SESSION PREPARATION
Read the following material before attending the workshop. As you read the excerpts and primary sources, take note of the “Questions to Consider” as well as any questions you have. The activities in the workshop will draw on information from the readings and the video shown during the workshop.

UNIT INTRODUCTION
From the 1940s to the 1970s, the African American civil rights movement galvanized other communities of color to end discrimination. Inspired by the civil rights movement, Americans challenged authority and secured more rights, and sounded a call for greater democratic participation. An expanding and influential mass media documented and influenced the cultural and political events of the civil rights movement and the “rights revolution.”

UNIT LEARNING OBJECTIVES
After reading the text materials, participating in the workshop activities and watching the video, teachers will understand

- that communities of color struggled to achieve civil rights as early as World War II;
- the internal tensions and external resistance experienced by minorities during the civil rights movements;
- movements and individuals sought “more democracy” in education, religion, the workplace, and the local community;
- the instrumental role of mass media in American popular culture and politics.

THIS UNIT FEATURES

- Textbook excerpts (sections of U.S. history surveys, written for introductory college courses by history professors)
- Primary sources (documents and other materials created by the people who lived in the period) including a court decision, manifestos, photographs, a poster, and song lyrics
- A timeline at the end of the unit, which places important events in the history of this period
During and after World War II, the struggle for civil rights was not only an appeal for equality before the law, but also equality in housing and at the workplace. The civil rights movement sought racial equality for African Americans, Asian Americans, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans. Labor organizers found some common ground with the civil rights movement, but internal differences and external resistance created tension between these two forces.

The civil rights movement led to other movements for social change as individuals realized they could challenge authority in all walks of life. Americans voiced and debated new ideas about freedom, equality, democracy, identity, war, and peace.

During the sixties and seventies, there was a grassroots call for “more democracy” in all areas of life. This effort emphasized a change in cultural expectations and norms in education, religion, the workplace, and local communities. Students called for a participatory democracy by reaffirming their rights to express themselves on college campuses. University governments brought on students to their boards, and middle managers and union workers served on corporate boards. The women’s movement played an important role in the call for more democracy as they sought fair pay, equal opportunity, comparable spending on collegiate sports programs, and control over their own bodies. The call for greater democracy also extended to protecting environmental and consumer rights as individuals successfully challenged the government and business to protect the safety and welfare of the public.

**Theme 1:**
Inspired by the momentum of the African American civil rights movement, communities of color mobilized to end discrimination, but faced internal tensions and external resistance.

**Theme 2:**
Motivated by the conviction that everyday citizens could bring about positive social change, movements and individuals challenged authority in schools, churches, corporations, families, and government.

**Theme 3:**
An expanding and influential mass media simultaneously reflected and reshaped a changing cultural and political landscape.
Historical Perspectives

The struggle for civil rights comprised many movements that emerged before and during World War II. Often overlooked in the civil rights movement was the landmark federal court case of *Mendez v. Westminster* (1945), which challenged the segregation of California public schools—and preceded the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* by eight years.

Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, individuals and other movements challenged authority by debating new ideas and issued a call for more democracy in education, religion, and work. Mass media reflected and influenced these movements by projecting images that engaged the public and drew attention to their causes.

Faces of America

Louis Armstrong, Tom Hayden, and Marlo Thomas used mainstream media to voice their dissent to the status quo and press for change in American society.

Louis Armstrong participated in a series of State Department-sponsored music tours aimed at promoting a favorable image of the United States through jazz, but he continued to criticize the United States for its racism.

While attending the University of Michigan, Tom Hayden became a leader of the Students for a Democratic Society, a student organized movement that sought a more “participatory democracy.” He, along with other members of SDS, collaborated to write the *Port Huron Statement*, a “manifesto” criticizing the United States government for its failure to address economic and social problems, and to bring about world peace.

In the popular show *That Girl*, Marlo Thomas used the medium of television to unwittingly become a champion for women’s rights. By playing the independent and liberated character of Marie, Thomas became a popular icon for American women.

Hands on History

Why are memorials important to the study of history?

Donovin Sprague is the director of education of the Crazy Horse Memorial in Black Hills, South Dakota. He tours the site and describes how the memorial serves as a primary and secondary source for interpreting the history and values of the Lakota and other Native American tribes.
Theme One: Inspired by the momentum of the African American civil rights movement, communities of color mobilized to end discrimination, but faced internal tensions and external resistance.

Overview

From the first decades of the twentieth century, African Americans, Latinos, and other groups had struggled for civil rights through such organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the League of United Latin American Citizens, but the experiences of World War II caused many minorities to hope for and demand change.

During World War II, African Americans mobilized around the idea of increased participation. Following the war, African Americans mobilized old and new organizations to fight for civil rights by promoting change through nonviolent protests such as boycotts, sit-ins, and the freedom rides. Other African Americans formed militant organizations that vowed to use any means possible to end racism. In Northern urban ghettos, African Americans voiced frustration at lingering powerlessness, including poverty, slum conditions, and police brutality. Such frustration erupted in riots in New York, New Jersey, and Los Angeles and led to the founding of militant organizations.

Beginning in 1946 with the Supreme Court decision in *Mendez v. Westminster* to outlaw segregated schools in California, Mexican Americans led the Latino protest movement for public education reform, workers’ rights, and political change. In the 1960s, migrant farm workers urged a boycott of California produce with the goal of obtaining better pay and working conditions and union recognition. During 1968, Mexican Americans also protested conditions in schools when 10,000 students walked out of high schools in California, Colorado, and Texas. Like the African American struggle for equality, the Latino movement promoted change through militant and moderate wings.

In the 1960s, Native Americans mobilized to challenge the government on water, fishing, and treaty rights. A series of court cases granted Native American tribes the right to take up to fifty percent of the allowable fishing limits. The American Indian Movement had some success securing federal funds for Native American organizations, but Native American militancy led to government suppression.

Yet, within these and other movements for equality existed internal differences and external resistance among different groups. Some white Americans recoiled from the assertiveness of these movements because their expectation was that minorities would want to emulate them. The riots, militancy, and Supreme Court decisions angered many white Americans, who claimed that some reforms amounted to reverse discrimination.

Questions to Consider

1. How did the African American civil rights movement parallel or differ from the movements of other communities of color?
2. How did the Cold War create support for African Americans’ civil rights?
   - How did it lend support to those who opposed civil rights?
3. Why did civil rights activists focus their efforts on attacking segregation through the courts instead of through other means?
1. Brown v. Board of Education

The first major success in the struggle to dismantle the Jim Crow system in the South came in the 1954 Supreme Court decision Brown v. Board of Education. Civil rights strategists decided to pursue their cause in the courts rather than through Congress. They knew that Southern Democrats in Congress, who held disproportionate power through their seniority and control of major committees, would block any civil rights legislation that came before the House or Senate. They believed that they had a better chance of success through the courts.

Initially, civil rights attorneys worked within the system of segregation. The Plessy v. Ferguson decision in 1896 justified Jim Crow laws on the principle of providing “separate but equal” facilities. The attorneys argued that southern school systems violated the segregation laws because the separate, racially segregated schools were far from equal. In Clarendon County, South Carolina, for example, public funds provided $179 per white child compared to $4 per black child. Soon the lawyers shifted their strategy to claim that separate was inherently unequal and began the push to overturn Plessy v. Ferguson. Leading the charge was Thurgood Marshall, general counsel of the NAACP and a graduate of Howard University Law School.

The NAACP lawyers filed suit against the Topeka, Kansas, Board of Education, on behalf of Linda Brown, a black child in a segregated school. The case reached the U.S. Supreme Court, where Marshall argued that separate facilities, by definition, denied African Americans their equal rights as citizens. A key argument in the case was the psychological effect of the stigma of segregation on black children. Psychologist Kenneth Clark, testifying as an expert witness, gave evidence showing that black children educated in segregated schools developed a negative self-image and responded more positively to white dolls than to black dolls. Although this argument was persuasive with the Court and helped to bring about school desegregation, some black leaders at the time objected to the use of that psychological argument. Those critics of the strategy argued that black children did not need to interact with white children in order to gain self-esteem and pointed to the positive influence of black teachers who believed in their students’ capabilities. They claimed that low self-esteem among black children resulted from widespread discrimination against black Americans, not simply black students’ lack of interaction with white students . . .

**Questions to Consider**

1. Why did the Ninth Circuit Court restrain further discriminatory practices against students of Mexican descent?

2. What role did *Mendez v. Westminster* play in the success of *Brown v. Board of Education* eight years later? What connections can be made between these two cases?

---

**Historical Significance:**

*Brown* is largely cited as the ruling that spurred desegregation in the United States, but other court cases on the state level predated this ruling. In 1946, the school desegregation case of *Mendez v. Westminster* placed the struggle for civil rights across regional, racial, and ethnic lines. Five Mexican American parents challenged local school board policies because districts in Orange County, California, forced their children and 5,000 other students to attend “Mexican” schools. In California, the Ninth Circuit Court outlawed the segregation of Mexican American students based on their national origin. In June 1946, Governor Earl Warren signed legislation that ended “separate but equal” school segregation statutes in California schools. By 1954, the issue of school segregation had reached the Supreme Court in the landmark case of *Brown v. Board of Education*.
... Specifically, plaintiffs allege:
... That all children or persons of Mexican or Latin descent or extraction, though Citizens of the United States of America, shall be, have been and are now excluded from attending, using, enjoying and receiving the benefits of the education, health and recreation facilities of certain schools within their respective Districts and Systems...

[6, 7] “The equal protection of the laws” pertaining to the public school system in California is not provided by furnishing in separate schools the same technical facilities, text books and courses of instruction to children of Mexican ancestry that are available to the other public school children regardless of their ancestry. A paramount requisite in the American system of public education is social equality. It must be open to all children by unified school association regardless of lineage.

We think that under the record before us the only tenable ground upon which segregation practices in the defendant school districts can be defended lies in the English language deficiencies of some of the children of Mexican ancestry as they enter elementary public school life as beginners. But even such situations do not justify the general and continuous segregation in separate schools of the children of Mexican ancestry from the rest of the elementary school population as has been shown to be the practice in the defendant school districts—in all of them to the sixth grade, and in two of them through the eighth grade.

The evidence clearly shows that Spanish-speaking children are retarded in learning English by lack of exposure to its use because of segregation, and that commingling of the entire student body instills and develops a common cultural attitude among the school children which is imperative for the perpetuation of American institutions and ideals...

We conclude by holding that the allegations of the complaint (petition) have been established sufficiently to justify injunctive relief against all defendants, restraining further discriminatory practices against the pupils of Mexican descent in the public schools of defendant school districts.

In the *Journal of American History* article below, Scott Kurashige examines race relations between African Americans and Japanese Americans in Los Angeles between World War II and the decision of *Brown v. the Board of Education* (1954). How does the author characterize race relations between African Americans and Japanese Americans?

**The Many Facets of Brown: Integration in a Multiracial Society**

No state in the union, not even the most unreconstructed southern one, faces the enormous and complicated racial problem California will have for some time. The South mainly just has Negroes and antebellum whites. California has Negroes, whites, Japanese, Mexicans and Chinese, all of whom must learn to live together, or the whole shebang might as well be chucked on a KKK bonfire.

*Editorial, Los Angeles Tribune, June 1, 1946*

If we focus our histories of integration solely on black-white encounters, then we lose a multiracial past that speaks to our multiracial present and future . . . Demographically, at least, postwar Los Angeles anticipated the United States of today . . .

Focusing on Los Angeles during the critical period between World War II and Brown, I examine how African Americans and Japanese Americans negotiated the overlapping space they . . . occupied in the city. In spite of their communities’ distinct experiences with racism, black and Japanese American activists struggled to defuse interethnic tensions and forge cooperative bonds . . .

[During the War], African Americans in Los Angeles organized a broad-based movement for “Negro Victory.” . . . Ultimately, the Negro Victory movement improved the social and political conditions of all working people and people of color in Los Angeles. Through participation in public demonstrations, union elections, and grass-roots political organizations, working-class Africans Americans, whose ranks and political clout were swelled by the wartime migrations, helped generate an oppositional culture in the city. Moreover, recognizing that wartime gains were mere initial steps that could prove temporary, black social democrats . . . pushed a vision of integration that was not race specific. They recognized that implementing universal social welfare and employment policies and programs required multiracial solidarity. Before the war, black, Japanese, and Mexican Americans tended to live in the same neighborhoods and to face similar forms of exclusion, but they rarely cooperated politically. During the war, however, the first truly multiracial social movement in the city’s history arose . . .
Following the government’s lifting of the internment order at the start of 1945, the return of Japanese Americans to the city seriously tested the new spirit of solidarity. The competition for living space was even more intense... Black and Japanese Americans especially felt the sting of the citywide housing crunch. An April 1945 survey by the county revealed that over 11,000 African American families lacked permanent housing. An estimated 6,000 of those were living in residences of uprooted Japanese Americans, who themselves resorted to makeshift hostels, trailer parks, boardinghouses, and “doubling up” to survive.

... The hype surrounding the fears of an impending race riot and the subsequent “miracle” of racial harmony was testimony to the high stakes of postwar racial politics. Reality fell somewhere in between. In response to real tensions, black and Japanese Americans consciously forged interethnic solidarity. For instance, tight-knit bonds further developed between black and Japanese Americans in Crenshaw, which emerged during the postwar era as the city’s first consciously integrated neighborhood. It served as base for the ascent of the black politician Tom Bradley to the mayor’s office (as well as for the joint efforts of “Black Power” and “Yellow Power” radicals later in the 1960s)...

But in the fight to implement racial integration, the victory proved incomplete, the coalition fragile, and the process a constant struggle. The fate of Pilgrim House exemplifies those points. Although it temporarily shared the Union Church with its Japanese American membership, the agency had to move in 1949. The integrationist concept behind programs such as Pilgrim House was a foreign one to most Japanese immigrants, whose prewar history of systematic exclusion had mandated a reliance on self-sufficient ethnic institutions. In their eyes, it was something being imposed on them by the state, white elites, and JACL leaders. Indeed, liberal white and Nisei assimilationists frequently lauded the “positive” effect the internment had in breaking down the “backward” ethnic institutions and the community’s immigrant leadership. Those assimilationists, however, were the elements who rank-and-file Japanese Americans felt had most betrayed them during the war. Japanese Protestant leaders, in particular, argued that the maintenance of several integrationist programs created during the war at the Union Church and other locations translated into the unjust and undemocratic usurpation of Japanese American institutions by white church officials. A Japanese immigrant and lay leader of the church characterized integration as a “good thing” but contended that his community was not “ready” for engineered race mixing while it was “still suffering from the effects of being segregated in camps.”

2. Civil Rights and Kennedy’s Response

... The pressures that had mounted in the decade and a half after World War II had brought significant change in eliminating segregation in American society. As the effort continued, a spectrum of organizations, some old, some new, carried the fight forward. The NAACP, founded in 1910, remained committed to overturning the legal bases for segregation in the aftermath of its victory in the Brown v. Board of Education case of 1954. The Congress of Racial Equality (CORE), an interracial group established in 1942, promoted change through peaceful confrontation. In 1957, after their victory in the bus boycott in Montgomery, Alabama, Martin Luther King, Jr., and others formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), an organization of southern black clergy. Far more militant was the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC, pronounced “snick”), which began to operate in 1960 and recruited young Americans who had not been involved in the civil rights struggle.

Confrontations continued in the 1960s. On January 31, 1960, four black college students from the Agricultural and Technical College in Greensboro, North Carolina, protested continuing patterns of segregation, despite the Supreme Court’s important rulings. Frustrated that they were permitted to shop but not to eat at a Woolworth’s, part of a department store chain specializing in household goods, they sat down at the lunch counter in the store and deliberately violated southern segregation laws by refusing to leave. When a reporter inquired how long they had been planning the protest, the students responded, “All our lives!” While they left at the end of the day, the next day more students showed up, and the following day still more. The sit-ins, which spread to other cities, captured media attention and eventually included as many as 70,000 participants...

The following year, sit-ins gave rise to freedom rides, aimed at testing southern transportation facilities that recently had been desegregated by a Supreme Court decision. Organized initially by CORE and aided by SNCC, the program sent groups of blacks and whites together on buses heading south and stopping at terminals along the way. The riders, peaceful themselves, anticipated confrontations that would publicize their cause and generate political support...

In Birmingham, police made an agreement with the Ku Klux Klan to give Klansmen 15 minutes alone to beat the Freedom Riders. Although the FBI knew about the plan, the federal agency did nothing to stop it.

In the North and South alike, consciousness of the need to combat racial discrimination grew.
... Alabama became a national focus that year as a violent confrontation unfolded in Birmingham. Local black leaders encouraged Martin Luther King, Jr., to launch another attack on southern segregation in the city, 40 percent black, which remained rigidly segregated along racial and class lines. “We believed that while a campaign in Birmingham would surely be the toughest fight of our civil rights careers,” King later explained, “it could, if successful, break the back of segregation all over the nation.”


3. Achievements and Challenges in Civil Rights

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 outlawed racial discrimination in all public accommodations and authorized the Justice Department to act with greater authority in school and voting matters. In addition, an equal-opportunity provision prohibited discriminatory hiring on grounds of race, gender, religion, or national origin in firms with more than 25 employees.

... The Voting Rights Act of 1965, perhaps the most important law of the decade, singled out the South for its restrictive practices and authorized the U.S. attorney general to appoint federal examiners to register voters where local officials were obstructing the registration of blacks. In the year after passage of the act, 400,000 blacks registered to vote in the Deep South; by 1968, the number reached 1 million.

Despite passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, racial discrimination remained throughout the country. Still-segregated schools, wretched housing, and inadequate job opportunities were continuing problems. As the struggle for civil rights moved north, dramatic divisions within the movement emerged.

[Urban African Americans faced problems of poverty, exclusion from unions, slum conditions, and police brutality that led to civil rights activism in northern cities. This created the conditions for the rise of militant groups.]

Even more responsible for channeling black frustration into a new set of goals and tactics was Malcolm X [who] ... became a convert to the Nation of Islam. ... Espousing black separatism and black nationalism for most of his public career, he argued for black control of black communities, preached an international
perspective embracing African peoples in diaspora, and appealed to blacks to fight racism “by any means necessary.” Malcolm X became the most dynamic spokesman for poor northern blacks since Marcus Garvey in the 1920s. Though he was assassinated by black antagonists in 1965, his African-centered, uncompromising perspective helped shape the struggle against racism.

. . . Black Power was a call for a broad-based campaign to build independent institutions in the African-American community. It drew on growing demands for an end to the physical and sexual abuse of black women . . . Black Power fostered a powerful sense of black pride . . . Black Power led to demands for more drastic action. The Black Panthers, radical activists who organized first in Oakland, California, and then in other cities, formed a militant organization that vowed to eradicate not only racial discrimination but capitalism as well. H. Rap Brown, who succeeded Carmichael as head of SNCC, became known for his statement that “violence is as American as cherry pie.”

Violence accompanied the more militant calls for reform and showed that racial injustice was not a southern problem but an American one. Riots erupted in Rochester, New York City, and several New Jersey cities in 1964. In 1965, in the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles, a massive uprising lasting five days left 34 dead, more than 1,000 injured, and hundreds of structures burned to the ground. Violence broke out again in other cities in 1966, 1967, and 1968.

Nash et al., 979.
Question to Consider
How did the platform of I WOR KUEN fit into the civil rights movement?

Asian people in Amerika have been continually oppressed by the greedy, traitorous gangsters of our own communities and by the wider racist exploitative Amerikan society. We have been bombarded by the media . . . with false ideas about how we should accept our position in this society. They have tried to brainwash us and have even coerced us into going overseas and fighting against our own people in S. E. Asia . . .

We want to improve the living conditions of our people and are preparing to defend our communities against the gangsters, businessmen, politicians and police. When a government oppresses the people and no longer serves the needs of the people, we have the right to abolish it and create a new one.

We are working for a world of peace, where the needs of the people come first, which is without class distinctions and is based upon the love and unity of all peoples.

I Wor Kuen, Getting Together newspaper, March 1971.

See Appendix for Transcript – pg. 50
4. Latino Mobilization

. . . [In 1968, Mexican-American students began to protest conditions in secondary schools. They pointed to overcrowded and run-down institutions and to the 50 percent dropout rate that came from expulsion, transfer, or failure because students had never been taught to read. In March 1968, some 10,000 Chicano students walked out of five high schools in Los Angeles. Their actions inspired other walkouts in Colorado, Texas, and other parts of California and led to successful demands for Latino teachers, counselors, and courses as well as better facilities.]

At the same time, new organizations emerged. Young Citizens for Community Action, founded by teenager David Sánchez and four Chicanos in East Los Angeles, began as a service club to assist the neighborhood. Later, the organization adopted a paramilitary stance and evolved into a defensive patrol, now known as Young Chicanos for Community Action, which tried to protect local residents. Its members became identified as the Brown Berets and formed chapters throughout the Midwest and Southwest.

Other Latinos followed a more political path. In Texas, José Angel Gutiérrez formed a citizens’ organization that developed into the La Raza Unida political party and successfully promoted Mexican-American candidates for political offices . . .

. . . In the 1960s and 1970s, Mexican Americans became more active politically . . . César Chávez, founder of the United Farm Workers, proved what could be done by organizing one of the most exploited and ignored groups of laboring people in the country, the migrant farm workers of the West. Chávez (who came from a family whose members were “the first ones to leave the fields if anyone shouted ‘Huelga!’—which is Spanish for ‘Strike!’”) concentrated on migrant Mexican field hands, who worked long hours for meager pay. By 1965, his organization had recruited 1,700 people and was beginning to attract volunteer help.

Chávez first took on the grape growers of California. Calling the grape workers out on strike, the union demanded better pay and working conditions as well as recognition of the union. When the growers did not concede, Chávez launched a nationwide consumer boycott of their products. Although the Schenley Corporation and several wine companies came to terms, others held out. In 1966, the DiGiorgio Corporation agreed to permit a union election but then rigged the results. When California governor Edmund G. Brown launched an investigation that resulted in another election, he became the first major political figure to support the long-powerless Chicano field hands. This time, the United
Farm Workers won. Similar boycotts of lettuce and other products harvested by exploited labor also ended in success.

In 1975, César Chávez's long struggle for farmworkers won passage in California of a measure that required growers to bargain collectively with the elected representatives of the workers. Farmworkers had never been covered by the National Labor Relations Board. Now they had achieved the legal basis for representation that could help bring higher wages and improved working conditions . . .

Nash et al., 1024.
BOYCOTT LETTUCE AND GRAPES

Question to Consider
How does the poster urge people to boycott produce?

Don't buy grapes or lettuce!
The Farmworkers Need You Now

Item 6633

See Appendix for larger image – pg. 53

Creator: United Farmworkers
Context: United Farmworkers' strike and boycott
Audience: American consumers of fruits and vegetables
Purpose: To bring national attention to the rights demanded by the United Farmworkers: better working conditions, union recognition, and better pay

Historical Significance:
The United Farm Workers (UFW) organized migrant farm workers in the West into a labor union. The UFW organized a strike of grape workers seeking better pay, improved working conditions, and union recognition, but the grape growers refused to concede to their demands. The UFW posters called upon Americans to show their support for the UFW by refusing to buy lettuce and grapes. The poster also showed the farm workers' organization in initiating a consumer boycott.
5. Native-American Protest

American Indians learned from the examples of protest they saw around them in rising Third World nationalism and, even more important, in the civil rights revolution. They too came to understand the place of interest-group politics in a diverse society. Finally, they were chastened by the excesses of the Vietnam War. They recognized a pattern of killing people of color that connected Indian–white relations to the excesses in the Philippines at the turn of the century and to atrocities in Korea and Vietnam . . .

At the same time, Native Americans became more confrontational. Like other groups, they worked through the courts when they could but also challenged authority more aggressively when necessary . . .

. . . [One] effort involved the reassertion of fishing rights. In various parts of the nation, the Nisqually, Puyallup, Muckleshoot, Chippewa, and other Indian tribes argued that they had treaty rights to fish where they chose, without worrying about the intrusive regulatory efforts of the states. Despite pressure from other fishermen, a series of court cases provided the tribes with some of the protection they claimed by ruling that nineteenth-century treaties allowing Indians fishing rights “in common with” whites meant that Indians could take up to 50 percent of allowable limits.

Urban Indian activism became highly visible in 1968 when George Mitchell and Dennis Banks, Chippewa living in Minneapolis, founded the activist American Indian Movement (AIM). AIM got Office of Economic Opportunity funds channeled to Indian-controlled organizations. It also established patrols to protect drunken Indians from harassment by the police. As its successes became known, chapters formed in other cities.

An incident in November 1969 dramatized Native-American militancy. A landing party of 78 Indians seized Alcatraz Island in San Francisco Bay in an effort to protest symbolically the inability of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to “deal practically” with questions of Indian welfare. The Indians converted the island, with its defunct federal prison, into a cultural and educational center . . . In 1971, federal officials removed the Indians from Alcatraz. Similar protests followed. In 1972, militants launched the Broken Treaties Caravan to Washington. For six days, insurgents occupied the Bureau of Indian Affairs . . .

Nash et al., 1026.
**American Indian Movement at Wounded Knee**

**Question to Consider**
How does the photograph show Native American disillusionment with the United States' policies towards Native Americans?

![Image of American Indian Movement at Wounded Knee]

**Creator:** The Associated Press/Wide World Photos

**Context:** Inspired by the confrontational approach of other movements, Native Americans resorted to militant tactics to claim more rights.

**Audience:** Newspaper readers

**Purpose:** To show the militancy of the American Indian Movement

**Historical Significance:**
In 1973, the American Indian Movement used armed force to seize the village of Wounded Knee, South Dakota, the original site of the U.S. Army’s massacre of the Sioux in 1890. During the 1960s and 1970s, abject poverty, a high drop-out rate from schools, and rampant alcoholism characterized life on the reservation. By occupying Wounded Knee for two months, AIM made a statement against these living conditions and the 371 treaties that the United States government had broken. A standoff ensued. As AIM brought in supplies, the FBI circled Wounded Knee and killed one Native American and wounded another. After the incident, the federal government promised to re-examine the treaty rights, but took no subsequent action.
6. Native-American Protest

At the same time, Native Americans devoted increasing attention to providing education and developing legal skills. Because roughly half of the Indian population continued to live on reservations, many tribal communities founded their own colleges. In 1971, the Oglala Sioux established Oglala Lakota College on the Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota. The motto “Wa Wo Ici Ya” (“We can do it ourselves”) revealed the college’s goal. Nearby Sinte Gleska College on the Rosebud Reservation was the first to offer accredited four-year and graduate programs. The number of Indians in college increased from a few hundred in the early 1960s to tens of thousands by 1980 . . .

Nash et al., 1026.

7. Backlashes

[Beginning in the 1960s, a backlash from whites] . . . developed in response to the increasing assertiveness of people of color . . . Conservatives resented what they considered to be black ingratitude at the civil rights measures enacted by the federal government, including black power’s condemnation of whites as “crackers” and “honkies.” Urban riots and escalating rates of violent crime, along with the Supreme Court’s expansion of the rights of the accused, deepened their anger. They associated crime with urban African Americans, for although whites were still the majority of criminals, blacks (like any other population with less money) were disproportionately represented in prisons. Many in the white working class feared that desegregating schools and neighborhoods would lead to a decline in their property values. While keeping darker-skinned Americans economically and socially subordinated, most whites still expected them to want to emulate mainstream white American society. Leaders such as Cesar Chávez and Martin Luther King, Jr., were devout Christians who emphasized equality and nonviolence, and many whites admired them. But the rise of often angry nonwhite nationalism dismayed most European Americans. They were troubled by the militancy of Chicanos in the Southwest, Puerto Ricans in the Northeast, Indians on reservations and in cities, and African Americans almost everywhere.

The backlash was not only about race. It also represented a defense of traditional hierarchies against the cultural rebellions of the 1960s. Proud of their lives and values, conservatives rejected a whole array of challenges to American society. Raised to believe in respecting one’s elders, they resented the disrespect of many youth, who warned, “Don’t trust anyone over 30.” A generation that had
fought and sacrificed in the “good war” against the Nazis found the absence of patriotism among many protesters unfathomable. The United States remained one of the most religious of industrialized societies, and conservative churchgoers emphasized obedience to authorities. They feared the effects of illegal drugs on their children. They resented being told that their assumptions about the roles and behavior of men and women, on which they had built their daily lives, were wrong. They did not want to argue about the behavior of the U.S. government; “America: Love It Or Leave It” became a favorite bumper sticker . . .

Wood et al., 892.
Conclusion
African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, and Native Americans organized movements for equal rights through nonviolent and, occasionally, armed protests. These movements helped outlaw racial discrimination, promoted equal opportunity in the workplace, and protected the rights of registered voters. Despite legislative victories, however, racial discrimination persisted in segregated schools, housing projects, and inadequate job opportunities. Some Americans attempted to limit these gains by claiming “reverse discrimination.”

Questions to Consider
1. Why did black militant organizations emerge after the passage of civil rights and voting rights legislation?
2. What was the connection of the Black Panthers and other identity-based groups to the economic situation?
3. Why was education an important civil rights issue for Mexican Americans, and what effect did it yield?
Theme Two: Motivated by the conviction that everyday citizens could bring about positive social change, movements and individuals challenged authority in schools, churches, corporations, families, and government.

Overview

During the sixties and seventies, the United States saw a call for more democracy in all areas of life as cultural expectations and norms changed in schools, communities, the workplace, and religious settings. Students reaffirmed their rights to express themselves on college campuses. Later on, students sought greater participation in university affairs and curriculum reform. With mounting protest against the Vietnam War, students took part in teach-ins that gradually became more like antiwar rallies.

The women’s movement also played an important role in the call for more democracy. Through the establishment of the National Organization for Women, women not only sought fair pay and equal opportunity, but a more egalitarian form of marriage. Through court challenges, women secured more rights. For example, Title IX required schools to spend comparable amounts on women’s and men’s sports programs, and the landmark case of Roe v. Wade ruled that constitutional privacy rights encompassed a woman’s decision on whether or not to end her pregnancy.

The call for greater democracy also extended to protecting environmental and consumer rights as individuals successfully challenged the government and business to protect the safety and welfare of the general public. The environmental movement produced legislation that halted the depletion of the country’s natural resources, regulated polluters, improved water and air quality, and protected endangered species. Paralleling this movement was the development of a consumer movement that protected the interests of the purchasing public and made business more responsible to consumers, particularly in regards to product safety.

Questions to Consider

1. To what extent did these movements succeed in challenging authority?
2. In what way did the leadership of these movements differ from other “rights” movements?
1. **Student Activism and Antiwar Protest**

[In the 1960s,] Americans began to protest their involvement in the [Vietnam War]. But their protest had roots in a deeper disaffection, based in large part on post–World War II demographic patterns. Members of the baby boom generation came of age in the 1960s, and many of them, especially from the large middle class, moved on to some form of higher education. Between 1950 and 1964, the number of students in college more than doubled. By the end of the 1960s, college enrollment was more than four times what it had been in the 1940s. College served as a training ground for industry and corporate life; more important, it gave students time to experiment and grow before they had to make a living . . .

The first blow of the growing student rebellion came at the University of California in Berkeley. There, civil rights activists became involved in a confrontation soon known as the Free Speech Movement. It began in September 1964 when the university refused to allow students to distribute protest material outside the main campus gate. The students, many of whom had worked in the movement in the South, argued that their tables were off campus and therefore not subject to university restrictions on political activity. When police arrested one of the leaders, students surrounded the police car and kept it from moving all night. The university regents brought charges against the student leaders, and when the regents refused to drop the charges, the students occupied the administration building . . .

The Free Speech Movement at Berkeley was basically a plea for traditional liberal reform. Students sought only the reaffirmation of the long-standing right to express themselves as they chose, and they aimed their attacks at the university, not at society as a whole. Later, in other institutions, the attack broadened. Students sought greater involvement in university affairs, argued for curricular reform, and demanded admission of more minority students. Their success in gaining their demands changed the governance of American higher education.

The mounting protest against the escalation of the Vietnam War fueled and refocused the youth movement. SDS [Students for a Democratic Society], which had been trying to mobilize both workers and students to create a more equitable society at home, now turned its attention to the war. As escalation began, 82 percent of the public felt that American forces should stay in Vietnam until the Communist elements withdrew. Then students began to question basic Cold War assumptions about battling communism around the globe. The first antiwar teach-in took place in March 1965 at the University of Michigan. Others soon followed . . .
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**Port Huron Statement of the Students for a Democratic Society**

**Question to Consider**
What events does the Port Huron Statement mention that influenced American students?

Introductory Note: This document represents the results of several months of writing and discussion among the membership, a draft paper, and revision by the Students for a Democratic Society national convention meeting . . . It is represented as a document with which SDS officially identifies, but also as a living document open to change with our times and experiences. It is a beginning: in our own debate and education, in our dialogue with society . . .

As a social system we seek the establishment of a democracy of individual participation, governed by two central aims: that the individual share in those social decisions determining the quality and direction of his life; that society be organized to encourage independence in men and provide the media for their common participation.

In a participatory democracy, the political life would be based in several root principles:

- that decision-making of basic social consequence be carried on by public groupings;
- that politics be seen positively, as the art of collectively creating an acceptable pattern of social relations;
- that politics has the function of bringing people out of isolation and into community, thus being a necessary, though not sufficient, means of finding meaning in personal life;
- that the political order should serve to clarify problems in a way instrumental to their solution; it should provide outlets for the expression of personal grievance and aspiration; opposing views should be organized so as to illuminate choices and facilities the attainment of goals; channels should be commonly available to related men to knowledge and to power so that private problems — from bad recreation facilities to personal alienation — are formulated as general issues.

**Creator:** Tom Hayden

**Context:** The height of the civil rights movement and the anti-Vietnam War protest movement of the mid-60s

**Audience:** Students for a Democratic Society

**Purpose:** To create a document that explained the political goals of Students for a Democratic Society

**Historical Significance:**
In 1962, the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) issued a political manifesto entitled the Port Huron Statement, which criticized the United States government for its failure to achieve international peace abroad and address social problems at home. In writing the Port Huron Statement, SDS employed a collaborative approach that relied on group discussion and feedback. As the war in Vietnam escalated, SDS protested through teach-ins on college campuses and demonstrations in Washington, D.C. SDS lasted to the end of the sixties and used direct action through non-violent civil disobedience to bring about “participatory democracy.”
The economic sphere would have as its basis the principles:

- that work should involve incentives worthier than money or survival. It should be educative, not stultifying; creative, not mechanical; selfdirect, not manipulated, encouraging independence; a respect for others, a sense of dignity and a willingness to accept social responsibility, since it is this experience that has crucial influence on habits, perceptions and individual ethics;

- that the economic experience is so personally decisive that the individual must share in its full determination;

- that the economy itself is of such social importance that its major resources and means of production should be open to democratic participation and subject to democratic social regulation.

- Like the political and economic ones, major social institutions — cultural, education, rehabilitative, and others — should be generally organized with the well-being and dignity of man as the essential measure of success . . .

As students, for a democratic society, we are committed to stimulating this kind of social movement, this kind of vision and program in campus and community across the country. If we appear to seek the unattainable, it has been said, then let it be known that we do so to avoid the unimaginable.

Tom Hayden, *The Port Huron Statement*, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and the Student Department of the League for Industrial Democracy, 1962.
2. Student Activism and Antiwar Protest

... Protest became a way of life. Between January 1 and June 15, 1968, hundreds of thousands of students staged 221 major demonstrations at more than 100 educational institutions.

One of the most dramatic episodes came in April 1968 at Columbia University, where the issues of civil rights and war were tightly intertwined. A strong SDS chapter urged the university to break ties with the Institute of Defense Analysis, which specialized in military research. The Students’ Afro-American Society tried to stop the building of a new gymnasium, which it claimed encroached on the Harlem community and disrupted life there. Whites occupied one building, blacks another. Finally, the president of the university called in the police. Hundreds of students were arrested; many were hurt. A student sympathy strike followed, and Columbia closed for the summer several weeks early.

The student protests in the United States were part of a worldwide wave of student activism. French students demonstrated in the streets of Paris. In Germany, young radicals like Rudi Dutschke and Ulrike Meinhof were equally vocal in challenging conventional norms. In Japan, students waged armed battles with police.

[Opposition to the Vietnam War was not limited to students. Large numbers of people from different religious affiliations opposed the war based on their religious convictions. Christian leaders from Catholic and Protestant denominations played a role in political activism. In the Catholic Church, the liberal reforms of Vatican II dovetailed with the spirit of political activism in the United States. The Catholic priests, Daniel and Phillip Berrigan, embodied the antiwar protest effort. In the Presbyterian Church, William Sloane Coffin promoted resistance to the draft.]
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3. **Attacking the Feminine Mystique**

Many white women joined the civil rights movement only to find that they were second-class activists. Men, black and white, held the policy positions and relegated women to menial chores when not actually involved in demonstrations or voter drives . . .

Although the civil rights movement helped spark the women’s movement, broad social changes provided the preconditions. During the 1950s and 1960s, increasing numbers of married women entered the labor force . . . Equally important, many more young women were attending college. By 1970, women earned 41 percent of all B.A. degrees awarded, in comparison with only 25 percent in 1950. These educated young women held high hopes for themselves, even if they still earned substantially less than men . . .

Women’s organizations played an important role in bringing about change in the 1970s. In 1966, a group of 28 professional women, including author Betty Friedan, established the National Organization for Women (NOW) “to take action to bring American women into full participation in the mainstream of American society now.” . . .
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Theme Two Secondary Source

Women in the Workforce, 1920–1980

This graph shows the number of women who entered the workforce between 1920–1980. Why did the number of women entering the workforce increase? What accounted for this change?

This graph shows the dramatic increase in the number of women in the workforce over the years. Note particularly the rise in the number of women 25–44 years old in the 1970s.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
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4. Attacking the Feminine Mystique

The women’s movement hit its stride in the 1970s . . . A 1970 survey of first-year college students showed that men interested in such fields as business, medicine, engineering, and law outnumbered women eight to one; by 1975, the ratio had dropped to three to one. The proportion of women beginning law school quadrupled between 1969 and 1973. Women gained access to the military academies and entered senior officer ranks, although they were still restricted from combat command ranks. According to the Census Bureau, 45 percent of mothers with preschool children held jobs outside the home in 1980. That figure was four times greater than it had been 30 years before. To be sure, many employers systematically excluded women from certain positions, and women usually held “female” jobs in the clerical, sales, and service sectors, but the progress was still unmistakable.

Legal changes brought women more benefits and opportunities. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 broadened the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The new legislation, which barred gender bias in federally assisted educational activities and programs, made easier the admission of women to colleges and changed the nature of intercollegiate athletics by requiring schools to fund sports teams for women. By 1980, fully 30 percent of the participants in intercollegiate sports were women, compared with 15 percent before Title IX became law.

Women both in and out of NOW worked for congressional passage, then ratification, of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the Constitution. Passed by Congress in 1972, with ratification seemingly assured, it stated simply, “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.” . . .
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**Theme Two: Primary Source**

**Ms. Magazine Cover**

**Question to Consider**
What does the Ms. cover suggest about the evolution of feminism?

**Creator:** Ms. Magazine

**Context:** The women’s movement generated publications to appeal to women.

**Audience:** Women

**Purpose:** To show the empowerment of women, particularly as it related to their own lives

**Historical Significance:**
The 1982 cover of Ms. magazine portrayed a mother-daughter sex talk that referred to the book *Our Bodies, Ourselves*. Ms. magazine originated from the women’s movement and published articles that appealed to women. *Our Bodies, Ourselves* was a revolutionary book produced during the women’s movement that gave women health information about their own bodies.

---


*See Appendix for larger image – pg. 55*
5. Environmental and Consumer Agitation

Although many of the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s were defined by race, gender, and sexual preference, one cut across all boundaries. Emerging in the early 1960s but not flourishing until the 1970s, a powerful movement of Americans concerned with the environment began to revive issues raised in the Progressive era and to push them further. In the mid-1960s, a Gallup poll revealed that only 17 percent of the public considered air and water pollution to be one of the three major government problems. By 1970, that figure had risen to 53 percent.

The modern environmental movement stemmed in part from post–World War II yearnings for a better “quality of life.” Many Americans began to recognize that clear air, unpolluted waters, and unspoiled wilderness were indispensable to a decent existence . . .

Equally frightening was the potential environmental damage from a nuclear accident . . .

The threat of a nuclear catastrophe underscored the arguments of grassroots environmental activists. Groups like the Clamshell Alliance in New Hampshire and the Abalone Alliance in northern California campaigned aggressively against licensing new nuclear plants at Seabrook, New Hampshire, and Diablo Canyon, California. While activist tactics did not always succeed in their immediate goals, they mobilized opinion sufficiently so that no new plants were authorized after 1978.

Western environmentalists were particularly worried about excessive use of water. The American West, one critic observed, had become “the greatest hydraulic society ever built in history.” Massive irrigation systems had boosted the nation’s use of water from 40 billion gallons a day in 1900 to 393 billion gallons by 1975, though the population had only tripled. Americans used three times as much water per capita as the world’s average, and far more than other industrialized societies.

. . . Environmental agitation produced legislative results in the 1960s and 1970s. Lyndon Johnson, whose vision of the Great Society included an “environment that is pleasing to the senses and healthy to live in,” won basic legislation to halt the depletion of the country’s natural resources. In the next few years, environmentalists went further, pressuring legislative and administrative bodies to regulate polluters. During Richard Nixon’s presidency, Congress passed the Clean Air Act, the Water Quality Improvement Act, and the Resource Recovery Act and mandated a new Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to spearhead the effort to control abuses. Initially, these measures aimed at controlling the toxic by-products of the modern industrial order. In subsequent years, environmentalists broadened the effort to include occupational health and social justice issues.
One such effort developed into an extraordinarily bitter economic and ecological debate. The Endangered Species Act of 1973 prohibited the federal government from supporting any projects that might jeopardize species threatened with extinction. It ran into direct conflict with commercial imperatives in the Pacific Northwest. Loggers in the Olympic Peninsula had long exploited the land by clearcutting (cutting down all trees in a region, without leaving any standing). Environmentalists claimed that the forests they cut provided the last refuge for the spotted owl. Scientists and members of the U.S. Forest Service pushed to set aside timberland so that the owl could survive. Loggers protested that this action jeopardized their livelihood. As the issue wound its way through the courts, logging fell off drastically.

Another protest against regulation in the late 1970s and early 1980s came to be called the Sagebrush Rebellion. Critics argued that large federal landholdings in the West put that region at a disadvantage in economic competition with the East. They demanded that the national government cede the lands to states, which could sell or lease them for local gain. Conservative state legislatures in the Rocky Mountain states supported the scheme. Ranchers applauded the notion. In the end, it went nowhere, though the agitation did persuade federal authorities to endorse a less restrictive policy on grazing.

[Coinciding with the rise of an environmental movement was] . . . a stronger consumer movement . . . aimed at protecting the interests of the purchasing public and making business more responsible to consumers.

Ralph Nader led the movement. He had become interested in the issue of automobile safety while studying law at Harvard and had pursued that interest as a consultant to the Department of Labor. His book *Unsafe at Any Speed: The Designed-in Dangers of the American Automobile* (1965) argued that many cars were coffins on wheels. Head-on collisions, even at low speeds, could easily kill, for cosmetic bumpers could not withstand modest shocks. He termed the Chevrolet Corvair “one of the nastiest-handling cars ever built” because of its tendency to roll over in certain situations. His efforts paved the way for the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, which set minimum safety standards for vehicles on public highways, provided for inspection to ensure compliance, and created a National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council.

The consumer movement developed into a full-fledged campaign in the 1970s. Nader’s efforts attracted scores of volunteers, called “Nader’s Raiders.” They turned out critiques and reports and, more important, inspired consumer activists at all levels of government—city, state, and national. Consumer protection offices began to monitor a flood of complaints as ordinary citizens became more vocal in defending their rights.
Conclusion
Inspired by the belief that they could bring about positive social change, everyday citizens challenged authority at all levels of American society. Individuals and movements changed higher education, women’s rights, and environmental and consumer protection. As definitions of what Americans were entitled to changed, notions of the rights of individuals expanded.

Questions to Consider
1. Why was there such a proliferation of movements during this period?
2. In what ways did the emerging environmental and consumer movements experience a backlash?
Theme Three: An expanding and influential mass media simultaneously reflected and reshaped a changing cultural and political landscape.

Overview

During the 1960s and 1970s, print, radio, and television reflected an expanding and influential mass media that highlighted the struggles for social and political change, reshaped American popular culture and politics, and further nationalized communication networks. Politicians, leaders of protest movements, and, of course, the news media and the entertainment industry became adept at using mass media to persuade voters, win converts, and increase profits.

After 1960, mass media increasingly exposed the public to political and social events. Newspaper reporting included more analysis and in-depth coverage that differed from the headlines presented on the televised evening news. Television presented indelible images that brought the viewer into the event and allowed audiences to view events “live.” The assassinations of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Jr., and Robert Kennedy shocked the nation as they viewed endless replays. During the civil rights movement, television also projected an image problem for the United States, and the Soviets called attention to the episodes of racism covered by networks and the U.S. government’s hypocrisy. Later, culture and politics came into American households for the moon landing, Vietnam, and the Watergate hearings. By the 1970s, live coverage of events occurred on a regular basis.

A television culture grew as 95 percent of American household owned a television set by 1970. ABC, CBS, and NBC produced television programs to appeal to a mass audience. Driven by the prospect that higher ratings could possibly translate into more profit, the networks competed with one another, hoping that the sponsors would want to strategically place commercial advertisements around a popular program.

Questions to Consider

1. What impact has television had on the course of American historical events such as presidential campaigns, human relations, and wars?
2. How did the media reflect historical events such as Vietnam, presidential addresses, and the moon walk?
3. How did the media influence American culture?
1. Television

In the last 50 years, television has played an increasingly important part in American life, providing historians with another source of evidence about American culture and society in the recent past... The 1948 presidential nominating conventions were the first to be televised, but the use of TV to enhance the public image of politicians was most thoroughly developed by the fatherly Dwight D. Eisenhower and the charismatic John F. Kennedy. [In 1952, the major network news played a role in broadcasting how the Democrats and Republicans nominated presidential candidates at the national party conventions. To some extent, major networks played a decisive role by providing analysis on the electability of candidates and choosing to cover some candidates above others. As television coverage continued into the 1960s, the national parties adapted to television’s scheduling and programming by “scripting” their conventions.

Also during the 1952 election, Dwight D. Eisenhower used a short television commercial to present his image. This novel approach presented an affable, charming person to a mass audience. His Democratic opponent, Adlai Stevenson, followed suite, but was unable to compete with Eisenhower’s popularity. Since 1952, all major presidential campaigns have used television spots to persuade the electorate to vote for their candidate.]
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Kennedy-Nixon Debate

Question to Consider:
Why did television viewers and radio listeners come to different conclusions for the same event?

Creator: The Associated Press/Wide World Photos
Context: Kennedy-Nixon debates in the presidential campaign of 1960
Audience: National television audience
Purpose: To show how television influenced political events

Historical Significance:
These photographs were taken during the Kennedy-Nixon presidential debates in 1960. Seventy million Americans watched John F. Kennedy debate Richard M. Nixon. On television, Kennedy appeared relaxed and energetic while Nixon looked tense. These photographs show the impact that visual images had on viewers who were able to “see” the candidates’ appearance, body language, and gestures as never before. After the debate, polls taken of who won the debate differed based on the medium. Radio listeners thought Nixon won the debate, while television viewers thought Kennedy had won. Kennedy himself admitted, “It was TV more than anything else that turned the tide.”

Items 4185 and 4181
See Appendix for larger images – pg. 56
2. Civil Rights and Kennedy’s Response

[During the civil rights movement, millions of Americans saw images on television of local police officers using electric cattle prods and spraying fire hoses on African American protesters.] . . . Though the demonstrations were nonviolent, the responses were not. City officials declared that protest marches violated city regulations against parading without a license, and, over a five-week period, they arrested 2,200 blacks, some of them schoolchildren. Police Commissioner Eugene “Bull” Connor used high-pressure fire hoses, electric cattle prods, and trained police dogs to force the protesters back. As the media recorded the events, Americans watching television and reading newspapers were horrified. The images of violence created mass sympathy for black Americans’ civil rights struggle.

Kennedy claimed to be sickened by the pictures from Birmingham but insisted that he could do nothing, even though he had sought and won black support in 1960. The narrowness of his electoral victory made him reluctant to press white southerners on civil rights when he needed their votes on other issues. Kennedy initially failed to propose any civil rights legislation and likewise ignored a campaign promise to end housing discrimination by presidential order. Not until November 1962, after the midterm elections, did he take a modest action—an executive order ending segregation in federally financed housing . . .

He also spoke out more forcefully than before. In a nationally televised address, he called the quest for equal rights a “moral issue” and asked, “Are we to say to the world, and, much more importantly, to each other that this is a land of the free except for the Negroes.” Just hours after the president spoke, [an] assassin killed Medgar Evers, a black NAACP official, in his own driveway in Jackson, Mississippi.
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THE JAZZ AMBASSADORS

Question to Consider
What impression did the State Department hope to convey with this photograph?

Item 5428

See Appendix for larger image – pg. 57

Creator: Unknown
Context: Rehearsals in preparation for State Department-sponsored tours during the Cold War
Audience: Iola and Dave Brubeck
Purpose: To promote a more positive image of American race-relations

Historical Significance:
During the height of the Cold War, America faced an image problem overseas because of its civil rights violations, which undermined its claim to equality and freedom. To combat this unfavorable portrayal, the State Department developed a cultural exchange program featuring the “Jazz Ambassadors,” a group of touring musicians that included Louis Armstrong and Dave Brubeck. The State Department chose the Jazz Ambassadors because they represented a uniquely American genre of music—many African Americans musicians played jazz—hoping that this would promote a more positive image of American race-relations. The Jazz Ambassadors toured nations that had not aligned with the Soviets or the United States. While Armstrong showed American cultural strength, however, he also remained a steadfast critic of U.S. racism. On the jazz tours, Armstrong and Dave and Iola Brubeck satirized the tours through their music, as well as the assumption that America’s race problem could be solved with a cosmetic fix to its tarnished international image.
3. Change of Command

In November 1963, Kennedy traveled to Texas, where he hoped to unite the state’s Democratic party for the upcoming election. Dallas, one of the stops on the trip, was reputed to be hostile to the administration . . . As the party entered the city in an open car, the president encountered friendly crowds. Suddenly shots rang out, and Kennedy slumped forward as bullets ripped through his head and throat. Mortally wounded, he died a short time later at a Dallas hospital . . .

Americans were stunned. For days, people stayed at home and watched endless television replays of the assassination and its aftermath. The images of the handsome president felled by bullets, the funeral cortege, and the president’s young son saluting his father’s casket as it rolled by on the way to final burial at Arlington National Cemetery were all imprinted on people’s minds. United around the event, members of an entire generation remembered where they had been when Kennedy was shot, just as an earlier generation recalled Pearl Harbor . . . [The assassination of Kennedy was the first shocking event in the age of television. People had never had such images brought into their living rooms. More shocking images later came from the Vietnam War.]

[In 1963, Walter Cronkite became the anchor for the CBS Evening News and was the only network news anchor to report Kennedy’s assassination to the American public. Viewers came to rely upon Cronkite’s credible and substantive news reporting as he ended the nightly news by stating, “And that’s the way it is.” By 1967, all three networks had increased nightly news coverage from fifteen to thirty minutes, further indicating television’s increased usage as a means of mass media.]

[After 1960, newspapers gave readers more analysis and in-depth reporting to distinguish their coverage from the headlines presented in thirty-minute blocks on the televised evening news. In the 1970s, large newspapers like the New York Times, Washington Post, and Los Angeles Times turned to investigative reporting to uncover the big stories. Bob Woodward and Carl Bernstein of the Washington Post exposed the Nixon administration’s involvement in the Watergate scandal and further established newspapers as watchdogs of the political classes. Meanwhile, local newspapers reflected issues that resonated nationally, often polarizing communities.]
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4. Student Activism and Antiwar Protest

[When the networks televised the Vietnam War,] . . . American audiences watched the fighting on television, as they had for several years, seeing images of burning huts and wounded soldiers each evening as they ate dinner. During the Tet offensive, American television networks showed scenes of a kind never screened before . . . Viewers who watched the television clip saw the corpse drop to the ground, blood spouting from his head. Gazing at such graphic representations of death and destruction, many Americans wondered about their nation’s purposes and actions—indeed, about whether the war could be won.
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5. The Counterculture

Cultural change accompanied political upheaval. In the 1960s, many Americans, particularly young people, lost faith in the sanctity of the American system. “There was,” observed Joseph Heller, the irreverent author of *Catch-22* (1961), “a general feeling that the platitudes of Americanism were horseshit . . . “

Surface appearances were most visible and, to older Americans, most troubling. The “hippies” of the 1960s carried themselves in different ways. Men let their hair grow and sprouted beards; men and women both donned jeans, muslin shirts, and other simple garments. Stressing spontaneity above all else, some rejected traditional marital customs and gravitated to communal living groups. Their example, shocking to some, soon found its way into the culture at large, both in the United States and among young people around the world.

Sexual norms underwent a revolution as more people separated sex from its traditional ties to family life . . . The arts reflected the sexual revolution. Federal courts ruled that books like D. H. Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, earlier considered obscene, could not be banned. Many suppressed works, long available in Europe, now began to appear. Nudity became more common on stage and screen. In Hair, a rock musical, one scene featured the disrobing of performers of both genders in the course of an erotic celebration.

Paintings reflected both the mood of dissent and the urge to innovate, apparent in the larger society. “Op” artists painted sharply defined geometric figures in clear, vibrant colors, starkly different from the flowing, chaotic work of the abstract expressionists. “Pop” artists such as Andy Warhol, Roy Lichtenstein, and Jasper
Johns broke with formalistic artistic conventions as they made ironic comments on American materialism and taste with their representations of everyday objects like soup cans, comic strips, and pictures of Marilyn Monroe.

Hallucinogenic drugs also became a part of the counterculture. One prophet of the drug scene was Timothy Leary, a scientific researcher experimenting with LSD at Harvard University . . . Working through his group, the League for Spiritual Discovery, he dressed in long robes and preached his message, “Tune in, turn on, drop out . . . “

The rock and roll of the 1950s and the gentle strains of folk music gave way to a new kind of rock that swept the country—and the world.

Rock festivals became popular throughout the 1960s. Held all over the country, the most dramatic such event occurred at the end of the decade. On an August weekend in 1969, some 400,000 people gathered in a large pasture in upstate New York for the Woodstock rock festival . . . [Woodstock came to symbolize the counterculture of the 1960s, and was one of the first instances in which the counterculture received coverage from the national news media.]
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“I FEEL LIKE I’M FIXIN’ TO DIE RAG”

Questions to Consider
1. How does Country Joe make his case against the Vietnam War?
2. What events in Country Joe McDonald’s life help to make his case against the Vietnam War?

Come on all of you big strong men, Uncle Sam needs your help again
He’s got himself in a terrible jam, way down yonder in Viet Nam
So put down your books and pick up a gun, we’re gonna have
a whole lotta fun

(CHORUS)
And it’s one, two, three, what are we fighting for
Don’t ask me I don’t give a damn, next stop is Viet Nam
And it’s five, six, seven, open up the pearly gates
Ain’t no time to wonder why, whoopee we’re all gonna die

Well come on generals, let’s move fast, your big chance has come at last
Gotta go out and get those reds, the only good commie is the one that’s dead
And you know that peace can only be won, when we’ve blown ’em all to
kingdom come

(CHORUS)
And it’s one, two, three, what are we fighting for
Don’t ask me I don’t give a damn, next stop is Viet Nam
And it’s five, six, seven, open up the pearly gates
Ain’t no time to wonder why, whoopee we’re all gonna die

Come on Wall Street don’t be slow, why man this war is a go-go
There’s plenty good money to be made, by supplying the army with the
tools of its trade
Just hope and pray that if they drop the bomb, they drop it on the Viet Cong

(CHORUS)
And it’s one, two, three, what are we fighting for
Don’t ask me I don’t give a damn, next stop is Viet Nam
And it’s five, six, seven, open up the pearly gates
Ain’t no time to wonder why, whoopee we’re all gonna die

Well come on mothers throughout the land, pack your boys off to Viet Nam
Come on fathers don’t hesitate, send your sons off before it’s too late
Be the first ones on your block, to have your boy come home in a box

(CHORUS)
And it’s one, two, three, what are we fighting for
Don’t ask me I don’t give a damn, next stop is Viet Nam
And it’s five, six, seven, open up the pearly gates
Ain’t no time to wonder why, whoopee we’re all gonna die

Country Joe McDonald, I Feel Like I’m Fixin’ To Die Rag, words and music by Joe McDonald © 1965; renewed 1993 by Alkatraz Corner Music Co, BMI.
THE GREAT HAIR DEBATE,
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Questions to Consider
1. Why is the length of boy’s hair important to Clark J. Matthews?
2. What does this case tell us about how the media reflected popular culture?

Editor, *El Paso Times*:

In reading and viewing the news as presented these days one cannot help but give a lot of thought to such problems as the school dress code and particularly that section which deals with long hair on males. In the past 300 years there have been many hair styles for both male and female of the species; but never in my opinion have the young males exhibited such dislike, such
apparent hatred and shame for having been born a male as now. So naturally they try to look as much like the females as possible, even to growing long hair and wearing [sic] as much like the females do as possible.

Where is that virile young male of yesteryear—so strong, so outstanding?

Where is that pride of manhood so nobly fought for by the males in the past?

Even among the dumb animals the male has so much pride in his being a male and protector of his female and offspring that he would die of shame if his looks were altered to make him look like a female.

Perhaps this apparent feeling of shame for being a male is one reason why we have so many “yellow bellies” who balk at doing their military duty. Also this may account for so many demonstrations and other militant acts.

I am not one to judge harshly, but when I behold my sex being betrayed by so many young teens who have more knowledge than their elders but so inexperienced [sic] that they do not know how to use it I take the position that these thoughts should be made known to the general public.

To say the least, it is a frustrating experience to be walking along the street and behold what looks and to all outward appearance is a good looking young woman approaching you and have that cloud of doubt seize you at the moment the person comes in close proximity to you.

Was it a boy or a girl?

Needless to say I prefer the old-fashioned appearance and a young man who, [sic] is proud to be and look like a male, and by the same token a young lady who looks and acts like a young lady.

Clark J. Matthews

Conclusion
Television and other forms of mass media transformed American politics and culture. As historic events unfolded before the eyes of Americans, print, radio, and television documented, interpreted, and influenced cultural and political events. Newspapers shaped outcomes through investigative reporting and in-depth analysis, particularly as it related to political campaigns. During the 1970s, live television coverage of political events influenced political campaigns, elections, and governance.

Question to Consider
Why did mass media have such a compelling influence on American culture during the 1960s and 1970s?

Unit Conclusion
Following the experiences of World War II, African Americans, Asian Americans, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans organized movements for equal rights through nonviolent and, occasionally, armed protests. In spite of internal differences and external resistance, the civil rights movement succeeded in pressuring Congress to pass legislation outlawing racial discrimination with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Federal legislation was not enough, however, to guarantee adequate housing, create new job opportunities, and end segregated schools.

Inspired by the civil rights movement, Americans challenged authority in schools, churches, the workplace, and even within local communities during the 1960s and 1970s. Student movements—such as the Students for a Democratic Society—called for greater “participatory democracy” and voiced opposition to the war in Vietnam. Students were not alone in their opposition: leaders from both Catholic and Protestant denominations challenged authority by protesting the Vietnam War based on their religious convictions. The women’s movement called for greater democracy as women sought fair pay, equal opportunity, and control over their own bodies. An environmental movement and a consumer rights movement challenged the government and business to protect the safety and health of the American public.

These movements took place in the midst of an expanding and influential mass media that reflected and reshaped the cultural and political landscape within the United States. Television not only reported “live” events, but created a format that presented opportunities in which politicians and leaders of protest movements could advance their cause by scripting the event and using professional media consultants. As television grew in popularity, newspapers adjusted their coverage of the news through more in-depth analysis and investigative reporting.
**Timeline**

1947  Jackie Robinson joins the Brooklyn Dodgers

1950  North Korea troops invade South Korea

1951  Ethel and Julius Rosenberg are convicted of treason

1953  The Korean War ends

1954  Brown V. Board of Education

1955  Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott begins

1957  Central High School, Little Rock, Arkansas, integrated
      Jack Kerouac publishes *On the Road*
      Civil Rights Act of 1957

1960  Beginning of lunch counter sit-ins (Greensboro, North Carolina)
      Birth control pill becomes available
      Sit-ins begin
      Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) founded

1961  Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba
      Freedom Rides begin
      Khrushchev and Kennedy meet in Berlin

1962  Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) publishes the Port Huron Statement
      Michael Harrington, *The Other America*
      Cuban missile crisis

1963  Lyndon B. Johnson becomes president after assassination of John F. Kennedy
      Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*
      Birmingham demonstration
      Civil rights march on Washington

1964  Civil Rights Act of 1964
      Johnson reelected president

1965  Civil Rights Act of 1965
      Martin Luther King, Jr., leads march from Selma to Montgomery
      United Farm Workers grape boycott

1966  Clean Water Act
      Stokely Carmichael becomes head of SNCC and calls for “black power”
      Black Panthers founded

1967  Thurgood Marshall appointed first African American Supreme Court justice
1968  Martin Luther King, Jr., assassinated
       Robert Kennedy assassinated
       Wild and Scenic Rivers Act
       Student demonstrations at Columbia University and elsewhere
       Police and protesters clash at Democratic national convention

1969  Huge antiwar protests in Washington, D.C.
       Indians occupy Alcatraz, San Francisco Bay
       Stonewall raid, New York City
       Woodstock and Altamont rock festivals
       Weathermen’s “Days of Rage” in Chicago

1970  National Guardsmen kill four students at Kent State University

1971  Pentagon Papers published

1973  **Roe v. Wade** legalizes abortion
       American Indian Movement members occupy Wounded Knee, South Dakota

1974  Nixon resigns; Gerald Ford becomes president

1975  End of the Vietnam War
       Farmworkers win right to bargain collectively with growers
       Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Acts

**UNIT REFERENCE MATERIALS**


- McDonald, Country Joe. *I Feel Like I’m Fixin’ to Die Rag*. Words and music by Joe McDonald, 1965, renewed 1993 by Alkatraz Corner Music Co, BMI.


FURTHER READING


VISIT THE WEB SITE

Explore these themes further on the America’s History in the Making Web site. See how this content aligns with your own state standards, browse the resource archive, review the series timeline, and explore the Web interactives. You can also read full versions of selected Magazine of History (MOH) articles or selected National Center for History in the Schools (NCHS) lesson plans.

Courtesy of the National Archives and Records Administration.
Asian people in Amerika have been continually oppressed by the greedy, traitorous gangsters of our own communities and by the wider racist exploitative Amerikan society. We have been bombarded by the media (newspapers, T.V., radio and schools) with false ideas about how we should accept our position in this society. They have tried to brainwash us and have even coerced us into going overseas and fighting against our own people in S. E. Asia.

But, Asian Amerikans have been fighting back against the oppression of this country ever since we first tasted bitterness of Amerika's racism and exploitation. The long and heroic history of the Asian Amerikan struggle inspired and strengthened us in our purpose. No longer can we endure these oppressive conditions. We cannot let our ancestors’ struggles go down in vain. We know who are our real enemies and friends and we have found new strength for we are joining our sisters and brothers within this country and around the world to fight for freedom and justice against the rulers of this country.

We have tried peaceful means of petitions, courts, voting and even demonstrations. But our situation remained the same. We are not free.

We want to improve the living conditions of our people and are preparing to defend our communities against repression and for revolutionary armed war against the gangsters, businessmen, politicians and police. When a government oppresses the people and no longer serves the needs of the people, we have the right to abolish it and create a new one.

We are working for a world of peace, where the needs of the people come first, which is without class distinctions and is based upon the love and unity of all peoples.

The following 12 points are what we are fighting for:

1. **WE WANT SELF-DETERMINATION FOR ASIAN AMERICANS.**

   The masses of Asian people in Amerika live in ghettos which are like small colonies. The Amerikan capitalists continually attempt to make profit off us by trying to alter our entire way of life for their own benefit. We want liberation from this enslavement so we can determine our own destinies.

2. **WE WANT SELF-DETERMINTATION FOR ALL ASIANS**

   Western impartialists have been invading and colonizing countries in Asia for the past 500 years. Amerikan imperialism, concentrating in Asia is new engaged in the most sadistic and genocidal war of aggression the world has ever seen. We want an immediate end to the Amerikan imperials.

3. **WE WANT LIBERATION OF ALL THIRD WORLD PEOPLES AND OTHER OPPRESSED PEOPLES.**

   People of color, Asian, Black, Brown, Red are all fighting for liberation from Amerika's racist oppression. Millions and millions of white people are also rising up to fight our common oppressor. We can recognize that only when the oppression of all people is ended can we all really be free.
4. WE WANT AN END TO MALE CHAUVINISM AND SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

The thousands of years of oppression under feudalism and capitalism have created institutions and myths of male supremacy over women. Man must fight along with sisters in the struggle for economic and social equality and must recognize that sisters make up over half of the revolutionary army. Sisters and brothers are equals fighting for our people.

5. WE WANT COMMUNITY CONTROL OF OUR INSTITUTIONS AND LAND.

Those institutions in our communities such as the police, schools, health, housing, transportation, sanitation, anti-pollution, and welfare must be controlled by and serve the needs of our peoples and not be geared to the making of money. We want an end to our community being used to make profit for outsiders, such as slumlords and tourist agencies.

6. WE WANT AN EDUCATION WHICH EXPOSES THE TRUE HISTORY OF WESTERN IMPERIALISM IN ASIA AND AROUND THE WORLD: WHICH TEACHES US THE HARDSHIPS AND STRUGGLES OF OUR ANCESTORS IN THIS LAND AND WHICH REVEALS THE TRULY DECADENT EXPLOITATIVE NATURE OF AMERIKAN SOCIETY.

Amerikan imperialists have tried to justify their world empire by covering up the inhuman deeds they perpetrated in Asian and to the rest of the Third World. They also try to brainwash us in school with racist history which does not tell of the degradation, oppression and humiliations Asians and other Third World people have been forced to suffer in Amerika. We want to learn of the heroic and inspiring struggles Asian people have conducted throughout the world as well as in Amerika.

7. WE WANT DECENT HOUSING AND HEALTH AND CHILD CARE.

The institutions of housing, health and child care are set up only to make money for landlords, doctors, hospitals and drug companies. We want housing, health and child care that gives us life and not slow death.

8. WE WANT FREEDOM FOR ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS AND ALL ASIANS.

Our Asian brothers and sisters in Amerika’s racist jails should be set free for they were not tried by their peers (other Asian brothers and sisters). Political prisoners are jailed because they fought for their freedom and basic rights as human beings. They all must be set free.

9. WE WANT AN END TO THE AMERIKAN MILITARY

The Amerikan military machine is butchering people throughout the world, especially in Asia. The end of the Amerikan military will be one of the greatest events in the history of the liberation of mankind. We want all Asian Amerikans exempt from military servitude.
10. **WE WANT AN END TO RACISM.**

White racism has been oppressing the Third World People for the past 500 years. Although we recognize and firmly support the progressive white people in the anti-imperialist struggle, we should continue to struggle against white racism on all levels. The racism among Third World People toward each other is being broken down and a new unity is being created in our struggle against our common enemy.

11. **WE WANT AN END TO THE GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES OF AMERIKA.**

From its beginning, Amerika has been a robber country. It stole land by the use of armed force from native Americans, Chicanos and Latins, and other peoples. Amerika can now only maintain its present boundaries both internally and externally by the threat and use of violence. We want free passage of all people to and from Amerika. The people of the world have built Amerika, and they must now determine its destiny. Amerika has also tried to blind those who live here as to the realities of socialism by restricting information from and travel to the People's Republic of China, Cuba, Albania, north Korea, and North Vietnam. We want open boundaries and an end to immigration and emigration harassment.

12. **WE WANT A SOCIALIST SOCIETY.**

What exists in Amerika today is a society where one man in order to survive must exploit his fellow man. We want a society that works for the fulfillment of human needs. We want decent housing, health, child care, employment, sanitation and old age care. We want a society where no man or woman will die due to lack of food, medical, care or housing, where each gives according to his ability and takes according to his need.
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