

UNIVERZITA PALACKÉHO V OLOMOUCI

Pedagogická fakulta

Katedra anglického jazyka

MARTIN MOUCHA

III. ročník – prezenční studium

Obor: Český jazyk se zaměřením na vzdělávání – Anglický jazyk se
zaměřením na vzdělávání

**AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN ASIA DURING THE COLD
WAR PERIOD AND ITS IMPACT ON THE SOCIETY**

Bakalářská práce

Vedoucí práce: PhDr. Světlana Obenausová, MLitt, Ph.D.

OLOMOUC 2016

Prohlašuji, že jsem závěrečnou práci vypracoval samostatně a použil jen uvedených pramenů a literatury.

V Olomouci dne 21. 4. 2016

.....

vlastnoruční podpis

I would like to thank PhDr. Světlana Obenausová, MLitt, Ph.D. for her patience, constructive criticism and valuable comments on the style and content of my final work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	6
INTRODUCTION	7
THE COLD WAR	9
I WAR CONFERENCES	9
I.1 TEHRAN, IRAN.....	9
I.2 YALTA, SOVIET UNION	10
I.3 POTSDAM, GERMANY	11
II DIVIDING OF BERLIN	13
II.1 BERLIN BLOCKADE	13
II.2 THE BERLIN WALL	14
III CUBA	16
III.1 CUBAN REVOLUTION	16
III.2 CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS.....	17
IV ENDING THE COLD WAR.....	19
IV.1 SOVIET INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN.....	19
IV.2 FINAL YEARS.....	20
THE KOREAN WAR	22
V OCCUPATION OF KOREA.....	22
V.1 KOREA BETWEEN 1900 AND 1945	22
V.2 KOREA AFTER THE WORLD WAR	23
VI KOREAN WAR DEVELOPMENT.....	24
VI.1 THE FIRST INVASION.....	24
VI.2 AMERICAN OFFENSIVE.....	25
VI.3 CHINA’S INTERVENTION	26
VI.4 ARMISTICE	27
VII CONSEQUENCES OF THE KOREAN WAR.....	28
VII.1 WAR CRIMES.....	28
VII.2 REFLECTION IN POPULAR CULTURE.....	29

VIETNAM WAR	30
VIII VIETNAM IN THE 20 TH CENTURY	30
VIII.1 THE FRENCH RULE	30
VIII.2 WAR OF INDEPENDENCE	31
VIII.3 VIETNAM 1955-1965	32
IX AMERICAN WAR.....	33
IX.1 KENNEDY’S ISSUE.....	33
IX.2 JOHNSON’S ESCALATION.....	34
IX.3 LEAVING VIETNAM	35
X CONSEQUENCES OF THE VIETNAM WAR.....	37
X.1 WAR CRIMES IN VIETNAM.....	37
X.2 VIETNAM WAR IN CULTURE	38
X.3 MOVEMENTS AGAINST THE WAR	39
X.3.1 THE HIPPIE MOVEMENT	39
X.3.2 ANTI-WAR ACTIVISTS.....	39
X.3.2.a DAVID HALBERSTAM	39
X.3.2.b WALTER CRONKITE.....	39
X.3.2.c JOAN BAEZ.....	40
X.3.2.d JANE FONDA	40
X.3.2.e ABBIE HOFFMAN	40
CONCLUSION	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY	42
RÉSUMÉ	45
ANOTATION	46

ABSTRACT

This bachelor thesis focuses on two main conflicts in Asia during the period of the Cold war. At first it introduces the war in general, with its causes, the sides which were involved in this conflict and the way how they were changing during the war. To be more specific, it is focused on common people, politicians, soldiers and the atmosphere in the US. Then it deals with the conflicts themselves, mentioning two of them, which are generally considered to be the most important – Korean War is followed up in the first part and the second part occupies Vietnam War. Its aim is to find out how each of these conflicts influenced the society, especially in the United States. It means the thesis deals with the war crimes, growth of pacifism, development of war technologies and strategies, beginnings of important anti-war movements and protests against war. The last point of the thesis is how those conflicts are reflected in popular culture.

INTRODUCTION

“During the Cold War, America undertook serious military cuts only once: after the election of Richard Nixon, during the Vietnam War. The result: Vietnam fell to the Communists, the Russians moved to Afghanistan and American influence around the globe waned dramatically.” (Ben Shapiro)

After the World War I, where the United States helped the Allies defeat the Central Powers, the USA became new world power. As a matter of fact, the war took place on European soil only, which means the whole Europe was devastated both financially and politically. On the other hand, people of the United States were going through their golden age, which the Americans know as “The Roaring Twenties.” The country kept sending money, mass-produced cars or weapons to Europe in order to help and, taking into consideration the matter of profit, the people were enjoying themselves, their belongings and wealth. This golden age ended up in 1929 with the Great Depression, which affected not only the country itself but the whole then advanced world.

In 1930s, F. D. Roosevelt’s New Deal helped solving the crisis but at the end of this decade the World War II began. The USA, being strictly neutral at first, entered the War in late 1941 after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, the US naval base in the Pacific. European Powers, being conscious of support by a powerful ally overseas, defeated the Nazis in May 1945. The World War II definitely ended in the beginning of September 1945, when the USA defeated Japan. Although the most fearful war was over, there was another war supposed to begin. It was not a war in its nature. It was a conflict of two World War II winning powers. It was a conflict of two oppositely ideologies – capitalism and communism. This war lasted for over forty years and most of time it has not been waged by weapons but more likely by espionage, intimidation, intelligence or propaganda. This was the Cold War.

This bachelor thesis is mainly focused on the two most important military conflicts of this war. Both of them took place in Asia and caused radical changes in the society of the United States. The Korean War was the first of the conflicts mentioned above. It was the first major conflict of the Cold War, which was more of a world power struggle than a real war. The war in Korean peninsula has lasted for only three years but its progress and final result strongly affected the people involved in the war and later development of both Korean republics, which newly formed after the war by separating the peninsula into communistic

North and democratic South. The second important conflict where the US forces took part lasted for over twenty years. It is considered to be the following-up of the First Indochina War (1946-1954), where the Vietnamese fought for their independence. The thesis also examines effect of these conflicts on the American people such as war protests, the Hippie movement and the way how it is reflected in culture.

THE COLD WAR

The World War II completely changed old orders of the world. Some of the pre-war powers of Europe, e.g. France or Great Britain, have shown their inability to win the war on their own or, as the French demonstrated, to defend themselves against the Nazis. It was the Soviet Union and the United States who lead the Allies to defeat the Axis powers. Having been the two most influencing powers in winning the war, both United States and the Soviet Union naturally had the most important say in post-war organization of Europe, which was, taking into consideration highly contradictory political ideologies of both countries, the base of the Cold War. This first major chapter introduces this war with its beginning, diplomacy, organizing post-war world and minor conflicts.

I | WAR CONFERENCES

Each of the three most important wartime conferences influenced the development of the post-war Europe. This chapter deals with the progress of these conferences together with the consequences it had for the sides involved in restoring the world destroyed by the war.

I.1 | TEHRAN, IRAN

The first important conference took place in Tehran, Iran, in November 1943. The United States were represented by the president Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Joseph Stalin took part as the leader of the Soviet Union and Great Britain, which was another big power of the Allies, sent to Tehran its Prime Minister Winston Churchill. The main outcome of the Tehran conference was opening the second front against Nazi Germany but the importance of this conference in the view of the Cold War resides in the first meeting of these politicians, informally referred to as “Big Three,” and the first outcome of the mutual relations between the three.

Gellately (2013) points out that Roosevelt and Churchill had opposing meaning towards Stalin. Roosevelt, by that time already sitting on a wheelchair due to his paralytic illness, was displaying his sympathies to Stalin much more than Churchill. A member of British delegation remarked that the conference was when it had only just begun because Stalin had the US President in his pocket.¹ Although Churchill had found out what was the Communist

¹ Field-Marshal Sir Alan Brooke, quoted in David Dilks, ed., *The Diaries of Sir Alexander Cadogan, 1938–1945* (New York, 1972)

all about during the Russian Revolution of 1917, at the time of World War II conferences he felt squeezed between the new world powers and resigned himself to thinking he had to make the best of a bad situation. It must have involved a high level of self-deception for Churchill to make concessions to the representative of an ideology which he regarded as abhorrent. (Gellately, 2013).

The conference itself, as mentioned above, resulted in agreement when and where to open the second front. The invasion of Normandy took place as planned, on 6th June 1944, and the supporting invasion of southern France, as arranged in Tehran as well, too.

I.2 | YALTA, SOVIET UNION

Yalta, a city located on the south of the Crimean peninsula, had been arranged to be the venue of the second important wartime conference. It was the second meeting of the “Big Three” and, with regard to later happenings, the last meeting of these particular men. It took place in the beginning of February 1945 with the aim of discussing the re-establishment of post-war Europe. McMahon (2003) claims that Stalin, Roosevelt and Churchill planned the war’s end, as well as resolve some of the disputes. The question of Eastern Europe was one of them. Churchill wanted Eastern Europe, especially Balkan, to be divided into British or Russian sphere of influence, according to percentages agreements, as tentatively approved by both Stalin and Churchill in November 1944. Roosevelt never agreed despite the fact it followed the principle of free and democratic self-determination of the countries. Roosevelt’s decision not to circle this point deepened Churchill’s pessimism in the question of further political and ideological development of Balkan countries, being afraid the whole Balkan would be Bolshevized. (McMahon, 2003)

Gellately (2013) writes about the crucial question of Poland. Having been split into the Soviet Union and Nazi Germany by the Molotov – Ribbentrop Pact, as signed by Foreign Ministers of both countries – Vyacheslav Molotov of the Soviet Union and Joachim von Ribbentrop of Nazi Germany, Poland practically did not exist. When discussing about how the Polish country would look like, Stalin strongly refused giving up Polish territories gained on base of the Molotov – Ribbentrop Pact. As a compensation for losing some parts of their one-time land, Stalin offered the Poles eastern territories belonging to Germany, concretely to the so-called Curzon Line. (Gellately, 2013)

Stalin's concessions to both Roosevelt and Churchill had been reflected in the situation in Poland. The discussion also turned to whether France should get the zone of occupation, as mentioned by Gellately (2013). Stalin it should not, claiming that the French have opened the gate to the enemy. Having used the example of Normandy landing, by which he demonstrated the importance of France for winning the war, Churchill tried to persuade Stalin to agree with the French having their occupation zone. Stalin permitted but only in case the French would have their occupation zone at the expense of Great Britain and the United States. Austria had also been divided into occupation zones, although there was consensus that it should become independent state again. But the Soviet Union was not interesting in having permanent influence there, nor was the rest of the war-winning powers, so Austria stayed saved up from communist influence. (Gellately, 2013)

The Yalta Conference was the most important meeting for organizing post-war Europe. Soon afterwards, Franklin Delano Roosevelt died of stroke and Winston Churchill has not been selected the Prime Minister again. From the "Big Three," only Stalin remained in his position and had the biggest share in the beginning of the Cold War.

I.3 | POTSDAM, GERMANY

The third and final meeting of the Allies leaders took place in Potsdam, the city in at-that-time-occupied Germany. This meeting was different from the previous two in Tehran and Yalta. The Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin, from the "Big Three" the only one not to be victim of neither any illness, which he did not suffer from yet at the time straight after the end of World War II, nor the political changes in his country, where there was any space, reason or opportunity for Stalin to be replaced. Newly elected president of the United States Harry Truman represented his country after his predecessor died in April 1945 and Clement Attlee, whose political party won the elections at the expense of Winston Churchill's party during the conference time, replaced his rival as the British Prime Minister.

The knowledge of when did they meet appears to be very important question. According to Gellately (2013), some Russian and American historians suggest that Truman wanted to postpone the conference until the experiment of the first atomic bomb succeeded, so he would have had more political clout. Churchill himself preferred sooner term rather than later, preferably in mid-June, but, having had scheduled the great Victory Parade for June 24, Stalin accepted July term, as suggested by Harry Truman. (Gellately, 2013)

The main aim of this conference was to establish the post-war order, peace treaty issues and, most of all, deciding how to administer Nazi Germany. McMahon (2003) highlights that in the question of Asia, the Americans and the Soviets agreed on dividing Korea, which was, as the Japanese Territory, on the losing side of the war, at the 38th parallel. They also agreed on joint working towards the establishment of independent and unified Korea. The first step to fulfill this goal was the establishment of the Soviet-American commission to prepare for the election of Korean government, which should have been the way towards the full independence of the country. This plan went to ruin very soon, falling victim to Cold War tensions which did not admit any meaningful cooperation or compromise between the United States and the Soviet Union. (McMahon, 2003)

The situation in Indochina was not much different. Vietnam had been divided at the 17th parallel. The United States appeared to be neutral but in fact, as claimed by McMahon (2003), Truman's administration tilted towards European colonist in south-east Asia, namely the French against the Vietnamese, and the Dutch in Indonesia, both of which fought to keep the colonies under their rule. Truman considered France and the Netherlands too important for his anti-Soviet coalition to risk antagonizing both of the countries by supporting their colonies in the fight for their independence. The leaders of Vietnam and Indonesia respectively appealed for US support, referring to self-determination issues, as claimed by Winston Churchill and Franklin D. Roosevelt during the Yalta Conference, and were disappointed when the support did not come. (McMahon, 2003)

II | DIVIDING OF BERLIN

The Berlin issue was another important event for the future happening in Berlin. It exposed intentions the communist Soviet Union had with treating its satellites in Eastern Europe. The Berlin question can be used as an example how far were the Soviet leaders go in preventing the inhabitants of Eastern bloc from emigrating to the West. The Berliners were one of the people mostly affected by the Cold War in its first half.

II.1 | BERLIN BLOCKADE

The first major post-war crisis, the blockade of Berlin, began in June 1948. It was the attempt of the Soviet Union to limit the ability of France, Great Britain and the United States to travel to their sectors of Berlin, which lay within the East Germany, controlled by the Soviet Union, and which was divided into four occupation zones regardless of the rest of the country. Straight after the war, the Soviet Union began spreading the communist ideology all over its satellites of Eastern Europe. One-by-one, the opposition leaders were purged in Poland, Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania and Czechoslovakia. Yugoslav leader Josip Broz Tito was the only one to break free his country from the Soviet sphere of influence in good time. Tucker (2008) highlights that the Czechoslovak fall into the thrall of the communists sent a shockwave through Western Europe but it also marked the zenith of the communist expansion in Europe. The Western powers now felt the vulnerability of three zones of West Berlin, having been placed inside the Soviet-controlled area, as mentioned above. This, as the Kremlin leaders expected, might have disheartened the West alongside with discouraging the United States in interfering in European political matters. (Tucker, 2008)

The blockade itself began on 24th July 1948. McMahon (2003) suggests Stalin's aim to escalate the vulnerability of Western powers in question of West Berlin by isolating the western enclave, stopping all surface travel between West Berlin and West Germany. He also pursued derailing of establishment of the separated West Germany, which he feared. As a response to the blockade, Harry Truman initiated airlift of supplies to the embattled inhabitants of West Berlin. This, as stressed by McMahon (2003), was one of the most unforgettable and cliff-hanging episode of the Cold War. Truman was convinced that losing Berlin would mean losing all Germany. Thousands of flights, delivering tons of supplies of help every day, saved the West Berliners their lives. Having lasted for 321 days, the attempt to isolate West Berlin from connection with Western powers was called off by Stalin on 12th

May 1949, having had failed. As a result, the blockade just deepened the split between the East and the West and destroyed any hopes for a German settlement acceptable to all four occupying powers. In September 1949, the Western powers created the Federal Republic of Germany and a month later, the Soviet occupation zone turned into the German Democratic Republic. The inhabitants of Germany reunited the country again in 1990. (McMahon, 2003)

II.2 | THE BERLIN WALL

The truly obvious symbol of the Cold War and Europe's division into Western and communist bloc was the concrete wall of Berlin. Having been built in August 1961, the Berlin wall divided the city into western and eastern part and may seem to be perceived as one of the consequences of the Berlin blockade.

In early 1950s, the inhabitants of East Germany took the advantage of the end of the Berlin blockade and the separation of the East German capital city. Afraid of Stalin's paranoid acting, a huge mass of people moved to West from 1950 to 1953. Then, after a couple of years' relative peace, the number of emigrants rose up again in 1958. In following three years, about three million refugees came from east to west. Many of them were young skilled workers, teachers, engineers or doctors. To prevent their moving westwards, in August 1961 the Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev, the successor of Joseph Stalin, who died in March 1953, invited the East German government to built the border between the east and the west side of the town, not respecting where the people worked, where lived their families, where the tram rail were. The construction of the border started with barbed wire, as mentioned by Freedman (2000), on 13th August. Just after the midnight that day, the first tempters tried to emigrate to the West and so kept doing their followers for the next couple of weeks. As a reaction to what was happening at that time the communist leaders decided to build the concrete wall. Having been twelve feet tall, four feet wide and demarcated completely the western part of Berlin, the wall was very tough to beat.

Freedman (2000) claims that the options for helping the people on the eastern side of the Iron Curtain were few and most seemed to increase the risk of great-power war. From Freedman's point of view the Berlin wall transformed the Cold War. He argues that it started European détente, based upon a shift in West Germany's foreign policy and the tolerance of the territorial status quo. Furthermore, it opened up lines of communication with the East. (Freedman, 2000). According to McMahon (2003), the then US President John Fitzgerald Kennedy considered the building of the Berlin wall not to be a very nice solution but still to

be “a hell of a lot better than war.” Fortunately for Kennedy, he never had to confront elementary question of whether Berlin was worth a war that would have almost certainly claimed millions of lives. (McMahon, 2003)

III | CUBA

III.1 | CUBAN REVOLUTION

Cuba, the island country lying just ninety miles away to the south from the southern tip of Florida, turned out to be another bone of contention between the United States and the Soviet Union. Fulgencio Batista, who was the Cuban president and dictator from 1940 to 1944 and then again from 1952 to 1958, served as the long-time ally for the United States. But the Cuban people became highly unsatisfied with Batista's reign and dictatorship. Freedman (2000) demonstrates the problem in thinking of Cuban people on the quote of John F. Kennedy, at that time one of the American senators. Kennedy acknowledged injustice the Cuban people felt, what turned their rage against Batista. They were convinced the United States treated Cuba more like a colony than an allied country. According to him, the people of Cuba were interested more in money the United States had taken out of their country than in seeing raising standard for the people living on the island. (Freedman, 2000)

The revolution itself, as mentioned by Freedman (2000), was a curiosity. Batista made a mistake by freeing Fidel Castro, later leader of the revolution, from prison, where he had spent two years, having been arrested during riots of summer 1953. During the time of revolution, Castro declared his earlier Marxist-Leninist sympathies to be retrospective, in order to win himself the leading position for the forthcoming coup d'état. Castro came to power as the only available leader and some of the liberal powers in the United States expressed their support towards the new Cuban leader. This support went to ruin immediately straight afterwards when Castro's attitudes to American economic interests turned out to be different from his predecessor's and when Castro showed no interest in calling democratic elections. The leaders of United States feared that the Cuban revolution would encourage other countries of Latin America in similar uprising. Latin America was the natural sphere of US influence, by which there was no natural environment for any communist foothold. When this foothold appeared in Cuba, moreover personalized by young and charismatic character of Fidel Castro, the fright of spreading communism into the American continent suddenly became greater. (Freedman, 2000)

Very soon after the revolution, the political situation in Cuba changed radically. Due to the land reform, the United States lost the Cuban land which they owned. The American companies were nationalized. In 1960, the Soviet Union and Cuba signed the treaty of

commerce and soon afterwards both countries established their diplomatic relations. The Soviet Union, with all of its satellites, initiated a massive economical and military help. On the other hand, the United States imposed an embargo against Cuba. The embargo still remains in existence even today.

III.2 | CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

The issue of Cuban revolution and its impact on the happenings in Latin America escalated in early 1960s. It lasted only for thirteen days but, during this period, in context of the whole Cold War very short period, the world was the most closely to the nuclear war.

The crisis began on 16th October 1962, when the pilot of an American spy plane, while flying over Cuba, photographed a Soviet medium-range ballistic missiles being ready for installation. American air force had been spying Soviet ships voyaging to the coast of Cuba but could not have revealed its real purpose. Now the US government, having had the proof, knew what was going on. Kennedy's consultants advised him to launch an attack against the Soviet Union but the President refused, knowing it would start the war. Next few days were calm and quiet but the CIA was intensively chasing information until 20th October, when they found out the missiles are completely installed and ready to be used against the United States. Having been aware what would the launching of the missiles cause, Kennedy decided to declare naval blockade of Cuba in order to prevent more Soviet ships from reaching Cuban coast. The Soviet side still did not leave any comment to the situation so the Americans had to publish newly taken photographs to convince the world about the truth. Having done that, they frightened the Soviet Union by starting the war in case the Soviet ships would try to break the naval blockade.

The situation escalated when one of the Soviet soldiers used the missile to shut down an American spy plane, by which he killed its pilot. It should be noted that he did it on his own without having been given any order to do so. The Cuban side, namely Fidel Castro with his closest fellow worker Che Guevara tried to persuade the Soviet side to start the war by firing the missiles but Khrushchev refused. On October 26, he offered Kennedy to remove the missiles from Cuba in exchange for a promise that the United States would not invade Cuba as planned and for removing their missiles installed in Turkey and Italy.

McMahon (2003) sees the reasons for installing the missiles in Cuba firstly in Khrushchev's aim to deter the Americans from possible invasion to Cuba, thereby affording

protection to the communist regime of Cuba. Additionally, in the beleaguered Cuban revolution Khrushchev saw the opportunity of closing the missile gap between the Soviet Union and the United States. It were the Americans to be the first to surround their enemy country with military bases and threatening nuclear weapons and now they tasted their own medicine, as claimed by the Soviet leader. (McMahon, 2003)

In addition, Tucker (2008) highlights that within the following two years after the end of the Cuban crisis, the attention of United States turned from the large-scale threat of the general war into the real local war, as happened by American intervention in Vietnam. This was not the type of war where the super weapons should have been used but still it was the war against the communist regime. Tucker reminds the Americans lost Vietnam without losing a single pitched battle. It all came with American misunderstanding of Vietnamese, who did not perceive the war as the war of ideologies; in their minds it was the war for national independence. (Tucker, 2008)

IV | ENDING THE COLD WAR

IV.1 | SOVIET INVASION OF AFGHANISTAN

The Soviet-Afghan War was the conflict lasting from late 1979 to 1992, when the last Soviet troops left the country. The civil war in Afghanistan continued as the country fought for its political organization. The totalitarian regime, which was overthrown in 1992, as the communists lost their influence, was established back in 1996 by the terrorist organization called Taliban.

The beginning of the Afghan conflict dates back to 1978 with left-wing military officers overtaking the government at the expense of the centrist government. The insurgent groups called the Mujahideen represented the opposition to the communist government and were financially supported by the United States, Great Britain, Saudi Arabia and many other countries from both Christian and Muslim worlds. Feeling the need to help the communist government in its conflict with anticommunist Muslim guerillas, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. Tucker (2008) considers this invasion to be a mistake. In his opinion, the invasion was not a part of the Cold War, although the United States armed the Afghans to fight the Soviet invaders. The main reason why the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan was, according to Tucker, in the announcement later referred to as the Brezhnev doctrine. Leonid Brezhnev, the Soviet leader from 1964 up to his death in November 1982, announced that whenever a communist regime was threatened, the other communist states had the right and obligation to intervene. His predecessor Nikita Khrushchev applied this in the case of Hungary in 1956, Brezhnev himself demonstrated his doctrine initially in 1968 by occupation of Czechoslovakia and now he followed his own words by invading Afghanistan. As a response, the United States, lead by its 39th President Jimmy Carter, sent to Afghanistan over 150,000 men alongside with aircraft and tanks. The most important help from the United States was probably the anti-aircraft missile that neutralized Soviet ground-supportive aircraft. It seems to be the parallel of Vietnam War where it was the Soviet Union military supporting the insurgent troops in their fight against the American invaders. For the Soviet Union it was a strain to fight in Afghanistan against the massively supported opponent. With Mikhail Gorbachev taking the power in 1985 and attempting to reform the whole country, the Soviet troops started withdrawing themselves from Afghanistan. (Tucker, 2008)

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan also reflected in sport. To punish the Soviet Union for its intervention and military actions in Afghanistan, President Carter ordered a boycott of US participation in the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow. This decision highly escalated the rivalry between the two world super powers. The Soviet delegation paid it back four years later by ordering its Olympians, alongside with those from all their satellite countries, not to participate in the 1984 Olympic Games, which took place in Los Angeles.

IV.2 | FINAL YEARS

The end of the Cold War is connected with Mikhail Gorbachev's appointment as the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1985. The economy of Soviet Union was stagnant and, comparing to the economy of the United States, substantially weaker. As said by Gross Stein and Lebow (1994), from Stalin to Gorbachev annual Soviet defense spending about 25% of country's disposable income, which was a huge burden for the economy (Gross Stein, Lebow, 1994). The deeper changes seemed to be necessary. Gorbachev, not being blind to this problem, announced an economic reform called perestroika.² Gross Stein and Lebow describe perestroika as a requirement of peaceful relations abroad to succeed at home. Accommodation with the West would permit a shift in resources from the military to productive investment. (Gross Stein, Lebow, 1994)

The second big change in political life of the Soviet Union which Gorbachev introduced was glasnost.³ This was the wider openness which increased the freedom of press, intended to reduce corruption within the Communist Party and assured the Soviet citizens better contact with the western world, particularly with the United States.

Gross Stein and Lebow (1994) say that the Cold War ended when the Soviet leaders became committed to domestic reforms and to a concept of common security that built on the reality of nuclear deterrence. They claim this allegation have no relevant evidence. Additionally, the detailed reconstruction of Soviet and American policy during the era of Mikhail Gorbachev would only be demonstrated at the time when the memoirs, documents and interviews of the key participants will be available. They see the strategy of nuclear deterrence as the key point of ending the Cold War (Gross Stein, Lebow, 1994).

² Perestroika – a Russian term for restructuring or rebuilding

³ Glasnost – a Russian term for publicity

The end of the Cold War was more of a natural process, which went hand-in-hand with technical and political development during the fifty-four-years lasting struggle of two belligerent ideologies for overtaking the power over the world. Wars cost a lot of money, which turned out to be main problem for the Soviet Union. The reforms of Mikhail Gorbachev, meant well by the last Soviet leader, together with the bad economic situation in the Soviet Union, were one of the main reasons of the Cold War end and finally destroyed the communist regime in the Soviet Union.

THE KOREAN WAR

The second major chapter is focused on the first major clash between the communist East and the capitalist West. The Korean War is, alongside with the Vietnam War, the only real military conflict between the two contradictory ideologies. The Soviet Union and the United States have never been in a conflict facing each other. They both kept sending their troops or any other kind of support to different conflicts to join ideologically identical side, as shown in both Korean and Vietnam Wars. The aim of the United States in this war was to protect the southern part of the Korean peninsula, which was controlled by them, as agreed after the World War II. This chapter deals with the development of the war and its influence of the people in Korea as well as in the United States, war crimes and the reflection in popular culture.

V | OCCUPATION OF KOREA

V.1 | KOREA BETWEEN 1900 AND 1945

The First Sino-Japanese War, which took place in the last decade of the 19th century, destroyed the Chinese rule over the Korean peninsula and established the Korean Empire, which lasted only for a decade at the turn of the 19th and 20th century. Having been the most militarily advanced country in Asia, Japan defeated the Russian Empire in the war of 1904 and 1905. Soon afterwards the Japanese annexed Korea and made it its protectorate. Due to this fact, many Korean nationalists escaped from the country and settled in China.

As written by Edwards (2006), during the forty-years-long period of occupation, the Japanese improved country's infrastructure by building an extensive railway system in order to connect cities from both northern and southern tips of the peninsula. The railway served more for the military actions than the public transport. Under the Japanese rule, air travel had been encouraged as well and, after the end of World War II, so did the rest of the service. The Japanese treated the Koreans harshly and completely until 1945. When speaking about religion, during the Japanese occupation Korea recorded a huge increase of Buddhism followers. Although this religion was part of the Korean culture for over fifteen centuries, the Japanese Buddhism is a little bit different from the Korean Buddhism and the two varieties of this religion maintain separated identities. From the Koreans' point of view, it may seem to be a form of little protest against the invaders. The growth of Christianity in Korea is connected

with opening the country to the whole world, which happened after the World War II. (Edwards, 2006)

V.2 | KOREA AFTER THE WORLD WAR II

After the World War II and the definite end of the rule of war-losing Japan, the Korean people saw the chance of unification of the nation and reaching independence for the whole country. The decision to divide the peninsula following the 38th parallel, as determined by the Allies during the Potsdam Conference [Chapter I.3] highly disappointed the Korean people, as referred by Edwards (2006). The Soviet Union, just entering the Pacific war in order to help the Americans with defeating Japan, by which its leader Joseph Stalin kept his word given to Franklin Delano Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference, agreed with occupying the north of the peninsula, while the United States took the control over the south.

By 1948 both the United States and the Soviet Union established by-them-controlled governments in each part of the Korean peninsula. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which established in the north, was lead by Kim Il-Sung and the southern Korea Republic had Syngman Rhee in its charge. Both of the leaders promised to keep jurisdiction all over Korea. The original plan of the Soviet and American governments was to withdraw their troops from Korea and let the governments administering the peninsula on their own. However, as highlighted by Edwards, both of the powers did not pay attention to the groups that trained the army of both Korean nations. (Edwards, 2006)

VI | KOREAN WAR DEVELOPMENT

VI.1 | THE FIRST INVASION

It was the communist North to start the Korean War. On June 25, 1950, North Korean soldiers crossed the borderline of 38th parallel, by which they started the first military action of not only the Korean War but of the Cold War in general as well. The American troops entered the Korean on South Korea's behalf by July. Hosch (2010) points out that the invasion of the South was planned by Kim Il-Sung already in 1949, when the North Korean leader told Stalin the time for the invasion had come. Having been aware and concerned by unpreparedness of the North Korean troops, the Soviet leader preemptorily refused. It was not only the unpreparedness of North Korea to wage war. Stalin also took into consideration possible American involvement in South's defense. However, within a year North Korea built the KPA (Korean People's Army) into a formidable offense force, following the example of Soviet Army. The People Republic of China helped in building this army by releasing Korean veterans from People's Liberation Army, which fought in Chinese Civil War (1945-1949). That was enough for Stalin to approve the invasion, as happened in spring 1950 after Kim's another meeting the Soviet leader in Moscow. (Hosch, 2010)

According to Kim (1973), the United States were not prepared to enter the conflict. Korea was not included in the strategic Asian Defense Perimeter, as outlined by Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State at that time. American military strategists were much more focused on defending Europe from the Soviet Union and East Asia stayed further behind. The administration of Harry Truman also worried about possible growth of the Korean War into another world war in case the Soviet Union and the China PR would decide to get involved in the conflict. The most important aspect of the Americans changing attitude towards Korea was Japan. When China fell under the communist rule, the United States' leaders saw Japan as the critical counterweight to the Soviet Union and China in the East Asia region. Not having been United States policy dealing with South Korea as a national interest, geographical, cultural and historical proximity of South Korea to Japan increased the level of importance of the country. (Kim, 1973)

The man selected to command the United States forces in Korea was the general Douglas MacArthur. Having had commanded the Southwest Pacific Theater during the World War II, he was the best man to be chosen for this particular job. Hosch (2010) writes that after

stemming North Korean offense near Pusan, he carried out a daring landing at Inchon in September. In October, he advanced deeper into North Korean soil as the opposing army rapidly disintegrated. But the massive Chinese attack of November 1950 forced MacArthur's troops to go back below Seoul. Two months later the US Army returned to offensive and drove into North Korea again. Having been unwilling to conduct a limited war, as ordered by Harry Truman, and not having been generally keen to subordinate, by April 1951 MacArthur was relieved of his commands by the President. He returned to the United States for the first time since the beginning of the World War II and received a massive popularity among the people. However, people's enthusiasm for the personality of the general waned as the Senate publicized the investigation of his dismissal from Korea. (Hosch, 2010)

VI.2 | AMERICAN OFFENSIVE

At first, the aim of the United States in entering the Korean War was just to defend the South and help the Southerners to get the communists out of their territory. Having been better-trained, better-equipped and better-disciplined, the North Korean Army drove Rhee's forces off to the absolute south of the Korean peninsula – into the Pusan Perimeter.⁴ Until this time the conflict was going badly for the Truman administration. The first but not the last twist of the Korean War arrived this exact moment. After defending the Pusan port, the Americans changed their strategy from only defensive to offensive. Casey (2008) suggests MacArthur's astonishingly successful September counterattack at Inchon, which suddenly transformed the situation. Shocked and outflanked North Korean army withdrew its positions back to the 38th parallel. This partial victory perked the South up and filled their hearts with such a happy cheer and optimism, refreshing the idea of uniting the whole peninsula. Having had the subconscious mind of a stunning victory on the horizon, the Democrats of the United States looked up very optimistically to the forthcoming elections. (Casey, 2008)

The United Nations interfered in the conflict in October 1950. Having pushed the communists back to the 38th parallel, the UN general staff offered the North unconditional surrender. Nevertheless, the Northern command refused by which they caused the UN troops, having been encouraged by recent successes, crossed the 38th parallel. Within a month they conquered Pyongyang, the capital of the Korea DPR, and drove the Northerners deep to the mountains which form the borderline between North Korea and the China PR. Then, as it is said by Casey (2008) MacArthur issued a command of crossing the Yalu River thinking this

⁴ Pusan Perimeter – an established 225 km area centered on the port of Pusan (Hosch, 2010)

move would definitely end the Korean War. However, the decision of crossing the river turned out to be a big mistake caused by MacArthur's misjudgment of the situation. (Casey, 2008)

VI.3 | CHINA'S INTERVENTION

Having crossed the Yalu River in late October 1950, MacArthur troops unknowingly made a huge mistake which turned out to be another twist of the War. They knew about the Chinese soldiers waiting on the opposite bank of the river. What they did not expect at all was the number of the soldiers, which inclined to about a half a million men, who, having a secret support from the Soviet Union, were ready to set to the War and join the communist North. Officially claimed as volunteers not dependent on Chinese army but in fact being its members, the total amount of over two million men helped the Northern troops to push their enemies away from the North Korean soil for one thing and, moreover, to win back the Southern capital city of Seoul for second thing. Due to this massive offensive of the Northerners and the severe winter of 1950 and 1951, the Southern troops suffered huge death toll. Sandler (2003) talks about the temperature dropped from 40 °F to -8°F, what is, recounted in Celsius degrees, about -26 °C in its minimum. This harsh winter truly coming against the troops was accompanied by 30 to 35 mph wind. A huge number of men collapsed due to the weather and were hospitalized. Taking into consideration that the temperatures would later fall even below -8 °F, the shock of the winter remained unforgettable for the soldiers. In such cold the water-soluble medicine frozen and the blood plasma could be given after a 60-90 minutes preparation in warm tents. The Chinese, having been much hardier than the UN troops and better used to the cold like this, were not so shocked by the cold but it made them suffer as well. It was caused by their equipment which was not fitting enough for such extreme weather conditions. (Sandler, 2003)

The Chinese, following the mistake of Douglass MacArthur's troops, also sank into optimism by winning back the lost land what made them think they could win the whole War. It was another twist in the plot of the Korean War. With Lieutenant-General Matthew Ridgway assuming the command in late 1950, the UN forces gained a skilled strategist to win again the Southern part of the peninsula. In late January 1951, finding that the Chinese People's Volunteer Army (PVA) had abandoned their battle lines, built his own battle line from one coast of the peninsula to another by which he started pushing the numerous but poorly armed Chinese back. This strategy is known as "Meat-grinder strategy." Edwards

(2010) explains this term as the infliction of maximum casualties on the Communist Chinese Forces (CCF) and decreasing the number of UN commands casualties. The strategy consisted of well-defended probes, territorial advances and concentrated artillery attacks. This strategy turned out to be marginally effective and did not force the CCF to surrender. On the contrary, it received criticism for its brutality (Edwards, 2010). In the beginning of spring 1951, both of the armies were back in their positions. This was, as said by Sandler (2003) the first UN counter-offensive since the entry of Chinese Communist forces and ended the speculation of withdrawal the UN troops from Korea. (Sandler, 2003)

VI.4 | ARMISTICE

The following two years of the War took place in the spirit of repetitive offensives and high number of casualties on both sides. The battle of Hoengsong may serve as the exception, having become the battle with heaviest US casualties, as claimed by Edwards (2006). The soldiers and inhabitants of Korea had to survive two years of the stalemate war and on-again, off-again armistice negotiations until the summer of 1953. The first firm suggestion the enemy was willing to negotiate the armistice came in June that year. Casey (2008) mentions that Yakov Malik, a member of Soviet delegation office at the United Nations, announced the Soviet Union believed in a possible peace settlement in Korea based on the 38th parallel. By that time, Harry Truman's tenure had been over for more than a half a year and his successor, general Dwight D. Eisenhower, familiarly nicknamed "Ike," travelled to Korea to learn what might end the Korean War. (Casey, 2008)

When agreeing about the armistice, the Powers established the Korean Demilitarized Zone at the 38th parallel. The United Nations Command, supported by the United States, the North Korean People's Army and the Chinese People's Volunteers signed the Armistice Agreement on 27th July 1953 to end fighting. The Armistice also called upon the sides involved in the War, namely North Korea, South Korea, the United States and the China PR governments to continue in peace talks. However, the Armistice Agreement is not a real peace treaty. Despite the war is over for almost sixty-three years today and there has been no fighting in Korean peninsula anymore since signing the Armistice, both countries of the Korean peninsula are still officially in a state of war and the 38th parallel is the most heavily guarded borderline of the world.

VII | CONSEQUENCES OF THE KOREAN WAR

Having lasted for three bloody years of fights, fears and dying, the Korean War in its nature did not solve anything. The borderline between North Korea and South Korea remained unchanged, as agreed in Potsdam after World War II. The post-war idea of unification the peninsula into one country, as wished by the Koreans after the World War II, faded out. The conflict escalated the rivalry between the East and the West and since then both sides were finding a pretext to clash the enemy in every little conflict all around the world, as illustrated on the examples of the Suez crisis, Cuba, the Berlin Wall, the Vietnam War or Afghanistan.

VII.1 | WAR CRIMES

Casey (2008) mentions that according to Colonel James N. Hanley, the chief of War Crimes' Section, the communists had murdered almost 5,800 American soldiers. The Korean War itself cost lives of nearly five million people, more than a half of which were the civilians. This number of casualties among the civilians is higher than in World War II and Vietnam. Lieutenant-General Ridgway talked about even more American soldiers murdered in the War, mentioning a number of approximately 8,000 military personnel. To make the matter worse, controlled interviews with released prisoners of the Korean War exposed the cruelty of communists' behavior to them; US prisoners had been exposed to force marches, beating, lack of food and summary executions. (Casey, 2008)

According to Sandler (2003), treating the prisoners in POW camps has also been brutal. In fact, in summer 1950 KPA troops organized something like a Death March for US Prisoners, having had an example in Japanese treating the prisoners during the World War II. Starvation, beating and execution on the spot rapidly decreased the number of prisoners. The ones who survived entering the POW camp could hardly endure the net wave of brutalities. On the other hand, using the napalm or white phosphorus strikes, as practiced by the US forces, especially in Vietnam a decade later, shows that even the Western powers used inhumane methods to reach their aim of winning the war (Sandler, 2003). As remarked by Edwards (2010), even the southern leader Syngman Rhee treated the opposing troops brutally. Having ordered the Bodo League Massacre, he is responsible for deaths of more than 100,000 suspected leftist sympathizers and their families by South Korean officials and right-wing

groups. During the massacre, the British protested to their allies and saved some citizens. (Edwards, 2010)

VII.2 | REFLECTION IN POPULAR CULTURE

In contrast with the Vietnam War, the Korean War fell into oblivion all around the world with the exception of the Far East. The War is reflected mainly in Korean culture. There are several movies of South or North Korean production dealing with the Korean War but almost all of them are unknown for European moviegoers. From the Western production, the movie experts may know *Inchon*. This movie portrays the Battle of Inchon in 1950, which was one of the turning points of the War. But, not having fulfilled the expectations, the movie turned out to be financial and critical fiasco. The War is also referred to in literature, theater, music and sculpture but, following the example of movies, these pieces of work are practically unknown for the general public, with the exception of Pablo Picasso's *Massacre in Korea* (1951), which depicts violence against civilians during the Korean War.

The only piece of work widely familiar for people all around the world is MASH. Primarily a novel by Richard Hooker, MASH was turned into silver screen in 1970. The real and massive popularity gained MASH with being transformed into the TV series. Having lasted from 1972 until 1983, the series' took almost four times longer time than the whole Korean War. With Alan Alda portraying the major character of the series, Cpt. Benjamin Franklin "Hawkeye" Pierce, MASH gives the people satirical view on the war. Although it is about the Korean War, which was already not a hot issue at the time of creating MASH, the parody of army and war can be easily applied to any conflict of the Cold War.

THE VIETNAM WAR

The third and last major chapter deals with the Vietnam War, which is the most divisive conflict in American history since the Civil War. Comparing the American intervention in Vietnam with Korea ten years before, the situation was different. While the Korean War lasted only three years and, apart from soldiers died in the war, it did not dramatically change the society in the United States and the people's view of the war. This statement is not true when speaking about the war in Vietnam. Contrarily, the Vietnam issue radically changed the United States. Having been going on mostly in for the United States rebellious 1960s, the War served as the pretext for growth of pacifism, first anti-war protest and even today still causes disparate reactions among the American citizens. The media played a crucial role in the War as well, by which they helped to escalate disgruntlement with the politics of the country among the American people during 1960s.

VIII | VIETNAM IN THE 20TH CENTURY

This chapter very briefly introduces the history of the country from the beginning of 20th century until the arrival of the United States' troops.

VIII.1 | THE FRENCH RULE

At the beginning of the 20th century, Vietnam, alongside with the whole area of Indochina, was under the French rule established in the mid-19th century. As it is written by Willbanks (2009), the beginning of the colonial rule in Indochina Union, declared in 1887, was politically repressive and economically exploitative. This way of treatment to the people resulted in the organization of various nationalist resistance movements which became increasingly active. The periodic uprisings, which took place in the area of Indochina, which were considered as a rebellion by the French colonists, were quickly and brutally repressed in order to maintain the stranglehold on the colonies. Nevertheless, the colonists were unable to eliminate nationalist sentiment and a high number of anti-colonial movements continued in their rebellions against the French.

With the outbreak of the World War II, the anti-colonialists felt an opportunity of ameliorating the situation as France fell under the German occupation and the later established pro-Nazi Vichy government accepted Japanese occupation of Indochina. Willbanks also highlights the forming of League for the Independence of Vietnam, as

performed by Ho Chi Minh, who was also one of the founders of the Indochinese Communist Party. (Willbanks, 2009)

VIII.2| WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

Having been aware of inevitable victory of the Allies, Japan overthrew the French in Vietnam and declared its independence under the Japanese protection. After the Japanese surrender in September 1945, the emperor Bao Dai, enthroned by the Japanese earlier in 1945, abdicated declaring his loyalty to the newly established Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The French were determined to restore their colonial influence and, having been supported by Great Britain, took control over the area of Cochinchina, which included the territory of today's southern Vietnam and eastern Cambodia, which resulted in the birth of two Vietnams, in its nature a situation not dissimilar to the situation in Korea: a communist north and noncommunist south. (Hosch, 2010)

Both sides realized the seriousness of the situation. According to Hosch (2010), negotiations between Ho Chi Minh and the French resulted in agreement of peaceful solution. France was willing to recognize Viet Minh's (League for the Independence of Vietnam) government and give the North Vietnam status of a free state within the French Union. As a quid pro quo, the French troops were about to remain in Vietnam and leave progressively in five years period. However, in spite of tactical cooperation between the two sides, their policies exposed to be more of contradictory. The French wanted to reestablish their colonial rule while the policy of North Vietnam strongly inclined to total independence. Having proclaimed Cochinchina an autonomous republic, the high commissioner for Indochina Georges-Thierry d'Argenlieu made the first major step to Vietnam War of Independence. Seeing themselves strong enough to win the war, the French totally ignored the main political reason of the war, which was again very similar to the situation in Korea – achieving unity and full independence for the whole country. In 1949, the French reunited Cochinchina with the rest of Vietnam to create Associated State of Vietnam, with Bao Dai as the chief of the state, but the nationalists did not respect this maneuver and continued struggling for their independence. Viet Minh, having waged successful guerilla war so far, gained the aid from the new communist government of China, as established after winning the Chinese Civil War in 1949. Despite having received a massive support from the Americans, fearful of widespread of communism in Asia, the French were not able to turn the war back on their way and agreed to negotiate the end of the war. The final document declaring independence to

the whole country of Vietnam was signed in 1954 at the conference in Geneva, Switzerland. It also divided the country into north and south following the 17th parallel. Viet Minh's troops moved northwards of that line, the French remained in the south. (Hosch, 2010)

VIII.3| VIETNAM 1955-1965

The Americans took interest in what was happening in Vietnam firstly in 1950. At that time they sent their military advisors to look over the escalating situation between the French and the Vietnamese during the First Indochina War. When the French quitted Vietnam after surrendering and left the country at the mercy of its own destiny, the situation escalated. At the beginning of the conflict was the effort of North Vietnam, with its capital in Hanoi and lead by well-known Ho Chi Minh, to unify the whole country under the communist regime similar to those in the Soviet Union and China. The aim of South Vietnam, having had its capital city in Saigon and being lead by Ngo Dinh Diem, fought to remain allied with the West.

The North Vietnam government did not fully observe the last of the Geneva Accords – providing the elections throughout the whole country in order to unify Vietnam. Hosch (2010) talks about North Vietnam leaders appearing certain to win these elections, and, on the contrary, the United States and the south would not approve or sign the Final Declaration, the elections were never held. That lead to the massive migration of the people from north to south at the time of reconstructing the land destroyed by the war, in which participated both North and South Vietnams. North Vietnam, having had the assistance of China and the Soviet Union, started with socialistic industrialization and collectivization of agriculture, while the south, relying on the support of the United States, succeeded with establishing anticommunist regime. Its leader Ngo Dinh Diem began, from the position of the Prime Minister, rebuilding the country by getting rid of pro-French elements and abolishing the autonomy of religious and political group. Then, in controlled referendum, removed by-the-French-appointed Bao Dai and made himself the president of South Vietnam. Having achieved relatively huge success in a very short time, Diem surprised the American government, which still poured into the South Vietnam economical aid. American military advisors helped Diem's government with equipping and training his army. The reason of doing that was to be ready in case the North Vietnam, which totalitarian methods were directed against all who were regarded to be opponents. (Hosch, 2010)

IX | THE AMERICAN WAR

The beginning of the Vietnam War, in Vietnam itself referred to as American War, is hardly recognizable. Officially stated, the War began on 1st November 1955 with American Military Assistance Advisory Group was established in Indochina. In the recent years of the conflict, the Americans did not intervene militarily. They supported the south just by advisors and technique. By 1963, a number of about 16,000 Americans appeared in Vietnam but still without fighting the North Vietnamese. The military action of the US troops in Vietnam began with the attack of the destroyer USS Maddox in August 1964.

IX.1 | KENNEDY'S ISSUE

John Fitzgerald Kennedy took the office of the President of the United States in 1961. As explained by Hosch (2010), the Vietnam issue represented for the newly elected President both a challenge and opportunity. The Viet Cong - which the name given by Western sources to the National Liberation Front, a left-wing political organization with its own army – with its struggle against Diem seemed to represent a prime example of the new Soviet and Chinese strategy of encouraging and aiding wars of national liberalization in newly independent African and Asian nations, in other words, helping communist-led insurgencies to overthrow the shaky new governments of emerging nations. Kennedy and some of his close advisers believed that Vietnam presented an opportunity to test the United States' ability to conduct a "counterinsurgency" against communist subversion and guerrilla warfare. Kennedy accepted without serious question the so-called domino theory, which held that the fates of all Southeast Asian countries were closely linked and that a communist success in one must necessarily lead to the fatal weakening of the others. (Hosch, 2010)

Having gone through the experience of the Berlin Wall and the Cuban missile crisis, Kennedy was careful in the question of military intervention in Vietnam. As pointed out by Reeves (1993), Kennedy claimed the United States had no prayer of staying in Vietnam, as a result of the Vietnamese people antipathies towards the Americans. But he was also aware of the impossibility of giving up the country to the communists. Kennedy himself had to face the crisis in July that year. Having had a massive support from the United States, South Vietnam appeared to be unsuccessful in the effect of its military against communists Viet Cong forces. (Reeves, 1993)

Kennedy's tenure of relative peaceful treating in Vietnam has ended in November 1963. In his visit to Dallas, Kennedy was assassinated while riding in his limousine through the street of Daley Plaza. Despite the detailed investigation of the President's assassination, the real motif of the act has not been proved until today. The American populace still does not know who assassinated John F. Kennedy and why. Even though Lee Harvey Oswald was arrested the same day the assassination took place, his guilt has never been a hundred per cent proved. Not even the later investigation of the crime proved tangible results. Moreover, the only possible man to help solving the crime, Lee Harvey Oswald, was murdered just two days after the President. Having happened so, the assassination of the 35th American President still remains among the biggest mysteries of US modern history.

IX.2 | JOHNSON'S ESCALATION

With the assassination of Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, the vice-president at the time of Kennedy's presidency, naturally gained the presidential office. VanDeMark (1995) writes about the Vietnam War being difficult and painful subject for the Americans. Although his book was published more than twenty years ago, this statement is still relevant even today. VanDeMark also mentions the decisions made by the President in question of American presence in Vietnam, fundamentally transformed US participation in the war and reflected and defined much of the larger history of United States' Vietnam involvement. Their decision may also teach the people lessons. But Vietnam experience tells the history lessons are dependent of each generation's understanding of the past. The policy makers of 1960s completely ignored the history of Southern Asian region and viewed Vietnam in the shade of the Cold War ideology, what later turned out to be a huge mistake. (VanDeMark, 1995)

The attacks on the US Maddox in August 1964 lead Johnson to conduct military operations in the particular area by which the United States actively entered the Vietnam War, despite not having declaring it to any of the enemy countries. The first major battle between the American troops and the Viet Cong forces took place in 1965 in the Ia Drang valley. Wiest (2005) describes the battle as the typically reflective of the whole Vietnam War. The communists realized they were facing a formidable foe and had to learn the American way of waging war. Having used artillery, ground force and helicopters, but also suffering a massive death toll, the Americans finally won the battle and occupied the valley. When counting the losses, they realized the Vietnamese suffered five times more losses than them. Declaring the battle to be won, the Americans left the valley, which later turned out to be mistake. The

Vietnam War experience exposed that the battle was not being won by having less number of the death toll but by the land conquered during the war. (Wiest, 2005)

In the following years, the spirit of waging the war did not radically changed. For moving the troops and the war materials, the communist partisans of Viet Cong were using the so-called Ho Chi Minh trail which was a logistical support line for the burgeoning running through the jungle located in Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, as explained by Wiest (2005). The Americans kept bombing the trail intensively but the effect of destroying turned out to be marginal. The frustration of the nowhere-leading war was grew bigger and bigger each month and the war itself was only a hair's breath away from its twisting point.

IX.3 | LEAVING VIETNAM

For the first time in the history of waging wars, the media coverage was present straight in battlefields. That turned out to be probably the main reason of the growing dissatisfaction among the American citizens in view of the war in Vietnam. The media daily kept bringing news from Vietnam to the United States so the people were being received objective facts about the development of the war. One of the most shocking news were annual numbers of death tolls in Vietnam, which grew higher and higher each year. Moreover, by publicizing the photographs of death soldiers alongside with their names, by which practically let the whole country know the basic information about the young men who lost their lives in Vietnam, the media highly increased the intense of growing pacifism all around the United States. Having massively protested against the war, the people forced the leaders of the country to do something about the situation.

The man in charge of changing the situation was Richard Nixon. Having been much more conservative comparing to his predecessor Lyndon Johnson, Nixon won the presidential election of 1968, as said by Wiest (2005). He promised to withdraw the troops from Vietnam, by which he succeeded in reducing antiwar feeling all over the country. Some of the US soldiers in Vietnam were painfully aware that their nation had abandoned them and the United States was withdrawing from the war. From the United States' point of view, the Vietnam War ended on January 27, 1973, as the Secretary of the State Henry Kissinger signed the Paris Peace Accords. Having signed that, the United States' soldiers were about to leave Vietnam within sixty days while the communists of North Vietnam promised to cease-fire. From the point of view of the Southern Vietnamese, this action of the United States diplomacy was perceived to be a betrayal. The Southerners did not trust the communist, which turned out to

be true in the following two years. Not having been supported by the United States, the troops of South Vietnam were unable to defend themselves against the communist offensive. Two years later from Henry Kissinger signing the Paris Peace Accords, the final offensive of the North defeated South Vietnam. Having entered the city of Saigon and crashed through the gates of Independence Palace, the North Vietnam ended the War and united the whole country under the communist rule, under which it remained until today.

X | CONSEQUENCES OF THE VIETNAM WAR

The Vietnam War was, alongside with the US Civil War, as mentioned in the introduction to this major chapter, one of the two most controversial wars in the history of the United States. Having taken part almost roughly a hundred years after the Civil War, in the period of relatively developed technique, influence of the media turned itself to be one of the most significant twisting points of the war and the Vietnam War in general substantially influenced the United States' daily live, especially in the 1960s.

X.1 | WAR CRIMES IN VIETNAM

During the Vietnam War, a large number of war crimes took place. In Vietnam, the massacres were committed by both of the sides, the communist North and the United States forces. These crimes included rape, terrorism, torture, bombing of civilians or murdering the prisoners of war but most of all, the massacres. Massacres of enemy soldiers and innocent people, not considering who is who, are the most common war crimes typical for each war. During the long-time period of the Vietnam War, there were so many “opportunities” for both sides to massacre the people of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. It would take a long time to name all the massacres committed during the Vietnam War. Russell (1967), when writing about war crimes of Vietnam, thinks the Vietnam was a responsibility of the United States. He blames the United States for everything that happened in Vietnam, claiming the Americans had completely misunderstood the Vietnamese. It does not concern only on the political powers, as marked above [Chapter IX.2]. Having published the book exactly during the wildest years of the conflict, Russell may have encouraged the people of the United States in continuing in the war protests by claiming that the tragedy of Vietnam indicates the extent to which it was possible to hide or disguise terrible crimes, adding that the time of late 1960s was the right time for the people of the West to raise their voices to end the bloodshed. (Russell, 1967)

The My Li Massacre is one of the best-known massacre committed by the American troops. According to Willbanks (2009), during the Operation Muscatine in the Province of Quang Ngai, American Division conducting the Operation massacred between 200 and 500 unarmed civilians while conducting the sweep of the village of Son My, better known as My Lai. (Willbanks, 2009)

Apart from the massacres, several other war crimes took place in Vietnam. The Americans were massively using poisonous substances, some of which were easily able to melt down steel, or napalm strikes, especially while finding the way to destroy the Ho Chi Minh trail. The attempts to fulfill the aim of destroying the trail failed but left permanent disablement on the civilians.

X.2 | VIETNAM WAR IN CULTURE

The Vietnam War reflected the popular culture more than any other local war of the world. As marked by Russell (2002), every war has its unifying theme or anything else to recognize. The unique of the Vietnam War resides in its image, which is simultaneously the image of the conflict itself. The Vietnam War is the first war to be portrayed with its hellishness and in this aspect it may be the last as well. Having been straightly inside the battlefields of the War, the journalist gave the world a unique view on the conflict, which was, taking into consideration the historical period of the Vietnam War, something that never happened before. The photo of the execution of a suspected Viet Cong member, as taken by Eddie Adams, or the naked Vietnamese child running away from the napalm-burnt village, having been recognizably and harshly burnt himself, were the pictures due to which the Vietnam War remains unforgettable. (Russell, 2002)

From the widely known movies, *Forrest Gump* is probably the best-known one dealing with the Vietnam War. In addition, it does not deal with the war only, portraying the overall atmosphere of the 1960s United States – the Civil Right Movement, the Hippie era, the wildness of the particular period and the drug experiments. These are the images connected with the Vietnam War which the Hollywood producers convert into massively-popular movies. Miloš Forman, the director of Czech origin, introduced his musical-based movie *Hair* in the late 1970s. Having been set in 1960s, the movie describes the life and opinions of the bunch of young hippies and their relations towards the Vietnam War in the contrary of the then society.

The theme of Vietnam War and the wild 1960s appear in music as well as in books, theater or even video games. In early 2000s, the video game called *Vietcong* earned massive popularity. When talking about music, there is a need to mention a high number of anti-war singers, including Joan Baez, Pete Seeger, John Lennon, Neil Young or Johnny Cash. The society in the United States keep forgetting about Sixto Rodriguez, a late 1960s singer whose popularity widely spread mainly in South Africa.

X.3 | MOVEMENTS AGAINST THE WAR

This chapter examines the main movements, people and actions which publically expressed their disagreement with the US intervention in the Vietnam War.

X.3.1 | THE HIPPIE MOVEMENT

The “Flower Power,” as are the Hippies referred to, has its roots in California, which was the birthplace of the Beat Generation as well. Refusing the typical American way of life, the hippies are still a controversial topic in the United States. Their life mottos and relationships between them or towards nature seem to be quiet normal for today’s society but in the 1960s’ United States, they were giving provocative impression to the society. Their style of life – long hair, drugs experiments, practicing free love or unwillingness of entering the army to be sent to Vietnam – became widely popular among the youngsters in the United States, as claimed by Bowman and Isserman (1992). Over three million young people identified with the hippies. In 1969, the hippies organized at-that-time-inconceivable live concert in Woodstock. Turning out to be the last major achievement of the movement, a number of almost 400,000 people appeared in the concert.

X.3.2 | ANTI-WAR ACTIVISTS

X.3.2.a DAVID HALBERSTAM

Having received a Pulitzer Prize for his penetrating coverage of Vietnam War, Halberstam initially supported US involvement in Vietnam. However, having experienced the war as a New York Times’ reporter, he became disillusioned by the war and wrote several publications about the conflict. (Hosch, 2010)

X.3.2.b WALTER CRONKITE

A long-time anchor of the CBS Evening News, Cronkite reported on many of the most important historical events of the 20th century. He left the position of a TV reporter of CBS to report from Vietnam on the aftermath of Tet Offensive. Having returned back, he lost his objectivity, stating the war could end only in a protracted stalemate. (Hosch, 2010)

X.3.2.c JOAN BAEZ

The popular American folk singer Joan Baez interested young audience due to her folk music. Despite fading of the folk music revival, Baez continued in performing. Her popularity did not fade even in the 21st century. As a political activist, by touring with younger performers throughout the United States as well as abroad, she still remains politically active. (Hosch, 2010)

X.3.2.d JANE FONDA

Jane Fonda became active on behalf of left-wing political causes. Having been outspoken opponent of the Vietnam War, in 1972 Fonda traveled to Hanoi to denounce US bombing campaigns in there. In 1988, Fonda apologized to the Vietnam veterans claiming some of her behavior in Vietnam thoughtless and careless. (Hosch, 2010)

X.3.2.e ABBIE HOFFMAN

As an American political activist, Hoffman was active in the Civil Rights movement before concentrating to the Vietnam War. In October 1967 he led a crowd of 50,000 anti-war protesters attempting to levitate Pentagon and exorcise the evil spirits residing inside. (Hosch, 2010)

CONCLUSION

Having been the main topic of the bachelor thesis, the Cold War with its major conflicts was presented. In the first, for the right understanding of the issue most important chapter, the Cold War was introduced as the unpredictable clash between the two, in its nature fallen out, ideologies. The struggle between the capitalism and communism is basically a clash between the democratic and the totalitarian regimes. Both of the regimes, having been represented by the United States on the one side and the Union of Soviet Socialistic Republics on the other side, starved for gaining the absolute power all over the economically important places of the world, spreading “the right” ideology there and treating the inhabitants of these places in the spirit of the particular ideology. We also learned something about the strategies of the two world superpowers. The democratic West’s basic aim was to protect democracy in places where it had been before the world while the communist East tried to spread the ideology of communism, which was, comparing to democracy, much younger and for the rest of the world relatively new, everywhere where possible, not taking into consideration the form of the coup d’état in particular region.

The second major chapter deals with the first major clash of the Cold War. The Korean War, having begun only five years after the end of World War II, was in motion of the spirit mentioned above. The chapter examines beginning of the war, giving the reasons of its purposes, development and ending. Its aim was the revision of the conflict which, due to following actions not only in Asia, almost sank into oblivion. The Korean War exposed itself to be the examination of preparedness of both sides from the points of view of diplomacy, war strategy and the level of willingness of both sides in question of people’s lives.

The last chapter examines the United States’ nightmare conflict, the war in Vietnam, which, having lasted for so long time without a significant benefit for any of the sides, turned out to be most likely forgotten. The War cost so much money and so many people’s lives. Moreover, it radically changed the political and social situation in America much more than in any other side taking part in the conflict.

In conclusion, the period of the Cold War means fifty-four years of fear, doubts, threat of the devastating nuclear war and radical changes in viewing of world. In addition, it exposed the level of importance of peace and democracy for each human being.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRINTED SOURCES

ADAMS, Chris. *Inside the Cold War: a cold warrior's reflections*. Maxwell AFB: Air University Press, 1999. ISBN 978-1-58566-068-1.

BOWMAN, John S., ISSERMAN, Maurice. *Vietnam War*. New York: Facts On File, 1992. ISBN 0-8160-4937-8.

CASEY, Steven. *Selling the Korean War: Propaganda, Politics and the Public Opinion in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008. ISBN 978-0-19-530692-7.

EDWARDS, Paul M. *Almanacs of American Wars: Korean War Almanac*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2006. ISBN 0-8160-6037-1.

EDWARDS, Paul M. *Historical Dictionary of the Korean War*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2010. ISBN 978-0-8108-7461-9.

FREEDMAN, Lawrence. *Kennedy's Wars: Berlin, Cuba, Laos and Vietnam*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. ISBN 0-19-513453-2.

GELLATELY, Robert. *Stalin's Curse: Battling for Communism in War and Cold War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. ISBN 978-0-19-966804-5.

GROSS STEIN, Janice, LEBOW, Richard Ned. *We All Lost the Cold War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994. ISBN 0-691-03308-0.

HALBERSTAM, David. *The Coldest Winter: America and the Korean War*. New York: The Amateurs Ltd., 2007. ISBN 978-1-4013-8959-8.

HOSCH, William L. (ed.). *The Korean War and The Vietnam War: People, Politics and Power*. New York: Britannica Educational Publishing, 2010. ISBN 978-1-61530-047-1.

KIM, Yöng-jin. *Major Powers and Korea*. Silver Spring, MD: Research Institute on Korean Affairs, 1973. OCLC 251811671

MADDOX, Robert James. *From War to Cold War: The Education of Harry S. Truman*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988. ISBN 0-8133-0443-1.

MCMAHON, Robert. *Cold War: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003. ISBN 978-0-19-280178-4.

REEVES, Richard (1993). *President Kennedy: Profile of Power*. New York: Simon & Schuster. ISBN 978-0-671-64879-4.

RUSSELL, Bertrand. *War Crimes In Vietnam*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1967.

RUSSELL, Jamie. *Vietnam War Movies*. Harpenden: Pocket Essentials, 2002. ISBN 1-903047-93-5.

SANDLER, Stanley. *The Korean War: No Victors, No Vanquished*. London: UCL Press, 2003. ISBN 0-203-56009-4.

TUCKER, Spencer C. (ed.). *The Encyclopedia of the Cold War: A Political, Social and Military History, 5 Volume Set*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2008. ISBN 978-1-85109-706-7.

VANDEMARK, Brian. *Into The Quagmire: Lyndon Johnson and the Escalation of the Vietnam War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. ISBN 0-19-506506-9.

WAGNER, Heather Lehr. *Henry Kissinger: Ending the Vietnam War*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2007. ISBN 0-7910-9222-4.

WIEST, Andrew. *The Vietnam War 1956-1975*. Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002. ISBN 84176 419.

WILLBANKS, James H. *Almanacs of American Wars: Vietnam War Almanac*. New York: Infobase Publishing, 2009. ISBN 978-0-8160-7102-9.

ONLINE SOURCES

Berlin Blockade. *History* [online]. A&E Television Networks, LLC., 2016 [cit. 2016-04-22].
Dostupné z: <http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/berlin-blockade>

Cold War History. *History* [online]. A&E Television Networks, LLC., 2016 [cit. 2016-04-22].
Dostupné z: <http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/cold-war-history>

Korean War. *History* [online]. A&E Television Networks, LLC., 2016 [cit. 2016-04-22].
Dostupné z: <http://www.history.com/topics/korean-war>

Vietnam War. *Encyclopaedia Britannica* [online]. 2016 [cit. 2016-04-22]. Dostupné z:
<http://www.britannica.com/event/Vietnam-War>

RÉSUMÉ

Bakalářská práce je zaměřena na politický vývoj světových dějin po konci druhé světové války. Toto období se dá charakterizovat jako období boje o moc mezi kapitalistickým Západem a komunistickým Východem. V rámci Studené války probíhala na světě spousta konfliktů, z nichž dva největší, válka v Koreji a válka ve Vietnamu, znamenaly pro všechny zúčastněné strany ztráty především na lidských životech. Práce se zabývá vývojem obou konfliktů, stejně jako jejich dopadem na vývoj společnosti v zemích zasažených válečnými konflikty, především pak na společnost ve Spojených státech.

ANOTATION

Jméno a příjmení:	Martin Moucha
Katedra:	Katedra anglického jazyka PdF UPOL
Vedoucí práce:	PhDr. Světlana Obenausová, MLitt, Ph.D.
Rok obhajoby:	2016

Název práce:	Americká intervence v Asii v období studené války a její dopad na společnost
Název v angličtině:	American intervention in Asia during the Cold War period and its impact on the society
Anotace práce:	Bakalářská práce je zaměřena na politický vývoj světových dějin po konci druhé světové války. V rámci Studené války probíhala na světě spousta konfliktů, válka v Koreji a válka ve Vietnamu. Práce se zabývá vývojem obou konfliktů, stejně jako jejich dopadem na vývoj společnosti v zasažených zemích, především pak ve Spojených státech.
Klíčová slova:	Studená válka, Korejská válka, Vietnam, Spojené státy, Sovětský svaz
Anotace v angličtině:	This bachelor thesis focuses on two main conflicts in Asia during the period of the Cold war. At first it introduces the war in general. Then it deals with the conflicts themselves, mentioning two of them, which are generally considered to be the most important Korean War and Vietnam War. Its aim is to find out how each of these conflicts influenced the society, especially in the United States.
Klíčová slova v angličtině:	Cold War, Korea, Vietnam, United States, Soviet Union
Přílohy vázané v práci:	0
Rozsah práce:	46 stran
Jazyk práce:	Angličtina