

Rights and Protest

IB SL Study Guide

Contents

How to Use This Guide

Section 1: Case Study 1 — The Civil Rights Movement in the United States, 1954—1965

- 1.1 Background: The Roots of Segregation
- 1.2 *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954)
- 1.3 The Montgomery Bus Boycott (1955—1956)
- 1.4 Little Rock, Arkansas (1957)
- 1.5 Sit-ins, Freedom Rides, and the Rise of Direct Action (1960—1961)
- 1.6 Birmingham, Alabama (1963)
- 1.7 The March on Washington (August 28, 1963)
- 1.8 Legislation: Civil Rights Act (1964) and Voting Rights Act (1965)
- 1.9 Key Figures and Methods
- 1.10 Opposition and Resistance

Section 2: Case Study 2 — Apartheid South Africa, 1948—1964

- 2.1 Background: Segregation Before Apartheid
- 2.2 The National Party and the Implementation of Apartheid (1948)
- 2.3 Resistance: The ANC and the Defiance Campaign (1948—1956)
- 2.4 Sharpeville and the Turn to Armed Struggle (1960—1964)
- 2.5 Key Figures

Section 3: Source Analysis Skills — Paper 1 Technique

- 3.1 Understanding Paper 1 Format
- 3.2 The OPVL Framework
- 3.3 Worked Example 1: Martin Luther King Jr., Letter from Birmingham Jail (1963)
- 3.4 Worked Example 2: Hendrik Verwoerd, Speech on Bantu Education (1954)
- 3.5 IB Command Terms for Paper 1

Section 4: IB Key Concepts Applied to Rights and Protest

Section 5: Comparative Analysis — US Civil Rights vs. Apartheid South Africa

- 5.1 Cross-Regional Comparison
- 5.2 Common Themes Across Both Case Studies

Section 6: Practice Questions

- 6.1 Paper 1 Style Questions
- 6.2 Model Answer Outlines
- 6.3 Paper 2 Style Essay Questions

Section 7: Key Timelines

- 7.1 US Civil Rights Movement, 1954—1965
- 7.2 Apartheid South Africa, 1948—1964
- 7.3 Parallel Comparison

Section 8: Common Exam Mistakes

Section 9: Glossary of Key Terms

MEMORISE THIS

Quick Reference — Prescribed Subject 4: Rights and Protest

	Civil Rights Movement (USA)	Apartheid South Africa
Period	1954—1965	1948—1964
Core struggle	End de jure segregation; secure voting rights for African Americans	Resist and expose comprehensive racial apartheid system
Key turning points	Brown v. Board (1954), Montgomery (1955—56), Birmingham (1963), Civil Rights Act (1964), Voting Rights Act (1965)	National Party elected (1948), Defiance Campaign (1952), Freedom Charter (1955), Sharpeville (1960), Rivonia Trial (1964)
Primary method	Nonviolent direct action throughout the period	Nonviolent (1948—1960) → armed sabotage (1961—1964)
Key figures	MLK, Rosa Parks, Malcolm X, Thurgood Marshall, LBJ	Nelson Mandela, Albert Luthuli, Robert Sobukwe, Hendrik Verwoerd
Outcome by period end	Civil Rights Act + Voting Rights Act — legal segregation abolished	ANC banned; Mandela imprisoned; apartheid intensifies

Top exam tip: The single biggest mark-earner in Q4 is explaining *why* nonviolence succeeded in the US but proved insufficient in South Africa. The answer is structural: the US had democratic elections, a free press, and federal courts the movement could use as levers. South Africa had none of these — making the turn to armed struggle after Sharpeville a rational, not reckless, decision.

How to Use This Guide

- **Prescribed Subject 4** covers two case studies from different regions: the Civil Rights Movement in the United States (1954—1965) and Apartheid South Africa (1948—1964)
- **Paper 1** is a source-based exam lasting **1 hour**, worth **24 marks** and **20% of your final grade** (identical weighting for SL and HL)
- You will receive **four or five sources** and answer **four questions** of increasing difficulty: comprehension, comparison, source analysis (OPVL), and a mini-essay that synthesises source material with your own knowledge
- The single most important skill: **source analysis**. You must be able to evaluate the origin, purpose, value, and limitations of historical sources quickly and precisely
- **Exam Alerts** flag the traps that cost marks in source questions
- **IB Tips** highlight what examiners reward in extended responses
- **Worked Examples** provide model source analyses and essay outlines

A Section 1: Case Study 1 — The Civil Rights Movement in the United States, 1954—1965

1.1 Background: The Roots of Segregation

The Civil Rights Movement did not emerge from nothing. It was the culmination of nearly a century of African American struggle against a legal and social system built to maintain white supremacy after the end of slavery.

The constitutional framework:

After the Civil War (1861—1865), three constitutional amendments transformed the legal status of African Americans:

Amendment	Year	Provision
13th Amendment	1865	Abolished slavery
14th Amendment	1868	Guaranteed equal protection under the law and due process to all citizens
15th Amendment	1870	Prohibited denial of voting rights based on race

These amendments promised equality. That promise was systematically broken.

The betrayal — Jim Crow:

After the end of Reconstruction (1877), Southern states constructed a system of **Jim Crow laws** — state and local legislation that enforced racial segregation in every area of public life: schools, transport, restaurants, hospitals, drinking fountains, public parks, and cemeteries. African Americans were separated from whites from birth to burial.

The Supreme Court gave Jim Crow constitutional legitimacy in **Plessy v. Ferguson (1896)**, ruling that “separate but equal” facilities did not violate the 14th Amendment. In practice, “separate” meant inferior: African American schools received a fraction of white schools’ funding, Black hospitals were underfunded and understaffed, and segregated facilities were consistently worse.

Voting suppression:

Despite the 15th Amendment, Southern states used a toolkit of suppression methods to prevent African Americans from voting:

- **Literacy tests** — arbitrarily administered; a white registrar could pass illiterate whites and fail Black college graduates
- **Poll taxes** — a fee to vote, disproportionately excluding poor African Americans

- **Grandfather clauses** — exempted anyone whose grandfather could vote before 1867 (i.e., whites) from literacy tests and poll taxes
- **White primaries** — the Democratic Party (the only party that mattered in the one-party South) restricted its primaries to whites
- **Violence and intimidation** — the Ku Klux Klan and local law enforcement used threats, beatings, and murder to prevent Black voter registration

By the 1950s, fewer than **5% of eligible African Americans** were registered to vote in Mississippi. In some Southern counties with majority-Black populations, not a single African American was registered.

EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: Students often describe segregation as if it applied only to the South. While Jim Crow was a legal system in the South, racial discrimination existed nationwide — Northern cities had de facto segregation in housing, education, and employment through redlining, restrictive covenants, and discriminatory hiring. A strong answer acknowledges this distinction between de jure (legal) and de facto (in practice) segregation.

1.2 Brown v. Board of Education (1954)

The legal assault on segregation was led by the **NAACP** (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) and its chief counsel, **Thurgood Marshall**, who would later become the first African American Supreme Court justice.

The case:

Oliver Brown sued the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas, after his daughter Linda was denied admission to a white elementary school near their home and forced to attend a Black school further away. The NAACP combined Brown's case with four similar cases from other states into a single challenge to school segregation.

The decision (May 17, 1954):

Chief Justice **Earl Warren** delivered a unanimous (9—0) ruling:

- “Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal”
- School segregation violated the **14th Amendment's equal protection clause**
- **Plessy v. Ferguson** was effectively overturned (for education)
- A follow-up ruling (Brown II, 1955) ordered desegregation proceed “with all deliberate speed”

Impact and limitations:

Impact	Limitation
Overtaken the legal basis of segregation in education	"All deliberate speed" gave Southern states room to delay indefinitely
Gave the Civil Rights Movement a Supreme Court victory to build on	Did not address segregation in transport, public facilities, housing, or voting
Inspired activism by demonstrating the courts could be a tool of change	Provoked massive white resistance — the "Southern Manifesto" (1956), signed by 101 Southern congressmen, pledged to resist desegregation

IB TIP

IB Tip: When analysing a source about *Brown v. Board*, consider its date carefully. Sources from 1954—1955 may express optimism about the ruling; sources from 1957—1960 are more likely to reflect frustration at the lack of implementation. The gap between the legal ruling and on-the-ground change is a key analytical point.

1.3 The Montgomery Bus Boycott (1955—1956)

On 1 December 1955, **Rosa Parks**, a seamstress and NAACP secretary in Montgomery, Alabama, refused to give up her bus seat to a white passenger. She was arrested for violating Montgomery's segregation laws.

Parks' arrest was not spontaneous. The **Montgomery NAACP** had been looking for a suitable test case — Parks was chosen because she was respectable, employed, and had no criminal record. Earlier that year, 15-year-old Claudette Colvin had been arrested for the same refusal, but the NAACP judged her case less effective for a public campaign.

The boycott:

The **Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA)**, led by the young pastor **Martin Luther King Jr.** (then 26 years old), organised a boycott of Montgomery's buses. African Americans constituted approximately 75% of bus riders.

- The boycott lasted **381 days** (5 December 1955 — 20 December 1956)
- African Americans walked, carpooled, and organised alternative transport
- The city and bus company suffered significant economic losses
- White opponents responded with bombings (King's house was bombed in January 1956), mass arrests of boycotters, and economic intimidation of Black employees

The outcome:

The boycott ended not because Montgomery negotiated, but because the Supreme Court ruled in **Browder v. Gayle (1956)** that bus segregation was unconstitutional. The buses were desegregated on 21 December 1956.

Significance of the boycott:

- Demonstrated that **mass nonviolent action** by ordinary people could challenge segregation
- Made **Martin Luther King Jr.** a national figure and established his philosophy of nonviolent resistance (influenced by **Mahatma Gandhi's** methods in India)
- Showed that **economic pressure** was a powerful weapon — businesses that depended on Black customers were vulnerable
- Established the organisational model for the movement: church-based leadership, disciplined nonviolence, media awareness

MEMORISE THIS

Montgomery Bus Boycott — Key Facts:

- **Date:** 1 December 1955 — 20 December 1956 (381 days)
- **Trigger:** Rosa Parks' arrest
- **Leader:** Martin Luther King Jr. (MIA)
- **Method:** Economic boycott + legal challenge
- **Outcome:** Browder v. Gayle (1956) — bus segregation unconstitutional
- **Significance:** Proved mass nonviolent action works; launched MLK nationally

1.4 Little Rock, Arkansas (1957)

Following *Brown v. Board*, most Southern school districts refused to desegregate.

Little Rock Central High School in Arkansas became the first major test of federal enforcement.

The crisis:

Nine African American students (the “**Little Rock Nine**”) attempted to enrol at the all-white Central High School in September 1957. Governor **Orval Faubus** deployed the **Arkansas National Guard** to prevent them from entering, claiming it was to prevent violence.

When federal courts ordered Faubus to remove the Guard, the students attempted to enter but were met by a violent white mob. Television cameras broadcast the images nationally — 15-year-old **Elizabeth Eckford** walking alone through a screaming crowd became one of the iconic images of the era.

President **Dwight D. Eisenhower**, who had been reluctant to involve the federal government, was forced to act. He deployed the **101st Airborne Division** (1,000 paratroopers) to Little Rock and federalised the Arkansas National Guard. The nine students entered the school under military escort.

Significance:

- First time since Reconstruction that a president used **federal troops to enforce civil rights**

- Demonstrated that the federal government could override state resistance — but only when publicly humiliated into action
- Showed the power of **television** — images of white mobs attacking children shocked the nation and the world
- Faubus became a hero to segregationists, winning re-election four more times

EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: If given a visual source (photograph) from Little Rock, consider who took it and for what purpose. Press photographers were documenting the crisis for national and international audiences. The value of such a source is that it provides direct visual evidence of white hostility; its limitation is that a single photograph captures one moment and may not represent the experience of all nine students across the entire school year.

1.5 Sit-ins, Freedom Rides, and the Rise of Direct Action (1960—1961)

The Greensboro Sit-ins (February 1960)

On 1 February 1960, four African American students from North Carolina A&T State University — **Ezell Blair Jr., David Richmond, Franklin McCain, and Joseph McNeil** — sat at a whites-only Woolworth’s lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina. They were refused service but remained seated until closing time.

Within two weeks, sit-ins had spread to **15 cities in five states**. By April 1960, an estimated **50,000 students** had participated in sit-ins across the South.

The sit-in movement led to the founding of the **Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)** in April 1960 — a youth-led organisation that would become one of the most important forces in the movement.

The Freedom Rides (May—November 1961)

The **Congress of Racial Equality (CORE)** organised Freedom Rides to test the Supreme Court’s ruling in **Boynton v. Virginia (1960)**, which had declared segregation in interstate bus terminals unconstitutional. Interracial groups of riders boarded buses heading through the Deep South.

What happened:

- In **Anniston, Alabama**, one bus was firebombed by a white mob; riders barely escaped alive
- In **Birmingham**, riders were beaten by a mob while police (under **Bull Connor’s** orders) stayed away for 15 minutes
- In **Montgomery**, riders were attacked again; a Justice Department aide was beaten unconscious

- Attorney General **Robert Kennedy** pressured the Interstate Commerce Commission to enforce desegregation of bus terminals, which it did in September 1961

Significance of direct action:

- Demonstrated that young people — not just established leaders — could drive the movement
- SNCC and CORE brought urgency and impatience that pushed the movement forward faster than the NAACP’s courtroom strategy alone could
- Provoked white violence that, when broadcast on television, generated national sympathy and federal action
- Established the pattern: **provoke a confrontation** → **white violence is televised** → **federal government is forced to intervene**

IB TIP

IB Tip: The distinction between the NAACP’s legal strategy (courts), SCLC’s mass action strategy (boycotts, marches led by King), and SNCC’s direct action strategy (sit-ins, voter registration) is important for comparison questions. They were complementary, not competing approaches — but tensions between them were real.

1.6 Birmingham, Alabama (1963)

Birmingham was the most segregated city in America. **Bull Connor**, the Commissioner of Public Safety, had a reputation for violent enforcement of segregation. King and the **SCLC** (Southern Christian Leadership Conference) chose Birmingham deliberately — they knew Connor’s response to nonviolent protest would be brutal, and they knew television cameras would broadcast it.

Project C (Confrontation):

In April—May 1963, the SCLC organised daily marches, sit-ins, and boycotts in downtown Birmingham. When adult demonstrators were arrested in large numbers, King made the controversial decision to allow **children and teenagers** to march (the “Children’s Crusade,” 2 May 1963).

Connor responded by ordering police to use:

- **High-pressure fire hoses** against marchers (including children)
- **Attack dogs** set on peaceful demonstrators
- Mass arrests — over **2,500 people** were jailed, including King himself

Letter from Birmingham Jail (April 16, 1963):

While imprisoned, King wrote one of the most important documents of the Civil Rights era — a response to white Alabama clergymen who had called his demonstrations “unwise and untimely.” King argued:

- Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere
- “Wait” has almost always meant “never” to African Americans
- There is a moral obligation to disobey unjust laws
- Nonviolent direct action creates a “creative tension” that forces society to confront injustice

EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: King’s Letter from Birmingham Jail is an ideal source for Paper 1 analysis. Its **origin** (King writing from jail) and **purpose** (defending direct action to moderate white critics) are clear. Its **value** lies in King articulating the philosophy of the movement; its **limitation** is that it represents King’s perspective — not all civil rights activists shared his commitment to nonviolence (Malcolm X, SNCC by 1966).

Outcome:

The Birmingham campaign succeeded:

- Downtown businesses agreed to desegregate lunch counters and improve Black hiring
- President **John F. Kennedy** announced a comprehensive civil rights bill in June 1963, stating the issue was “a moral issue... as old as the scriptures and as clear as the American Constitution”
- Birmingham proved that nonviolent protest could force both local and national action

1.7 The March on Washington (August 28, 1963)

An estimated **250,000 people** gathered at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., in the largest demonstration in American history to that date. The march was organised by **A. Philip Randolph** and **Bayard Rustin** and demanded passage of Kennedy’s civil rights bill, voting rights, desegregation of schools, and job equality.

King delivered his “**I Have a Dream**” speech — calling for a future in which people would be judged “not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.”

Significance:

- Demonstrated mass interracial support for civil rights (approximately 25% of marchers were white)
- Put enormous political pressure on Congress to pass civil rights legislation
- Broadcast globally, damaging the international reputation of American segregation during the Cold War (the Soviet Union used American racism as propaganda against US claims to lead the “free world”)
- Cemented King’s status as the pre-eminent leader of the movement

IB TIP

IB Tip: The March on Washington was carefully managed as a media event — organisers vetted speeches, planned the route, and coordinated with television networks. If given a source about the March (a photograph, a speech extract, a newspaper editorial), consider the extent to which the image of unity and hope it projects was deliberately constructed versus a spontaneous expression of public feeling. This tension between media strategy and genuine mass conviction is analytically rich.

1.8 Legislation: Civil Rights Act (1964) and Voting Rights Act (1965)

The Civil Rights Act (July 2, 1964)

President Kennedy was assassinated on 22 November 1963. His successor, **Lyndon B. Johnson** (LBJ), used Kennedy's death and his own formidable political skill to push the Civil Rights Act through Congress, overcoming a 75-day **Senate filibuster** by Southern Democrats.

Key provisions:

- Banned discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin in **employment**
- Outlawed segregation in **public accommodations** (hotels, restaurants, theatres, parks)
- Authorised the federal government to **enforce desegregation of schools**
- Created the **Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)**

The Voting Rights Act (August 6, 1965)

The campaign for voting rights reached its climax in **Selma, Alabama**, where SNCC and SCLC organised voter registration drives in early 1965. On **7 March 1965** ("**Bloody Sunday**"), state troopers attacked 600 peaceful marchers at the Edmund Pettus Bridge with tear gas, nightsticks, and horse-mounted officers. Television broadcast the violence nationally.

Two weeks later, King led a successful march from Selma to Montgomery, protected by federal troops. LBJ addressed Congress, declaring "We shall overcome," and the Voting Rights Act was passed.

Key provisions:

- Banned literacy tests and other voter suppression devices
- Authorised **federal registrars** to register voters in areas with a history of discrimination
- Required states with a history of voter suppression to submit any changes to election laws for **federal "preclearance"**

Impact:

Measure	Before VRA (1964)	After VRA (1968)
African American voter registration in Mississippi	6.7%	59.8%
African American voter registration in Alabama	19.3%	51.6%
African American elected officials in the South	~70	~400 (and rising rapidly)

MEMORISE THIS

The Two Landmark Acts:

- **Civil Rights Act (1964):** Banned discrimination in employment and public accommodations; ended legal segregation
- **Voting Rights Act (1965):** Banned literacy tests; authorised federal registrars; preclearance requirement; transformed Southern politics

1.9 Key Figures and Methods

Martin Luther King Jr. (1929 – 1968)

- Pastor of Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, Montgomery; leader of SCLC
- Philosophy: **nonviolent direct action** inspired by Gandhi, Thoreau, and the Social Gospel
- Strategy: provoke confrontation, attract media, force federal intervention
- Key moments: Montgomery, Birmingham, March on Washington, Selma, Nobel Peace Prize (1964)
- Assassinated 4 April 1968 in Memphis, Tennessee

Malcolm X (1925 – 1965)

- Minister of the **Nation of Islam** (NOI) under Elijah Muhammad
- Advocated **Black self-defence, separatism, and pride** — rejected integration and nonviolence as strategies
- Famous for his rhetorical power: “by any means necessary”
- After a 1964 pilgrimage to Mecca, Malcolm X moderated his views, embracing pan-African solidarity and breaking with the NOI
- Assassinated 21 February 1965 in New York

EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: Do not present King and Malcolm X as simple opposites. By 1964–1965, their positions were converging: King was becoming more radical (criticising economic inequality and the Vietnam War), while Malcolm X was moving toward broader coalitions. A strong answer recognises this complexity.

Rosa Parks (1913—2005)

- NAACP secretary in Montgomery; trained activist (attended Highlander Folk School)
- Her arrest was the catalyst for the Montgomery Bus Boycott
- Her action was courageous but also strategic — she was chosen as a test case

Lyndon B. Johnson (1908—1973)

- Texan Democrat who as Senate Majority Leader had watered down civil rights legislation in 1957
- As President (1963—1969), he became the most significant presidential ally of civil rights since Lincoln
- Signed the Civil Rights Act (1964) and Voting Rights Act (1965)
- Reportedly said after signing the Civil Rights Act: “We have lost the South for a generation” — acknowledging the political cost

1.10 Opposition and Resistance

Organised white resistance:

- **White Citizens’ Councils** — middle-class organisations that used economic pressure (firing Black employees, denying mortgages) to punish civil rights activism
- **Ku Klux Klan** — committed murders, bombings (16th Street Baptist Church bombing, Birmingham, September 1963 — four young girls killed), and widespread intimidation
- **Southern state governments** — used “interposition” and “massive resistance” doctrines to block desegregation; closed public schools rather than integrate them (Prince Edward County, Virginia, closed its schools for five years, 1959—1964)
- **J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI** — while the FBI nominally investigated civil rights violations, Director Hoover viewed King as a dangerous radical; the FBI wiretapped King, attempted to blackmail him, and sent him a letter suggesting he commit suicide

Federal government ambivalence:

Both Eisenhower and Kennedy were reluctant to act on civil rights. Eisenhower sent troops to Little Rock only after being publicly embarrassed; Kennedy delayed his civil rights bill for two years, fearing loss of Southern Democratic votes. Only Birmingham’s violence and the moral crisis it created forced Kennedy’s hand. LBJ’s commitment was more genuine, but even he acted partly from political calculation (the 1964 election) and Cold War pressure (Soviet propaganda exploited American racism).

Section 2: Case Study 2 — Apartheid South Africa, 1948—1964

2.1 Background: Segregation Before Apartheid

South Africa’s racial hierarchy did not begin in 1948. It was built over centuries of colonialism, conquest, and economic exploitation.

Key historical context:

- **Dutch colonisation** (from 1652): The Dutch East India Company established a settlement at the Cape of Good Hope; enslaved labour (from Southeast Asia, Madagascar, and within Africa) was central to the economy from the start
- **British colonisation** (from 1806): Britain took control of the Cape Colony; abolished slavery in 1834 (without addressing structural inequality); the Boer settlers (Afrikaners) trekked inland to escape British control, establishing the Transvaal and Orange Free State
- **Mineral Revolution** (from 1867): Discovery of diamonds (Kimberley, 1867) and gold (Witwatersrand, 1886) transformed South Africa into a mining economy dependent on cheap Black labour. The **migrant labour system** forcibly separated Black men from their families, sending them to work in mines under exploitative contracts
- **The South African War / Boer War (1899—1902)**: Britain defeated the Boer republics; the Union of South Africa (1910) was created as a white-ruled dominion that excluded the Black majority from political power
- **The Natives Land Act (1913)**: Restricted Black land ownership to approximately **7% of South Africa’s territory** (later expanded to 13%), laying the foundation for the spatial segregation that apartheid would intensify

Pre-apartheid segregation:

By 1948, South Africa already had extensive racial segregation: residential segregation, pass laws restricting Black movement, job reservation protecting white workers, and an electoral system that excluded the vast majority of the population. Apartheid did not invent segregation — it systematised, legalised, and intensified it.

IB TIP

IB Tip: Understanding that segregation existed before apartheid helps you answer “causation” and “continuity” questions. Apartheid was not a sudden break but an escalation of existing structures. The 1948 election represented a decision to make informal discrimination into comprehensive, legally enforced racial engineering.

2.2 The National Party and the Implementation of Apartheid (1948)

The **National Party (NP)**, led by **D.F. Malan**, won the 1948 general election on a platform of “apartheid” (Afrikaans for “separateness” or “apart-hood”). The NP drew its support primarily from Afrikaner nationalists — farmers, mine workers, and the Afrikaner middle class — who feared economic competition from Black workers and political domination by English-speaking whites and the Black majority alike.

Key apartheid legislation:

Law	Year	Provision
Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act	1949	Banned marriage between whites and other races
Population Registration Act	1950	Classified every person by race (White, Coloured, Indian, Native/Bantu); classification determined where you could live, work, and go to school
Group Areas Act	1950	Assigned racial groups to specific residential areas; forced removals of non-white communities from “white” areas (most infamously, Sophiatown in Johannesburg, District Six in Cape Town)
Suppression of Communism Act	1950	Broadly defined “communism” to include virtually any opposition to the government; used to ban organisations and individuals
Bantu Authorities Act	1951	Established a system of tribal authorities in the reserves, undermining traditional leadership and creating a puppet administration
Bantu Education Act	1953	Placed Black education under government control; designed to prepare Black children for manual labour, not academic careers. Minister Hendrik Verwoerd stated: “There is no place for [the Bantu] in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour”
Reservation of Separate Amenities Act	1953	Legalised separate and unequal public facilities (removed the requirement for “equal” in “separate but equal”)
Pass Laws (tightened 1952)	1952	Required all Black South Africans over 16 to carry a “reference book” (pass book) at all times; failure to produce it on demand was a criminal offence — over 250,000 people were arrested annually for pass law violations

⚠️ EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: If analysing a source that is a piece of apartheid legislation or a government statement, note that the **purpose** was not merely administrative — it was to maintain white economic and political dominance. The language of apartheid laws was often bureaucratic and euphemistic (“separate development,” “Bantu self-government”), but the intent was racial subjugation. Identifying the gap between the language and the reality is a key analytical skill.

2.3 Resistance: The ANC and the Defiance Campaign (1948—1956)

The **African National Congress (ANC)**, founded in 1912, was the oldest and largest Black political organisation in South Africa. After 1948, a younger generation of leaders — including **Nelson Mandela**, **Walter Sisulu**, and **Oliver Tambo** — pushed the ANC toward more assertive action.

The Programme of Action (1949)

The ANC Youth League, led by Mandela, Sisulu, and **Anton Lembede**, pushed through a Programme of Action at the 1949 ANC conference, committing the organisation to mass action: boycotts, strikes, and civil disobedience. This represented a shift from the ANC's earlier strategy of polite petitions and delegations.

The Defiance Campaign (June—November 1952)

The **Defiance Campaign Against Unjust Laws** was the first large-scale, multi-racial civil disobedience campaign in South Africa. Volunteers deliberately broke apartheid laws — entering “whites only” areas, refusing to carry passes, using “whites only” facilities — and accepted arrest.

Results:

- Over **8,500 people were arrested** in six months
- ANC membership grew from approximately 7,000 to over **100,000**
- The campaign attracted international attention and Indian, Coloured, and some white participants
- The government responded with harsher legislation: the Criminal Law Amendment Act (1953) imposed severe penalties for protest, and the Public Safety Act gave the government emergency powers

The Freedom Charter (June 26, 1955)

The **Congress of the People**, a multi-racial gathering of 3,000 delegates at Kliptown near Johannesburg, adopted the **Freedom Charter** — a visionary statement of principles for a non-racial, democratic South Africa.

Key demands:

- “The People Shall Govern” — universal suffrage
- “All National Groups Shall Have Equal Rights” — non-racialism
- “The People Shall Share in the Country's Wealth” — nationalisation of mines and banks
- “The Land Shall Be Shared Among Those Who Work It” — land redistribution
- “All Shall Be Equal Before the Law” — equal justice

The government arrested 156 leaders and charged them with treason (the **Treason Trial**, 1956—1961). All were eventually acquitted, but the trial consumed the leadership's time and resources for five years.

MEMORISE THIS

Key ANC milestones 1948—1956:

- **1949:** Programme of Action — shift to mass action
- **1952:** Defiance Campaign — 8,500 arrested; ANC membership surges to 100,000
- **1955:** Freedom Charter — vision for non-racial democracy
- **1956—1961:** Treason Trial — 156 leaders charged; all acquitted

2.4 Sharpeville and the Turn to Armed Struggle (1960—1964)

The Sharpeville Massacre (March 21, 1960)

The **Pan Africanist Congress (PAC)**, a breakaway from the ANC led by **Robert Sobukwe**, organised a nationwide campaign against pass laws. On 21 March 1960, a crowd of approximately 5,000—7,000 gathered at the Sharpeville police station in the Transvaal to hand in their pass books and invite arrest.

What happened:

Without warning, police opened fire on the crowd. In approximately 40 seconds, they fired **705 rounds**. **69 people were killed** and **180 wounded**. Most were shot in the back — they were running away.

Aftermath:

- The government declared a **State of Emergency** and arrested over 18,000 people
- Both the ANC and PAC were **banned** (April 1960)
- International condemnation was swift: the UN Security Council for the first time addressed apartheid; South Africa began its long diplomatic isolation
- The ANC was forced underground and into exile

EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: Sharpeville is a pivotal turning point. Before Sharpeville, the ANC pursued nonviolent resistance. After Sharpeville, the ANC concluded that nonviolent methods could not work against a regime willing to massacre unarmed protesters. If a source question asks about the significance of Sharpeville, the key analytical point is this transition from nonviolence to armed struggle.

Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) — “Spear of the Nation”

In December 1961, the ANC launched its military wing, **Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK)**, with Mandela as its first commander. MK carried out a campaign of **sabotage** — targeting government buildings, power lines, and infrastructure — while deliberately avoiding killing people.

Mandela’s justification, articulated at the Rivonia Trial:

- Fifty years of nonviolence had brought nothing but more repressive legislation
- The government had closed all legal channels of protest
- Sabotage was the least violent form of resistance available — it avoided loss of life while demonstrating that the status quo was unsustainable
- “It would be unrealistic and wrong for African leaders to continue preaching peace and non-violence at a time when the government met our peaceful demands with force”

The Rivonia Trial (October 1963 — June 1964)

In July 1963, police raided the ANC’s secret headquarters at **Liliesleaf Farm** in Rivonia, near Johannesburg, capturing most of MK’s leadership. Mandela (already in prison) and seven others were charged with sabotage and conspiracy to overthrow the state — charges that carried the death penalty.

Mandela’s speech from the dock (April 20, 1964):

Mandela’s three-hour speech is one of the most significant political statements of the 20th century. He concluded:

“During my lifetime I have dedicated myself to this struggle of the African people. I have fought against white domination, and I have fought against black domination. I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve. But if needs be, it is an ideal for which I am prepared to die.”

Verdict: Mandela and six others were sentenced to **life imprisonment** on Robben Island; Denis Goldberg, the only white defendant, was sent to Pretoria Central Prison under apartheid’s racial segregation of prisoners. The Rivonia Trial removed the ANC’s internal leadership for a generation but made Mandela an international symbol of resistance.

IB TIP

IB Tip: Mandela’s Rivonia speech is an outstanding source for Paper 1 analysis. Its **origin** (a defendant facing the death penalty, speaking in open court) gives it extraordinary power and authenticity. Its **purpose** was both legal (defending himself) and political (making the case for the ANC to a global audience). Its **value** is that it articulates the ANC’s reasoning for the turn to armed struggle with exceptional clarity.

Its **limitation** is that it is, by definition, an advocacy document — Mandela presents the ANC's case in the most favourable light.

2.5 Key Figures

Nelson Mandela (1918—2013)

- Lawyer; ANC Youth League leader; architect of the Defiance Campaign
- Founded MK (1961); arrested 1962; Rivonia Trial (1963—1964)
- Imprisoned for **27 years** (Robben Island, Pollsmoor, Victor Verster)
- Released 1990; negotiated end of apartheid; first Black President of South Africa (1994—1999)
- Nobel Peace Prize (1993, jointly with F.W. de Klerk)

Albert Luthuli (1898—1967)

- ANC President (1952—1967); committed to nonviolent resistance
- Deposed as chief of Grootvlei by the government for his ANC activities (1952)
- First African to receive the **Nobel Peace Prize** (1960) — awarded while under government banning orders
- Represented the older generation's commitment to moral witness and multi-racial cooperation

Robert Sobukwe (1924—1978)

- Founder and president of the PAC (1959)
- Led the anti-pass campaign that culminated in Sharpeville
- Imprisoned on Robben Island (1960—1969); kept under house arrest until his death
- Advocated Africanism — Black self-reliance and rejection of white liberal involvement in the struggle

Hendrik Verwoerd (1901—1966)

- Prime Minister (1958—1966); the “Architect of Apartheid”
- As Minister of Native Affairs (1950—1958), designed and implemented the Bantu Education Act and the “Bantustan” system
- Vision of “separate development” — creating nominally independent “homelands” for Black South Africans, denying them citizenship in South Africa itself
- Assassinated in parliament (1966) — but by a disgruntled white parliamentary messenger, not by a political opponent

Section 3: Source Analysis Skills — Paper 1 Technique

3.1 Understanding Paper 1 Format

Paper 1 provides four or five sources and asks four questions. The questions follow a predictable pattern:

Question	Type	Marks	Time
Q1	Comprehension — “According to Source A, what...”	3	~5 min
Q2	Comparison — “Compare and contrast Sources A and B...”	6	~12 min
Q3	Source analysis (OPVL) — “With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source C...”	6	~12 min
Q4	Mini-essay — “Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate...”	9	~25 min

EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: Time management is critical. Students who spend too long on Q1—Q3 run out of time for Q4, which is worth the most marks and requires the most sophisticated analysis. Aim for 30 minutes on Q1—Q3 combined and 25—30 minutes on Q4.

3.2 The OPVL Framework

OPVL stands for **Origin, Purpose, Value, Limitations**. This is the analytical framework the IB expects you to use when evaluating sources.

Origin: Who created the source? When was it created? Where was it created? What type of source is it (speech, letter, government document, photograph, memoir, newspaper article)?

Purpose: Why was this source created? Who was the intended audience? What effect did the creator want to have? Was it to inform, persuade, justify, criticise, record, or entertain?

Value: What makes this source useful to a historian studying this topic? What can we learn from it? Consider both what the source says (content) and what its existence tells us (context).

Limitations: What restricts the usefulness of this source? Consider bias, gaps, the creator’s perspective, what the source does not show, and how its origin or purpose might shape its content.

IB TIP

IB Tip: Do NOT use OPVL as a mechanical checklist where you list origin, purpose, value, limitations separately in four disconnected paragraphs. Instead, **integrate** them: “Because this source was written by X for the purpose of Y [origin + purpose], it is particularly valuable for Z [value], but this same purpose means it likely overstates/understates A [limitation linked to purpose].” The best answers show how origin and purpose *create* specific values and limitations.

3.3 Worked Example 1: Martin Luther King Jr., Letter from Birmingham Jail (1963)

Source excerpt (adapted for Paper 1 style):

“We know through painful experience that freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed. Frankly, I have yet to engage in a direct-action campaign that was ‘well timed’ in the view of those who have not suffered unduly from the disease of segregation. For years now I have heard the word ‘Wait!’ It rings in the ear of every Negro with piercing familiarity. This ‘Wait’ has almost always meant ‘Never.’ We must come to see... that justice too long delayed is justice denied.”

Martin Luther King Jr., “Letter from Birmingham Jail,” written while imprisoned in Birmingham, Alabama, April 16, 1963. Published widely in June 1963.

Question: With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of this source for historians studying the Civil Rights Movement.

 **WORKED EXAMPLE**

Model Answer:

This source is a letter written by Martin Luther King Jr. from Birmingham City Jail in April 1963, during the Birmingham campaign. King was responding to a public statement by eight white Alabama clergymen who had criticised the demonstrations as “unwise and untimely.” The letter was later published nationally.

The source is **valuable** for several reasons. First, as a statement by the acknowledged leader of the Civil Rights Movement, it provides direct insight into the philosophy driving nonviolent direct action — King explicitly addresses the criticism that Black Americans should “wait” for change and argues that delay is itself a form of injustice. Second, because it was written during imprisonment (not retrospectively), it captures the urgency and frustration of the movement at a critical moment, unfiltered by hindsight. Third, the intended audience — moderate white Americans who sympathised with civil rights in principle but opposed disruptive protest — reveals the political challenge King faced: persuading potential allies that action was morally necessary.

However, the source has **limitations**. King was writing as an advocate, not as a neutral observer. His purpose was to justify the Birmingham campaign and defend direct action against criticism. He therefore presents the strongest possible case for his position and does not acknowledge any validity in the argument for gradualism or concerns about the practical risks of confrontation. The source represents King’s perspective specifically — it does not reflect the views of other civil rights leaders such as Malcolm X (who rejected integration) or younger SNCC activists (who were becoming impatient with King’s approach). Finally, while King frames the letter as a spontaneous response, it was in fact a carefully crafted public document — the “spontaneous” quality is itself part of its rhetorical strategy.

Examiner’s note: This answer integrates OPVL rather than listing them separately, links the source’s purpose to both its value and its limitations, and identifies specific gaps in perspective. Band 5—6.

3.4 Worked Example 2: Hendrik Verwoerd, Speech on Bantu Education (1954)

Source excerpt (adapted for Paper 1 style):

“There is no place for the Bantu in the European community above the level of certain forms of labour. Until now he has been subjected to a school system which drew him away from his own community and misled him by showing him the green pastures of European society in which he was not allowed to graze... It is therefore necessary that education should be controlled in such a way that it should be in accord with the policy of the State.”

Hendrik Verwoerd, Minister of Native Affairs, speaking in the South African Senate during debate on the Bantu Education Act, June 1954.

Question: With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of this source for historians studying apartheid.

 **WORKED EXAMPLE**

Model Answer:

This source is a speech by Hendrik Verwoerd, South Africa’s Minister of Native Affairs and the primary architect of the Bantu Education Act (1953), delivered in the Senate in June 1954 while defending the Act during parliamentary debate.

The source is **exceptionally valuable** because it reveals the explicit reasoning behind one of apartheid’s most damaging policies. Verwoerd states plainly that Black South Africans have “no place” above manual labour in white society, and that education must therefore prepare them for subordination. This candour is historically significant — many defenders of apartheid used euphemisms like “separate development” and “self-governance.” Verwoerd’s statement strips away that language and exposes the raw intent: to limit Black aspirations and entrench white economic dominance. As a speech by the government minister directly responsible for the policy, delivered in an official legislative forum, it is an authoritative statement of government intent.

The **limitations** of the source must also be considered. As a parliamentary speech, it was delivered to an audience of white legislators and was intended to justify legislation to political allies. Verwoerd was therefore presenting his policy in the terms most likely to gain support, emphasising control and order. He may have been more extreme in his language than the legislation itself — political speeches often overstate for effect. Furthermore, this source tells us what the government intended Bantu Education to achieve, but not what it actually achieved in practice — many Black South Africans resisted, subverted, or transcended the limitations of their education. The source also presents the government’s view exclusively; the voices of Black students, parents, and teachers who opposed Bantu Education are absent.

Examiner’s note: This answer demonstrates understanding that the source’s very candour creates its value — it is unusual and revealing precisely because it is so explicit. The limitations section correctly notes that intent is not the same as outcome. Band 5—6.

3.5 IB Command Terms for Paper 1

Command Term	Meaning	What Examiners Expect
Analyse	Break down into component parts; examine each part and how they relate	Systematic examination of factors/causes/features, not just description
Compare	Identify similarities	Explicit identification of shared features with evidence from both sources
Compare and contrast	Identify similarities AND differences	Must do BOTH — students who only compare or only contrast will lose marks
Evaluate	Make a judgment about the significance, value, or effectiveness	A clear judgment supported by evidence; not just “on the one hand... on the other”
Discuss	Present a considered and balanced review	Multiple perspectives with evidence; arrive at a conclusion
To what extent	How far is this claim true?	Evaluate the claim’s validity; consider counter-arguments; reach a nuanced judgment
What message is conveyed	What does the source communicate?	Identify the explicit and implicit meaning; use content evidence to support your reading

EXAM ALERT

Exam Alert: In Q2 (compare and contrast), you must explicitly use both sources. A common mistake is to summarise Source A, then summarise Source B, and leave the comparison to the reader. Instead, use **linking phrases**: “Both Source A and Source B suggest that...”, “While Source A emphasises X, Source B focuses on Y...”, “Source A and Source B agree on Z but differ regarding W.”

Section 4: IB Key Concepts Applied to Rights and Protest

The IB History course is built around six key concepts. For top marks, demonstrate awareness of these concepts in your answers.

Concept	Application to US Civil Rights	Application to Apartheid South Africa
Change	Brown v. Board, Civil Rights Act, VRA transformed the legal status of African Americans	Apartheid legislation transformed informal segregation into a comprehensive legal system; Sharpeville transformed the ANC's strategy
Continuity	Despite legal changes, de facto segregation and economic inequality persisted; the struggle continued after 1965	Racial hierarchy existed long before 1948; apartheid built on colonial-era segregation
Causation	What caused the CRM to succeed? Multiple factors: court victories, mass action, media, Cold War pressure, federal intervention	What caused the turn to armed struggle? Sharpeville, the banning of the ANC, failure of nonviolent methods, government intransigence
Consequence	CRA and VRA transformed Southern politics; increased Black voter registration; inspired other movements worldwide	Sharpeville led to international isolation; Rivonia Trial made Mandela a global symbol; armed struggle escalated conflict
Significance	Why does the CRM matter? It ended legal segregation, expanded voting rights, reshaped American politics, and inspired rights movements globally	Why does apartheid matter? It was the most comprehensive system of racial engineering in the 20th century; its dismantling became a global cause
Perspectives	Different actors had different views: King (nonviolence), Malcolm X (self-defence), LBJ (political calculation), white segregationists (racial hierarchy), SNCC (youth impatience)	Government (separate development), ANC (nonracial democracy), PAC (Africanism), international community (human rights), white liberals (gradual reform)

Section 5: Comparative Analysis — US Civil Rights vs. Apartheid South Africa

5.1 Cross-Regional Comparison

Theme	United States (1954—1965)	South Africa (1948—1964)
Nature of discrimination	De jure segregation in the South; de facto in the North	Comprehensive, nationwide apartheid — every aspect of life regulated by race
Proportion of population oppressed	African Americans were ~10% of the population; a minority fighting for inclusion	Black, Coloured, and Indian South Africans were ~80% of the population; a majority denied rights
Primary method of protest	Nonviolent direct action: boycotts, sit-ins, marches, voter registration	Nonviolent protest (1952—1960), then sabotage and armed struggle (post-1960)
Role of law/courts	Courts were an ally — <i>Brown v. Board</i> , <i>Browder v. Gayle</i> ; Constitution provided a framework for rights claims	Courts enforced apartheid; the legal system was an instrument of oppression, not a venue for redress
Federal government role	Reluctant but ultimately decisive ally (Eisenhower, Kennedy, LBJ)	The government WAS the oppressor — no higher authority to appeal to within the system
International pressure	Cold War embarrassment helped; but US had powerful allies who did not sanction it	International isolation: UN resolutions, sports boycotts, economic sanctions (though partial and slow)
Role of media	Television was transformative — images of white violence created national outrage	More censored; international media coverage grew after Sharpeville, but the apartheid government controlled domestic media
Turn to violence	Movement remained largely nonviolent (though urban riots occurred after 1965, outside our period)	ANC turned to sabotage after 1960; armed struggle became central to strategy
Outcome (by end of our period)	Major legislative victories (CRA 1964, VRA 1965); legal segregation ended	Leadership imprisoned or exiled; apartheid intensified; but international awareness raised; struggle continued to 1994

IB TIP

IB Tip: For comparison questions, the most important analytical point is that the US Civil Rights Movement succeeded (within the period studied) because the legal and political system — despite its flaws — ultimately provided mechanisms for change

(Supreme Court, Congress, federal enforcement). In South Africa, the legal system itself was the instrument of oppression, leaving no internal mechanism for change. This structural difference explains why the US movement achieved legislative victories by 1965, while South Africa's struggle continued for three more decades.

5.2 Common Themes Across Both Case Studies

1. The role of leadership: Both movements produced charismatic leaders (King, Mandela) who articulated compelling moral visions. But both movements were much broader than their leaders — grassroots activists, women organisers, student groups, and ordinary people sustained the struggle. Exam questions that ask about the “role of the individual” expect you to balance leadership with mass participation.

2. Nonviolence vs. armed struggle: Both movements began with nonviolent strategies. The US movement largely maintained nonviolence through 1965; the South African movement abandoned it after 1960. The key question for essays: was nonviolence a principled commitment or a tactical choice made possible by specific circumstances? King operated in a democracy where televised violence against peaceful protesters generated political pressure for change. The ANC faced a regime willing to massacre, ban, and imprison opponents with no democratic accountability.

3. The role of international opinion: The Cold War shaped both struggles. The US government was embarrassed by segregation because Soviet propaganda exploited it; South Africa's regime faced growing isolation. In both cases, international pressure was important but not decisive alone.

4. Methods of government response: Both governments combined coercion (police violence, arrests, surveillance) with attempts at co-optation or delay. The US federal government ultimately sided with civil rights; the South African government never did (within our period).

Section 6: Practice Questions

6.1 Paper 1 Style Questions

Source comprehension (Q1 style — 3 marks):

1. According to Source A, what were the main objectives of the Montgomery Bus Boycott?
2. What does Source B suggest about the reasons for the Sharpeville Massacre?
3. According to Source C, how did the ANC justify the turn to armed struggle?

Source comparison (Q2 style — 6 marks):

4. Compare and contrast the methods used by civil rights campaigners in Sources A and B.

5. Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources C and D about the effectiveness of nonviolent protest.

Source analysis / OPVL (Q3 style — 6 marks):

6. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source A for historians studying the US Civil Rights Movement.
7. With reference to its origin, purpose and content, analyse the value and limitations of Source D for historians studying resistance to apartheid.

Mini-essay (Q4 style — 9 marks):

8. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the claim that “nonviolent protest was the most effective method of challenging racial discrimination in the period 1948—1965.”
9. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the significance of international pressure in the struggle against racial discrimination.
10. Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent was the role of individual leaders decisive in the success of civil rights movements?

6.2 Model Answer Outlines

Question 8: Evaluate the claim that nonviolent protest was the most effective method...

Model outline:

Introduction: Define nonviolent protest; note it took different forms in each context. Thesis: nonviolent protest was highly effective in the US where the political system could be pressured through moral witness and media; it was less effective in South Africa where the regime's willingness to use overwhelming force ultimately required a shift to armed struggle.

Paragraph 1 — For the claim (US):

- Montgomery Bus Boycott (1955—56): economic pressure + legal challenge = desegregation
- Birmingham (1963): televised violence against nonviolent marchers forced Kennedy to propose civil rights legislation
- Selma (1965): Bloody Sunday footage led directly to the Voting Rights Act
- Key mechanism: nonviolence worked because it exposed the moral bankruptcy of segregation to a national audience through television

Paragraph 2 — For the claim (South Africa, pre-1960):

- Defiance Campaign (1952): grew ANC membership from 7,000 to 100,000
- International attention and sympathy generated by peaceful protests

Paragraph 3 — Against the claim (South Africa, post-1960):

- Sharpeville (1960): peaceful protesters massacred; ANC banned
- The regime faced no democratic accountability — no elections to lose, no free press to embarrass, no independent courts to enforce rights
- MK's sabotage campaign (1961—1963) was a rational response to the closure of nonviolent options
- Source: Mandela's Rivonia speech explicitly argues nonviolence had failed

Paragraph 4 — Nuance:

- Even in the US, nonviolence was not sufficient alone — it required federal enforcement (troops at Little Rock, federal registrars under VRA)
- Legal strategy (NAACP), direct action (SNCC/CORE), and political lobbying (LBJ) all contributed
- The effectiveness of any method depends on context: political system, media environment, international pressure, regime type

Conclusion: Nonviolent protest was the most effective method where a democratic framework and free media existed to amplify its moral force (US). Where those conditions were absent (South Africa after 1960), other methods became necessary. The claim is therefore partially valid — context determines effectiveness.

Examiner's note: This outline scores Band 4—5 because it evaluates both sides with specific evidence, uses both case studies, considers context, and reaches a nuanced

judgment.

Question 10: To what extent was the role of individual leaders decisive...?

Model outline:

Introduction: Thesis: Individual leaders were important but not sufficient. Structural conditions (legal frameworks, economic pressures, international context) and mass participation were equally or more decisive.

Paragraph 1 — Leaders mattered (US):

- MLK: articulated the philosophy of nonviolence; chose Birmingham and Selma strategically; mobilised national opinion through rhetoric (March on Washington)
- LBJ: used political skill to pass CRA and VRA — without a president willing to spend political capital, legislation would have stalled
- Without King's leadership, the movement might have lacked coherence and national visibility

Paragraph 2 — Leaders mattered (South Africa):

- Mandela: his Rivonia speech became the defining statement of the anti-apartheid cause; his imprisonment made him a global symbol
- Luthuli: maintained the ANC's moral authority through commitment to nonviolence
- Verwoerd: as architect of apartheid, individual decisions shaped the system (Bantu Education was his personal project)

Paragraph 3 — Leaders were not sufficient:

- The Montgomery boycott was sustained by 50,000 ordinary people walking to work every day for over a year — not by King alone
- SNCC's sit-ins and Freedom Rides were driven by student activists, not established leaders
- In South Africa, thousands participated in the Defiance Campaign; Sharpeville was a PAC grassroots initiative
- Structural factors: the Great Migration, Cold War pressure, television technology, urbanisation — these created the conditions that made leadership effective

Paragraph 4 — Assessment:

- Leaders channelled and articulated grievances that already existed
- Without mass participation, leaders would have been isolated voices
- Without favourable structural conditions (media, international pressure, economic leverage), even the best leadership would have failed

Conclusion: Individual leaders were significant catalysts but not decisive in isolation. The most accurate assessment is that leadership and mass participation were mutually dependent — leaders needed movements, and movements needed leaders.

6.3 Paper 2 Style Essay Questions

The following questions are modelled on IB History Paper 2 format for Prescribed Subject 4 (Rights and Protest). These differ from Paper 1 in that they require a sustained essay argument using your own knowledge (no sources provided). Practise under timed conditions: 40 minutes per essay.

US Civil Rights Movement:

11. “Economic pressure was more important than moral persuasion in achieving civil rights gains in the United States.” To what extent do you agree?
12. Examine the role of federal government in the success of the US Civil Rights Movement in the period 1954—1965.
13. “The US Civil Rights Movement succeeded because of the actions of a small number of exceptional leaders.” Discuss.

Apartheid South Africa:

14. To what extent was international pressure responsible for challenging apartheid in the period 1948—1964?
15. Evaluate the significance of the Sharpeville Massacre (1960) as a turning point in the history of resistance to apartheid.
16. “The turn to armed struggle by the ANC in 1961 was an inevitable consequence of government repression.” To what extent do you agree?

Comparative (cross-case study):

17. Compare and contrast the methods used by civil rights movements in the United States and South Africa to challenge racial discrimination in the period 1948—1965.
18. “Nonviolent protest was only effective where the political system could be pressured through democratic accountability.” Discuss with reference to the United States and South Africa.
19. To what extent did government repression strengthen rather than weaken civil rights movements in both the United States and South Africa?

Question 15 — Model Outline: Sharpeville as a turning point

Command term: Evaluate the significance — weigh the importance of Sharpeville against other factors and events; avoid treating it as an automatic “turning point” without justification.

Thesis: The Sharpeville Massacre was a genuine turning point in South African resistance history because it directly caused the banning of the ANC and PAC, forced the abandonment of nonviolent strategy, and internationalised the anti-apartheid struggle — but its significance must be weighed against prior developments (Defiance Campaign, Youth League radicalism) and later ones (Rivonia Trial, Soweto 1976).

Paragraph 1 — Evidence for significance:

- 69 killed, 180 wounded — the massacre’s scale shocked both domestic and international audiences
- State of Emergency declared; ANC and PAC banned within weeks (April 1960)
- Banning made nonviolent legal protest impossible — the ANC could no longer hold public meetings, march, or campaign
- International reaction: UN Security Council called for an end to apartheid; South Africa isolated at the Commonwealth
- Direct causal link to MK’s formation (December 1961) — Mandela has stated that Sharpeville made armed struggle a necessity

Paragraph 2 — Limitations of “turning point” framing:

- Radicalisation had been underway before 1960: ANC Youth League’s 1949 Programme of Action already rejected petitioning in favour of mass action
- PAC broke from the ANC in 1959 precisely over the question of confrontational tactics
- The banning of organisations, while dramatic, did not end resistance — it changed its form rather than beginning resistance

Paragraph 3 — Other turning points:

- Rivonia Trial (1964): jailing of the entire MK leadership effectively ended internal armed resistance for a generation
- Soweto Uprising (1976): rejuvenated resistance with youth activism after more than a decade of quiescence
- These events also qualify as turning points — Sharpeville is necessary but not sufficient as the singular watershed

Conclusion: Sharpeville was highly significant — it marked the decisive end of legal nonviolent mass protest within South Africa and accelerated the internationalisation of the struggle. However, “turning point” language can obscure continuities: the conditions for this shift had been building for years. The most accurate formulation is

that Sharpeville was the moment at which a long-developing crisis became irreversible.

Section 7: Key Timelines

7.1 US Civil Rights Movement, 1954—1965

Date	Event	Significance
May 1954	Brown v. Board of Education	Supreme Court rules school segregation unconstitutional
Aug 1955	Emmett Till murdered in Mississippi	14-year-old's lynching and open-casket funeral galvanise national outrage
Dec 1955 — Dec 1956	Montgomery Bus Boycott	381 days; launches MLK; Browder v. Gayle ends bus segregation
Sep 1957	Little Rock Nine	Eisenhower sends 101st Airborne; first federal enforcement since Reconstruction
Feb 1960	Greensboro sit-ins	Student-led movement spreads to 15 cities; SNCC founded
May 1961	Freedom Rides	CORE tests bus terminal desegregation; mob violence televised
Sep 1962	James Meredith enrolls at University of Mississippi	Federal marshals required; two killed in riots
Apr—May 1963	Birmingham campaign	Fire hoses, attack dogs; King jailed; Letter from Birmingham Jail
Jun 1963	Medgar Evers assassinated	NAACP field secretary in Mississippi murdered by white supremacist
Aug 1963	March on Washington	250,000 people; "I Have a Dream" speech
Sep 1963	16th Street Baptist Church bombing	Four girls killed in Birmingham; deepens national resolve
Nov 1963	JFK assassinated	LBJ takes office; commits to civil rights legislation
Jul 1964	Civil Rights Act signed	Bans discrimination in employment and public accommodations
Feb 1965	Malcolm X assassinated	Nation of Islam minister killed in New York
Mar 1965	Selma — "Bloody Sunday"	State troopers attack marchers at Edmund Pettus Bridge
Aug 1965	Voting Rights Act signed	Bans literacy tests; federal registrars; transforms Southern politics

7.2 Apartheid South Africa, 1948—1964

Date	Event	Significance
May 1948	National Party wins election	Apartheid becomes official government policy
1949—1953	Apartheid legislation enacted	Population Registration, Group Areas, Bantu Education, pass laws
1949	ANC Youth League Programme of Action	Shift from petitions to mass action
Jun—Nov 1952	Defiance Campaign	8,500 arrested; ANC membership surges
Jun 1955	Freedom Charter adopted	Blueprint for non-racial democracy
1956—1961	Treason Trial	156 ANC leaders charged; all acquitted
Mar 1959	PAC founded	Robert Sobukwe breaks from ANC; Africanist ideology
Mar 1960	Sharpeville Massacre	69 killed; State of Emergency; ANC and PAC banned
Apr 1960	ANC and PAC banned	Forced underground and into exile
Dec 1961	Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) formed	ANC turns to sabotage; Mandela as first commander
Aug 1962	Mandela arrested	Captured after 17 months underground (the “Black Pimpernel”)
Jul 1963	Rivonia raid	MK leadership captured at Liliesleaf Farm
Oct 1963 — Jun 1964	Rivonia Trial	Mandela and 7 others sentenced to life imprisonment

7.3 Parallel Comparison

Year	United States	South Africa
1948	Truman desegregates the military	National Party elected; apartheid begins
1952—		Defiance Campaign
1954	Brown v. Board of Education	—
1955	Montgomery Bus Boycott begins	Freedom Charter
1957	Little Rock crisis	—
1960	Greensboro sit-ins; SNCC founded	Sharpeville Massacre; ANC banned
1961	Freedom Rides	MK formed; turn to armed struggle
1963	Birmingham; March on Washington; JFK killed	Rivonia raid; leadership arrested
1964	Civil Rights Act	Rivonia Trial; Mandela sentenced to life
1965	Voting Rights Act	— (apartheid intensifies; struggle enters long exile phase)

MEMORISE THIS

Key parallel: 1960 was a turning point in both countries. In the US, the sit-in movement and SNCC’s founding marked a shift toward more confrontational direct action by younger activists. In South Africa, Sharpeville and the banning of the ANC

marked the end of legal nonviolent protest and the turn to armed struggle. The contrast: in the US, escalation led to legislative victories within five years; in South Africa, escalation led to decades of underground struggle, exile, and imprisonment.

Section 8: Common Exam Mistakes

EXAM ALERT

Paper 1 — Mistakes That Cost Marks:

1. **Describing sources instead of analysing them.** Do not simply paraphrase what a source says. Evaluate its origin, purpose, value, and limitations in an integrated way.
2. **Ignoring the command term.** If the question says “compare and contrast,” you must identify both similarities AND differences. If it says “evaluate,” you must make a judgment.
3. **Treating OPVL as a checklist.** Do not write four disconnected paragraphs. Link origin and purpose to value and limitations in a flowing analysis.
4. **Failing to use own knowledge in Q4.** The mini-essay explicitly requires “the sources and your own knowledge.” Students who only use the sources or only use own knowledge will not reach the top bands.
5. **Running out of time on Q4.** Budget your time: Q1 (5 min), Q2 (12 min), Q3 (12 min), Q4 (25—30 min). Q4 is worth 37.5% of Paper 1’s marks.
6. **Writing about events outside the prescribed dates.** The prescribed subject covers specific dates (1954—1965 for the US, 1948—1964 for South Africa). You can briefly reference context before or after, but your analysis must focus on the prescribed period.
7. **Presenting King and Mandela as identical.** They operated in fundamentally different contexts. King worked within a democracy and maintained nonviolence; Mandela faced a regime with no democratic accountability and concluded that armed struggle was necessary.
8. **Ignoring the “different regions” requirement.** Paper 1 for Prescribed Subject 4 requires two case studies from different regions. Make sure your comparative analysis explicitly contrasts the US and South African experiences.

Section 9: Glossary of Key Terms

Term	Definition
Apartheid	System of institutionalised racial segregation in South Africa (1948–1991); Afrikaans for “separateness”
Jim Crow	System of state and local laws enforcing racial segregation in the American South (c.1877–1965)
De jure segregation	Segregation enforced by law (e.g., Jim Crow laws, apartheid legislation)
De facto segregation	Segregation that exists in practice without explicit legal mandate (e.g., residential segregation in Northern US cities)
NAACP	National Association for the Advancement of Colored People — oldest US civil rights organisation; pursued legal strategy
SCLC	Southern Christian Leadership Conference — King’s organisation; mass nonviolent direct action
SNCC	Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee — youth-led; direct action, voter registration
CORE	Congress of Racial Equality — organised Freedom Rides and direct action campaigns
ANC	African National Congress — South Africa’s oldest liberation movement (founded 1912)
PAC	Pan Africanist Congress — Africanist breakaway from the ANC (founded 1959)
MK (Umkhonto we Sizwe)	“Spear of the Nation” — ANC’s armed wing (founded 1961)
OPVL	Origin, Purpose, Value, Limitations — analytical framework for source evaluation
Nonviolent direct action	Confrontational but peaceful protest: boycotts, sit-ins, marches, civil disobedience
Civil disobedience	Deliberate, nonviolent refusal to obey unjust laws, with willingness to accept legal consequences
Filibuster	Extended debate in the US Senate used to block legislation; requires 60 votes to end (cloture)
Preclearance	Requirement under the VRA that states with histories of discrimination get federal approval before changing election laws
Bantustan	”Homeland” created by the apartheid government as nominally independent territory for Black South Africans
Pass laws	Laws requiring Black South Africans to carry identification documents at all times; failure was a criminal offence
Freedom Charter	1955 declaration of principles for a non-racial, democratic South Africa; adopted at the Congress of the People

