

Chapter 1 : The Seven Years War begins - HISTORY

Volume 3 is subtitled The War Years And After, but the vast bulk of the pages (plus nearly one hundred pages of bibliography and notes) deals with the period from.

The third and final volume in this biography of Eleanor Roosevelt, covering her advocacy, friendships, and relationship with Franklin during the war years, and briefly, her accomplishments after his death. I had often heard that Eleanor Roosevelt did as much to redefine the role of First Lady as her husband did the Presidency, perhaps more. This work, volume three of a biography of Eleanor Roosevelt who the author usually refers to as "ER" helped me understand that she did far more than that, in the war years and after. She represented her husband not only at various domestic functions but in a number of overseas trips including extensive journeys in the southwest Pacific at some personal risk and Latin America. And she hosted countless functions at the White House, and their Hyde Park residence, including a visit from the royal family. Her address to the Democratic Convention may have saved the day for Roosevelt in that election. Most striking was her tireless advocacy for Jewish refugees before, during, and after the war. She was among the earliest to recognize the impending holocaust and struggled against a resistant State Department as well as foreign governments to rescue refugees attempting to flee the Nazi threat. And sadly, as in so many instances since, including the genocide in Aleppo, the U. Yet there were many who owed their lives to her. Cook chronicles her efforts to end the oppression against blacks, including her support for the Tuskegee airmen, trained but sitting at a U. She fought for voting rights against the poll taxes, and even late in life, was one of the foremost voices urging college youth to go south in the early sixties to support voting registration. She argued for social and economic assistance for those in Depression-era poverty, including a basic level of nutrition, housing, and health care, recognizing that deficiencies in these area hampered employment, as well as the fitness of young men to serve in the approaching conflict. Later on, she would propose support for college education, incorporated into the G. Because she fought so many progressive causes, she often was criticized and even monitored by the FBI for ties with Communists. She was actually vociferously anti-Communist in her statements but her support for groups like the American Youth Congress made her suspect. The book does a good job exploring her complex relationship with Franklin. She knew of his affairs, including that with Lucy Mercer Rutherford who was with him when he died, and came to terms with this. He both valued her principled advocacy and was annoyed by it, and sometimes set limits on what she could do for political reasons. She constantly pushed her ideas, and pushed him, and Cook sees some of her language and ideas in his best speeches. Some of the complexity relates as well with the intimate friendships ER had with Lorena Hickock, and the circle of women who were close friends, several including Hickock known to be lesbian. The bulk of the book pages concern the war years up to the death of Franklin. Only the last 30 pages discuss the last seventeen years of her life, although not her death. Most of this is focused around her role in the first U. Articles 1 to 22 in this declaration concern personal and political freedoms that were finally ratified in Congress in The social and economic freedoms of Articles 23 to 30 never have been. Even today, then, the document stands as a challenge to all governments, including that of the United States, of the high ideals of human freedom, rarely attained in any of our countries. Perhaps it goes without saying, but Eleanor Roosevelt broke new paths for women, not only in the White House, but in politics, in journalism, in the military, and industry. Her example and advocacy, as well as her stubborn persistence described well in her work with an all-male U. Reading the final volume made me want to go back to the first two. In volume three, we see who Eleanor Roosevelt had become and at the top of her influence. Perhaps the publishers will release the biography as a set, now that it is complete. Welcomed or not, it might make a good gift to the incoming First Lady. I received this book free from the publisher. I was not required to write a positive review. The opinions I have expressed are my own. This one was disappointing in its incompleteness. If that was the case, I wish she would have abandoned the project and moved on. The text was poorly copy edited, and there were huge holes. This was apparent in large ways: And in small ways: Hold the

phone -- what? Cook characterizes ER as having been accepting of these. So to suddenly mention an "affair" not otherwise described was odd. Although not the delicious and thoroughly satisfying treat that the other volumes represented, this volume is useful to those of us who remain fascinated and inspired by ER.

Chapter 2 : Eleanor Roosevelt, Volume 3: The War Years and After, by Blanche Wiesen Cook

Targeted killing program against radical groups in the region continue since ; intensify after beginning of civil war U.S. Naval blockade put in place in attempt to assist Saudi Arabia in preventing Iranian weapons from moving weapons into Houthi territory.

Visit Website Did you know? The series ran from until , and its final episode was the most-watched in television history. By the end of the decade, two new states had formed on the peninsula. In the south, the anti-communist dictator Syngman Rhee enjoyed the reluctant support of the American government; in the north, the communist dictator Kim Il Sung enjoyed the slightly more enthusiastic support of the Soviets. Neither dictator was content to remain on his side of the 38th parallel, however, and border skirmishes were common. Nearly 10, North and South Korean soldiers were killed in battle before the war even began. As far as they were concerned, this was not simply a border dispute between two unstable dictatorships on the other side of the globe. Instead, many feared it was the first step in a communist campaign to take over the world. For this reason, nonintervention was not considered an option by many top decision makers. As the North Korean army pushed into Seoul, the South Korean capital, the United States readied its troops for a war against communism itself. At first, the war was a defensive one—a war to get the communists out of South Korea—and it went badly for the Allies. Also, it was one of the hottest and driest summers on record, and desperately thirsty American soldiers were often forced to drink water from rice paddies that had been fertilized with human waste. As a result, dangerous intestinal diseases and other illnesses were a constant threat. By the end of the summer, President Truman and General Douglas MacArthur , the commander in charge of the Asian theater, had decided on a new set of war aims. Now, for the Allies, the Korean War was an offensive one: Initially, this new strategy was a success. An amphibious assault at Inchon pushed the North Koreans out of Seoul and back to their side of the 38th parallel. This was something that President Truman and his advisers decidedly did not want: They were sure that such a war would lead to Soviet aggression in Europe, the deployment of atomic weapons and millions of senseless deaths. As President Truman looked for a way to prevent war with the Chinese, MacArthur did all he could to provoke it. For Truman, this letter was the last straw. On April 11, the president fired the general for insubordination. Still, the fighting continued along the 38th parallel as negotiations stalled. Finally, after more than two years of negotiations, the adversaries signed an armistice on July 27, Nearly 5 million people died. Almost 40, Americans died in action in Korea, and more than , were wounded.

Chapter 3 : After 65 years of 'armistice,' it's about time to end the Korean War (opinion) - CNN

To mark the centenary of Armistice Day and the end of the World War One, the Herald has compiled a list of names of those servicemen from the Worthing and Lancing area who lost their lives during the Great War. The list is taken from calendrierdelascience.com and features names from the Durrington.

Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. It was 15 years ago today when the U.S. The attack came despite worldwide protest and the lack of authorization from the United Nations Security Council. Within the hour, President George W. Bush gave a nationally televised speech from the Oval Office announcing the war had begun. American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger. My fellow Americans, major combat operations in Iraq have ended. In the battle of Iraq, the United States and our allies have prevailed. Well, the fighting has yet to end, and the death toll may never be known. Conservative estimates put the Iraqi civilian death toll at 1 million. But some counts range as high as 2 million. In 2003, the British medical journal Lancet estimated that 100,000 Iraqis died in just the first 40 months of the war. Just last week, seven U.S. The war in Iraq has also destabilized much of the Middle East. To talk more about the 15th anniversary of the U.S. Her forthcoming book is titled *Women and Gender in Iraq: Between Nation-Building and Fragmentation*. Ali grew up in France. Her parents were Iraqi political exiles. Matt Howard is co-director of *About Face*: He served in Iraq once in 2003, again in 2007. We welcome you both to Democracy Now! Fifteen years ago today, the U.S. Talk about what happened then and the repercussions today. I mean, first of all, I would like to say, you know, that as a daughter of an Iraqi political exile family, who grew up in France, I refuse to be put in a false dilemma: either you oppose the regime, either you oppose the war. You know, I opposed the regime, and we had to flee Iraq because of the authoritarian regime, and also I got involved in the antiwar movement in France. And also, we have to name the war. We have to name it as, you know, a criminal war. And we have to define it as, you know, the very operation of the destruction of Iraq as a functioning state and society. I mean, if we talk about the U.S. And then, after this terrible situation, the imposition of the U.S. So, a country that needed to be reconstructed was plunged into a deep humanitarian crisis that destroyed its middle class, weakened, to an extreme level, its state institutions and infrastructure. So, we had, before the sanction, a free and strong education system, a good healthcare system—so, a functioning state. And then, so this is the situation, you know, that characterized Iraq in 2003, when the invasion happened. So, the Iraqi society had already been brutalized by decades of wars and by the normalization of political violence, of course, you know, the repression of all the different uprising of the population in the north and in the south, and social, economic and humanitarian crisis. And I want to say that, you know, the U.S. And it was done through what was called the de-Baathification campaign, so that disbanded the army and part of the administrative basis of the regime. And also, something that is very important and that we have to, you know, remind ourselves, to understand what is going on today—you know, the rise of ISIS, etc. In other words, this is to say that the U.S. So it has created a political regime that relies on communal-based identity. You are an Arab political leader, a Kurdish political leader, a Sunni, a Shia or Christian political leader. And this really is at the core of what, you know, provoked the social, ethnic and sectarian fragmentation and the sectarian war in the country. As well, we have to say that the U.S. And even for those political exiles who had some legitimacy, some political legitimacy, inside the country, I mean, they have less legitimacy, because they have proved to be extremely sectarian, extremely conservative and extremely corrupted, as well. He lives in the Iraqi city of Najaf. And he moved back to Iraq in 2003, after living abroad for nearly 30 years. He left Iraq in the late 1970s and eventually moved to the United States and settled down in Minneapolis. Welcome back to Democracy Now! Thank you for having me on your [inaudible] show. Juan, greetings from Iraq. And again, 15 years—15 years, and the immeasurable tragedy continues to unfold, while disasters and adversity keeps trapping us under things, asking whether we have learned anything from that tragedy. Well, George Bush was one of the worst presidents, but yet, today, some people think what we have currently is really bad, and George Bush, in comparison, better. So, Iraq entered in a tunnel in with no light at the end, from the invasion to occupation to

sectarianism, then terrorism, ISIS, and we should not forget about Iranian expansion in Iraq. We do know Iraq is right now going in a decrease of education level, healthcare quality. Security, the worst in the world, Iraq is considered, because borders are widely open. The Iraqi Army is not yet capable to keep Iraq safe. There are many military bases, have been built by the U. So, unfortunately, Iraqi people are paying heavily a price. Our Muslim Peacemaker Teams been working since now in a form of outreach and advocacy for peace and promoting the principles of peacebuilding throughout the country between all factions, regardless whether they are Kurds, Arabs, Sunni, Shia, Muslims or Christians. Right now, we are hosting two Americansâ€”from New Jersey, Mr. And the project is called English for Reconciliation. I started this school, as I said, about six months ago, trying to bring from so-called infidels from the West to meet so-called terrorists in the east of Iraq mainly, according to the American mainstream media, to meet around a roundtable, break bread together, seeing the eyes. And they found out nothing of that nonsense is true. This is Democracy Now! Zahra Ali is a sociology professor at Rutgers University. She grew up in France. He served in Iraq once in , then again in Talk about your first deployment, your sense at the time of what the Iraq War was about, and your own evolution in terms of your understanding of the war. Yeah, so, when I wasâ€”well, first off, I watched the invasion from Okinawa, Japan, where I was stationed at the time, and had a real kind of gnawing sense of dread that we were making a decision we could never step back from. A year later, I was stationed in Iraq outside of Fallujah in support of helicopters that were doing casualty evacuation. And I think an experience that really crystallized for me where I really went down a path of challenging everything that had been told to me was when we were guarding Iraqi men who were laborers that were coming onto our forward operating base, who basically spelled out everything Zahra said, that their lives had measurablyâ€”the quality of life had taken a dramatic hit, and that everything that we were being told, in terms of our, you know, hearts and minds and how we were going to make this place better, was as far from the truth as could possibly be. Why did you end up going to Iraq? Where did you grow up? I grew up in Portland, Oregon. And that was before September 11th. And I deployedâ€”or I went to boot camp about a month after September 11th. But when you think of the 22,, more than 22,, who were injured, as well, many of those soldiers injured would have, in previous wars, died but not for the miracle of science and medicine. But many have survived with lifelong injuries, of amputated limbs and traumatic shock and brain damage. Can you talk about the impact on the soldiers for this constant warfare, because, obviously, they never were able to win the hearts and minds of the Iraqi people? And just want to make it clear that if that goes toâ€”if that goes for the military, that very definitely goes for the Iraqi civilians that are continuing to, you know, deal with the after-effects of this war. When did you make your about-face, Matt? I mean, it could have been in a few different places. And it was actually an antiwar protest. There was the Winter soldier hearings. The Winter Soldier hearings outside of Maryland. If you could explain what they were? So, the Winter Soldier hearings were a moment when our community got together to really testify to the costs of war, both in Afghanistan and Iraq, and to alert the American people what was being done in their name. Thank you for asking that. Thank you so much for asking that. And thank you, as well. And, you know, it was a criminal war. It was a dirty war, as well. And the effect for the Iraqi population, in Fallujah and elsewhere, is actuallyâ€”you know, it goes even through generations, you know, when you think of the use of all the chemicals, etc. And we are stillâ€”I mean, perhaps, you know, U. We live, you know, the war. And now, when you think about the invasion of ISIS and the very militarization of the society and the militarization of the public spacesâ€”so, for example, if you take Baghdad, the capital of Iraq, I mean, we have to have this image in mind when we talk about it, is the capital is divided, fragmented by checkpoints and concrete walls, you know, that divide the neighborhoods according to sectarian, religious, ethnic belongings. So, evenâ€”and I talk about it when I talk about women and human rights, in general, in my research in Iraq.

Chapter 4 : List of wars involving the United States - Wikipedia

Rumors aside, let's take a look at what exactly a five-year gap between the two Avengers sequels might mean. For one thing, we'd see how everyone has adjusted to years of half the universe being gone.

Email In , the historian Michael S. Sherry in effect reinterpreted the history of American air power in a way that was more contextually based and fiercely critical. In a larger context, historian Peter Paret has written in *Parameters*: Instead we are asked to pay greater attention to the interaction of war with society, economics, politics, and culture. The Progressive Foundations of American Air Power, U of Nebraska P, is a fitting occasion to reconsider some of the ideas put forth by Sherry a quarter century ago. In his book *Clodfelter* argues that consciously or unconsciously the developers of American air power theory and strategy were a reaction to a Progressive as in Progressive Era way of thinking. Clodfelter also points out that the airmen wanted a reformation of the U. In addition, the airmen believed that an independent air force would be capable of winning future wars entirely on its own, without the assistance of armies or navies. While Clodfelter should be lauded for his attempt to place the study of American air power in a wider context, his view of it in regard to American Progressivism is somewhat narrow. Progressivism is a multifaceted and often contradictory movement typically characterized by activism for social justice, political reform, and efficiency. It may be difficult to tie American air power to a single motivation. *Technology and the Revenge of Unintended Consequences* [Vintage,]. Janis *Victims of Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*, ; these describe various states of single-mindedness and collective rationalization in group behavior. Both men made revolutionary contributions to the way that social scientists comprehend and explain complex patterns of human motivation and behavior, particularly as they apply to organizations. In her book *Rhetoric and Reality in Air Warfare: Decision makers with powerful organizational goals or self-interests may discount or minimize incoming information that conflicts with those interests, and highlight information that supports them.* Another quality was their belief in superior knowledge in being able to pilot an aircraft; that only airmen really understood the potential of air power and that those outside their select group, even if they were military men, did not have the requisite experience require to wage aerial warfare. More than that, they refused to test their ideas empirically in more than a superficial fashion, and trusted that the military aviation technology that supported their ideas would more than make up for any mistakes in their thinking. Moreover, American air power theorists were unable or unwilling to admit that enemy technologies might be developed to counteract their theoretical plans, even while the testing of such technologies were going on underneath their noses. Another, perhaps more significant factor was the desire of the airmen to form an independent air service, free of interference from the army, and able to carry out its own independent mission. Whatever the reasons, the theorists failed on a number of fronts. With their eyes securely fixed on precision bombardment, the airmen ignored the role of fighter aircraft in combat. Chennault believed in fighters and their role in a coordinated ground-air aerial defense system. In his memoir, *Way of a Fighter* G. Moreover, the lessons of the Spanish Civil War, which might be considered a major laboratory for aerial warfare in the interwar years, were largely ignored by American strategic bombing theorists. Other army commentators noted the lack of bombing accuracyâ€”the inability to hit specific targets. This idea was fine in theory, but it suffered from a number of deficiencies. Moreover, the theorists pinned their hopes on the Norden bombsight, as yet unproven in combat and tested only under the most optimal conditions. In London December St.

Chapter 5 : Rebuilding the world after the second world war | World news | The Guardian

After 17 years of war, top US commander in Afghanistan admits Taliban cannot be defeated What a waste of money and lives, all lost due to the Osama bin.

Share via Email A close-up of a page from a ration book. However, was different, so different that it has been called Year Zero. The capacity for destruction had been so much greater than in the earlier war that much of Europe and Asia lay in ruins. And this time civilians had been the target as much as the military. The figures are hard to grasp: During the war, millions more had fled their homes or been forcibly moved to work in Germany or Japan or, in the case of the Soviet Union, because Stalin feared that they might be traitors. Now, in , another new word appeared, the DP, or "displaced person". There were millions of them, some voluntary refugees moving westward in the face of the advancing Red Army, others deported as undesirable minorities. The newly independent Czech state expelled nearly 3 million ethnic Germans in the years after , and Poland a further 1. Everywhere there were lost or orphaned children, , alone in Yugoslavia. Thousands of unwanted babies added to the misery. It is impossible to know how many women in Europe were raped by the Red Army soldiers, who saw them as part of the spoils of war, but in Germany alone some 2 million women had abortions every year between and The allies did what they could to feed and house the refugees and to reunite families that had been forcibly torn apart, but the scale of the task and the obstacles were enormous. The majority of ports in Europe and many in Asia had been destroyed or badly damaged; bridges had been blown up; railway locomotives and rolling stock had vanished. Great cities such as Warsaw, Kiev, Tokyo and Berlin were piles of rubble and ash. Factories and workshops were in ruins, fields, forests and vineyards ripped to pieces. Millions of acres in north China were flooded after the Japanese destroyed the dykes. Many Europeans were surviving on less than 1, calories per day; in the Netherlands they were eating tulip bulbs. Britain had largely bankrupted itself fighting the war and France had been stripped bare by the Germans. They were struggling to look after their own peoples and deal with reincorporating their military into civilian society. The four horsemen of the apocalypse " pestilence, war, famine and death " so familiar during the middle ages, appeared again in the modern world. The once great powers of Japan and Germany looked as though they would never rise again. In retrospect, of course, it is easy to see that their peoples, highly educated and skilled, possessed the capacity to rebuild their shattered societies. And it may have been easier to build strong economies from scratch than the partially damaged ones of the victors. Two powers, so great that the new term "superpower" had to be coined for them, dominated the world in The United States was both a military power and an economic one; the Soviet Union had only brute force and the intangible attraction of Marxist ideology to keep its own people down and manage its newly acquired empire in the heart of Europe. The great European empires, which had controlled so much of the world, from Africa to Asia, were on their last legs and soon to disappear in the face of their own weakness and rising nationalist movements. We should not view the war as being responsible for all of this, however; the rise of the US and the Soviet Union and the weakening of the European empires had been happening long before The war acted as an accelerator. It also accelerated change in other ways: The world got atomic weapons but it also got atomic power. Under the stimulus of war, governments poured resources into developing new medicines and technologies. In many countries, social change also speeded up. The shared suffering and sacrifice of the war years strengthened the belief in most democracies that governments had an obligation to provide basic care for all citizens. When it was elected in the summer of , for example, the Labour government in Britain moved rapidly to establish the welfare state. The rights of women also took a huge step forward as their contribution to the war effort, and their share in the suffering, were recognised. In France and Italy, women finally got the vote. If class divisions in Europe and Asia did not disappear, the moral authority and prestige of the ruling classes had been severely undermined by their failure to prevent the war or the crimes that they had condoned before and during it. Established political orders " fascist, conservative, even democratic " came under challenge as peoples looked for new ideas and leaders. In Germany and Japan, democracy slowly took root. In China, people turned increasingly from the corrupt and incompetent nationalists to the communists. While many Europeans, wearied by years of war

and privation, gave up on politics altogether and faced the future with glum pessimism, others hoped that, at last, the time had come to build a new and better society. In western Europe, voters turned to social democratic parties such as the Labour party in Britain. In the east, the new communist regimes that were imposed by the triumphant Soviet Union were at first welcomed by many as the agents of change. The end of the war inevitably also brought a settling of scores. In many parts people took measures into their own hands. Collaborators were beaten, lynched or shot. Women who had fraternised with German soldiers had their heads shaved or worse. Governments sometimes followed suit, setting up special courts for those who had worked with the enemy and purging such bodies as the civil service and the police. The Soviets also tried to exact reparations from Germany and Japan; whole factories were dismantled down to the window frames and were carted off to the Soviet Union, where they frequently rotted away. Much of the revenge was to gain advantage in the postwar world. In China and eastern Europe the communists used the accusation of collaboration with the Japanese or the Nazis to eliminate their political and class enemies. German de-Nazification The allies instituted an ambitious programme of de-Nazification in Germany, later quietly abandoned as it became clear that German society would be unworkable if all former Nazis were forbidden to work. In both Germany and Japan, the victors set up special tribunals to try those responsible for crimes against peace, war crimes, and the catalogue of horrors that came increasingly to be known as "crimes against humanity". In Tokyo, leading Japanese generals and politicians, and at Nuremberg, senior Nazis those that had not committed suicide or escaped, stood in the dock before allied judges. The trials, inconclusive though they were, formed part of a larger attempt to root out the militaristic and chauvinistic attitudes that had helped to produce the war, and to build a new world order that would prevent such a catastrophe from ever happening again. Well before the war had ended, the allies had started planning for the peace. Among the western powers, the United States, by very much the dominant partner in the alliance, took the lead. In his Four Freedoms speech of January, President Roosevelt talked of a new and more just world, with freedom of speech and expression and of religion, and freedom from want and fear. In the Atlantic charter later that year, he and Churchill sketched out a world order based on such liberal principles as collective security, national self-determination, and free trade among nations. A host of other allies, some of them represented by governments in exile, signed on. The Soviet Union gave a qualified assent, although its leader Stalin had no intention of following what were to him alien principles. Roosevelt intended that the American vision should take solid institutional form. This time, Roosevelt was determined, the United States should join. The idea that there were universal standards to be upheld was present, no matter how imperfectly, in the war crimes trials, and was later reinforced by the establishment of the United Nations itself in 1945, the International Court of Justice in 1946 and Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948. Stalin was interested above all in security for his regime and for the Soviet Union, and that to him meant taking territory, from Poland and other neighbours, and establishing a ring of buffer states around Soviet borders. The grand alliance held together uneasily for the first months of the peace, but the strains were evident in their shared occupation of Germany, where increasingly the Soviet zone of occupation was moving in a communist direction and the western zones, under Britain, France and the United States, in a more capitalist and democratic one. By 1947, two very different German societies were emerging. Soviet pressure on its neighbours, from Norway in the north to Turkey and Iran in the south, along with Soviet spy rings and Soviet-inspired sabotage in western countries, further deepened western concerns. For their part, Soviet leaders looked on western talk of such democratic procedures as free elections in eastern Europe as Trojan horses designed to undermine their control of their buffer states, and regarded the Marshall plan, which funnelled American aid into Europe, as a cover for extending the grip of capitalism. Furthermore, their own Marxist-Leninist analysis of history told them that sooner or later the capitalist powers would turn on the Soviet Union. Both sides built military alliances and prepared for the new shooting war that many feared was bound to come. In 1949, the Soviet Union exploded its first atomic bomb, giving it parity, at least in that area, with the United States. That the cold war did not in the end turn into a hot one was thanks to that fact. The terrifying new power of atomic weapons was to lead to a standoff suitably known as *Mad as Hell* Mutually Assured Destruction. The cold war overshadowed another momentous international change that came as a result of the second world war. Before much of the non-European world had been divided up among the great

empires: Japan and Italy lost their empires as a result of defeat. Britain, France, and the Netherlands all saw their imperial possessions disappear in the years immediately after the war. The Soviet Union was not to lose its until the end of the cold war. Empires crumble The former imperial powers no longer had the financial and military capacity to hang on to their vast territories. Nor did their peoples want to pay the price of empire, whether in money or blood. Furthermore, where the empires had once dealt with divided or acquiescent peoples, they now increasingly faced assertive and, in some cases, well-armed nationalist movements. The defeat of European forces all over Asia also contributed to destroying the myth of European power. The United Nations grew from 51 nations in to by the end of the century. Because of the cold war, there was no comprehensive peace settlement after the second world war as there had been in Instead there were a number of separate agreements or ad hoc decisions. The Soviet Union seized back some bits of territory such as Bessarabia, which it had lost to Romania in The one major exception was Poland, as the joke had it "a country on wheels", which moved some miles to the west, losing some 69, sq metres to the Soviet Union and gaining slightly less from Germany in the west. In the east, Japan of course lost the conquests it had made since , but was also obliged to disgorge Korea and Formosa now Taiwan and the Pacific islands that it had gained decades earlier. Eventually the United States and Japan concluded a formal peace in Because of an outstanding dispute over some islands, the Soviet Union and its successor Russia have not yet signed a peace treaty ending the war with Japan. Remembering the war We have long since absorbed and dealt with the physical consequences of the second world war, but it still remains a very powerful set of memories. How societies remember and commemorate the past often says something about how they see themselves " and can be highly contentious. Particularly in divided societies, it is tempting to cling to comforting myths to help bring unity and to paper over deep and painful divisions. In the years immediately after , many societies chose to forget the war or remember it only in certain ways. Austria portrayed itself as the first victim of Nazism, conveniently ignoring the active support that so many Austrians had given the Nazi regime. In Italy, the fascist past was neglected in favour of the earlier periods of Italian history. For a long time, schools did not teach any history after the first world war.

The Afghanistan war cannot be won militarily and peace will only be achieved through a political resolution with the Taliban, the newly-appointed American general in charge of US and NATO operations has conceded. In his first interview since taking command of NATO's Resolute Support mission in.

Kim Jong Un has been open, terrific. He was the senior adviser for North Korea in the office of the Secretary of Defense from to . The views expressed in this commentary are solely their own. View more opinion articles on CNN. But North Korea also vowed that it would only take major denuclearization steps if the United States takes "corresponding measures," including declaring an end to the Korean War, which President Donald Trump reportedly told Kim he would do during their June meeting in Singapore. Nathan Park Trump continues to be complimentary toward the North Korean leader -- going so far as to say at a recent rally that they "fell in love. We should not let bureaucratic inertia and the fear of a potential disruption to our status quo defense posture in the region constrain our ability to achieve even greater security by building a new peace paradigm on the Korean Peninsula. An end of war declaration would provide a low-cost way of testing the hypothesis that Kim will denuclearize if he can be assured of a better relationship with the United States. Kim already possesses nuclear weapons, and he may never give them up. An end of war declaration would encourage Kim to stay on this path. We can correctly characterize Kim as no different than his father and grandfather in his unwillingness to denuclearize. The United States can tell China we tried its preferred approach of negotiating with North Korea to no effect. The United States can then move forward with a policy that recognizes the reality of a nuclear North Korea that needs to be contained and deterred. Kim is playing Trump -- and it could come at great cost. Read More All diplomatic negotiations involve a give and take. But in agreeing to an end of war declaration, the United States would not be giving up much: It would merely recognize the reality that, as a practical matter, the war has been over for decades. However, the declaration is potentially a game changer for the Kim regime, which fears for its survival and foreign encroachments on its sovereignty. The formal expression of the end of the "hostile" US policy, as Pyongyang sees it, may help Kim neutralize the hardliners within his regime, creating greater flexibility to take further steps toward denuclearization. As a nonbinding political measure, a declaration would not require lengthy, complicated negotiations like a peace treaty. Most importantly, it gives forward momentum to the negotiations, allowing the bicycle to stay upright, as diplomats like to say. Critics of the end-of-war declaration argue that it may weaken the United States-South Korea alliance. Declaring the war over, the argument goes, would give Pyongyang, Beijing and Trump the rationale to demand removal of the 28, US troops stationed there. Eventually, after several years of relative peace, South Korea may question the alliance altogether, seeing it as an impediment to Korean reunification. These concerns are warranted and not inconsequential. Both Moon and Kim have reaffirmed that an end of war declaration would not affect the US troop presence on the Korean Peninsula at any rate. Yet the concerns about the end of war declaration undermining the US-South Korea alliance also underestimate the resilience of the alliance, and the US ability to recalibrate our strategic posture. The Mutual Defense Treaty remains the cornerstone of our security relationship with South Korea, but since then, our bilateral partnership has widened into a more comprehensive alliance that goes beyond the North Korean threat, and encompasses political, economic, social and cultural cooperation. The number of US troops has constantly evolved -- from 70, in the s to 38, in the s to 28, today -- adapting according to the strategic, military and political demands of the times. In his recent interview on Fox News, Moon made this point clear: Even Moon, who has been criticized for undermining unity with Washington by pushing aggressively for inter-Korean cooperation, has constantly stressed the need to develop the alliance into an "even greater" one. Indeed, in his Fox News interview, Moon would envision the US forces in Korea remaining in place "even after the unification [of the two Koreas] is achieved. The end of war declaration would be another step in the right direction. The US-South Korea alliance often describes itself as standing "shoulder-to-shoulder" with "no daylight" in between. The two allied leaders should have the courage to trust the strength of the alliance and boldly pursue peace.

Chapter 7 : NPR Choice page

A Hundred Years After the Armistice If you think the First World War began senselessly, consider how it ended.

This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. Empress Maria Theresa of Austria had signed the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in in order to gain time to rebuild her military forces and forge new alliances. The War of the Austrian Succession had seen the belligerents aligned on a time-honoured basis. Prussia , the leading anti-Austrian state in Germany, had been supported by France. Neither group, however, found much reason to be satisfied with its partnership: British subsidies to Austria produced nothing of much help to the British, while the British military effort had not saved Silesia for Austria. Prussia, having secured Silesia, came to terms with Austria in disregard of French interests. Even so, France concluded a defensive alliance with Prussia in , and the maintenance of the Anglo-Austrian alignment after was deemed essential by the Duke of Newcastle , British secretary of state in the ministry of his brother Henry Pelham. The collapse of that system and the aligning of France with Austria and of Great Britain with Prussia constituted what is known as the " diplomatic revolution " or the "reversal of alliances. On 2 June , Austria and Russia concluded a defensive alliance that covered their own territory and Poland against attack by Prussia or the Ottoman Empire. Alexey Bestuzhev-Ryumin , grand chancellor of Russia under Empress Elizabeth , was hostile to both France and Prussia, but he could not persuade Austrian statesman Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz to commit to offensive designs against Prussia so long as Prussia was able to rely on French support. If war against France for colonial expansion was to be resumed, then Hanover had to be secured against Franco-Prussian attack. French policy was, moreover, complicated by the existence of the Secret du Roi â€”a system of private diplomacy conducted by King Louis XV. Frederick saw Saxony and Polish west Prussia as potential fields for expansion but could not expect French support if he started an aggressive war for them. If he joined the French against the British in the hope of annexing Hanover, he might fall victim to an Austro-Russian attack. Neither state could pose as a great power. Saxony was merely a buffer between Prussia and Austrian Bohemia , whereas Poland, despite its union with the ancient lands of Lithuania, was prey to pro-French and pro-Russian factions. A Prussian scheme for compensating Frederick Augustus with Bohemia in exchange for Saxony obviously presupposed further spoliation of Austria. Not only that, Britain would soon join the Austro-Russian alliance, but complications arose. At the same time, Kaunitz kept approaching the French in the hope of establishing just such an alliance with Austria. France also saw the dismemberment of Prussia as threatening to the stability of Central Europe. Besthuzev, assuming the preparation was directed against Prussia, was more than happy to obey the request of the British. Unbeknownst to the other powers, King George II also made overtures to the Prussian king, Frederick, who, fearing the Austro-Russian intentions, was also desirous of a rapprochement with Britain. On 16 January , the Convention of Westminster was signed, whereby Britain and Prussia promised to aid one another; the parties hoped to achieve lasting peace and stability in Europe. The carefully coded word in the agreement proved no less catalytic for the other European powers. The results were absolute chaos. Not only that, but France was enraged, and terrified, by the sudden betrayal of its only ally. Austria, particularly Kaunitz, used this situation to their utmost advantage. Now-isolated France was forced to accede to the Austro-Russian alliance or face ruin. Thereafter, on 1 May , the First Treaty of Versailles was signed, in which both nations pledged 24, troops to defend each other in the case of an attack. This diplomatic revolution proved to be an important cause of the war; although both treaties were self-defensive in nature, the actions of both coalitions made the war virtually inevitable. In North America[edit] Main article: France had long claimed the entire Mississippi River basin. This was disputed by Britain. In the early s the French began constructing a chain of forts in the Ohio River Valley to assert their claim and shield the Native American population from increasing British influence. The British settlers along the coast were upset that French troops would now be close to the western borders of their colonies. They felt the French would encourage their tribal allies among the North American natives to attack them. Also, the British settlers wanted access to the fertile land of the Ohio River Valley for the new settlers that were flooding into

the British colonies seeking farm land. Peaceful British attempts to halt this fort construction were unsuccessful, and the French proceeded to build the fort they named Fort Duquesne. British colonial militia from Virginia were then sent to drive them out. Led by George Washington , they ambushed a small French force at Jumonville Glen on 28 May killing ten, including commander Jumonville. News of this arrived in Europe, where Britain and France unsuccessfully attempted to negotiate a solution. The two nations eventually dispatched regular troops to North America to enforce their claims. Britain concluded a treaty whereby Prussia agreed to protect Hanover. In response France concluded an alliance with its long-time enemy Austria, an event known as the Diplomatic Revolution. Strategies[edit] Prussian Leibgarde battalion at Kolin, For much of the eighteenth century, France approached its wars in the same way. It would let colonies defend themselves or would offer only minimal help sending them limited numbers of troops or inexperienced soldiers , anticipating that fights for the colonies would most likely be lost anyway. This approach did not serve France well in the war, as the colonies were indeed lost, and although much of the European war went well, by its end France had few counterbalancing European successes. In marked contrast to France, Britain strove to prosecute the war actively in the colonies, taking full advantage of its naval power. The Russians and the Austrians were determined to reduce the power of Prussia, the new threat on their doorstep, and Austria was anxious to regain Silesia , lost to Prussia in the War of the Austrian Succession. Along with France, Russian and Austria agreed in to mutual defence and an attack by Austria and Russia on Prussia, subsidized by France.

Chapter 8 : Korean War - HISTORY

The Afghanistan war cannot be won militarily and peace will only be achieved through a political resolution with the Taliban, the newly-appointed American general in charge of US and NATO operations has conceded.

Every day a new rumor or leak gives us some insight into where things might go next. One of the latest bits to hit the fan, though, is a bit of a doozy. Talk about messing with a cliffhanger ending. Rather than seeing the world in the immediate, aftershock of Thanos-induced heart-rending grief, we could come back to the MCU after years of healing and adjustment have taken place. Casting our doubts aside Getty Images One possible confirmation of the five-year time jump comes in the form of casting rumors. While any actor change in the MCU is scrutinized regardless of the cause, the deeper meaning behind the move was instantly apparent: Emma Fuhrmann is seven years older than her predecessor. Of course, this could play out in very different ways onscreen. For instance, with Avengers 4 time travel rumors a dime a dozen these days, an older Cassie could simply show up at some point. Only time will tell. The truth is, while grief can last for a lifetime, five years is a long time to get over some initial emotions. One of the Thanos selling points in Infinity War was that the big purple bruiser really did have a genuine motivation that he believed in. Ah, the tensions that could present themselvesâ€¦ Avoiding some loose ends One of the more curious implications of a five-year jump forward in time is not just "what will things be like at that point," but rather how many loose ends from Infinity War will probably just disappear. The aftermath moments of the finger snap, most of which were so tantalizingly withheld from us â€” supposedly for the next installment â€” may simply be already over. Along with the obvious emotional adjustments that will have been made, there are also some logistical situations that may be long resolved. However, this time he utterly failed, while everyone he loved fell to ashes around him. Oh, and he was stabbed too. Yeah, that guy went through a lot all at once. If Avengers 4 jumps forward five years, there are a lot of pieces to the Stark storyline that will likely be already in place when things begin. A really â€” like really, really â€” overdue reunion? Another issue pointed out by fans as they sorted through the haze of Infinity War was the lack of the long-awaited reunion between Steve Rogers and Tony Stark. The two had literally beaten the crap out of each other at the end of Captain America: Whether Tony Stark or Bruce Banner are involved or, as seems more likely, the Ant-Man crew shows up to bring some Quantum fun to the story, the idea of going back in time to fix things or figure things out or alter the past or whatever the heck they choose to do seems to be a fan favorite theory at this point. And the idea of a five-year jump into the future continues to add oomph to the argument as well. After all, if time travel is in their future, who cares what time it is when the movie starts, right? Heck, they could all be on their deathbeds. As soon as going back in time becomes a factor, it can all be undone one way or another. The only fear here is that the "undoing" might appear tacky. The thought is pretty fun to entertain. As for the five-year gap? That would play perfectly into the reemergence of a completely retooled Barton, giving him time to develop the new persona. After all, the man really wants one thing in life, to be with his family, right? So what could drive him to leave all that he loves to head off and train in the ways of the samurai? What if all that he loves leaves him first? We saw it on Titan, where everyone but Tony Stark and Nebula were wiped out. If the five-year rumor is trueâ€¦ the timeline could fit. Or more green drama? Another notable plot point in Infinity War, the movie that juggled a million pieces at once, was the conspicuous reluctance of Hulk to participate in the action. After a brief foray into the fray, one that ended rather quickly and unpleasantly for the Green Machine, Hulk remained safely ensconced within Banner for the remainder of the film other than when he popped out quickly to yell at his alter ego like he was a kid ringing the doorbell too many times. The Hulk and Banner have been duking it out ever since Ragnarok saw the Hulk end a two-year streak of being in control. Will Banner be bitterly unforgiving that the Hulk refused to take part in the desperate last stand to stop Thanos from getting the Mind Stone in Wakanda? It was definitely a jerk move, to say the least. Will Hulk still be angry at feeling manipulated and used? Or will the two finally have put their differences to bedâ€¦ and perhaps even created Professor Hulk in the process? Tying it in The MCU has mastered the art of the crossover, tying together films without screwing things upâ€¦ so far, at least. But the sheer number of characters, plot lines, and loose ends

that will need to be woven together in Avengers 4 is incredibly daunting. And, if the latter, then how will that impact the storylines of other movies? Since then all hell has broken loose with that franchise, so the resulting movie or not could go anywhere. But what about the upcoming Spider-Man sequel? Far From Home is supposedly starting " immediately " after Avengers 4.

Summary: The third and final volume in this biography of Eleanor Roosevelt, covering her advocacy, friendships, and relationship with Franklin during the war years, and briefly, her accomplishments after his death.

Prussia, the leading anti-Austrian state in Germany, had been supported by France. Neither group, however, found much reason to be satisfied with its partnership: British subsidies to Austria had produced nothing of much help to the British, while the British military effort had not saved Silesia for Austria. Prussia, having secured Silesia, had come to terms with Austria in disregard of French interests. Even so, France had concluded a defensive alliance with Prussia in 1756, and the maintenance of the Anglo-Austrian alignment after 1757 was deemed essential by the duke of Newcastle, British secretary of state in the ministry of his brother Henry Pelham. If war against France for colonial expansion was to be resumed, then Hanover had to be secured against Franco-Prussian attack. French policy was, moreover, complicated by the existence of *le Secret du roi* – a system of private diplomacy conducted by King Louis XV. Aleksey Petrovich, Graf count Bestuzhev-Ryumin, grand chancellor of Russia under the empress Elizabeth, was hostile to both France and Prussia, but he could not persuade Austrian statesman Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz to commit to offensive designs against Prussia so long as Prussia was able to rely on French support. Frederick the Great saw Saxony and Polish West Prussia as potential fields for expansion but could not expect French support if he started an aggressive war for them. If he joined the French against the British in the hope of annexing Hanover, he might fall victim to an Austro-Russian attack. Neither state could pose as a great power. Saxony was merely a buffer between Prussia and Austrian Bohemia, whereas Poland, despite its union with the ancient lands of Lithuania, was prey to pro-French and pro-Russian factions. A Prussian scheme for compensating Frederick Augustus with Bohemia in exchange for Saxony obviously presupposed further spoliation of Austria. That proposal foundered on the opposition of Frederick the Great elector of Brandenburg as well as king of Prussia, whom the other German electors did not dare to antagonize. In 1758 Great Britain acceded to the Austro-Russian defensive alliance of 1757, but without subscribing to the secret clause on Silesia and without obtaining from the two empires a guarantee of the status quo in Hanover. France, however, was neither ready to resume diplomatic relations with Russia severed in 1756 nor willing to connive in the destruction of Prussia, a development that would have restored Austria to incontestable hegemony in Germany. By 1759, when Maria Theresa recalled him to Vienna to serve as chancellor, Kaunitz had achieved only a vague atmosphere of Franco-Austrian goodwill. Kaunitz, Wedgwood medallion portrait; in Gripsholm Castle, Sweden Courtesy of the Svenska Portrattarkivet, Stockholm Meanwhile, the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle had done nothing to ease tensions between the French and British East India companies, and in North America relations between the colonists had deteriorated steadily from 1754. By 1756 French aggression in North America had reached a level that the British could no longer ignore. British Admiral Edward Boscawen attacked French ships in the Strait of Belle Isle in June 1756, beginning an undeclared naval war between the two countries. Before the British government could declare open hostilities against France, it had to safeguard Hanover. Map of British and French dominions in North America, Kaunitz believed that Great Britain should hire German and Russian mercenaries to defend both Hanover and the southern Netherlands; the latter had served as a launching point for previous Austro-British and Dutch operations against France. The decline of the Dutch as a military force had compromised the defense of the Austrian Netherlands, and Kaunitz was in fact willing to consider ceding the territory to the French in return for help regarding Silesia. Ultimately, the force that Kaunitz was willing to exert against France for the defense of Hanover or the Netherlands was far less than what the British required from him. Rebuffed by Austria, the British sought a new treaty with Russia, and on September 30, 1756, a preliminary agreement was signed in St. Petersburg. It stipulated that Russia should maintain 55,000 men on the Livonian-Lithuanian frontier so that they could be promptly moved to defend British interests on the Continent if necessary. Bestuzhev, assuming that the treaty was aimed at Prussia, was delighted to have British money to spend on his own projects. The Austrian Netherlands were expressly excluded from that guarantee. The Convention of Westminster dismayed Bestuzhev and his empress, who had not yet ratified the British treaty. Elizabeth

peremptorily informed the British that the common enemy envisaged in the treaty could only be Prussia, and, when the British rejected that interpretation, the whole Russo-British arrangement came to nothing. The French government was no less angry at the duplicity of its one ally, Prussia. The French, hoping to thaw relations with Russia and gain more information about the Anglo-Russian talks, had sent a Scottish Jacobite refugee, Alexander Mackenzie, on a clandestine mission to St. Petersburg in autumn. Mackenzie was acting in the service of le Secret du roi as well as the French foreign ministry, but the chief agents of le Secret in Poland had been kept unaware of his mission, lest they regard an overture to Russia as a betrayal of the anti-Russian line to which they had been dedicated. In April the Russians pledged 80,000 men to Austria for an attack on Prussia. To Kaunitz the Convention of Westminster provided obvious reasons for self-congratulation. It justified his view that the British alliance was no longer worthwhile, and it obliged France to draw closer to Austria for fear of isolation now that Prussia was defecting. The announcement of the Convention of Westminster gave them new impetus, however, and on May 1, 1756, the First Treaty of Versailles was concluded. That pact was a defensive alliance between France and Austria, with either party pledging to send 24,000 men to support the other in the event of attack. Notably, it exempted Austria from any obligation to join in a war against Great Britain. The Convention of Westminster and the First Treaty of Versailles are generally taken as the constituent factors of the diplomatic revolution, but they did not make war in Europe inevitable. Both being expressly defensive, they might well have had the contrary effect, though Kaunitz at least could see the Austro-French agreement as a step toward enticing France into an Austro-Russian offensive alignment against Prussia. Frederick the Great had tried, unavailingly, to present the Convention of Westminster as not inconsistent with his French alliance. He had, accordingly, to profess to regard the First Treaty of Versailles as harmless to Prussia, but that treaty was clearly advantageous to Austria and so, indirectly, to Russia. In fact, both Austria and Russia were now massing troops on their frontiers nearest to Prussia. Throughout July and as late as August 20, 1756, Frederick appealed to Maria Theresa for assurances of her good intent toward him, but he received no satisfactory reply. Was he frightened into a preventive war, intending only to seize what military advantage he could in the face of imminent aggression by Austria and Russia, or did he think that the moment had come for another war of annexation? However much the British were annoyed at the prospect of having to support Frederick if his war went ill, the French were aghast at his action. Whereas they had signed their Austrian treaty in the belief that their hands would be free for the vital war against the British and that they could later choose whether or not to abet an Austrian offensive against Prussia, they now found themselves committed to defend Austria against the unforeseen aggression. The Saxon army, numbering no more than 20,000, fell back to Pirna, in the southeast. To prevent that union, Frederick advanced southward into Bohemia, where he soundly defeated Browne at Lobositz now Lovosice, Czech Republic on October 1. Returning to Saxony, Frederick received the capitulation of the Saxons at Pirna October 16, whereupon he took nearly all of them into his own service. *Balechou*, after a portrait by Louis Silvestre. For the perfect achievement of an anti-Prussian coalition, it was most desirable, as Kaunitz saw, for Russia and France to come to terms. The Russians, however, saw the new development as an occasion for extracting concessions from France with regard not only to Poland but also to Sweden and Turkey. The French foreign ministry was ready to admit swift passage of Russian troops across Polish territory and thus relieve France of the obligation to help Austria. However, that came into conflict with le Secret du roi, a primary purpose of which was to exclude the Russians from Poland at any cost. In Great Britain the accession of William Pitt the Elder to office as virtual prime minister in November would have a decisive effect on the development of the war. That contradiction of the long-standing Franco-Turkish entente was immediately disavowed by the French government. An Austro-Russian offensive alliance against Prussia was concluded on February 2, 1757, with each party undertaking to put 80,000 men into the field and forswearing any separate peace, while secret articles provided for a partition of Prussia. Militarily, France was to maintain 100,000 men in Germany, in addition to the contingent to be supplied to Austria which was raised from 24,000 to 30,000, and would grant an annual subsidy of 12 million livres to Austria. Shortly after the treaty was concluded, Bernis was named French foreign minister. In April the Prussians again advanced into Bohemia. An Austrian force under Leopold Joseph, Graf von Daun, arrived too late to affect the outcome of the battle, and the Austrians lost

more than 14, men. Some 16, escaped to join Daun while the rest took refuge in Prague itself, which the Prussians, who had taken comparable losses, proceeded to besiege. A month later Daun, with more than 50, men, moved to relieve Prague, and Frederick met him with a force of 34, Raising the siege of Prague, the Prussians evacuated Bohemia. Prussia, meanwhile, was exposed to attack from several directions. Defeated at Hastenbeck on July 26, , Cumberland withdrew to Stade , near the Elbe estuary, abandoning the defense of the electorate and Brunswick. Furthermore, Sweden, having signed an alliance with France and Austria on March 21, invaded Prussian Pomerania in September with the intention of annexing it. A Russian army of 90, men, which had begun to cross Polish territory in May, at last entered East Prussia in August In a puzzling move, Apraksin then began a retreat, pleading difficulties of supply. It seems that his conduct was caused, partly at least, by a consideration that was long to bedevil Russian affairsâ€”the fact that the empress Elizabeth , who hated Prussia, was in notoriously uncertain health, while her heir, the future emperor Peter III , adored Frederick and opposed the anti-Prussian war. Any Russian general or statesman who did too much harm to Prussia was therefore risking the displeasure of his future master. Frederick, with Saxony as his main base, decided first to confront the danger from the west, leaving Frederick Francis of Brunswick-Bevern to face the Austrians in Silesia. Finally, hearing that Soubise and Saxe-Hildburghausen were in Thuringia, Frederick moved to engage them. The Battle of Rossbach followed on November 5, The combined strength of the French and the Army of the Reich was at least 41, against just 21, Prussians, but the aggressive Saxe-Hildburghausen and the more-cautious Soubise were at odds. When at last the battle was joined, the greatly superior mobility of the Prussians, with the brilliant cavalry leadership of Friedrich Wilhelm, Freiherr baron von Seydlitz won the day. In September a British naval expedition against the French base of Rochefort had been a failure. Frederick then force-marched his army from Thuringia to support Brunswick-Bevern, and at the Battle of Leuthen December 5, , he won the greatest of his victories. With 43, men, he attacked the 72, under Charles of Lorraine and utterly routed them with an unexpected cavalry charge followed by an artillery bombardment. Frederick suffered 6, casualties, but Charles lost 22, men, including 12, who were taken prisoner. Shortly thereafter the Prussians reclaimed Breslau. In the course of the winter, Lehwaldt drove the Swedes back into their own part of Pomerania, where they were able to hold the Prussians outside Stralsund. With the onset of spring, however, thawing snows made the northern roads impassable, and his force was temporarily immobilized. In Russia itself, the anti-French Bestuzhev was arrested, and power came into the hands of his rival Vorontsov. Ferdinand of Brunswick, with his Anglo-Hanoverians, launched a successful offensive against the French in Westphalia , and on March 27 he crossed the Rhine River at Emmerich, near the Dutch frontier. On June 23, with 40, men, he defeated 70, men under Louis de Bourbon, comte de Clermont, at Krefeld. The effect of that victory, which enabled him to secure all of northwestern Germany, was scarcely offset by subsequent French successes farther to the south, in Hesse and Thuringia. In July, however, the Austrians forced Frederick to abandon the siege by threatening his supply bases. In the north, meanwhile, a new Swedish attack on Prussian Pomerania was being fended off by Lehwaldt, but the Russians were on the march again, going southwestward from East Prussia toward the Oder River and Brandenburg. To evade the Austrians, Frederick had to march first northwestward into Bohemia, then northward across Silesia. In the bloodiest battle of the war, the Russians lost 42,, with 21, killed, and the Prussians lost 13, Leaving Christoph von Dohna to pursue the defeated Russians, Frederick hastened back to Saxony to save his brother Prince Henry from attack by superior Austrian forces under Daun. Daun fell back until he found a strong position at Kittlitz, where he decided to stand with his 90, men. Frederick, with 37,, advanced as far as Hochkirch, not believing that Daun would venture an offensive. Hochkirch put new spirit into the French, who after Krefeld and Zorndorf had been inclined to despair of their European war.