FROM 1911 TO 1949, CHINA EXPERIENCED A REVOLUTION, A STRUGGLE AGAINST WARLORDS, A FOREIGN INVASION, AND FINALLY A CIVIL WAR BETWEEN NATIONALISTS AND COMMUNISTS. THE COMMUNISTS WON THE CIVIL WAR AND RADICALLY CHANGED CHINA.

In 1911, Sun Yat-sen led a revolution that ended thousands of years of rule by imperial dynasties and established the Republic of China. Sun aimed to unify his country and create a European-style elected parliament. His “Three Principles of the People” envisioned a New China based on nationalism, democracy, and the well-being of the people. In 1919, Sun founded the Kuomintang (KMT), the Chinese National People’s Party, to put his principles into practice.

Sun attempted to unify China by defeating a number of regional warlords, each of whom wanted to become master of China. He sought aid from Western countries, but they ignored him. He then turned to the Soviet Union, which had been formed after the 1917 Russian Communist Revolution. Joseph Stalin, emerging as dictator, agreed to provide Soviet aid to Sun on condition he form a “united front” with the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) against the warlords. Sun agreed, and his Nationalist KMT party joined with the CCP in this effort.

A small group of radical Chinese revolutionaries had organized the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in 1921. One of its leaders, Mao Zedong, adapted the Communist theories of Karl Marx to conditions in China. Marx had written that industrial city workers would be the ones to lead the Communist revolution. Mao, the son of a prosperous peasant, believed that a Chinese Communist revolution had to be led by poor peasants, who made up the vast majority of the country’s population. Many of these peasants...
barely eked out a living, going into debt to rent land from rich landlords.

Sun died in 1925 before achieving his New China. He was replaced by one of his chief military leaders, Chiang Kai-shek, who became the Nationalist president of China. Chiang completed Sun’s campaign to defeat the warlords in 1927.

Chiang then turned against the Communists, whom he believed to be loyal to the Soviet Union and a threat to his government. Starting with a massacre of Communists in Shanghai, Chiang’s Nationalist forces succeeded in driving them into the countryside of southern China where Mao preached his ideas of a peasant revolution.

Chiang’s armies crushed Communist revolts in several areas of southern China. Mao then led a 6,000-mile Communist retreat to northern China, a trek known as the Long March. By 1934, with most of his rivals killed off by the Nationalists, Mao became the unquestioned leader of the Communists in China.

The Anti-Japanese War

In 1931, the Japanese invaded and occupied Manchuria, the homeland of the last imperial dynasty in northeast China. Because Chiang’s priority was destroying the Communists, he did little to oppose the Japanese takeover of this part of China.

In 1936, a group of Chiang’s officers, fed up with his reluctance to fight the Japanese, kidnapped him and forced him to agree to another “united front” with the Communists. But before the Nationalist and Communist forces could accomplish much, the Japanese invaded the rest of China.

During the Anti-Japanese War in China, Chiang’s armies did most of the fighting. They were considerably weakened by Japan’s superior occupying forces. Mao’s armed forces were guerilla fighters who mostly harassed the Japanese, but did not suffer great losses as did Chiang’s military.

Since the Japanese mainly occupied eastern Chinese cities, ports, and provinces, Mao was relatively free to expand Communist influence in much of northern China. He had established his capital there after the Long March.

At first, Mao ordered his cadres (Communist political workers) to confiscate landlord properties and distribute them to the peasants. But to gain the widest support during the Anti-Japanese War, he pulled back from this policy and only forced landlords to reduce their peasant land rents.

In the last days of the war, the Soviet Union temporarily occupied Manchuria. Stalin then enabled Mao to establish bases there. Stalin also turned over large quantities of captured Japanese weapons and military equipment to Mao’s forces.

In September 1945, a month after Japan surrendered, the U.S. began to land troops in China, south of Manchuria. The U.S. then airlifted Chiang’s troops into Manchuria to take over as the Soviets withdrew. The Manchurian people soon grew hostile to Nationalist military rule, corruption, and support of the landlords.

The Chinese Civil War

When Japan surrendered, Chiang’s troops in Manchuria and the rest of China greatly outnumbered Mao’s guerilla fighters. The Nationalists mainly held the cities throughout China while the Communists dominated the peasant countryside in Manchuria and parts of northern China. In these Communist “liberated” areas, Mao’s cadres were once again distributing land to the peasants.

Although Stalin had helped Mao build up his military strength in Manchuria, the Soviet leader doubted Mao’s revision of Marxism that called for a peasant-led Communist revolution in China. Nor did Stalin believe that Mao’s Chinese Communist Party was ready or strong enough to rule China. A better strategy, Stalin advised Mao, was to accept a compromise peace agreement with the Nationalists and then follow Marx’s roadmap for a worker revolution.

Nevertheless, armed conflict soon resumed in China between the Nationalists and Communists. U.S. President Harry Truman made several attempts to mediate the conflict, which included arranging a meeting between Chiang and Mao in the fall of 1945. Mao assured the Americans he was interested only in land reform and not the violent overthrow of Chiang’s Nationalist government.

The U.S. pressed for a ceasefire and a new government that involved both the Nationalists and Communists. U.S. President Harry Truman made several attempts to mediate the conflict, which included arranging a meeting between Chiang and Mao in the fall of 1945. Mao assured the Americans he was interested only in land reform and not the violent overthrow of Chiang’s Nationalist government.

The U.S. pressed for a ceasefire and a new government that involved both the Nationalists and Communists. They agreed to a ceasefire, but that quickly fell apart when both sides violated it. In the end, neither Chiang nor Mao was interested in a compromise settlement.

In the summer of 1946, Chiang made a fateful decision. He ordered his armies into northern China and Manchuria to crush the Communists...
once and for all. The Chinese Civil War had begun.

President Truman withdrew most American troops from China in early 1947. But the U.S. provided Chiang’s Nationalist government with financial aid, weapons, military equipment, and training for his armies.

Chiang’s military offensive against the Communists in northern China and Manchuria was at first successful. His armies captured Mao’s capital and forced the Communists to retreat. But his armies soon became overextended, as his troop supply system broke down. Mao’s small guerilla forces attacked at will.

The military tide turned in favor of the Communists in 1948. Mao’s reorganized People’s Liberation Army defeated the Nationalists in Manchuria and then moved relentlessly southward. Nationalist leaders pleaded with the U.S. for more help as their armies collapsed. In April 1948, Congress and President Truman approved more economic and military aid, but this proved to be too late.

The decisive battles of the war occurred at the end of 1948 just north of the Yangzi River, which separates northern and southern China. Nearly 2 million soldiers from both sides fought a series of battles, all won by the Communists. The Communists went on to capture with little resistance the Nationalist capital of Nanjing. The speed of Communist advances stunned both Chiang and Mao.

Chiang turned over his authority as president to his vice president in order to gather resources for a counter-offensive. The acting president called for peace negotiations. But Mao sensed total military victory and refused to consider a meaningful peace agreement. In early 1949, President Truman concluded that Chiang’s cause was lost and suspended all aid to the Nationalist government.

The Nationalists surrendered Beijing, the capital of old imperial China, without a shot being fired. A month later, Communist soldiers, many with captured U.S. weapons and equipment, marched into the city. On October 1, Mao proclaimed the People’s Republic of China in Beijing’s Tiananmen Square. Aided by Stalin, Mao then set out to establish a “people’s democratic dictatorship.”

In December 1949, Chiang and his supporters fled the mainland to establish a new Nationalist headquarters on the large Chinese island of Taiwan. A month later, President Truman declared the U.S. would not send armed forces or military aid to assist Chiang retake mainland China.

Chiang never returned to the mainland. No formal surrender or peace treaty was ever signed between the Nationalists and the Communists. Historians estimate that up to 6 million soldiers and civilians died in the Chinese Civil War between 1946 and 1949.

Why Did the Communists Win?

Many Nationalist failures began with Chiang Kai-shek’s government. Controlled entirely by his Kuomintang Party, it failed to carry out the reforms promised by Sun Yat-sen.

Chiang’s government was filled with incompetent and corrupt officials. The people especially hated the tax collectors, who were commonly called “blood-sucking devils.” Chiang himself held dictatorial powers, but his orders were often ignored. He had little success in rallying Chinese nationalism to win an unpopular war against the Communists.

Chiang’s decision to go to war against the Communists in 1946 came at the cost of postponing the economic reconstruction of China. This meant diverting tax revenues, investment, and other resources to the war effort rather than to the needs of the people. Heavy taxes, a huge government debt, inflation, unemployment, and food shortages caused many, especially in the cities, to lose faith in the Nationalist government.

Economic discontent in the cities led to thousands of labor strikes. Students, newspaper editors, and intellectuals protested against Chiang’s Nationalist government. They demanded an end to the civil war and the creation of a government that included the Communists. The Nationalists responded with censorship, beatings, mass arrests, and even assassinations. This repression drove many to the Communist cause.

The Nationalist government seemed to care only for city business interests and rural landlords while ignoring the suffering of the peasants. In Communist areas captured by the Nationalists during the early part of the civil war, corrupt government administrators helped landlords take back lands that the Communists had handed over to the peasants. The government often punished peasants for participating in Mao’s land-distribution programs.

Two Critics

Below are the opinions of a Chinese city newspaper editor about the Nationalist government and a Christian missionary’s account of how rural landlords were being treated by the Communists. Based on these excerpts, what criticisms did the writers make of the Nationalists and Communists?

In general, everything is for the Government itself; this regime has no interest in anything that is not of direct benefit to it. . . . The people have nothing to eat, does it care? It does not. The people have no clothes to wear. Does it care? It does not. They have no houses in which to live. Does it care? It does not care. The Government only protects the wealthy and cares nothing for the poor.

– Ch’u An-p’ing, newspaper editor, May 1, 1948

We are still in the middle of land reform, and they [the Communists] are busy dealing with the landlords. They are hung by their toes and by their thumbs, they are whipped with thorns, their arms and legs are broken, and there are other tortures. All of this is to make them declare everything they own and where it is hidden. Land, houses, and everything they own are taken from them, and many die as a result of the torture.

– Bergljot Borgen, Christian missionary, early 1948
Chiang’s army had more soldiers than Mao’s, but it was poorly led. Chiang’s military was not coordinated by a central command. Generals tended to head independent armies and even competed with one another for food and ammunition. Many officers were corrupt, sometimes selling for personal profit the rice intended for their troops. Chiang’s military supply system was inadequate, unreliable, and crippled by corruption.

More important, few volunteered to join Chiang’s armies. Most soldiers were drafted against their will or even kidnapped by army “recruiting squads.” Soldiers were poorly trained, clothed, and fed. Officers enforced discipline by beating them. Some were roped together on marches to prevent them from deserting.

Communist propaganda took full advantage of all the Nationalist failings. Mao focused on winning over the peasants to gain their support in the civil war. “The battle for China,” he said, “is a battle for the hearts and minds of the peasants.”

Whenever the Communists secured an area during the civil war, Mao’s cadres went to work, organizing village “struggle meetings.” Peasants and laborers, who owned little or no land, met to force wealthy landlords to confess their bad treatment of the poor. This sometimes included torturing, beating, or even killing landlords as “enemies of the people.”

The cadres then cancelled all debts owed to the landlords and distributed their land and other property to the poor peasants and laborers. What they received became their own private property.

As more peasants and laborers acquired land, more of them had a stake in the success of the Communists. If the Nationalists won the civil war, the new landowners understood they would lose everything the Communists had handed over to them. As a result, they increasingly supported Mao’s army with food, labor, transportation, and soldier recruits. Most of these people were not dedicated Communists, but now they had something to fight for.

Mao had an even greater reason to confiscate and re-distribute land from the landlords to the poor peasants and laborers. In doing so, he destroyed the traditional landlord power structure in the villages and replaced it with new peasant leadership under the control of the Chinese Communist Party.

Land reform built Mao’s peasant revolution to transform China into a Communist society. As he kept reminding his cadres, land reform was “the mother of all other work.”

Unlike Chiang’s numerous independent armies, Mao’s People’s Liberation Army (PLA) was unified under a tightly controlled central command. Mao’s generals, dedicated to the Communist cause, were superior military leaders. They transformed small guerilla bands into a modern conventional army capable of moving quickly to take advantage of the much larger but uncoordinated Nationalist armies.

PLA officers treated ordinary soldiers with more respect than the soldiers got in Chiang’s armies. PLA soldiers were also more motivated than Chiang’s troops. During the civil war, hundreds of thousands of individual Nationalist soldiers deserted, surrendered, or defected to the Communists.

The Aftermath

Chiang established a new Kuomintang government on Taiwan, but claimed he was still the president of all China. Likewise, Mao declared that Taiwan was part of the People’s Republic of China. This political conflict over Taiwan’s status remains unresolved to this day.

As the Chairman of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao possessed absolute power. To purify the Communist revolution in China, he ordered political purges, mass imprisonment, and executions of “enemies of the people.”

By 1955, Mao had forced the peasants to give up their privately owned plots of land to form state-owned collective farms. The peasants then worked for the government. A few years later, Mao ordered the peasants to work on even larger communes. Food production plummeted, and many Chinese starved.

Mao’s political persecutions and failed economic policies killed many millions of people.

Chiang Kai-shek died in 1975, and Mao Zedong died the next year. Following Mao’s death, China began to adopt free-market reforms that introduced elements of capitalism into its economy. As a result, the People’s Republic of China today has greatly improved the standard of living of the people. The Chinese Communist Party, however, still holds a monopoly of power. It does not tolerate political dissent or anyone who questions its right to rule.

**DISCUSSION & WRITING**

1. In what ways were Chiang Kai-shek and Mao Zedong similar?
2. Why did Mao carry out his land-reform ideas during the Chinese Civil War?
3. Should the U.S. have intervened with armed force to prevent the Communists from winning the Chinese Civil War? Why or why not?

**ACTIVITY**

**Why Did the Communists Win the Chinese Civil War?**

1. Students will each choose two main reasons why they think the Communists won the Chinese Civil War.
2. Students will then support their reasons in an essay based on the information and evidence provided in the article.
3. Next, students will participate in a class discussion to explain and defend their reasons why the Communists won the Chinese Civil War.
4. Finally, the class will vote to choose which two reasons they have discussed provide the best answers to the question.
THE COLD WAR: HOW DID IT START? HOW DID IT END?

The Cold War was a conflict after World War II between the U.S. and Soviet Union. The superpowers never fought each other, but backed opposite sides in “hot wars,” offered aid to influence neutral countries, and competed in a dangerous nuclear arms race. It lasted 45 years, but ended surprisingly fast.

After the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, the United States realized that the Atlantic and Pacific oceans could no longer protect the nation from an enemy’s air and sea power. American leaders concluded that the U.S. must have a military defense superior to all other nations and never again permit a hostile power to dominate Europe or East Asia.

When the Germans invaded the Soviet Union in 1941, it lost more than 20 million soldiers and civilians. Russia had also been invaded by Napoleon early in the 19th century and by the Germans in World War I. Soviet leaders concluded they must secure their national borders and never again suffer an invasion.

The capitalist U.S. and communist Soviet Union were allies in World War II. But their conflicting world views and national security concerns soon drove them into a Cold War.

How Did the Cold War Start?

In early 1945, American and Soviet armies pushed toward the Nazi capital of Berlin. The Soviets occupied the Eastern European countries of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, and the eastern part of Germany.

The chief Allied leaders (Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and Joseph Stalin) met in the Crimean resort city of Yalta (in the Soviet Union) in February 1945. Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to recognize pro-Soviet governments in each of the Eastern European nations as long as free elections were held.

In April 1945, Roosevelt died and Harry Truman, the U.S. vice president, became president. In July, the American and British leaders met again with Stalin, this time in Potsdam, Germany. Stalin wanted to permanently weaken Germany to ensure it would never again invade the Soviet Union. The three leaders agreed to divide Germany and Berlin into American, British, French, and Soviet occupation zones.

The next month, the U.S. dropped atomic bombs on two Japanese cities, which quickly led to Japan’s surrender. Stalin believed that the U.S. used the atomic bombs to intimidate the Soviet Union after the war. He called it “atomic blackmail.”

Truman and Churchill soon worried that Stalin wanted to expand Soviet power and communism into Western Europe. By early 1946, Truman had dropped Roosevelt’s plan to withdraw all American troops from Europe in two years.

Stalin believed that communism would eventually overcome capitalism. His top priority, however, was to secure the Soviet Union’s borders from attack. To protect his western border, he wanted not only a weak Germany but pro-Soviet Eastern European governments.

At first, Stalin was satisfied with communist and non-communist coalition governments. He believed the communists would gradually operate from within to gain control of the powers of government.

In March 1946, Winston Churchill delivered a speech in the United States, warning that Stalin was rapidly transforming the Eastern European countries into communist states. He said, “an iron curtain has descended across the continent” that separated Europe between the democratic and capitalist West from the totalitarian and communist East.

In early 1947, a Greek communist minority was fighting a guerrilla war against Greece’s government, which the British had long helped to defend. The British informed President Truman that they no longer could afford to provide military and economic aid to Greece or its neighbor Turkey.

Truman quickly decided to take on the role of defending Greece and Turkey in order to block possible Soviet control of this strategic area near the oil-rich Middle East. Truman and his advisers believed Stalin was behind the Greek communists. But Josip Broz Tito, the communist leader of neighboring Yugoslavia, was their chief supporter.

In March 1947, Truman addressed Congress and asked for military and economic aid, but no U.S. troops, for Greece and Turkey to prevent them from falling under Soviet control. “It must be the policy of the United States,” he declared, “to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside powers.”

The three Allied leaders — Winston Churchill, Franklin Roosevelt, and Joseph Stalin (left to right) — sit for photographers at the Yalta Conference, February 1945. FDR died two months later.
Truman seemingly committed the U.S. to help defend “free peoples” anywhere with aid and possibly even troops. Such a commitment had never before been made by a U.S. president.

A few months later, U.S. diplomat and Soviet expert George F. Kennan gave a name to the policy Truman had announced. In a magazine article, Kennan analyzed Soviet behavior. “In these circumstances,” Kennan wrote, “it is clear that the main element of any United States policy toward the Soviet Union must be that of long term patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies.” Truman’s “containment policy” also became known as the Truman Doctrine.

In April 1948, Congress passed a massive program of economic aid for Europe to include Germany and even the Eastern European countries occupied by the Soviets. The Marshall Plan, named after Secretary of State George C. Marshall who proposed it, had two purposes. One was to assist Europe’s recovery from the destructive war. The other was to strengthen Western European governments, threatened by communists who appealed to many with promises of a better life.

Stalin viewed the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan as a threat. He feared these policies were an attempt by the U.S. to draw Soviet-occupied Germany and Eastern Europe toward Western Europe and away from Soviet control.

Stalin reacted by forbidding any of these countries, soon called “Soviet satellites,” to accept Marshall Plan aid. He also abandoned his policy of favoring coalition governments that included non-communists.

In February 1948, Stalin engineered the overthrow of Czechoslovakia’s coalition government, leaving only communists in power. Several months later he blocked all ground access to the American, British, and French occupation zones in Berlin. Truman countered with an airlift of food and supplies that within a year defeated the Soviet blockade.

In 1949, the U.S., Canada, and countries in Western Europe created NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization), a military defense alliance. Stalin then formed his own military alliance of Eastern European Soviet satellites called the Warsaw Pact.

By the end of 1949, Europe was divided and Germany was split into two countries: West Germany, democratic and independent; East Germany, communist and controlled by the Soviet Union. The Cold War was well underway.

What Happened?

Beyond Europe

The Cold War soon expanded well beyond Europe. Communists won the Chinese Civil War in 1949, but Stalin had done little to help them.

The U.S. sent troops into the Korean and Vietnam “hot wars.” The Soviets aided the communist side in each case, but did not send any troops as the Chinese did in the Korean War.

The Cold War was also a war of ideas. The world divided along ideological lines into the communist bloc and the Western bloc. Each side proclaimed the superiority of its system of government and economic order. A number of unaligned nations, mostly in the developing world, declined to side with either superpower in their contest between capitalism and communism. But the superpowers often used economic and military aid in these countries to gain their support.

Nuclear Arms Race

The Soviet Union successfully tested an atomic bomb in 1949. The Americans and then the Soviets developed a more powerful hydrogen bomb.

Both superpowers eventually built thousands of long-, intermediate-, and short-range nuclear ballistic missiles. Each carried one or more warheads many times more powerful than the atomic bombs dropped on Japan.

Cuban Missile Crisis

In 1959, Fidel Castro led a successful communist revolution in Cuba. The U.S. trained anti-communist Cuban exiles to invade Cuba and overthrow Castro, but this operation failed.

Nikita Khrushchev, the Soviet leader, believed the attempt to invade Cuba was a new American strategy to overthrow existing communist governments. He decided to counter this by secretly placing nuclear missiles in Cuba aimed at the U.S.
President Kennedy demanded the missiles be removed. Khrushchev refused. During several tense days in October 1962, nuclear war became a real possibility. But Khrushchev backed down after Kennedy agreed to dismantle NATO missiles in Turkey aimed at the Soviet Union.

**The Brezhnev Doctrine**

Over the years, the Soviet Union tightened its grip on Eastern Europe. It crushed a revolt in Hungary in 1956. In 1961, the Soviets built the Berlin Wall, guarded by soldiers, to stop East Germans from escaping into free West Berlin. In 1968, the Soviets sent Warsaw Pact troops and tanks into Czechoslovakia to suppress a popular movement for Czech freedoms and restore Soviet control.

The Soviet leader, Leonid Brezhnev, announced that any attempt to overthrow existing communist governments would result in Soviet military intervention. This became known as the Brezhnev Doctrine.

**Collapse of Détente**

After the Cuban Missile Crisis, the fear of nuclear war brought on a period of better relations and negotiations between the superpowers called “détente” (relaxation). Détente led to the first treaty that limited nuclear missiles.

Détente began to collapse in 1979 when Brezhnev sent Soviet military forces into a “hot war” in Afghanistan to rescue a communist regime, fighting Muslim rebels. President Carter believed this was a new phase of Soviet communist expansion toward the oil-rich Persian Gulf region. He responded by greatly increasing U.S. military spending.

In December 1979, NATO installed new intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe that targeted the Warsaw Pact countries. This was in response to the Soviet Union’s earlier upgrading of Warsaw Pact missiles that targeted the NATO countries.

**The Evil Empire**

Ronald Reagan was elected president in 1980 and immediately launched an aggressive foreign policy against the Soviet Union, which he called “the evil empire.” He aided anti-communist fighters in Afghanistan, Nicaragua, and elsewhere. He proposed the Strategic Defense Initiative, called “Star Wars” by critics, which would provide a space-based nuclear missile shield against a Soviet attack.

Reagan backed the biggest peacetime military spending build-up in American history. His goal was military superiority over the Soviet Union.

**How Did the Cold War End?**

After being re-elected in 1984, Reagan backed away from his hardline positions. Going against the views of some of his advisers, he said he wanted to negotiate with the Soviet Union. Reagan had experienced some scary moments in 1983 when the Soviets mistook a NATO nuclear weapons training exercise for a preparation for an actual attack.

In 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev was appointed the new Soviet leader. Gorbachev recognized that the Soviet economy, especially the civilian sector, had been weakening for a decade. This was largely due to the enormous cost of military spending and subsidizing the economies of the Eastern European satellites, Cuba, and other communist countries.

Gorbachev’s “new thinking” resulted in his introducing radical economic and political reforms that he hoped would save the communist system. He had in mind such things as private ownership of businesses, more production of civilian consumer goods, and multi-party competitive elections. In foreign policy, he was ready to pull out of Afghanistan and negotiate an end to the nuclear-arms race.

Thus, in the mid-1980s, both superpower leaders were ready to talk. In 1986, they met for a summit meeting at Reykjavik, Iceland. Gorbachev proposed a 50 percent reduction in American and Soviet nuclear ballistic missiles and the total elimination of the intermediate missiles in Europe. Reagan shocked everyone, including his own advisers, when he came back with a counterproposal to phase out all nuclear missiles.

The two leaders failed to reach a “grand bargain” due to Reagan’s insistence on building his Strategic Defense Initiative, the space-based defensive missile shield. Gorbachev was concerned that such a “Star Wars” shield would enable the U.S. to attack the Soviet Union without fearing retaliation.

But the ice had been broken. The next year, Gorbachev and Reagan signed a treaty to destroy all intermediate nuclear missiles in Eastern and Western Europe. They also negotiated a system of mutual inspections, prompting Reagan’s famous caution, “trust, but verify.”

After the intermediate missile treaty, things began to move fast. Gorbachev ordered the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. He also withdrew Soviet support of communist revolutionaries fighting in Africa and other places.

---

**Excerpt from Mikhail Gorbachev’s Address to the U.N.**

*December 7, 1988*

The history of past centuries and millennia has been a history of almost ubiquitous wars and sometimes desperate battles, leading to mutual destruction. . . . However, parallel with the process of wars, hostility, and alienation of peoples and countries, another process, just as objectively conditioned, was in motion and gaining force: The Process of the emergence of a mutually connected and integral world.

Further world progress is now possible only through the search for a consensus of all mankind, in movement toward a new world order. . . . The world community must learn to shape and direct the process in such a way as to preserve civilization, to make it safe for all and more pleasant for normal life. . . . It is evident, for example, that force and the threat of force can no longer be, and should not be, instruments of foreign policy . . . .

*What does Gorbachev mean by “a new world order”?*
In December 1988, Gorbachev addressed the United Nations. He informed the world that the Soviet Union was going to reduce its armed forces by a half-million troops. In addition, the Soviets planned to withdraw 50,000 troops and 5,000 tanks from East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

In 1989, Gorbachev refused to send Soviet troops to protect Eastern European communist governments from mass demonstrations, demanding free elections. The communist governments of Poland, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria all quickly resigned without bloodshed. The Romanian dictator refused to resign and fled the capital. He was tracked down, given a quick trial, and shot by firing squad. Free multi-party elections soon followed, even in the Soviet Union itself.

On November 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall, a symbol of how the Cold War divided Europe, was knocked down by crowds of East and West Berliners. The sudden collapse of communist Eastern Europe surprised everyone. The Brezhnev Doctrine was dead.

One major piece of the Cold War conflict remained: the division of Germany, which had been the core of Stalin’s national security policy. East and West Germany plus the four occupying powers signed a reunification treaty in 1990, making Germany whole again.

Gorbachev agreed that the reunified Federal Republic of Germany could become a NATO alliance member. He concluded Germany would be less dangerous to the Soviet Union in NATO than on its own where it might become a nuclear power.

After the Cold War Ended
The Soviet Union consisted of 15 “republics,” all controlled by the central government in Moscow, Russia. After a failed attempt to overthrow Gorbachev by some military generals, Communist Party leaders, and KGB spy agency members, his authority faded.

Boris Yeltsin, the newly elected president of the Russian republic, abolished the Communist Party and on December 25, 1991, dissolved the Soviet Union. Russia and the other Soviet republics like Ukraine then became independent countries that began to adopt democratic governments and capitalist economies.

In his resignation speech, Gorbachev declared, “An end has been put to the ‘Cold War,’ the arms race, and the insane militarization of our country, which crippled our economy, distorted our thinking, and undermined our morals. The threat of a world war is no more.”

But is the Cold War really over? Vladimir Putin, the current leader of Russia and a former KGB officer, stated in 2005, “The collapse of the Soviet Union was the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the century.”

In 2014, Putin ordered Russia’s military takeover of Crimea, a part of Ukraine heavily populated with Russians. In the past, he has complained about Poland and three former Soviet republics joining NATO. Putin views this and attempts to draw Ukraine and other Eastern Europe countries into the economy of Western Europe as a hostile “encirclement” of Russia, endangering its national security.

### DISCUSSION & WRITING

1. What do you think was the main cause of the Cold War? Explain.
2. Who do you think played a more important role in ending the Cold War: Reagan or Gorbachev? Why?
3. Who do you think won the Cold War? Why?

### ACTIVITIES

1. **#1: Why Did the Cold War End?**
   - We know how the Cold War ended, but why did it end after going on for nearly half a century?
   - Form small groups to discuss this question.
   - Each group will write a single sentence thesis statement in answer to the question.
   - Each group will then gather evidence from the article to support its thesis statement.
   - Finally, each group will present its thesis statement and evidence to the rest of the class.
   - Optional: The class may want to vote to choose the best thesis statement.

2. **#2: ‘Iron Curtain’**
   - Each student should have a copy of Churchill vs. Stalin (p. 9).
   - Divide students into pairs.
   - Student instructions:
     1. Read the excerpts from Churchill’s speech and Stalin’s response.
     2. Using the documents as your source, explain how Churchill and Stalin have answered the following questions. Answer separately for each leader. Specifically cite passages from the documents as evidence for your answers. When citing evidence, quote particular passages (and state the number of the line the passages are on).
        a. What explains the growth of Communist parties in Eastern Europe?
        b. What should be the most important characteristic of the governments of Eastern Europe?
     3. Using the main article and the documents, answer this question: Was Churchill’s or Stalin’s viewpoint more accurate about the situation in Eastern Europe? Explain.
     4. Be prepared to report your answers, with reasons and evidence, to the class.
Churchill vs. Stalin

Excerpt From Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' Speech (1946)

[T]he people of any country have the right, and should have the power by constitutional action, by free unfettered elections, with secret ballot, to choose or change the character or form of government under which they dwell; that freedom of speech and thought should reign; that courts of justice, independent of the executive, unbiased by any party, should administer laws which have received the broad assent of large majorities or are consecrated by time and custom. . . .

A shadow has fallen upon the scenes so lately lighted by the Allied victory. Nobody knows what Soviet Russia and its Communist international organisation intends to do in the immediate future, or what are the limits, if any, to their expansive and proselytising tendencies. I have a strong admiration and regard for the valiant Russian people and for my wartime comrade, Marshal Stalin. There is deep sympathy and goodwill in Britain . . . towards the peoples of all the Russias and a resolve to persevere through many differences and rebuffs in establishing lasting friendships. We understand the Russian need to be secure on her western frontiers by the removal of all possibility of German aggression. We welcome Russia to her rightful place among the leading nations of the world. We welcome her flag upon the seas. Above all, we welcome constant, frequent and growing contacts between the Russian people and our own people on both sides of the Atlantic. It is my duty however, for I am sure you would wish me to state the facts as I see them to you, to place before you certain facts about the present position in Europe.

From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent. Behind that line lie all the capitals of the ancient states of Central and Eastern Europe. Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest and Sofia, all these famous cities and the populations around them lie in what I must call the Soviet sphere, and all are subject in one form or another, not only to Soviet influence but to a very high and, in many cases, increasing measure of control from Moscow. Athens alone . . . is free to decide its future at an election under British, American and French observation. The Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous and wrongful inroads upon Germany, and mass expulsions of millions of Germans on a scale grievous and undreamed-of are now taking place. The Communist parties, which were very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to pre-eminence and power far beyond their numbers and are seeking everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments are prevailing in nearly every case, and so far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.

Excerpt From Stalin's Reply to Churchill in the Soviet newspaper Pravda (1946)

In the first place it is quite absurd to speak of exclusive control by the U.S.S.R. in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils made up of the representatives of four States and where the U.S.S.R. has only one-quarter of the votes. . . . Secondly, the following circumstance should not be forgotten. The Germans made their invasion of the U.S.S.R. through Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary. The Germans were able to make their invasion through these countries because, at the time, governments hostile to the Soviet Union existed in these countries. As a result of the German invasion, the Soviet Union has irrevocably lost in battles with the Germans, and also during the German occupation and through the expulsion of Soviet citizens to German slave labor camps, about 7 million people. In other words, the Soviet Union has lost in men several times more than Britain and the United States together.

It may be that some quarters are trying to push into oblivion these sacrifices of the Soviet people which insured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget them. One can ask therefore, what can be surprising in the fact that the Soviet Union, in a desire to ensure its security for the future, tries to achieve that these countries should have governments whose relations to the Soviet Union are loyal? How can one, without having lost one’s reason, qualify these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as “expansionist tendencies” of our Government? . . .

Mr. Churchill wanders around the truth when he speaks of the growth of the influence of the Communist parties in Eastern Europe. . . . The growth of the influence of communism cannot be considered accidental. It is a normal function. The influence of the Soviets grew because during the hard years of the mastery of fascism in Europe, Communists slowed themselves to be reliable, daring and self-sacrificing fighters against fascist regimes for the liberty of peoples.

Mr. Churchill sometimes recalls in his speeches the common people from small houses, putting them on the shoulder in a lordly manner and pretending to be their friend. But these people are not so simpleminded as it might appear at first sight. Common people, too, have their opinions and their own politics. And they know how to stand up for themselves.

It is they, millions of these common people, who voted Mr. Churchill and his party out in England, giving their votes to the Labor party. It is they, millions of these common people, who isolated reactionaries in Europe, collaborators with fascism, and gave preference to Left democratic parties.
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WOMEN IN THE MILITARY

AMERICAN WOMEN HAVE GONE TO WAR IN VARIOUS ROLES THROUGHOUT U.S. HISTORY. ONLY SINCE 1948, HOWEVER, HAVE WOMEN BEEN SLOWLY INTEGRATED INTO THE ARMED SERVICES. TODAY, A DEBATE CENTERS ON WHETHER WOMEN SHOULD BE IN DIRECT GROUND COMBAT.

From the American Revolution to the Spanish-American War, women served as nurses, laundry workers, cooks, couriers, spies, and saboteurs. A few actually fought in hand-to-hand combat, usually disguised as male soldiers. But nearly all women who participated in the nation’s early wars served as civilians who were “with” but not “in” the military.

In the early 1900s, Congress established Army and Navy nurse corps. Although these were permanent organizations, they were only “attached” to the armed services, not a part of them.

During World War I, the Navy and Marine Corps recruited women to serve as uniformed clerks, radio operators, translators, and in other jobs with a military rank. The Army and Navy also made use of their female nurse corps, but still did not recognize them as part of the military.

Due to serious shortages of personnel in many non-combat jobs during World War II, Congress created the Women’s Army Corps (WAC) whose members held full military status, but in an organization separate from the Army. Congress also authorized separate women’s reserve units for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

More than 350,000 women volunteered to serve with the regular armed services in World War II. They held such jobs as nurses, clerks, truck drivers, mechanics, electricians, and auxiliary pilots. Their main job was to “Free a Man to Fight,” which was the slogan of many World War II recruitment posters.

America’s World War II allies used women in combat roles. Britain drafted women and trained some to operate anti-aircraft guns. They were not, however, allowed to “pull the trigger.” In the Soviet Union, women took a direct part in fighting as snipers, machine-gunners, tank crew members, combat pilots, and anti-aircraft gunners who did pull the trigger.

Integration of Women

After the war, Congress debated whether to make women a permanent part of the regular military. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower, who had led the allied forces in Europe, favored this. “The women of America,” he said, “must share the responsibility for the security of this country in a future emergency as the women of England did in World War II.”

President Harry Truman signed the Women’s Armed Services Integration Act in June 1948. This authorized the enlistment of women and commissioning of female officers in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and newly formed Air Force. The separate Women’s Army Corps and female reserves of the other armed services continued for a while, but eventually were phased out.

The integration of women finally put them fully “in” the regular armed forces — but with restrictions. Women could make up no more than 2 percent of the total military force. The number of female officers and the rank they could achieve were capped. Woman officers could hold no command authority over men. Nor could women be assigned to military aircraft and most Navy ships. Finally, women were prohibited from serving in combat.

During the Korean War, only female nurses and other medical personnel went to Korea itself. The rest of the women in the military served outside Korea, such as in Japan and the U.S.

As the draft became more unpopular during the Vietnam War, the armed forces stepped up their recruitment of women, who were excluded from conscription. The 2 percent cap was lifted, and female volunteers filled more military jobs than ever before, easing the need to draft more men.

In 1973, after the U.S. withdrew from Vietnam, Congress ended the draft and replaced it with an all-volunteer military. Immediately, the armed services saw the need to recruit more women to fill the jobs no longer being filled by drafted men. This proved to be a big turning point for women in the military.

In the early years of the all-volunteer military, the armed forces no longer kept females in segregated
units, but females were far from equal to their male peers. Most of the restrictions of the 1948 Women’s Armed Services Integration Act still applied.

Women quickly proved they could do many military jobs previously held only by men. Outside the military, a growing women’s movement in American society demanded more equal opportunity for women in the armed services.

During the 1970s, barriers to women within the military began to fall. Women were assigned to non-combat Navy ships and military aircraft. The armed services opened their advanced officer training schools to women. In 1976, West Point and the other service academies began admitting women. Women officers started to command both women and men.

The exclusion of women from combat experience, however, slowed their promotion to higher ranks.

‘Direct Ground Combat’

Since 1973, all males at age 18 must register with the Selective Service for a possible future draft. In 1981, the U.S. Supreme Court in Rostker v. Goldberg ruled that the law making women ineligible for the draft was constitutional. The court reasoned that a draft is designed to produce combat troops, and the law excluded women from combat.

In 1988, the Department of Defense announced the Risk Rule. This rule barred women from non-combat jobs that put them at risk of exposure to direct combat, hostile fire, or capture.

After Iraq’s Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait in 1990, the U.S. and a coalition of allies attacked his forces. During the Persian Gulf War, nearly 40,000 female military personnel were deployed to the area.

Women were still barred from combat and at-risk non-combat duty, but in this war everyone was at risk. All people in the wide area of military operations were constantly under the threat of ground-to-ground missiles fired by Iraqi forces. In fact, 13 American women in the U.S. armed forces were killed in the war.

After the Persian Gulf War, Congress repealed laws prohibiting women from serving on combat aircraft and combat Navy ships except submarines. Since 1993, all military assignments have been left to the discretion of the Department of Defense (DOD).

In 1994, the DOD canceled the Risk Rule and replaced it with the Ground Combat Exclusion Policy. This policy declared that qualified service members were eligible for all jobs “except that women shall be excluded from assignments to units below the brigade level whose primary mission is to engage in direct combat on the ground. . . .”

Instead of ‘frontlines’ or attacks by large enemy armies, these wars had ambushes, roadside bombs, rocket grenade attacks, snipers, guerilla raids, and suicide bombers.

The policy defined “direct ground combat” as “engaging an enemy on the ground with individual or crew served weapons, while being exposed to hostile fire and to a high probability of direct physical contact with hostile force’s personnel.” In effect, this barred women from “tip of the spear” military units, which includes the Army and Marine infantry, paratroopers, armor (tanks), most artillery, and special forces such as Navy SEALs and Army Rangers. In addition, the new policy stated that women could not be assigned to support jobs or units located close to direct combat units.

The 1994 Ground Combat Exclusion Policy reflected long-held American beliefs about women in the military. These beliefs included that female soldiers should be protected from battlefield dangers and capture by the enemy. Also, that as life-givers, women should not be trained to kill; combat was a man’s job. Another long-held belief was that women generally lacked the physical strength and stamina for combat.

The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq put into question all the female combat exclusions. Instead of “frontlines” or attacks by large enemy armies, these wars had ambushes, roadside bombs, rocket grenade attacks, snipers, guerilla raids, and suicide bombers.

Under the exclusion rules, women took such “non-combat” jobs as truck drivers, truck convoy guards, military police, base guards, medics, communications specialists, and intelligence officers. But female soldiers often found themselves in the middle of direct ground combat because the battlefield had changed so drastically.

Commanders often faced the dilemma of removing women soldiers from their needed positions in combat zones or violating the exclusion rules by keeping them there. For example, Army Rangers found that during village search operations, female soldiers were much more effective in searching Muslim women and their homes than male soldiers.

Women also flew helicopters and other aircraft in rescue and combat missions. Thus, in this new kind of warfare, women found themselves in all kinds of combat situations. As a reflection of the reality of combat in Afghanistan and Iraq, more than 150 military women had died along with many hundreds more wounded by 2013.

Sexual Assault

As the integration of more women into previously all-male jobs and units increased, sexual assault cases within the military soared. Sexual assault includes rape and other forms of unwanted sexual contact.

Between October 2012 and June 2013, more than 3,500 sexual assault cases were officially reported in the armed services. This was a 50 percent increase over the same period the previous year. Only about 300 cases, however, went to a court-martial trial.

A separate Department of Defense report estimated that 26,000 members of the armed services, both men and
Women in the U.S. Armed Forces

Firsts for Women:
- Admitted to West Point and the other service academies in 1976.
- Fly combat aircraft in 1993.
- Serve aboard Navy combat ships in 1993.
- Assigned to Navy submarines in 2012.

Women Deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq (since Sept. 2001): 250,000+

Total Female Veterans (2013): 1,853,690

Women on Active Duty (Dec. 2013): 214,098 (14.6% of total in armed services)

Percent of Female Active Duty Members by Service (2012):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Corps</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think the percentage of women in the U.S. armed forces is too little, too much, or about right? Why?


Women, were victims of sexual assault in 2012. Another DOD report released in 2013 revealed that 20 percent of all women in the military experienced unwanted sexual contact. Victims said they often did not report a sexual assault, fearing retaliation by their attacker or believing their commanding officer would do nothing.

In 2013, Congress passed legislation that attempted to address the sexual assault problem. Among other things, the law requires commanders to send all complaints of sexual assault to military criminal investigators and makes it a crime to retaliate against anyone reporting such a complaint.

A controversial measure to take the decision to prosecute sexual assault cases away from commanders and hand it over to military prosecutors failed to pass Congress. Opponents argued that removing such a decision from the military chain of command would weaken the authority of commanders over their troops.

Women in Ground Combat

On January 24, 2013, then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, acting on the unanimous recommendation of the chiefs of the armed services, announced the end of the Ground Combat Exclusion Policy. “Female service members,” Panetta said, “have faced the reality of combat, proven their willingness to fight, and, yes, to die to defend their fellow Americans.”

The new policy gave the military until January 2016 to integrate women into the direct ground combat jobs and “tip of the spear” units. It will still be possible to exclude women from certain jobs, but this will require the approval of the secretary of defense.

The decision to integrate women into direct ground combat jobs and units drew much criticism. Elaine Donnelly, president of the Center for Military Readiness, remarked that Congress should pass new legislation and “assign highest priority to military necessity” and not to “ideology that denies differences between men and women.”

The Case For

1. Women have already been in direct ground combat in Afghanistan and Iraq. They have proven their ability to kill the enemy in such jobs as truck convoy machine gunners, base guards, and military police.
2. Women who physically qualify should not be denied ground combat service. In 2013, the first three women completed the Marine infantry training course. This included a 12-mile hike, carrying 85 pounds of gear. Besides, in a ground combat zone there are skills other than strength that females tend to be better at than males such as handling civilians.
3. Promotion in the military has always been facilitated by having combat experience. Officers in the Army, Marines, and Special Forces today are overwhelmingly males largely due to the long exclusion of women from ground combat assignments. Even female West Point graduates have been slow to reach the top ranks of the Army due to this exclusion.

4. One cause of the sexual assault problem in the military is that some servicemen view service-women as inferior sex objects rather than warriors. When women achieve real equality by being integrated into ground combat units, they will gain more respect from their male peers and sexual assaults will decline.

5. Barring women from ground combat violates their constitutional right of “equal protection of the law.” Both men and women have a citizenship duty to defend their country.

6. Some countries such as Canada and Israel have opened more combat jobs to women than the U.S. Israel drafts women who make up half the lieutenants in its military forces. A law in 2000 granted equal opportunities in the military to women who qualify for the job.

The Case Against

1. While female soldiers have defended themselves and others in Iraq and Afghanistan, there is a big difference between defensive and offensive combat. Offensive ground combat involves “tip of the spear” units like the Marine infantry that seeks and attacks the enemy under fire, sometimes in hand-to-hand combat. Our enemies do not intentionally weaken their forces under defensive ground combat. Offensive ground combat involves “tip of the spear” units like the Marine infantry that seeks and attacks the enemy under fire, sometimes in hand-to-hand combat. Our enemies do not intentionally weaken their forces under defensive

2. Studies, comparing men and women in the military, show that most women possess less muscle strength, less lifting ability, lighter bones, slower marching speed, and are more prone to injuries. Few women will be able to complete the rigorous training courses for “tip of the spear” combat
units. Politicians and feminists will then pressure the military to lower the training standards for women, which will weaken our ground combat forces. Another problem is female soldiers who are pregnant when their units are called up for deployment will leave gaps in the ranks.

3. Within the military today, the main push for women in combat comes from female officers who want combat experience to get faster promotions to advance their careers. Among enlisted women in the military, surveys show that few of them want to become combat fighters like men.

4. The military should have expected sexual conflicts when mixing women into units dominated by men. The competition for the attention of women among males is only natural. But it is also a distraction from the military mission and causes a breakdown of unit trust. Moving women into direct ground combat units will make the sexual assault problem worse.

5. Integrating women into ground combat roles will result in the courts finding the registration and drafting of only men to be an unconstitutional violation of “equal protection of the law.” If women are drafted in the future, some will involuntarily be assigned to direct ground combat units.

6. No other country today has found it necessary to put women into direct ground combat units like the U.S. Marine infantry and Navy SEALs. Even Israel limits women in combat to mainly border defense.

**DISCUSSION & WRITING**

1. Do you think women should be in the military at all? Why or why not?
2. What do you think should be done to stop the soaring rise of sexual assault cases in the armed forces? Explain.
3. Under the current Department of Defense policy announced in 2013, direct ground combat jobs are open to women, although certain positions may still be closed to them by the secretary of defense. In the following list of jobs, which do you think should be open and which closed to women today? Explain your choice in each case.
   a. Tank Crew Member
   b. Paratrooper
   c. Infantry Rifleman
   d. Explosive Ordinance Disposal Technician

**Further Reading**


---

**ACTIVITY**

**Should Women Be in Direct Ground Combat?**

Divide students into three groups to debate the question above.

1. Group 1 will take the affirmative and prepare arguments and evidence from the article to support women in direct ground combat.
2. Group 2 will take the negative and prepare arguments and evidence from the article to oppose women in ground combat.
3. Members on each side will have a chance to question the assertions made by their opponents after their presentation.
4. Group 3 will be the judges of the debate. They should review the 1994 Ground Combat Exclusion Policy and be prepared to ask both sides questions after their presentations.
5. After the debate, the judges will discuss the choices below and decide on one by majority vote. The judges must then explain the reasons for their decision.
   - A. Women should be in direct ground combat.
   - B. Women should not be in direct ground combat.
   - C. Women should be in direct ground combat but should be excluded from certain kinds of jobs named by the judges.
14 US HISTORY

National High School World History Standard 3B: Understands reform, revolution, and social change in the world economy of the early 20th century. (7) Understands events and ideas that led to China’s revolutionary movements in the early 20th century (e.g., social and cultural conditions in China that led to the New Culture, or May Fourth movement; the four points of Sun Yat-sen’s Manifesto for the Revolutionary Alliance [Tong Meng Hui] and to whom these revolutionary goals appealed).

National High School World History Standard 40: Understands the search for peace and stability throughout the world in the 1920s and 1930s. (9) Understands elements of social and political change in China in the early 20th century (e.g., which populations supported the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party, and how the Japanese invasion of China in the 1930s changed viewpoints regarding these two parties; how Mao Zedong adapted Marxism to Chinese needs and how he viewed the peasantry as a revolutionary force; the goals and outcomes of the three major revolutions in China in the first half of the century).

National High School World History Standard 43: Understands how post-World War II reconstruction occurred, new international power relations took shape, and colonial empires broke up. (6) Understands factors that influenced political conditions in China after World War II (e.g., how much of the Communist success in the Chinese civil war was the result of Mao Zedong’s leadership or Jiang Jieshi’s lack of leadership, why rifts developed in the relationships between the U.S.S.R. and China in spite of the common bond of Communist-led government).

California History-Social Science Standard 10.4: Students analyze patterns of global change in the era of New Imperialism in at least two of the following regions or countries: Africa, Southeast Asia, China, India, Latin America, and the Philippines. (4) Describe the independence struggles of the colonized regions of the world, including the roles of leaders, such as Sun Yat-sen in China, and the roles of ideology and religion.

California History-Social Science Standard 10.9: Students analyze the international developments in the post-World War II world. (4) Analyze the Chinese Civil War, the rise of Mao Zedong, and the subsequent political and economic upheavals in China . . . .

Cold War

Common Core Standard RH.11-12.1: Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, connecting insights gained from specific details to an understanding of the text as a whole.

Common Core Standard RH.11-12.2: Determine the central ideas or information of a primary or secondary source; provide an accurate summary of how key events or ideas develop over the course of the text.

Common Core Standard RH.11-12.4: Determine the meaning of words and phrases as they are used in a text, including analyzing how an author uses and refines the meaning of a key term over the course of a text . . . .

Common Core Standard RH.11-12.3: Evaluate various explanations for actions or events and determine which explanation best accords with textual evidence, acknowledging where the text leaves matters uncertain.

National High School U.S. History Standard 27: Understands how the Cold War and conflicts in Korea and Vietnam influenced domestic and international politics. (1) Understands U.S. foreign policy from the Truman administration to the Johnson administration (e.g., . . . , Kennedy’s response to the Bay of Pigs and the Cuban Missile Crisis; how the Korean War affected the premises of U.S. foreign policy; . . . . (4) Understands factors that contributed to the development of the Cold War . . . .
Sources

Chinese Civil War

Cold War

Women in the Military
**Criminal Justice in America, 5th Ed.**

The most comprehensive secondary criminal justice text

Our most popular publication, *Criminal Justice in America*, has been completely revised, updated, and formatted in color. It now has new and revised readings, up-to-date statistics, and new, expanded case studies. It is the most comprehensive secondary text available on the subjects of criminal law, procedure, and criminology. It can serve as a text for an entire law-related education course, or as a supplement for civics, government, or contemporary-issues courses.

Its extensive readings are supported by:
- Directed Discussions
- Role Plays
- Mock Trials
- Cooperative and Interactive Exercises
- Activities to Involve Outside Resource Experts
- Research Activities for Students to Use the Library or Internet

**The Student Edition** has six units:
- Crime
- Police
- The Criminal Case
- Corrections
- Juvenile Justice
- Solutions

**The Teacher's Guide**, a completely reworked comprehensive guide, provides detailed descriptions of teaching strategies, suggested answers to every question in the text, activity masters, tests (for each unit and a final test), background readings, and extra resources to supplement the text.

*Criminal Justice in America, 5th Ed.*
- #10120BR Student Edition, 408 pp. $24.95
- #10121BR Teacher's Guide, 126 pp. $12.95
- #10122BR Set of 10 Student Editions $199.95

**Landmarks: Historic U.S. Supreme Court Decisions**

**Grades 9-12**

U.S. Supreme Court cases have greatly affected U.S. history. Let your students discover some of the most important cases. Each reading in the student text focuses on one case, giving historical background, exploring the majority and dissenting opinions, and explaining the case's significance.

A separate teacher’s guide contains lesson plans for each reading. The plans include focus activities, discussion questions with suggested answers, step-by-step instructions for interactive activities, and debrief questions and suggestions.

The student text begins with a reading on how the Supreme Court works. The book continues with readings on the following important cases:

- Marbury v. Madison (1803)
- McCulloch v. Maryland (1819)
- Gibbons v. Ogden (1824)
- Dred Scott v. Sandford (1857)
- Plessy v. Ferguson (1896)
- Schenck v. U.S. (1919)
- Palko v. Connecticut (1937)
- Brown v. Board of Education (1954)
- Mapp v. Ohio (1961)
- Gideon v. Wainwright (1963)
- Miranda v. Arizona (1966)
- Regents of UC v. Bakke (1978)

**Web Links:** Landmarks Links offer extensive links to more information on each case and how the Supreme Court works.

**Landmarks: Historic U.S. Supreme Court Decisions**
- #10420CBR Student Edition, 114 pp. $14.95
- #10422CBR Teacher's Guide, 74 pp. $21.95
- #10421CBR Set of 10 Student Editions $114.95

**About Constitutional Rights Foundation**

Constitutional Rights Foundation is a non-profit, non-partisan educational organization committed to helping our nation’s young people to become active citizens and to understand the rule of law, the legal process, and their constitutional heritage. Established in 1962, CRF is guided by a dedicated board of directors drawn from the worlds of law, business, government, education, and the media. CRF's program areas include the California State Mock Trial, youth internship programs, youth leadership and civic participation programs, youth conferences, teacher professional development, and publications and curriculum materials.

**Officers:** Robert R. Stern, Board Chair; Publications Committee: K. Eugene Shutler, Chair; Douglas A. Thompson, Vice Chair; Louis E. Kempinsky, L. Rachel Lerman, Kevin C. Mayer, Patrick G. Rogan, Peggy Saferstein, Hon. Marjorie Steinberg, Gail Migdal Title.

**Staff:** Marshall Croddy, President; Carlton Martz, Writer; Bill Hayes, Editor; Andrew Costly, Sr. Publications Manager; Kevin C. Mayer, Board Reviewer.
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# People v. Concha

**Murder and search and seizure**

Grades 6-12

Following a high-school student's death from an overdose of Adderall, which the student did not have a prescription to take, police arrest a student suspected of selling the drug to the victim. The defendant, Rae Concha, is charged with second-degree murder and possession with intent to sell a controlled substance. **Pretrial issue:** Did an undercover officer's shining of a flashlight into the defendant's car at night constitute a search?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People v. Concha, 64pp.</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People v. Concha (Set of 10)</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

# People v. Meadows

**A Mock Trial Designed for the Classroom**

Grades 6-12

This specially designed mock trial is perfect for engaging students in the classroom. The high-interest case involves a high school basketball game that got out of hand. A coach is arrested for aggravated assault against a referee.

The case of **People v. Meadows** is both an exciting mock trial and an informative lesson on the important right of privacy. Students engage in a criminal trial simulation and learn the fundamentals of due process, proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and the jury system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People v. Meadows, Teacher's Guide, 64pp.</td>
<td>$19.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People v. Meadows, Student Handbook, 48pp.</td>
<td>$5.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People v. Woodson (Set of 10 Student Handbook)</td>
<td>$29.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Mail purchase orders or checks payable to:
Constitutional Rights Foundation
Publications Dept.
601 South Kingsley Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90005-4128

Order online at: www.crf-usa.org

Order by credit card toll free: 1-800-488-4CRF

Fax to: (213) 386-0459

Prices valid until Septembe 1, 2014.
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Electronic-only Edition of 
Bill of Rights in Action

The winter 2014 edition of Bill of Rights in Action (29:2) was not printed and mailed to subscribers. It is available to download on our web site at www.crf-usa.org/bria.

If you would like to sign-up or switch to an electronic-only subscription, please go to www.crf-usa.org/bria. Your copy of Bill of Rights in Action will arrive much sooner – as much as two to three weeks before the printed issue.

We also value your feedback, which you can send to us at crf@crf-usa.org. Thank you for remaining our loyal subscriber.

Download and sign up today at: http://www.crf-usa.org/bria
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