gorbachev era "glasnost" (openness) and "perestroika" (reform). Gorbachev also began to argue in favour of an end to the arms race with the West. His reforms were not popular with the hard-liners of the Communist Party and so while he was on holiday in the Crimea in August 1981, they staged a coup (overthrow). It was not successful, but Gorbachev lost prestige. At the end of 1991 he was forced to resign as president of a Soviet Union that no longer existed. Many Russians blamed him for their political and economic problems in the post Cold War era, but the Western world view him as the Nobel Peace Prize winner who helped end the Cold War.

In 1981, Ronald Reagan, the president of the United States, a conservative, promised the USA a new "Star Wars" defence system capable of knocking enemy missiles out of the sky. In 1985, Reagan therefore ordered American scientists to start working on a Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI), his "Star Wars" plan, as people soon called it. The idea behind "Star Wars" was to set up a kind of giant shield in space to use weapons such as lasers to shoot down Russian missiles before they could reach the USA. As a result, a new arms race began as both the Soviets and the Americans tried to develop bigger, better and more technologically advanced weapons.

What reforms did Gorbachev implement in the USSR?

Reagan's Star Wars plan and the resulting arms race had an enormous impact on Soviet thinking and thus, during the 1980s, major changes took place in the Soviet Union, both in its domestic and foreign policies. These changes had an enormous impact not only on the lives of millions of Russians but on the world as a whole. These reforms contributed to the end of the Cold War and this, in turn, had an impact on the world, including Africa.

- When Mikhail Gorbachev became Secretary-General of the Soviet Communist Party in 1985, he inherited a country that was facing many problems. Not only was the USSR in a state of "Cold War" with the west, but the Soviet standard of living was even lower than in most other Eastern European countries. The people were suffering severe food shortages and the government had to import grain from the USA and other western countries. Health standards were poor and housing was inadequate and declining.

Gorbachev aimed to do the following in the Soviet Union:

- Restructure and restore the Soviet economy by reducing Communist Party control of the economy. His policy, which allowed more competition and more incentives, became known as "Perestroika".
- Reduce military spending.
- Encourage Western companies to invest in the USSR.
- Facilitate transparency about government policy and listen to and take note of public opinion.
- Allow some form of elections, but continue to ensure that the real power remained in the hands of the Communist Party.
- Gorbachev did implement reforms in the Soviet Union via his Perestroika and Glasnost programmes. Perestroika was the reshaping of the Soviet economy to allow more profit-making by individuals and to reduce control by the government. Glasnost meant more openness about government and more freedom of speech.
- Criticism of government policy would be allowed and corruption by government officials would be stopped. People were thus offered more freedom and reforms in the Soviet economy resulted in people being able to buy and sell for a profit for the first time since Stalin had come to power over sixty years before.
- The Soviet government, however, spent so much money on trying to keep up with American military spending that they were unable to provide some of the basic consumer goods to the Russian population. This resulted in huge unrest in the Soviet Union as the main philosophy of communism was to address the essential basic needs of all its people. Gorbachev's policies therefore upset many traditional Soviet communists, as well as, leading the people of the Soviet Union to expect greater changes in the future. Soon, the country was in turmoil as people from all sides critcised Gorbachev.

How did Gorbachev respond to the West?

Between 1985 and 1991 there was once again a détente in the relationship between the USA and USSR, due partly to the attitude of Reagan and Gorbachev. Despite having different aims, they met and developed a respect for one another. Hence, they were able to make real progress on the reduction of NATO and Warsaw Pact conventional armed forces. In 1987 they signed the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty in which the superpowers agreed to eliminate all intermediate missiles in Europe within three years. This was later followed by the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, which resulted in the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks Treaty (START). These talks focused on long-range missiles and resulted in an agreement between the USSR and USA to reduce the number of weapons significantly.
The reaction to Gorbachev’s reforms

What was Soviet reaction to Gorbachev’s reforms?

Although many welcomed Gorbachev’s reforms, a significant number of hard-line communists were upset. In fact, discontent grew in the Soviet Union and many called for the end of communism altogether, as economic reforms had not brought immediate improvement in the people’s daily lives. In August 1991, hard-line Communists overthrew Gorbachev who was made prisoner in his own country. Boris Yeltsin, the Mayor of Moscow, led a demonstration against this coup as he insisted that the process of reform continue in order to rescue Russia from a slide back into the days of Communist repression. Yeltsin was seen as a hero to the Russian people. Open elections were held for the first time and Yeltsin was chosen as the new leader. As the new President of the USSR, Yeltsin actually encouraged the break up of the Soviet Union. Many supported this idea while others felt it was going too far. In December 1991, Yeltsin disbanded the Communist Party in Russia and formally ended the Soviet Union. The USSR was broken up, the republics were set free and the Soviet Union was replaced by a Commonwealth of Independent States.

A map, adapted from The Great Power Conflict, showing the independent republics of the Russian Federation.


Activity 4.2: Individual

What reforms did Gorbachev implement in the USSR?

Refer to the information in this chapter as well as your own knowledge and then attempt the activity that follows:

- Mikhail Gorbachev has just been appointed Secretary-General of the Communist Party in the Soviet Union. He has “inherited” a country that is facing many problems, which he hopes to address through his new programme of reform.

- Prepare a two minute speech that Gorbachev would have presented to the senior members of the Politburo. In your presentation, you should outline and justify your plans for the Soviet Union that is in crisis.

Reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union

So, what were the reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union?

There are several reasons for the collapse, as follows:

- The political and economic reforms implemented by Gorbachev.
- Yeltsin’s actions: the disbanding of the Communist Party and the formal ending of the USSR.
- The massive spending on military technology that the Soviets saw as necessary in response to NATO’s increased armaments of the 1980s, which is often seen as the main cause of the collapse of the Soviet Union.
- Soviet efforts to keep up with NATO military expenditures resulted in massive economic disruption and the bankruptcy of the Soviet economy.
- The pace of military technology was advancing at such a rapid rate that the Soviets were simply incapable of keeping up and still maintaining a healthy economy.
- The arms race, both nuclear and conventional, was too much for the underdeveloped USSR economy of the time. It is for this reason that President Reagan, portrayed by some as a militarist or warmonger, is seen by many as the man who “won” the Cold War by forcing the Soviets into bankruptcy through his aggressive pursuit of military expansion.

A cartoon from The Guardian showing the Communist hammer and sickle in tears.
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Impact of the collapse of the Soviet Union on the world

So, what did the collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War mean for the world?

The Cold War was the longest conflict of the twentieth century and had a huge impact on the world. It affected everything, from political ideology, foreign and domestic policies of countries, personal lives of thousands of people around the world, even the presidency of the USA. With the fragmentation and subsequent dissolution of the Soviet Union came the collapse of the so-called "Iron Curtain" in Eastern Europe, the reunification of Germany, an end to the Cold War and the beginning of a new chapter in world history. The end of the Cold War and the "collapse" of the Soviet Union were to have a profound impact not only on Americans and Russians, but also on many African countries including South Africa.

4.1.2 WHAT WAS THE IMPACT OF THE COLLAPSE OF THE USSR ON SOUTH AFRICA?

South Africa's position regarding the Cold War

What was South Africa's position regarding the Cold War?

During the 1970s there was international opposition to South Africa's policy of apartheid but this was weak in substance. The South African government managed to offer an effective response as a result of the Cold War. As de-colonisation swept through Africa, the South African government's foreign propaganda used the Cold War fears and prejudices of the Americans and Europeans to its advantage. They were careful to portray South Africa as a stable, civilised and indispensable member of the "free world" that opposed international communism. Many members of the "free world" believed that the South African government's aim was world domination and the South African government pointed out that imperial powers were leaving tropical Africa open to communist infiltration. They also portrayed the African National Congress (ANC) as a communist organisation that was directed by Moscow and they blamed the communists for uprisings such as the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960 and the Soweto Uprising of 1976.

The Communist threat - how real was it?

Let us consider how real the communist threat was to South Africa?

- The Soviet Union and its Communist Eastern European satellite states, especially East Germany, did champion the interests of the third world against Western imperialism. In Africa, for instance, they supplied arms and ammunition to resistance movements in Angola, Mozambique and Zimbabwe (Rhodesia). In Zimbabwe, however, the Soviets supported the weaker of the two resistance movements, whereas its rival, communist China supported Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe African National Union or ZANU who eventually won the election held in 1980. This communist activity in countries close to South Africa alarmed the South African government.
- The Soviet Union also armed and transported Cuban troops when the Portuguese left Angola in 1975, to help the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA). This helped the MPLA to consolidate control in Angola and resist an invasion launched by the South African army in collusion with the USA.
- The Soviet Union and its allies also had close links with the ANC. They provided education and military training for South African refugees and they were the main suppliers of arms for the military wing of the ANC, Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK). The ANC also included communists in its ranks and among its leaders. Its top leaders such as Nelson Mandela and Oliver Tambo, however, were not communists. Mandela was very clear about where the ANC stood regarding communism. He stated that the ANC was not a communist organisation, but that the South African Communist Party had supported its struggle against racism since the early 1920s and through the years when the ANC had no other allies. He stated that the ANC was not the kind of organisation that would desert its friends. He said: "Which man of honour will ever desert a lifelong friend at the insistence of a common opponent and still maintain a measure of credibility among his people". Thus, the ANC did enjoy very close working relations with the Communist Party and even supported some of its principles, however it declared it was not a communist party.
- Southern Africa was never a high priority on the agenda of the Soviet Union. The communist government in Moscow was mainly concerned with preserving its control of Eastern Europe, defending its border with China and increasing its influence in Southeast Asia and the Horn of Africa. It was not really practical for the Soviet Union to risk a military confrontation with the Western powers in distant southern Africa. Soviet trade with countries in southern Africa was significant and so was the level of aid to the black southern African states. The South African government's propaganda against communism was a very skilful attempt to divert attention away from the real causes of black resistance in South Africa. This strategy did prove successful.
- During the Cold War, powerful interests in the USA and Western Europe were wary of disturbing the status quo in South Africa. With their Cold War perspective they were prone to exaggerating the communist threat, and with their business perspective they tended to assume that economic growth was bound to erode the apartheid system.

A map, adapted from A Map History of the Modern World, showing South Africa and her neighbours 1976 - 1990.
The situation in South Africa in the 1980s

Let us focus on the situation in South Africa in the 1980s.

- In the 1980s the South African government faced a transformed world order. The African continent was no longer controlled by Europeans and South Africa had become isolated. Most of its neighbours were no longer European colonies but independent black states. Also, by the end of 1989 the Soviet Union was beginning to disintegrate, the communist regimes in Eastern Europe were collapsing and the Berlin Wall had fallen. These profound changes in the wider world contributed to the end of the apartheid regime in South Africa. The collapse of the USSR deprived the liberation movement of its main source of support and also made the government's claim to be protecting South Africans from a communist onslaught unrealistic. The Western-dominated world powers supported the move in South Africa to look seriously at resolving its problems peacefully and democratically.

- Many influential white South Africans such as Frederik Van Zyl Slabbert, leader of the Progressive Federal Party, acknowledged these new realities. At the same time, it was becoming increasingly evident that the NP government could not maintain white supremacy indefinitely. Some of the leaders of the National Party started to realise that apartheid was not the answer to the needs of white capitalist development and that reform of some kind was necessary. The NP was aware, however, that the introduction of drastic economic reform would significantly undermine its support base and therefore, if reform was introduced it needed to be moderate reform. After the Soweto Uprising of 1976-7 there was no doubt that the continued repression of black people would not ensure political stability. The government began to believe that any reforms introduced also needed to include the development of a strong black middle class, which it felt would act as a "bulwark (defence) against revolution".

A photograph taken from The Other Side of History, showing Van Zyl Slabbert (fourth from the left) in Moscow in 1989.

The National Party's attempts at reform

How did the NP government go about implementing reforms?

- A 12-point "total strategy" was developed and an attempt was made to co-opt a significant proportion of the black community to accept this plan. It was expected that this would redeem South Africa's poor status in the eyes of the rest of the world and therefore also facilitate economic growth. Constitutional reform was intended to be an important part of the "total strategy" and in 1983 the Tricameral constitution was implemented extending Parliament to include two other houses: The House of Representatives for Coloureds and the House of Delegates for Indians. The greatest weakness in this reform process was that Africans who constituted the majority in the country, were totally excluded. Hence, there was much opposition to the Tricameral system from the outset.

- Reforms continued in the 1980s amidst increasing revolt against the government and its various structures. Resistance took various forms and was accompanied by increasing violence. To critical observers, the reforms introduced along with the constitutional changes made by the government, were made merely to avoid the losing of power and control. By early 1984, it had become clear to the majority that government reform was inadequate and constitutional reform in particular was seen as a perpetuation (continuation) of apartheid.

So, why did the NP government's thinking change?

- Aware of the serious nature of black resistance against their exclusion from the 1983 Tricameral constitution, the government's thinking changed to the extent that in 1985 the principle of black political representation in the central government was accepted. The NP admitted for the first time that the homeland policy had been a failure and realised that black South Africans should be granted political expression outside the homelands. Although the principle of universal franchise and common citizenship was acknowledged, the NP government under President P.W. Botha had no intention of getting rid of the existing national states or accommodating black South Africans politically within the same system as that of the white population.
The reaction of the liberation movements to the government's reform policy

What was the reaction of the liberation movements to the government's reform policy?

- The liberation struggle continued unabated with two new organisations being formed in 1983, the National Forum (NF) and the United Democratic Front (UDF). Both of these organisations were federations of trade unions, religious, civic and community organisations. The UDF, with its adherence to the Freedom Charter, played a more significant role, drawing support from all parts of the country.

- By the mid 1980s the townships in South Africa had become ungovernable - exactly what the ANC in exile had hoped would happen. Starting in the Vaal Triangle, resistance to the government spread rapidly throughout the country. Large-scale unemployment, as a result of the declining economy, aggravated the situation. Resistance took the form of armed attacks on police stations and other government targets combined with mass action. Much to the concern of many South Africans, bombing of public places also increased.

So, how did the government respond to the increased resistance?

- The government responded by calling in the army to assist the police in October 1984, but this just resulted in more resistance against the government. In response to the increased resistance the government declared a state of emergency on 20 July 1985. About 5000 people were arrested and all organised political meetings were banned. The state of emergency, except for a short period in 1986, continued until 1990. This did not end the liberation struggle and, to the contrary, increased the drive for liberation. Opinion polls at this time showed a marked shift in political loyalty among urban blacks who by the mid-1980s wanted a political settlement, which would comprise "one person one vote" in a unitary system that excluded any form of power sharing. Support for the ANC grew, whereas the more moderate Inkatha Freedom Party began to lose support to the ANC-aligned organisations such as the UDF, COSATU and NUM (National Union of Mineworkers). This aspect is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

The impact of foreign pressure on the situation in South Africa

How did foreign pressures affect the situation in South Africa?

- By this time, there was increased foreign pressure on the South African government to bring about reform. Anti-apartheid organisations in Western countries mobilised support for economic pressure against South Africa. By mid 1985, the US Congress forced President Reagan, who was strongly opposed to sanctions, to accept limited sanctions against South Africa. Economic Community (EEC) member states followed suit with restrictions on economic ties with South Africa. The message to the South African government was all too clear, reform had to be speeded up to avoid more drastic measures.

- Expectations in South Africa and in Western countries rose when foreign diplomats were informed that the state president, P.W. Botha would make an important announcement regarding reform in a speech at the Natal congress of the NP on 15 August 1985. However, no new reform measures were mentioned in his speech but rather his determination not to yield to foreign pressure. He vaguely committed himself to reform by saying that on that day South Africa was "crossing the Rubicon." This speech, which became known as the "Rubicon Speech" (a speech announcing an important turning point) had a disastrous effect on South Africa politically and economically, as follows:
  - Many major international banks demanded immediate repayment of their loans, and also refused to renew short-term and medium-term loans.
  - By 1987 more than 250 foreign companies withdrew from South Africa.
  - Loss of foreign capital seriously hampered economic growth and resulted in increased unemployment.
  - Economic stagnation, unfortunately, also meant the reform process was slowed down as it was estimated that an annual growth rate of 5.7% was needed to facilitate effective social reform. The growth rate in 1982 was less than one per cent.
  - A growing perception began to take root that the NP had become incapable of handling the crisis. At the beginning of the 1980s the NP had had a dominant position in white politics, but by the late 1980s it had lost ground to the left (radical and conservative support).
  - A growing number of influential businessmen, clergy, academics, politicians and journalists began to believe that talks with the ANC were necessary in order to end the turmoil in South Africa.
  - By the late 1980s the Government, under PW Botha, must have realized that their "total strategy" was not working as neither the security forces nor the state of emergency had stopped the revolt. In fact, their policy had only given rise to increased hostility by the liberation movements and from foreign countries. Reform measures such as the relaxation of pass laws and influx control that had been introduced did not have the desired effect because they fell short of the expectations of black people. Although the government was disappointed by the lack of recognition for its reform attempts, they did not change their policy. They continued to suppress resistance while simultaneously pursuing reform within the limits of the defined strategy.
1989: the impact of the collapse of the USSR on South African politics

So, what happened in 1989 that changed the course of South African history?

- By the late 1980s South Africa had become increasingly militarised, its economy was seriously damaged and in the general elections of 1989 there was a swing towards the conservative right-wing parties. The reforms that the government introduced were more administrative in nature and not real constitutional reform that would give the black population any meaningful role in politics.
- 1989 was a significant year in both world and South African politics. In Europe, the Berlin Wall came down on the 9 November 1989. This symbolised the fall of institutionalised communism. In South Africa important events also occurred. PW Botha suffered a second stroke in January 1989, just before the opening of parliament. Botha desperately tried to cling to power but in August 1989 he finally retired. He was succeeded by FW de Klerk, who was sworn in as president in September 1989 and from the outset, adopted a different stance to that of Botha. These two events were to have a profound impact on the history of South Africa.

Let us look at how the collapse of the Soviet Union had an impact on South African politics.

- In early 1989 the signs of the collapse of the Soviet Union were already there. Although some Soviet officials were still largely supportive of the ANC, among others, there was a marked decline of enthusiasm, especially for MK and the so-called armed struggle. Some even spoke of MK being a “glorified fundraising exercise”. The fall of the Berlin Wall not only signified the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, it also drove home some hard lessons to the ANC and the NP government. The ANC could no longer rely on Soviet support and the NP government could no longer pretend to be a bulwark against the spread of communism in Africa.
- Up until 1989, FW de Klerk did not clearly identify himself with either the left wing or the right wing of the NP. However, once he had assumed power, he indicated that he was determined to make more radical reforms than any of his predecessors. Many factors influenced FW de Klerk’s decision to pursue a new policy for South Africa, some internal and others international. Of all the international influences, none was greater than the Gorbachev reforms that began the unraveling of the communist empire. These reforms eased the government’s phobia that a black struggle against apartheid was actually a conspiracy directed from Moscow. This enabled De Klerk to justify the new approach he wished to adopt by engaging in discussions with the liberation organisations.

The impact of Namibian independence on South Africa

Let us now consider how Namibian (South West African) Independence influenced De Klerk’s action?

- The negotiations which brought about the independence of Namibia in October 1989, had a positive influence on FW de Klerk’s strategy for the future of South Africa. South Africa had administered the former German colony under the terms of an old League of Nations mandate. The Soviet Union under the leadership of Gorbachev, started settling regional conflicts and removing points of friction with the United States.
- One area where they did this was Namibia, where a deal was struck to have Cuban troops pull out of Angola in return for South Africa’s withdrawal from Namibia. The South West African People’s Organisation (SWAPO), which in many ways was similar to the ANC, won the elections that followed in independent Namibia and South Africa handed over the territory peacefully to an enemy it had been fighting for thirty years. Sir Robin Renwick, British ambassador in South Africa at the time said: “Namibia showed the South Africans that this kind of change would not necessarily have catastrophic results.”

A photograph, taken from Understanding History, of a SWAPO Youth League rally in Katutura township, Windhoek, during Namibia’s first free election campaign, 1989.
The fall of the Berlin Wall and its impact on South Africa

Let us look at how the fall of the Berlin Wall influenced the situation in South Africa.

- Three months after the Berlin Wall came down, de Klerk made his 2 February 1990 speech. In this speech he announced his decision to unban the African National Congress (ANC), the Pan African Congress (PAC) and South African Communist Party (SACP) and to release Mandela and other political prisoners from prison. Political commentators have speculated about his reasons for taking such a far-reaching step. Although there were several possible reasons, one was the belief that the collapse of communism in Russia and Eastern Europe had a detrimental effect on the ANC and that the organisation would be prepared to make some sacrifices. The ANC also realised that they faced an entirely new situation. De Klerk at this time said: "I would have been a fool not to take the gap that the fall of the Wall gave me." The fall of the Wall also meant that the "West", in whatever form, was no longer available to help the apartheid government fight communism as there was no longer any organised communism.

A photograph of FW de Klerk.

Activity 4.4: Pairs

What influenced FW de Klerk’s decision to unban the ANC and release Mandela?

Using the information in this chapter, as well as any additional information gathered through research, attempt the following activity.

Source 4D: This is an excerpt from the Unisa Study Guide in which FW de Klerk speaks to his brother, Dr Willem de Klerk.

"The insight and opportunity to unban prohibited organisations, including the ANC, coincided with the logical conclusion that such a step would mean political normalisation. In any event, many organisations were already busy promoting their policies and ideals. At the same time, the decline and collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and Russia put a new complexion on things. The ANC was formerly an instrument of Russian expansionism in Southern Africa; when that threat fell away, the carpet was pulled under the ANC; its base of financing, counseling and moral support had crumbled. It was as if God had taken a hand - a new turn in world history. We had to seize the opportunity.”
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Enrichment
De Klerk and transformation in South Africa

- With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, support for the ANC to combat racism and oppression became universalised and the USA was no exception. The ANC now had a whole new range of Western allies. They had never considered that the "Capitalist West" would support them as a "National Democratic Movement" to get rid of apartheid. The ANC leader, Nelson Mandela realised this and the first country he visited after his release was not Russia but the USA. The American public honoured him and from that moment on, De Klerk was on the defensive. The issue was no longer how to preserve White minority participation in a future South Africa, but how to transfer White minority control to a new fully democratic constitution.

When Nelson Mandela visited the United States, he had a triumphant ticker-tape parade down Broadway in a 40-car motorcade. In Washington, he addressed both houses of Congress where he received a standing ovation.

- Both De Klerk and the ANC faced the same set of circumstances, for which neither was responsible but which each thought they could exploit to their advantage. De Klerk really thought that he had the ANC at a disadvantage because of the fall of the Berlin Wall. The ANC were reluctant about negotiations, but saw how rapidly international support was flowing in their direction.
- The De Klerk speech started a process of profound significance for a democratic and peaceful South Africa. His speech was received with elation by the international community. It appeared that South Africans had at last reached an agreement to end apartheid without a violent revolution. De Klerk's speech signalled a new era in race relations in South Africa similar to how the collapse of the Berlin Wall was to communism. It signalled the end of one of the world's last racial oligarchies (government by the minority).

Let us sum up the impact of the collapse of the Soviet Union on South African politics.

+ The collapse of Communist rule in Eastern Europe, symbolised by the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, changed NP thinking regarding their opponents and themselves.
+ The NP could no longer claim to be the bulwark against communist expansion.
+ The government probably felt that the withdrawal of Soviet support would weaken the ANC.
+ American distrust for the ANC as a communist front, and their consequent support for the South African government, was no longer relevant.

This all resulted in the NP government embarking on a process of reform and transition, in the belief that they could control the process of transition, in such a way as to guarantee their own interests and possibly maintain their rule.

1.3. WHAT WAS THE IMPACT OF THE COLLAPSE OF THE USSR ON AFRICA?

Reflection and re-imagining the nation in the 1990s

After the end of the Second World War, Africa became caught up in the confrontation between the USA and the Soviet Union in the so-called Cold War. In Africa,
Communists openly supported many Black liberation movements with arms and troops, resulting in many African countries falling under communist influence. Aside from a number of educational scholars and from military aid, the Soviet Union also sent thousands of Cuban troops to Angola in the 1970s and 1980s. However, the Soviet Union gave little support to the aid of trade and generally the Soviet Union was not adequately informed about the history, political structures and the needs of the countries it supported.

A map showing Angola, Guinea and Libya. The collapse of the USSR had a huge impact on these countries.

Activity 4.5: Pairs

What was the impact of the collapse of the USSR on Africa?

Study Source 4F below and then answer the questions which follow.

Source 4F: A table showing the numbers of weapons delivered by major suppliers to Sub-Saharan Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of weapon</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>China</th>
<th>Major West European countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1987-1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-propelled guns</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armoured cars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor surface combatants</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided missile boats</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersonic combat aircraft</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsonic combat aircraft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-1994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-propelled guns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artillery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armoured cars</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor surface combatants</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guided missile boats</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2000)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submarines</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supersonic combat aircraft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsonic combat aircraft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Why do you think the USA, Russian and China supplied weapons to Sub-Saharan countries?
(c) Using your own knowledge, explain why there is a difference in the number of weapons delivered to sub-Saharan Africa in the periods 1987-1990 and 1991-1994.
(d) Discuss what impact you think these weapons had on the sub-Saharan countries that received them.
So, why did African countries believe in socialism?

There were several reasons, some of which were as follows:

- The level of ideological commitment or interest in socialism varied among the different governments and movements that received Soviet military aid.
- The main aim of African countries was not a socialist revolution, but actually to achieve independence with majority rule throughout the continent and to be free of military aggression from South Africa.
- The Western world’s failure to offer more support and assistance, resulted in African countries looking for support from the Soviets.
- The anti-capitalist, socialist outlook that was central to communism was very appealing to the people in a region where mineral and human resources had been exploited for the benefit of the minority of the population.
- Many African leaders felt it made more sense to develop their own African form of socialist, which would draw on African traditions, rather than following in the footsteps of the Soviet Union. In Tanzania, for example, President Julius Nyerere introduced Ujamaa villages.

A table showing African governments that received diplomatic or military support from the Soviet Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>LEADERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Dos Santos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Samora Machel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>Amilcar Cabral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Major Ngouabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Gamal Abdel Nasser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Siad Barre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Mengitsu Haile Mariam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Milton Obote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Mathieu Kerekou</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Case Study: Central Africa: Angola

Let us look at a country from Central Africa: Angola

What was the situation in Angola in the 1970s?

- Angola was proclaimed independent in 1975. The new Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) government, under President Agostinho Neto was not recognised by some of the other liberation movements such as the National Liberation Front of Angola (FNLA) and National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), which led to a civil war in Angola. The MPLA initially controlled most of the country, especially the major cities and the important territory of Cabinda with its oil industry. On the other hand, UNITA under the leadership of Jonas Savimbi controlled most of the diamond-producing areas.
- The MPLA government had by this time received international recognition. In the 1970s as an outspoken opponent of the South African apartheid government, the MPLA government, received active military assistance from Cuba, while UNITA on the other hand received aid from South Africa. The Angolan Civil War had thus become a sideshow of the Cold War. Ironically, Agostinho Neto had actually tried to adopt a non-aligned foreign policy during the Cold War, although the MPLA needed Soviet support for its very survival. Neto did not live long enough to implement this policy as he died in September 1979 less than four years after taking office. He was succeeded by a Soviet-trained petroleum engineer, Jose Eduardo dos Santos.

Let us look at the situation in Angola under Dos Santos’ leadership.

- Dos Santos very quickly abandoned any pretense of non-alignment and formed even closer ties with the Soviet Union and Cuba. The Soviet Union welcomed Dos Santos’s new foreign policy as Angola provided an important Southern African base from which to operate during the Cold War. The Soviet Union was particularly interested in influencing events in southern Africa in the hope that liberation movements would implement the Soviet model of political, economic and social development. Cuba, a communist state, also provided additional support to Dos Santos. However, given their own problems and limitations, neither Cuba nor the Soviet Union could solve the MPLA’s problems or prevent UNITA from becoming a growing threat to the government, as Zaire, South Africa and America continued to assist UNITA.

In the early 1980s the USA followed a clear policy to overthrow the communist supported MPLA government in order to bring UNITA to power. American support for anti-communist guerrilla movements had an almost immediate impact on the Angolan Civil War as UNITA became a major recipient of sophisticated American weapons such as Stinger anti-aircraft missiles. These missiles threatened the air supremacy that the MPLA government had enjoyed. As a result, all major military offensives mounted by the MPLA/Cuban/Soviet forces to dislodge the Angolan rebels from their bases ended in failure.
By the time US military aid to Angola ended in 1992, the USA had contributed an estimated 300 million dollars worth of weapons to UNITA, including highly sophisticated small arms and light weapons, and stronger anti-aircraft missiles.

- Eventually the involvement of external forces on the sides of the MPLA and UNITA created a military stalemate that facilitated the search for political solutions to the problems of Angola. This stalemate, important changes in international politics, and the dismantling of the apartheid regime, influenced both Cuba and South Africa to rethink their positions. They were now forced to accept that a negotiated framework for the withdrawal of Cuban troops and peace in the region was inevitable. As a result of negotiations among Angola, South Africa, Cuba and the United States, the withdrawal of Cuban troops began in 1989. Moreover, in the late 1980s Communist Angola implemented programmes of privatisation under President Dos Santos.

- Angola implemented programmes of privatisation under President Dos Santos.

So, how did the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War impact on the situation in Angola?

- The collapse of the Soviet Union and the thawing of Cold War relations between the USA and Russia (the former Soviet Union) decided to press the MPLA government and UNITA to begin direct talks on national reconciliation. This position was then formalised at a meeting between former American Secretary of State, James Baker, and his Soviet counterpart, Eduard Shevardnadze while they attended Namibia’s independence ceremonies in March 1990. At the end of the Cold War, both the USA and the former Soviet Union saw Angola as a good opportunity to repeat the collaboration that hastened Namibia’s independence. Both countries thus signalled to the MPLA and UNITA that major diplomatic rewards would be given when the peace process in Angola was successful.

- Portugal was willing to help its former colony find peace for various reasons. As a result of both internal and external factors, the Angolan government announced on the 25 April 1990, that it would enter talks with UNITA, mediated by the Portuguese government, to find the path to national reconciliation.

A photograph from Jonas Savimbi: A Key to Africa, showing MPLA government soldiers bound and blindfolded as they await questioning by intelligence officers.

Let us examine the reasons why the peace in Angola was short-lived.

- In 1995 localised fighting started again, but in April 1997 a government of national unity was installed. Peace did not last as in late 1998 Savimbi, who claimed that the MPLA were not fulfilling their obligations, renewed the war for the second time. In 1999 the Angolan military launched a massive offensive that destroyed UNITA’s capacity and recaptured all major cities previously held by Savimbi’s forces.

- Savimbi then declared that UNITA would return to guerrilla tactics and much of the country remained in turmoil. In 2002 Savimbi was killed in a military operation and UNITA and the MPLA agreed to sign a cease-fire six weeks later on the 4 April.

- In August 2002 UNITA declared itself a political party and officially demolished its armed force, thereby ending the civil war.

It was estimated that over one million people died in the fighting in Angola since 1975 and the great danger of land mines remains. British army engineers estimate that nearly 20 million land mines, covering one third of the land mass were still in place in 1996. So, many more lives are likely to be lost in the future.
Let's sum up the impact the collapse of the Soviet Union had on the situation in Angola.

- With the collapse of communism and the apartheid regime in South Africa, the international community made an attempt to end the civil war in Angola. In 1994, the UN sent peacekeepers and the integration of UNITA into the government was planned. Despite these efforts, the civil war continued. Angola was thus one of the countries that became a battleground of the Cold War. Angola was a Soviet and Cuban ally, regarded by most Western powers, particularly the USA, as an unfriendly state. It is important to note that one of the major US foreign policy goals during the Cold War was to contain the spread of communism around the world and because the Angolan government was perceived to be communist, the USA was willing to support UNITA in its attempt to overthrow the regime. The USA used South Africa as a supply line but refused to aid South Africa itself, as it did not want to associate itself with the white minority government.

Case Study: West Africa: Guinea

We will now look at a country from West Africa: Guinea

Conditions in Guinea before 1989.

After independence from France in 1958, Guinea led by Sékou Touré, became a one-party Marxist-socialist republic, which cultivated close relations with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union replaced France as the country’s chief source of economic and technical assistance. However, it did not manage to retain the same level of dependence as the Cold War

Re-imagining the nation in the 1990s

Immediately after Sékou Touré died in 1984, a military coup brought Colonel Lansana Conté to power. Under Conté, private enterprise and ties with Western nations were strengthened. In 1989 Conté announced that the newly established civilian government would take place in the mid-1990s. At the same time, French funding was provided for the construction of a hydro-electric plant on the Konkouré River. In 1991 voters approved a new constitution and political parties were legalised in 1992 in preparation for the forthcoming elections. Although Guinea is a multi-party democracy, Conté has ruled Guinea for three terms as a result of the 2001 referendum that lifted presidential term limits. Many opposition parties have claimed the outcome of the referendum was rigged.

Conté won his third presidential election in December 2003 with 95.3% of the votes, but most of the opposing candidates boycotted the election as they believed that Conté would never allow a fair election.

Case Study: North Africa: Libya

Let us now focus on a country from North Africa: Libya

Libya (official name: Great Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

The Libyan flag is entirely green. It was adopted in 1977 after leaving the Federation of Arab Republics. Green is the national colour of Libya, as well as a symbol of devotion to Islam.

Did you know?

Conditions in Libya before 1989

On 1 September 1969 a small group of military officers led by the then 28-year-old army officer Mu'ammar Abu Minyar al-Qadafi (Gaddafi) staged a coup (revolt) against King Idris, who was exiled to Egypt. The new regime, headed by the Revolutionary Command Council (RCC) abolished the monarchy and proclaimed the new Libyan Arab Republic. Gaddafi emerged as leader of the RCC and eventually as head of state, a role he still plays today. Libya's political system is in theory based on the philosophy in Gaddafi's Green Book, which combines socialist and Islamic theories and rejects parliamentary democracies and political parties. In reality, Gaddafi has almost total control over all major government decisions.

Gaddafi's government based its legal system on Islamic Sharia law, including, in theory, amputations of one's hands if found guilty of theft.

Since 1969 Gaddafi has determined Libya's foreign policy. His main foreign policy goals may be listed as follows:

- Arab unity and the elimination of Israel
- Advancement of Islam
- Support for the Palestinians
- Elimination of outside, particularly Western influence, in the Middle East and Africa

Upon coming to power, Gaddafi shut down American and British bases on Libyan territory and partially nationalised all foreign oil and commercial interests in Libya. He also played a key role in promoting the use of oil embargoes (legal stoppage of commerce) as a political weapon for challenging the West, in order to end American support of Israel. Gaddafi rejected both Soviet communism and Western capitalism and claimed he was charting a middle course, however Libya's relationship with the Soviet Union involved massive Libyan arms purchases from the Soviet bloc and the presence of thousands of Eastern bloc advisers.
Libya’s use and loss of Soviet-supplied weaponry in its war with Chad was a breach of a Soviet-Libyan understanding not to use the weapons for activities that were not in line with Soviet-Libyan aims. As a result, Soviet-Libyan relations reached their lowest point in mid-1987. Gaddafi’s confrontational foreign policies and use of terrorism, as well as Libya’s growing friendship with the USSR in the 1980s, led to increased tension with the West. As a result of the 1986 terrorist bombing at a discotheque in West Berlin, which was frequented by American military personnel, the United States retaliated militarily against Libyan targets and imposed broad sanctions on Libya.

Re-imagining the nation in the 1990s

By the late 1980s Gaddafi’s policies began to come under increasing pressure. Firstly, the oil price of oil on the world market impacted radically on the state’s finances, for instance, oil revenues were reduced by more than 50 percent due to world overproduction. Secondly, Libya was attracting the hostile attentions of the new Reagan administration in the USA which was committed to containing the spread of communism.

After the fall of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact, Libya concentrated on expanding diplomatic ties with Third World countries and increasing its commercial links with Europe and East Asia. Gaddafi decided to improve Libya’s relationship with the West. There are many explanations for the change in Gaddafi’s politics, the most obvious being that the once very rich Libya lost economic strength in the 1990s, because oil prices remained low. Gaddafi, therefore, needed other countries more than before. Added to this is the view that Western reactions have forced Gaddafi to change his politics and he could no longer rely on the Soviet Union. The demise of the Soviet Union had left Gaddafi’s main symbolic target, the USA, stronger than ever.

Activity 4.6: Individual

Enrichment

What is Islamic Sharia Law?

Research the following questions on Sharia Law by going to your school library/local community or town library/using the internet:

(a) What is Sharia law?
(b) What similarities does Sharia Law have with South African law?
(c) How is Sharia Law different to South African law?

4.1.4. WHAT WAS THE IMPACT OF THE COLLAPSE OF THE USSR ON DOMINANCE OF THE USA?

The world in the 1990s

What did the world look like in the 1990s after the collapse of the Soviet Union?

- As the world entered the 1990s, with the Cold War
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over and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the superpowers of the Cold War era faced major re-adjustment. Russia, on the one hand, became much more accepted in the international community and the world stage. An example of this acceptance were the trips Russian president Boris Yeltsin made to attend “G7” meetings that were held by the key world leaders to discuss matters of trade and commerce. On the other hand, the United States of America was left as the sole remaining “superpower”, which brought the possibility of a “unipolar order”. This also meant that the United States became the leader of international affairs.

What does the term “unipolar order” mean?

With the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union, the world entered a phase that has been called the “unipolar order”. This means that only one superpower dominates the global scene i.e. the USA. The USA stands alone as the major player determining the course of world affairs.

The USA as world leader

So, why did many countries look to the USA to play a leadership role in world affairs?

There are several factors which may be summarised as follows:

- The idea that the United States should play a major role in world affairs lies deeply rooted in their history.
- The idea that the United States was the world’s “saviour” came about when their belated entry into World War One tipped the scales in favour of the Allied Powers.
- World War Two confirmed and solidified the idea that the USA was the indispensable leader in world affairs when it brought about the defeat of the Nazis.
- The formation of the United Nations with its hope that the USA would become involved in global leadership.
- The Cold War between the West and East cemented the involvement of the USA in world affairs.
- The Truman Doctrine put in place the USA’s involvement in world affairs after 1945.
- After these wars the world had come to expect American leadership. World powers appeared to accept that the bulk of the burden of international security and stability, should be left to the United States.
- The above reasons indicate that many respect the USA’s general performance as a leader of the free world. However, it must be noted that there are others who question America’s credibility as a world leader and constantly criticize the so-called “hypocrisy” of US foreign policies and interventions in conflicts such as the Middle East. There are also those who believe the USA government is arrogant and shows disdain of international law and the authority of the United Nations and other multilateral agencies.
There are several reasons why the USA is expected to accept the burdens of global leadership:

- There are many problems facing the world, for instance, HIV/AIDS.
- The USA has an important stake in the healthy development of the international economy.
- The USA has an interest in the development of environmental activities worldwide.
- The USA wishes to see the end to ethnic conflicts and the promotion of democratic societies and general order and stability as a result of inter-dependence in the new world order.
- American national interests are unavoidably affected by the state of the world.
- Playing the leadership role is essential to America’s welfare and security.
- Leadership of the world allows the USA to put its own interest first, above all else.

The “new world order”

Let us look at the new world order after the collapse of the USSR

What does the term “new world order” mean?
The term “new world order” has been used to refer to a new period in history that shows a dramatic change in world political thought and the balance of power. In this instance, the term has been used to describe the period that came at the end of the Cold War.

- After the fall of the Soviet bloc and throughout the 1990s, a new world order started to emerge. Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union and George H.W. Bush of the United States used the term to try and define the nature of the post Cold War era, and the spirit of Great Power co-operation that they hoped might come about.
- The new world order was supposed to replace the policy of containment with superpower co-operation and was to be based on the principles of political liberty, self-determination and non-intervention. This would mean an end to the sponsoring of military conflicts in third world countries, restrictions on global arms sales and greater engagement in the Middle East. In fact, the deeper reality of the new world order was that the United States emerged as “the single greatest power in a multipolar world” as Russia was crippled by internal problems and thus was unable to project power overseas. The United States’ position as world leader seemed to be unchallenged in this “new world order”.

Samuel Huntington wrote critically of the “new world order” in The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order.

The expectation of harmony was widely shared. Political and intellectual leaders elaborated similar views. The Berlin Wall had come down, communist regimes had collapsed. The United Nations was to assume a new importance, the former Cold War rivals would engage in “partnership” and a “grand bargain”, and peacekeeping would be the order of the day. The President of the world’s leading country proclaimed the “new world order”.

The moment of euphoria at the end of the Cold War generated an illusion of harmony, which was soon to be revealed as exactly that. The world became different in the early 1990s, but not necessarily more peaceful. Change was inevitable; progress was not. The illusion of harmony at the end of the Cold War was soon dissipated by the multiplication of ethnic conflicts and “ethnic cleansing”, the breakdown of law and order, the emergence of new patterns of alliance and conflict among states, the resurgence of neo-communist and neo-fascist movements, intensification of religious fundamentalism, the end of the “diplomacy of smiles” and the “policy of yes” in Russia’s relations with the West, the inability of the United Nations and the United States to suppress bloody local conflicts and the increasing assertiveness of China.

Differing views of the USA in the post-Cold War era

Let us now look at how the USA is viewed in the post-Cold War era

- In the post Cold War era, many people, especially in the USA, came to believe that peaceful economic competition conducted through the mediation (an attempt to bring about agreement) of democracies and inter-governmental organisations, dominated by the United States, would take the place of military conflict. They saw the United States as “the indispensable nation” for keeping the peace and furthering the system of market democracies.
- Carrying forward the claim that the USA is the nation that the world cannot do without, many have pictured a world in which the United States would spread democracy and police (manage) world capitalism. They would do this using their military supremacy to enforce an order that other powers would have to accept because they would have no alternative. It must be noted, however, that the USA military has its limitations. It is now obvious that the USA has neither the capability nor the will to police the world, and that it does not want any other power to do so.
- It has been suggested that the USA has the strength and the resources to pursue its own interests, but also has a responsibility to use its power in pursuit of the common good, as well as an obligation to lead and be involved in world affairs.

So, where does the United States fit into the world in the post-Cold War era?

The role of the USA may be summarised as follows:

- The United States is at the pinnacle of world power.
- Due to the collapse of the USSR, the military strength and vast resources of the United States allows it to be in a unique position to provide global leadership.
- In the 1990s as the world’s remaining superpower the United States was uniquely suited to take centre stage in world affairs.
- Many believed that the USA was so far ahead of its closest rival in the 1990s that they could do exactly what they pleased without having to follow international law and acting through international organisations.
- Many have feared that the USA, with its military and economic strength could act unilaterally against any state they perceive to be a threat.
- Others believe that in today’s world, America’s military might and economic power are not enough for her to go it alone.
- The world’s globalised economies, real-time telecommunications, the World Wide Web, and global problems such as terrorism, global warming and the AIDS epidemic illustrate that no one nation can take on these problems alone.
What was the impact of the collapse of the USSR on the dominance of the USA?

Read the sources and then attempt the activity that follows.

Source 4G: Kennedy School Dean Joseph S. Nye Jr. said the following about America's power:

"Despite its dominance, the US can't go it alone... Countries are going to need to turn to international institutions to deal with problems that globalisation is putting on the table... These are not problems that one country can solve on its own."

Source 4H: A critic of American President Bush's view of the "new world order" said the following:

"Does it mean a strengthened UN? And new regional security arrangements in the Gulf and elsewhere? Will the US be willing to put its own military under international leadership? In the gulf, Mr Bush has rejected a UN command outright. Sometimes, when Administration officials describe their goals, they say the US must reduce its military burden and commitment. Other times, they appear determined to seek new arrangements in order to preserve US military supremacy and to justify new expenditures."

Source 4I: An extract taken from a paper presented by a professor from the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

There is no doubt, good reason to be concerned about possible misuse of America's unmatched power - if not in cynical imperialist ventures, then at least in misguided efforts to impose political values believed by Americans to have universal validity... It (the world) dreads the power of the United States and depends upon that power, it fears what America may do and what it may refrain from doing, it worries about the irresponsible exercise of American power and, even more, I think, about the irresponsible misuse of American power.

(a) Using Sources 4G to 4I, as well as any additional information from this chapter and your own knowledge from your own research, write an extended piece of approximately 3 pages on the impact of the collapse of the USSR on the dominance of the USA in world politics.

4.1.5 CONCLUSION: WHAT IS THE WORLD LIKE TODAY?

The fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 and the collapse of the USSR brought the Cold War to an end. Thus the world entered a new phase in its history. The end of communist rule in the USSR and Eastern Europe proved to be a definite turning point in history. For many it meant that the threat of communism was gone. The USA remained the only superpower and took on a leadership position in world politics. Many African countries including South Africa, felt the impact of the collapse of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Berlin Wall. Numerous political changes took place in Africa, which included the emergence of a democratic South Africa.

With the end of the Cold War many people believed that the threat of nuclear war had been removed, but this is not the case, as there are still countries that are developing and stockpiling nuclear weapons. The world today also faces many other challenges that threaten humanity. There are inequalities between the industrialised and developing worlds, ethnic and regional conflicts, drought, famine, disease, poverty and a host of basic human rights abuses throughout the world today.

Self Assessment Checklist

Have you understood this chapter? Test yourself by answering the following questions. If you can answer the question, tick in the appropriate box, if not, go back to the relevant section and try to find the answer there.

1. I understand what brought about the collapse of the Soviet Union. [ ] [ ]
2. I can explain the role Gorbachev played in bringing the Cold War closer to an end. [ ] [ ]
3. I understand the impact that the fall of the Berlin Wall had on the NPR government's policies. [ ] [ ]
4. I can explain the impact that the collapse of the USSR had on the ANC's policies in South Africa. [ ] [ ]
5. I can determine to what extent the collapse of the USSR brought about the end of apartheid. [ ] [ ]
6. I am able to discuss the impact that the collapse of the USSR had on the Angolan Civil War. [ ] [ ]
7. I can explain why many African countries received aid from the Soviet Union. [ ] [ ]
8. I understand to what extent the collapse of the Soviet Union impacted on Gaddafi's policies in Libya. [ ] [ ]
9. I am able to explain to what extent the collapse of the Soviet Union brought about a change in Guinea. [ ] [ ]
10. I can define the term "unipolar" world. [ ] [ ]
11. I can define the term "new world order". [ ] [ ]
12. I can discuss the impact that the collapse of the Soviet Union had on the dominance of the USA. [ ] [ ]
1. KEY QUESTION: What was the impact of the collapse of the USSR on South Africa?
LO 1/AS 2,3,4; LO 2/AS 1,2,3; LO 3/AS 2,3,4

Study the sources below and then answer the questions which follow.

SOURCE A: This comment from The Fall of the Berlin Wall, was made by American pilot G. Halvorsen after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

"What was my reaction the other night? I tell you. I'm a hard old retired colonel, but I had tears in my eyes. To see people standing on the wall, where once they would have been shot. I could hardly take it all in."

SOURCE B: This comment taken from CNN (the TV programme) Interactive, reflects Bettina Luscher's reaction to the fall of the Berlin wall. She was the CNN Berlin news anchor at the time.

"It seemed unthinkable... maybe in a few years, a few decades - but not now... It didn't feel like a new phase of the Cold War. It was much more immediate. Much more intense. Joy. Laughter. Happiness. Curiosity. Confusion. Uncertainty, fear... if the world had not realised that change was in the air in the East, it could now watch it on television... The Wall was open. Berliners were dancing on the Wall, hammering away at the Wall, kissing strangers on the Wall, driving their "Trabi" cars through theopened Wall. It was over. The TV networks built platforms overlooking the Wall, showed the scenes live around the world around the clock, anchored special after special in languages from every corner of the world."

SOURCE C: This is an extract from Tomorrow Is Another Country, The Inside Story of South Africa's Negotiated Settlement by Allister Sparks.

But of all the international influences, none was greater than the Gorbachev reforms that began unraveling the communist empire, for they eased Pretoria's phobia that the Black struggle against apartheid was a conspiracy directed from Moscow. It took the monkey off De Klerk's back and enabled him to justify to his people what would otherwise have appeared to them like a suicidal course of action... Economic sanctions and campaigns to withdraw investment in South Africa added significantly to the pressure on De Klerk to act. These together with racial unrest, had plunged South Africa into the deepest financial crisis of its history. Business confidence was at an all-time low, and increasingly the cry was raised, "We can't go on like this!"

SOURCE D: This document was forwarded to FW de Klerk by Nelson Mandela on 12 December 1989 the day before the two met.

Mr President
I hope that Ministers Koos Coetsee and Gerrit Viljoen have informed you that I deeply appreciate your decision in terms of which eight fellow-prisoners were freed on 15 October 1989, and for advising me of the fact in advance. The release was clearly a major development which rightly evoked praise here and abroad... In your inaugural address on 20 September 1989, you made an important statement which must have had a formidable impact inside and outside the country. You said: "There is but one way to peace, to justice for all, that is the way of reconciliation, of together seeking mutually acceptable solutions, of together discussing what the new South Africa should look like, of constitutional negotiation with a view to a permanent understanding."

1.1. Study Source A:
(a) What does Source A tell you about people's reactions to the fall of the Berlin Wall?
(b) What does Source A suggest about the situation in Berlin prior to the fall of the Wall?
(c) Explain how valuable Source A would be to a historian studying the Cold War.

1.2. Refer to Sources A and B:
(a) Compare the reactions of Bettina Luscher to the fall of the Berlin Wall to those of G. Halvorsen.
(b) What does Source B tell you about the significance of the fall of the Berlin Wall?
(c) Explain how useful Source B would be to a historian studying the Cold War period in history.
(d) Explain which of the two sources (A or B) would be of more use to a historian studying the Cold War.

1.3. Consult Source C:
(a) What reasons does Sparks suggest prompted De Klerk to abandon the policy of apartheid in South Africa?
(b) What does Sparks mean when he refers to "Pretoria's phobia that the Black struggle against apartheid was a conspiracy directed from Moscow"?
(c) According to this source, how significant was the collapse of the USSR, on the political situation in South Africa?

1.4. Read through Source D:
(a) What world event prompted FW de Klerk to release Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners?
(b) Discuss the impact this event had on De Klerk's thinking.
(c) Why would Mandela describe the release of these political prisoners as "a major development which rightly evoked praise here and abroad"?
1.5. Using Sources A to D, as well as your own knowledge, explain the importance of the “unravelling of the communist empire” on De Klerk’s decision to end apartheid.

1.6. Extended Writing
   (a) Write a newspaper article of about 1 to 2 pages in which you analyse the impact of the collapse of the Soviet Union on either Angola or the USA.
   (b) “The fall of the Berlin Wall proved to be a definite turning-point in world history.” Critically discuss this statement by making reference to relevant events to support your argument.

CHAPTER FIVE
SOUTH AFRICA’S ROAD TO DEMOCRACY
(1980s TO 2000)

KEY QUESTION FOR THIS CHAPTER:
5.1 How did South Africa emerge as a democracy from the crises of the 1990s?

CONTENT/KNOWLEDGE FOCUS AREAS
5.1.1 Introduction: Factors leading to the ultimate demise of apartheid
5.1.2 The crisis of apartheid
   • Why was apartheid in crisis in the 1980s?
5.1.3 The collapse of apartheid in South Africa - coming together of internal and external pressures
   • Internal pressures (intensified resistance by the community, students, and workers; imposition of the state of emergency and its effects)
   • External pressures (international pressure, sanctions, talks in Lusaka/ Dakar)
   • Change of leadership (PW Botha vs FW de Klerk, unbanning of political parties and the release of political prisoners)
5.1.4 How the crises were managed
   • Conflict