On February 14, 2018, a shooter armed with an AR-15 semi-automatic rifle went to his former high school in Parkland, Florida, and shot and killed 17 people. The community was traumatized. Within days, student-survivors of the shooting helped organize a rally. Speeches by students went viral. Students confronted lawmakers at a televised town hall. And their efforts gave the national debate on gun safety a new sense of urgency. The shooting and survivors’ responses also sparked debates about what schools should do to keep campuses safe.

News outlets described the Parkland shooting as the 18th school shooting of 2018, less than two months into the year. Of those 18 incidents, two were suicides, three were accidental shootings, and nine involved no injuries or deaths. Not all school shootings are mass public shootings (or “mass shootings”). Certainly all shootings are concerning for Americans.

Between 2006 and 2013, two out of seven mass shootings at schools involved more than 10 deaths. One of those two incidents was a 2007 shooting at Virginia Tech University. The other was the infamous shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Connecticut. Over the years, lawmakers have responded to these traumatic events, and the public has experienced disagreement about what should be done.

What Is the Current Law?

There are federal laws about gun safety at schools, and there are state laws. The Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution reads, “A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.” In 2008, the U.S. Supreme Court held that this amendment means an individual has the right to own firearms for lawful purposes, but it is not an absolute right. The government may impose reasonable regulations on gun ownership. And ownership does not have to do with an individual’s membership in a “well-regulated militia.”
Federal Law

Given the individual right to own guns, what has Congress done over the years about school safety? In 1990, Congress passed the Gun Free School Zones Act (GFSZA). This law prohibits any person from knowingly possessing a firearm in a place that person knows, or reasonably should know, is a “school zone.” A school zone includes the grounds of public and private schools, as well as public property within 1,000 feet from the grounds of those schools.

The GFSZA’s prohibition has exceptions. Anyone who otherwise has a legal right in their state or city to possess a gun may do so in a school zone. For example, police officers are allowed to possess firearms, as are local residents on private property. And as long as a gun is unloaded and properly locked away, or used in a school-sponsored program, then it is allowed within a school zone.

In 1994, Congress passed a law specifically about students and guns called the Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA). This law requires any school receiving federal funds (public schools) to expel students for at least one year if they possess a gun at school. The GFSA does allow local educational authorities to modify expulsions when it sees fit. In certain circumstances, guns that are lawfully locked away in a vehicle or even on school property are allowed.

After the Sandy Hook shooting, President Barack Obama issued executive orders to improve training for law enforcement and school officials on “active shooter” situations. The Department of Justice also gave grants to school districts to hire more school resource officers (SROs).

State Law

State laws vary from state to state. Almost all states, however, prohibit guns in K-12 schools. Many states do allow people to get licenses to carry a concealed weapon (CCW permits). States have different requirements for CCW permits, but all states allow people to get them. In general, “plain clothes police” can get these permits, and in some states, so can people who show “good cause” (e.g., documented threats from another). Eight states either allow concealed firearms at K-12 schools or just do not have a law to prohibit them.

Proposed Policies

The fact of gun violence at schools has sparked many different proposals to solve the problem. Below are five of the main policy proposals to either change or enhance the laws described above.

School Resource Officers

Public schools have had trained SROs on their campuses since as far back as 1953. The GFSA law in 1994, however, led to an increase in the use of SROs. As you have learned, the Department of Justice authorized more funding for SROs on K-12 campuses in 2013. They are essentially police officers for schools.

Supporters of this proposal argue that SROs have decreased crime on K-12 campuses. In 2001, a survey showed that 90 percent of SROs stop between one and 25 violent acts on campuses each year. A general decrease in violence at schools nationwide since the mid-1990s coincides with an increased presence of SROs at schools. And often SROs act as informal counselors and educators at the schools where they work.

Some critics of this proposal argue that SROs are not responsible for the decline of crime in schools. Crime in general has declined since the mid-1990s. And critics site cases in which SROs have treated misbehaving juveniles the same as adult offenders. Many disciplinary problems handled by SROs, they argue, are better handled by a referral to the principal’s office.

Some critics also argue that SROs are simply not effective. The school in Parkland, Florida, had an SRO on duty when the attack happened. There were two SROs present during the Columbine shooting that left 13 dead. Supporters, however, argue that school districts can simply require better training for SROs assigned to their schools.

Active Shooter Drills

Many school districts have adopted the practice of active shooter drills. An “active shooter situation” is one in which a person is actively trying to shoot other people. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security adds that active shooters are typically “attempting to kill people in a confined and populated area.” A drill is intended to prepare students for this situation at their school, just as a fire drill prepares them for a fire or natural disaster.

The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence
support the use of active shooter drills. But the NASP does not endorse one particular type of drill. The NASP encourages “traditional lockdowns” as the foundation for any effective active shooter drill. A lockdown typically involves immediate locking of all exterior and interior doors and gates. Students and teachers must remain where they are and away from all windows as law enforcement comes to the school.

President Donald Trump opposes active shooter drills. He has said, “I don’t like it. I’d much rather have a hardened school.” Some parents, too, have complained in various school districts that these drills have made their children feel traumatized. The NASP warns that the success of these drills depends on the training, calmness, and sensitivity of the school staff.

**Gun Control**

This proposal is really a series of proposals. And not all gun control supporters agree on which proposals are best. But as the name implies, gun control means a law or laws that restrict either the type of guns that can be sold; the ability of certain people to buy or own guns; or both. Many of the Parkland school students made public demands for gun control measures.

After mass shootings, gun control advocates often renew demands to ban the type of weapon that was used in the shooting. In Parkland, the shooter used an AR-15 semi-automatic rifle. In Las Vegas in 2017, the shooter used a device called a “bump stock,” which allowed him to make a semi-automatic rifle function like a fully automatic machine gun.

Other proposed gun control policies include waiting periods after gun sales (to delay a person’s ability to have a gun immediately); background checks to restrict people with any violent criminal record from owning guns; raising the minimum age to buy a handgun to 21; and expanded mental health training for teachers and school staff to better recognize young people with serious issues. The National Parent-Teacher Association believes youth safety will come from a combination of gun control measures, including requiring safety locks on guns to protect young children and increasing penalties for anyone who sells a gun to a minor.

The National Rifle Association (NRA) is a lobbying organization for both gun owners and gun manufacturers. The NRA argues that the Second Amendment makes most gun control laws unconstitutional, especially federal laws. The NRA has about five million members and spends $250 million dollars each year to promote lawful gun ownership and influence lawmakers. President Trump has supported the NRA and received praise from the organization, but he has also supported banning the sale of bump stocks.

### Should the AR-15 Be Banned?

In 1994, Congress passed a law banning the sale of “assault weapons,” or “military style” semi-automatic rifles, including the AR-15 later used in the Parkland, Florida, mass shooting. The law expired in 2004. After the Parkland shooting many renewed a push to ban assault weapons once again. Since the AR-15 is popular among gun-buyers the debate sometimes centers on banning that weapon in particular. The AR-15 is a civilian version of a military firearm. It is a semi-automatic rifle meaning it loads and fires a new round with each squeeze of the trigger. Because the AR-15 fires high-velocity, low-caliber ammunition, its bullets can “tumble” through a person’s body, often ripping apart organs and even bones. The AR-15 can be fitted with high-capacity magazines holding up to 30 bullets.

### Main Arguments

- The AR-15 is unnecessary for any lawful purpose, such as hunting, sport-shooting, or home defense. Civilians do not need military-style weaponry.
- The 2008 Supreme Court decision in _D.C. v. Heller_ allowed for banning “dangerous and unusual weapons.” The AR-15 is especially dangerous and unusual. It fires ammunition at high-velocity and a shooter can fire hundreds of rounds in a very short time span.
- Many military veterans support banning semi-automatic rifles like the AR-15. “I recognize the power of firearms. I’ve seen what they can do,” Army veteran Dennis Magnusco says. “And it makes me sick to know that we have high school kids seeing this in their schools.”

### Main Counterarguments

- Many opponents of an assault-weapons ban argue that there are many semi-automatic rifles used for hunting and sport and the AR-15 is just a type of semiautomatic rifle. Jeff Sellers, a professional hunter, says, “A weapon cannot assault; people assault.” Law abiding civilians should be able to own semi-automatic rifles.
- The 1994 assault-weapons ban did not eliminate assault weapons. In fact, it caused a spike in sales of semi-automatic rifles just before the ban went into effect. Today, there are already 10 -12 million AR-15 rifles alone in private hands in the U.S. A ban would not affect those rifles.
- The 2008 _Heller_ decision should not apply to semi-automatic rifles or even fully automatic rifles (e.g. machine guns). The NRA supports the position that _Heller_ prohibits weapons not commonly used by civilians like poison gas, tanks, or artillery. AR-15s are no more “unusual” than a pistol or shotgun.
Many in the NRA and others who are generally opposed to gun control do believe that improving mental health treatment will stop people from illegally using guns. They also support increased criminal penalties for illegal gun use. They believe this will deter would-be criminals from becoming active shooters.

**Arming Teachers and School Staff**

In 2012, after Sandy Hook, NRA President Wayne LaPierre famously stated, “The only way to stop a bad guy with a gun is a good guy with a gun.” Therefore, he proposed that states and localities should pass laws that allow teachers to carry firearms on campus. President Trump has echoed the NRA position.

In March 2018, President Trump appointed U.S. Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos to lead a commission to come up with ways to keep schools safe. DeVos supports allowing teachers trained in firearms to carry them into classrooms. In fact, DeVos’s home state of Michigan has allowed trained teachers to carry concealed handguns in some districts.

Texas and Utah, as well, allow teachers to carry concealed handguns in schools. And in Ohio, schools may have firearms locked away, accessible only with authorized thumbprints, for emergency use by school staff. In March 2018, Florida passed a law allowing teachers to undergo law enforcement training.

Many oppose these approaches because they believe the practice is ineffective. National Education Association President Lily Eskelsen Garcia says, “We need solutions that will keep guns out of the hands of those who use them to massacre innocent children and educators. Arming teachers does nothing to prevent that.”

Opponents also believe that arming teachers is, in itself, a bad lesson for students and society. Many have called it “dystopian” to arm teachers. A dystopia is the opposite of a utopia, the opposite of a perfect world.

**WRITING & DISCUSSION**

1. In your opinion, which set of laws, federal or state, seem to address the problems of gun violence more effectively? Use evidence from the article in your answer.

2. Of the proposed policies to address gun violence at schools, which seem most effective? Why?

3. What is your opinion of gun control? Adam Lankford, a professor of criminology at the University of Alabama, has found that countries with higher rates of gun ownership experience more mass shootings. In the United States, there are 88.8 guns per 100 people in the country. Does this statistic affect your opinion of gun control? Why or why not?

**ACTIVITY: A New Bill on Gun Violence**

1. You are an elected member of your state’s legislature. You are on a committee that has the task of proposing a new bill intended to lessen gun violence at schools in your state.

2. Form groups of five lawmakers. Each group is a special legislative committee focused on increasing school safety. Re-read the section “Proposed Policies” in the article. Take notes on which policies you think are most effective and which are least effective.

3. Choose a chairperson for your committee. The chairperson keeps the committee on task and will be the spokesperson for the committee.

4. In your committee, discuss the policies and decide which policy or combination of policies your committee will propose to be part of the new bill:
   a. Expanded funding for school resource officers
   b. State-funded training for teachers and school staff in active shooter drills
   c. New gun regulations, or “gun control” measures
   d. Allowing teachers to carry concealed firearms in schools
   e. Another policy not listed

5. Be ready to present your committee’s proposal to the rest of the legislature assembled. Your presentation must include three reasons why your committee reached its conclusion and must reference facts from the article.

**Enrichment Activity**

Each lawmaker faces re-election. After all committees have presented their proposed bills, you will write a short speech of 300-500 words to be delivered to your constituents, the people, that will (a) describe the bill, and (b) convince the people why your support of the bill will benefit them.

**Correction:** The printed version of this Bill of Rights in Action mistakenly stated there is a supplemental activity by teacher Regina Henning Yount for this article. Yount’s supplemental activity is for “The Warsaw Ghetto Uprising” article on page 10. The supmental activity is at the end of the article.
Since the Industrial Revolution, machines have eliminated jobs, but they also have created new ones. However, some argue today that new automation forms like robots and artificial intelligence are not just affecting jobs, but are becoming the workers themselves.

Automation refers to work done by machines that require little or no worker assistance. The term was first widely used in the automobile industry in the late 1940s to refer to automatic machines and controls that operated assembly lines.

During the English Industrial Revolution of the 1700s, hand weavers and many other craftspeople lost their jobs to machines. Some of these workers rioted and smashed the new machines. But soon people realized that the steam-powered machinery was creating new jobs, boosting wages, reducing prices, and improving the standard of living for all. The new factories divided up the work into many tasks that required less skill but more workers.

For the next two hundred years, most economists welcomed the idea of destroying old jobs and replacing them with better and more productive ones through advances in technology. In the 20th century, electric-powered machinery once again opened up new jobs.

Automation benefited the employer who saw an increase in labor productivity, the average rate of a worker’s hourly output. This increased profits. Automation also reduced repetitive, dangerous, and hard physical labor while boosting pay for skilled workers to operate complex machines. Consumers benefitted from cheaper prices. However, there was a potential dark side to automation.

In 1930, British economist John Maynard Keynes predicted that there would be rapid technological progress over the next 90 years. However, he foresaw an emerging problem. “We are being afflicted with a new disease,” he warned, “...namely technological unemployment.” He was one of the first economists to worry that more and more technology may not mean more and more jobs, but fewer of them.

Automation Today

The modern era of automation started after World War II. Then the “computer revolution” in the 1980s followed by the “Internet revolution” speeded up the replacement of worker tasks by machines.

Automation in the U.S. made its first big impact in manufacturing, especially for automobiles. General Motors first introduced industrial robots into its factories in the 1960s.

Industrial robots are machines that do not need a human operator. They can be programmed to do multiple tasks like welding, assembling, and packaging with speed and accuracy, outdoing human capability. They can work 24 hours a day with little maintenance.

The robots today are most often used for routine manufacturing jobs like placing a computer chip into a smartphone. But robots have many other uses such as retrieving items in a warehouse for shipping. Worldwide, there are almost two million industrial robots in operation. In 2017, South Korea was the most automated country in the world with one robot for every 19 human workers.
Other examples of automation are everywhere today:

- Restaurants can enable customers to self-order meals that are prepared by robots in the kitchen, delivered by robot waiters, and paid for on a tablet.
- Machines can read millions of medical research articles and records to diagnose illnesses and recommend treatment.
- Judges can use software to help them make decisions on bail and probation, avoiding human biases and inconsistencies.
- Wall Street computer programs can buy and sell stocks in milliseconds.
- Universities are adopting inexpensive online education systems called MOOCs (massive open online courses).
- In 2018, Amazon opened an experimental convenience store without any checkouts. Customers download a smartphone app that allows them to enter the store where they scan each purchase and then walk out the door. They are billed later.

Automation Tomorrow

Automation is advancing rapidly in the area of “artificial intelligence” (AI). AI attempts to simulate functions of the human mind such as reasoning, learning, problem solving, decision-making, and understanding human speech. AI utilizes algorithms, which are sets of steps usually written in computer software code.

Artificial intelligence is often compared to the earlier general purpose steam and electric power technologies. The goal of AI is to empower machines to think like people and match or even exceed their performance. This is already happening in some activities, such as games like chess and Jeopardy! Currently, over 600 companies are developing AI systems in the United States.

In manufacturing, artificial intelligence is moving beyond traditional industrial robots, which are usually programmed to do a routine task. AI systems can control, manage, and maintain factory floors filled with industrial robots and other “smart machines.” Once a machine “learns” a new algorithm from human input, the change can be quickly communicated to other machines that are all networked together. AI developers predict that a fully automated factory would ultimately only need a few on-site engineers and highly trained technicians to keep manufacturing operations running smoothly.

Artificial intelligence is rapidly branching off into many other surprising areas:

- Self-driving or driverless cars can operate and navigate themselves without human assistance.
- Machines are beginning to master capabilities once thought to be exclusively human: writing, music composition, understanding and speaking natural human language (e.g., Siri and Alexa), and, ironically, algorithms that create algorithms.
- 3-D printing is being developed to produce cheap consumer-produced car parts and someday maybe human organs.
- AI-controlled tools are likely to perform surgeries and “edit” malfunctioning genes.
- Robots are being developed to provide care and conversation for elderly persons living alone.

What are the limits of robots, artificial intelligence, and other forms of automation? Some will say there are no limits. But, at least today, the cost of this advanced technology is a barrier. A high-end laser self-driving car system costs up to $75,000, which does not include the car itself. Another barrier is social resistance. Will people accept the wonders of AI if that means lots of people will lose their jobs?

Automation and Jobs

In his 2015 book *Rise of the Robots*, futurist Martin Ford challenged the old assumption that machines are tools that increase worker productivity. Instead,
he declared, “machines themselves are turning into workers.”

In the past, big manufacturing companies such as General Motors hired hundreds of thousands of low to medium skilled workers. But today’s new automated companies like Google and Facebook employ relatively small numbers of tech-savvy employees.

Erik Brynjolfsson is a researcher at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He and his colleagues have noticed a set of contradictory trends that they had never seen before in the U.S. economy. Starting in 1950:

- Labor productivity (the rate of worker output) continued to rise; 
- GDP (gross domestic product), the output of U.S. goods and services adjusted for inflation, continued to rise; but 
- Family income, adjusted for inflation, began to fall in the mid-1980s, and private employment growth slowed around 2000.

In addition, corporate profits increased, except during recessions, while wages as a percent of GDP fell sharply after 2000. In other words, economic productivity has steadily increased while typical workers’ jobs and income wavered and began to decrease.

Brynjolfsson and others called this separation of economic indicators “The Great Decoupling.” What caused this separation between rising worker productivity, GDP, and corporate profits, but declining worker income, wages, and job growth?

Workers have long blamed companies leaving the country, seeking cheaper labor, as well as expanding U.S. trade with China and deals like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Economists have confirmed these causes to some degree, especially the “trade shocks” with China. But their findings did not account for all the drops in job growth and wages.

Not until the last few years have studies shown that automation has also been a significant cause of job and wage losses. This was already occurring in the 1980s when the computer revolution gained speed, but before the opening up of Chinese trade and the NAFTA deal. A study reported in MIT Economics last year found that the increase in industrial robots between 1990 and 2017 had a “large and robust negative effect on employment and wages.”

Erik Brynjolfsson, the “Decoupling” researcher, found that starting in the 1970s labor productivity continued to rise as wages lagged behind. However, he also saw a slowing of labor productivity just before, during, and after the Great Recession of 2008. He saw this as partly due to a decline in the use of technology during those years.

Labor productivity has very recently begun to recover. Brynjolfsson says that AI may take a while to impact the economy in a big way. Fully integrating electricity into American factories took several decades. “But to me,” Brynjolfsson declares, “It’s dead certain it’s going to happen.”

At Risk of “Technological Unemployment”

What Jobs Are at Risk?

The McKinsey Global Institute is a think tank that lists industries most likely to be automated with current technology: hotel and food services, manufacturing, warehousing, agriculture, retail businesses, and transportation such as trucking. But, as artificial intelligence advances, jobs requiring higher skills and learning will become more at risk, such as journalism, language translation, medical diagnosis, legal research, and computer programming.

By contrast, areas less at risk of automation are the arts, jobs involving negotiation or persuasion, health care, child care, and skilled trades like plumbing.

Who Are at Risk?

Researchers at the University of Redlands (California) last year completed a study of the risks of U.S. job automation according to education level, race, ethnicity, age, and gender. Americans of all groups have a higher risk the less education they have. Those without a high school diploma are six times more likely than high-school graduates to lose a job because of automation.

According to the study, those aged 16-19 have a 66 percent higher risk of automation job loss than those 35-44. Hispanics and African Americans have a greater risk than whites or Asians. And women are more than two times more likely than men to lose a job that is at high risk of being automated. Other studies show that white, non-college-educated men in the U.S. are most at risk from automation, especially in manufacturing.
How Many Workers Are at Risk?

Since 2013, a number of studies have estimated the proportion of workers in the U.S. at risk from automation to be about 10 to 50 percent. In its December 2017 report, the McKinsey Company’s Global Institute stated that up to a third of the U.S. workforce may need to find new jobs as a result of automation. By comparison, 25 percent of workers lost their jobs due to economic conditions at the peak of the Great Depression.

Most occupations today are not likely to entirely disappear, the McKinsey report said, but about two-thirds of them include some tasks that could be automated. In any case, virtually all workers will need to adapt as machines and their jobs evolve.

Most economists are convinced that workers will have to be more educated and possess skills that are hard to automate, like critical thinking. Even then, will average workers be able to compete with the quickening pace of artificial intelligence before the robots replace them? Some argue that workers need to prepare to work with AI machines, which will take advantage of the strengths of both.

Visions for an Automated Future

Economists and others who have studied automation mostly hold one of three visions for the future:

- The **boosters** of automation are confident that history will repeat itself and technology will drive economic growth, create more new jobs, and result in an economy beneficial for all.
- The **critics** of uncontrolled automation worry that if no safeguards for workers are put into place, a major unemployment crisis will occur as more and more workers are put out of work by smarter and smarter machines.
- The **futurists** welcome automation and say it will lead to a “jobless society,” which will liberate people to explore their talents, revive arts and crafts, care for family, and volunteer for the public good.

Nobody really knows which of these visions will become reality. Currently, the U.S. and most other advanced industrial countries are doing little to prepare for any of these visions.

**WRITING & DISCUSSION**

1. What do you think is the best thing about automation? What is the worst? Explain.
2. Overall, do you think automation is good or bad for American workers? Why?
3. What do you think is the most important strength of human workers and AI machines? Why?

**ACTIVITY: Preparing for the Automated Economy**

In this simulation, one group will role play members of a congressional committee whose task is to propose legislation to prepare for the coming automated economy. Three groups, representing the visions of the automation boosters, critics, and futurists, will lobby the committee with their ideas.

1. Each lobby group should plan a presentation to the congressional committee to argue for specific ideas that reflect its vision for the future. The ideas listed below are some suggestions to consider, but the lobby groups may propose other ideas based on information in the article and their own thoughts.
2. The members of the congressional committee should ask questions during each presentation. They will then discuss the ideas they have heard, and pick the ones they will recommend for legislation by the full Congress, taking a vote if necessary. Finally, the committee members should explain why they have chosen them and not the others.

**Some Ideas to Prepare for the Automated Economy**

- fund basic research to develop advanced automation
- fund tuition-free community (2 year) colleges and online learning to expand technical job certifications and retrain workers
- fund vocational high schools that will emphasize a STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) curriculum
- mandate businesses to reskill their workers to work with AI machines
- tax robots and AI machines
- fund a basic guaranteed income for those who are retraining, unable to learn needed skills, or need it in a “jobless society”
- increase taxes for companies and owners profiting from automation
- fund grants for the arts and jobs difficult to automate
Before reading the article, have students think-pair-share about their knowledge of artificial intelligence (AI).

After students read the article, have them think-pair-share again about how their knowledge of artificial intelligence may have changed due to the reading. After one or two minutes of sharing, have each pair join with another pair to form a group of four. Have the pairs exchange their knowledge of AI within their groups. Let them know that they will use their knowledge of AI for the next part of the activity.

Each group now represents a team of partners looking to create a business in one of the categories listed below (A-F). Assign a category to each group. It is fine if more than one group has the same category. Each new business must rely on artificial intelligence as its main source of labor. Groups will have 20 minutes to discuss and write down (a) a name and brief description of the new business, (b) how AI will be used, and (c) the pros and cons of using AI as a main source of labor in the business.

A. Restaurant  B. Clothing shop  C. Landscaping company
D. Hotel  E. House cleaning company  F. Supermarket

After 20 minutes, have each group share their new business. Hold a whole-class discussion about the pros and cons of using artificial intelligence as a main source of labor in the new businesses.

Exit slip: On a sheet of paper, have each student answer the following questions: Should our society replace more or fewer jobs with AI? Why?
After the German Nazis invaded Poland in 1939, they forced Polish Jews to live in city zones called ghettos. The largest ghetto was in Warsaw. In 1942, the Germans exterminated the majority of the Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto. But young Jews who remained in the ghetto vowed to fight the next time Nazis came.

Warsaw Ghetto
By 1941, over 400,000 Jews filled the Warsaw Ghetto. The Germans built an eight foot wall with guarded gates to enclose it. Everyone over the age of 12 had to wear an armband with the Jewish Star of David on it. The Germans prohibited the Jews to leave the ghetto without permission.

To govern the ghetto, the Germans approved a Jewish community council called the Judenrat, headed by Adam Czerniakow. He was a Jewish engineer who had some experience in Warsaw city government, but was unknown to most of the ghetto’s Jews.

The real job of Czerniakow and the Judenrat council was to carry out the orders of the German authorities. Among its many duties, the Judenrat established a force of Jewish Police to maintain order in the ghetto. But the Jewish Police were also merely a tool of the Germans.

About half the working age men and women living in the ghetto were unemployed and depended on help from friends and public soup kitchens. Each week hundreds died because of hunger and disease.

German owners of companies that manufactured uniforms and other supplies for the army set up workshops in the ghetto. The owners paid Jewish workers starvation wages while making huge profits. Workers were beaten for not filling quotas.

The most persistent problem suffered by all in the ghetto was getting enough food. Jewish gangs smuggled in food and other goods from outside the ghetto and then charged the people high prices for them.

Many poor families depended on their children to smuggle food for them. It was easier for those 12 and under who did not have to wear a Jewish armband to move about Polish neighborhoods scavenging for potatoes and bread. What follows is an excerpt from a poem by Henryka Lazowertowna who lived in the ghetto and later died at the Treblinka extermination camp.

The Little Smuggler
Over the walls, through holes, through the guard posts,
Through the wire, through the rubble, through the fence,
Hungry, cheeky, stubborn,
I slip through, I nip through like a cat.
At midday, in the night, at dawn,
In snowstorms, foul weather, and heat,
A hundred times I risk my life,
I stick out my childish neck.
A rough sack under my arm,
Wearing torn rags on my back,
With nimble young legs
And in my heart constant fear.
But you have to bear it all,
And you have to put up with it all,
So that tomorrow you
Will have your fill of bread.

The Great Deportation

In June 1941, Adolf Hitler ordered his armies to invade the Soviet Union. Special units of the Nazi Party’s Schutzstaffel, or “Protection Squadrons” known as the SS, followed the German army across Eastern Europe. They rounded up entire Jewish communities and shot them to death.

The Germans also occupied Lithuania, just north of Poland. In the fall of 1941, the SS massacred about 40,000 Jews living in the ghetto of the country’s capital, Vilna. Afterward, for the first time, Jewish survivors there organized an armed underground resistance (a secret illegal movement).

Eyewitness accounts of these horrors reached the Warsaw Ghetto early in 1942. But the Judenrat leaders and most of the people dismissed the idea that the Nazis were going to murder all the Jews. They thought the idea was too far-fetched. Jewish youth organizations, however, called for organizing an armed resistance as was done in Vilna. But the Judenrat elders argued that resistance would bring “catastrophe” to the Warsaw Ghetto.

On January 20, 1942, Hitler, Heinrich Himmler, and other top Nazi leaders agreed on a “final solution to the Jewish problem.” This was to destroy the entire population of European Jews whom the Nazis said were an inferior race. Himmler then took charge and ordered the construction of camps with gas chambers in Poland. One of these death camps was Treblinka near Warsaw.

Meanwhile, Adam Czerniakow, the Judenrat leader, tried to convince the people in the ghetto that the Germans would leave them alone because of their huge numbers. Besides, they were needed for their labor in the German workshops. But on July 19, 1942, SS Reichsfuehrer Heinrich Himmler ordered the removal of the Warsaw Ghetto Jews to Treblinka for extermination.

On July 22, Himmler’s SS troops suddenly appeared in the ghetto and ordered the people, block by block, to go to a large assembly area called the Umschlagplatz (Transport Place). Members of the Judenrat and employees of the German-owned ghetto workshops were exempted. Some able to work were separated from their families, including their children, and sent to real work camps. But most of the others in the ghetto were loaded into railroad cattle cars that took them directly to Treblinka and death.

Each day, groups of Jews passively left their homes and were led to the Umschlagplatz by Jewish Police who were also exempted from the deportation. SS troops beat and sometimes shot those who resisted in any way.

From July 22 to September 24, 1942, a period later called the Great Deportation, about 300,000 Jews from the Warsaw Ghetto perished at Treblinka. Among them was a group of orphans and the head of their orphanage who marched together one day to the Umschlagplatz.

On the second day of the Great Deportation, Adam Czerniakow committed suicide when he finally realized that the deported Jews were not being “resettled” but were instead gassed and then cremated. In a suicide note to his wife, he wrote: “They are demanding of me that I kill the children of my people with my own hands. Nothing is left for me but to die.”

The Resistance

After the Great Deportation, about 60,000 Jews remained in the ghetto, some legally, some in hiding. The Judenrat leaders who had argued against resistance were now discredited. A debate then took place among underground organizations about what to do to save the rest of the Jews of the Warsaw Ghetto.

Some wanted to escape the ghetto and join Polish guerilla fighters. Others argued for a mass breakout in which they would hide among the Polish people of Warsaw. The Jewish youth leaders, however, pleaded to fight the Germans when they came into the ghetto again. This time the young Jews won the debate.
After making the decision to fight, the numerous and often quarrelsome Jewish political organizations and parties failed to agree on a single resistance group and commander. As a result, two groups emerged. The leading group was the Jewish Fighting Organization (ZOB, the initials of the group’s name in Polish). It had tried to organize during the Great Deportation, and even attempted to assassinate the head of the Jewish Police.

In October 1942, the ZOB regrouped with the support of most of the Jewish political parties. Membership in a party was required. About 500 young men and women joined the ZOB. The man chosen to be the military commander was Mordechai Anielewicz, age 23.

The ZOB members had no military experience or training and, crucially, no weapons. Anielewicz immediately tried to make contact with the Polish underground to get guns and training from them, but was only partly successful. Most of the ZOB’s weapons consisted of old pistols and hand-made fire-grenades (gasoline in bottles with a wick).

In 1941, former Jewish officers and soldiers of the Polish army had organized the second resistance group, the Jewish Military Union (ZZW). The ZZW welcomed all who were willing to fight the Germans. The ZZW attracted about 250 members. Pawel Frenkel, age 21, became the group’s senior military commander.

The ZZW had stronger contacts than the ZOB with Polish guerilla fighters. They provided the ZZW with training and large numbers of weapons, including machine guns. Unlike the ZOB, the ZZW prepared escape tunnels under the ghetto’s walls.

After failing to unify, the ZOB and ZZW agreed to defend separate areas of the ghetto. The fighting groups encouraged the civilians to build hiding places, called bunkers, stocked with survival supplies. Some were secret rooms in homes, but most were underground dugouts.

In January 1943, the resistance expected the Germans to start a second deportation of the ghetto. The following is an excerpt from a ZOB proclamation distributed to the people.

**ZOB Proclamation**

Jewish Masses—the hour is drawing near. You must be ready to resist, not give yourselves up to slaughter as sheep. Not a single Jew should go to the railroad cars. Those who are unable to put up an active resistance should resist passively, meaning go into hiding. . . . Our slogan must be: All are ready to die as human beings.

(From *The Uprising and the Revolt in the Warsaw Ghetto* (1965), Nahman Blumental and Yosef Kermish, eds.)

**The Uprising**

SS Reichsfuehrer Himmler wanted to “erase” the rest of the Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto. However, Walter Tobbens and the other German owners of ghetto workshops used political pressure to transfer their workshop employees to new locations outside of Warsaw.

On January 18, 1943, SS units together with Ukrainian support troops suddenly invaded the ghetto. This time, however, the people did not passively follow German orders to line up in the streets and march to the Umschlagplatz. Instead, they hid in their bunkers, forcing the Germans to find and remove them. As the SS forcibly rounded up people, Mordechai Anielewicz, the ZOB commander, mixed some of his fighters in with them. Then at his signal, the fighters pulled out their pistols and fired at the Germans. The German soldiers were shocked and yelled, “The Jews are shooting at us!”

The young ZOB and ZZW fighters sniped at and ambushed the Germans as they searched for bunkers. But after four days, the Germans retreated from the ghetto. The people cheered their resistance heroes.

The ZOB and ZZW fighters knew the Germans would be back. They used the gap in fighting to get more weapons and make passageways through attics and cellars to move quickly from one position to another.

Three months later, the Germans again entered the ghetto and met strong Jewish resistance, forcing the Germans to again retreat. Himmler immediately replaced the ineffective commander with one of his own SS men, Brigadefuhrer Jurgen Stroop.

Stroop commanded about 2,000 officers and men. They were heavily armed with rifles, machine guns, artillery, flamethrowers, and a few tanks. Each day the SS and other German forces blocked off certain neighborhoods, searched for bunkers, forced the people out of them, and marched them to the Umschlagplatz for transport to Treblinka. All this time, the Germans had to defend themselves, mostly from the lightly armed ZOB fighters, shooting from surrounding buildings.

There was one major battle that lasted several days at Muranowski Square where Pawel Frenkel and his more heavily armed ZZW fighters made a stand. At one point, they raised two flags on top of one of the buildings: one with the Jewish star and the other a Polish flag. Himmler was furious and ordered Stroop to “bring down those flags at all costs.” He feared a Polish revolt. The “battle of the flags” was intense, but the Germans finally overwhelmed the ZZW fighters with superior numbers of infantry, artillery, and flamethrowers.
The fighting in the ghetto continued for days from bunker to bunker. Stroop finally ordered the entire ghetto to be set on fire “to make these subhumans show themselves above ground.” Many Jews suffocated or were burned alive in their bunkers as buildings collapsed over them.

During the “battle of the bunkers,” more and more ZOB and ZZW fighters were killed. Survivors began to escape through smugglers’ tunnels and sewers.

The End

On May 8, the Germans discovered the ZOB’s large headquarters at their 18 Mila Street bunker, which was filled with fighters and civilians. The civilians surrendered, but the fighters, including the ZOB commander, Mordechai Anielewicz, refused to give up. The Germans pumped poison gas and threw grenades into the bunker. What happened next was recorded by a ZOB courier in a memoir she wrote after the war.

The Mila 18 Bunker
The fighters returned fire. . . . The gas continued to penetrate the bunker and the fighters began to suffocate. But there was not a single one who was ready to fall into the hands of the enemy alive. A shot was heard from the bunker. The fighters had shot themselves. . . . Thus ended the lives of people who incited the Jews of the ghetto to rebel with fearless determination.

(From On Both Sides of the Wall (1977) by Vladka Meed)

On May 16, Stroop personally blew up the Great Synagogue of Warsaw. In his daily report he declared, “Jews, bandits, and subhumans were destroyed. The former Jewish quarter of Warsaw is no longer in existence.”

Pawel Frenkel, the ZZW leader, had escaped with some of his fighters to a hideout in Polish Warsaw. On June 19, the Germans discovered them and a battle took place where Frenkel and the others were killed.

According to Stroop’s reports, the total number of Jews captured or killed in the Uprising was 56,065. About 7,000 of them were deported to Treblinka. Others were sent to labor, prison, and other extermination camps. Most of the Jewish Police lost their special status and were executed. Between July 1942 and June 1943, nearly the entire population of 400,000 Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto had been wiped out.

The number of Germans killed was between 16 (Stroop’s reports) and 86 (Polish press). After the war, Jurgen Stroop was tried as a war criminal.

He was convicted and hanged at the site of the destroyed Warsaw Ghetto in 1952.

The Jewish Warsaw Ghetto Uprising was the first major urban rebellion in any German-occupied country. It inspired other revolts and even a partly successful breakout at Treblinka.

WRITING & DISCUSSION
1. What dangers did Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto face if they tried to escape from the ghetto?
2. Why did the resistance want to fight the Germans?
3. Why do you think Jurgen Stroop was convicted and hanged as a war criminal?

ACTIVITY: Primary Sources of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

A poem, proclamation, photograph, and survivor’s account provide primary source information in the article. Form groups of 3-5 to study these sources and answer the accompanying questions. Then, hold a class discussion to share the small groups’ answers.

The Little Smuggler
Do you think parents were justified in having their children smuggle food? Why?

ZOB Proclamation
What as the significance of the slogan “All are read to die as human beings”? In what way did the uprising illustrate this slogan?

“Dragged Out of Bunkers by Force”
Study the little boy, the woman looking at the soldier holding the rifle, and the soldier himself. What thoughts and feelings do you think they likely had the moment the photo was taken?

The Mila 18 Bunker
In the end, what three words would you use to characterize the resistance fighters? Why?
RAFTs are a creative outlet for students, allowing them to immerse themselves in history and explore roles and relationships between historical figures and events.

Procedure
1. Divide students into pairs. Tell students they will be researching people who lived in the Warsaw Ghetto and writing from those people’s perspectives.
2. Assign one of the people listed below to each pair. Each student in each pair will (a) research the assigned person, (b) share and discuss research with his or her partner, and (c) do their own writing (i.e., two written products per pair as described in the (F) column).
   a. Students should be sure to complete their writings considering who their audience is and use the correct format.
   b. Students should be sure to include important vocabulary in context within their writing.
3. Have students meet in groups of four or five in which each of the four people listed below is represented. Once in groups, have students take turns reading their writings aloud to their small groups.
4. Have students in each group jot down questions for each reader based on what they hear (Who? What? Why? Where? How?). They should ask these questions of each reader after the reader has finished reading his or her written product.
5. Collect their writings and display them in the classroom.

Note: The last two columns of the chart below can be easily eliminated for advanced students who can do their own quality research and include important vocabulary. For students that need more support doing quality research, online links have been provided in the Sources (S) column. For added convenience for the teacher to use during grading, or to provide scaffolding for struggling students, the Vocabulary (V) column includes vocabulary that should be explored during the research project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role (R)</th>
<th>Audience (A)</th>
<th>Format (F)</th>
<th>Topic (T)</th>
<th>Sources (S)</th>
<th>Vocabulary (V)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Civics on Call
Discussion of current events and controversial issues is one of the six proven practices of highly effective civic education identified by the Civic Mission of Schools (CMS). “When students have an opportunity to discuss current issues in a classroom setting,” reports CMS, “they tend to have a greater interest in civic life and politics as well as improved critical thinking and communication skills.”

Civics on Call, is a one-stop web page for classroom-ready lessons on issues of the day. All lessons are free, downloadable, and reproducible for classroom use. We will continue to add lessons here for your easy access, and you will find the following current events lessons at Civics on Call today:

- Guns and School Safety: What is the Best Way Forward?
- The Iran Nuclear Deal and Its Critics
- What Should the U.S. Do About North Korea’s Nuclear Weapons?
- Understanding 'Fake News'
- The Emoluments Clause and the President
- Youth and Police
- Immigration Enforcement Raids
- The Syrian Refugee Crisis and U.S. Policy
- Police Body Cameras and the Use of Force
- and more...

Standards Addressed
Guns and School Safety
National Civics Standard 26: Understands issues regarding the proper scope and limits of rights and the relationships among personal, political, and economic rights. Middle School Benchmark 4: Understands different positions on a contemporary conflict between rights and other social values and interests (e.g., the right of the public to know what their government is doing versus the need for national security; the right to property versus the protection of the environment). High School Benchmark 2: Understands different positions on a contemporary conflict between rights such as one person’s right to free speech versus another person’s right to be heard.

California History-Social Science Standard 12.2: Students evaluate and take and defend positions on the scope and limits of rights and obligations as democratic citizens, their relationships among them, and how they are secured. (3) Discuss the individual’s legal obligations to obey the law, serve as a juror, and pay taxes.

California History-Social Science Standard 12.7: Students analyze and compare the powers and procedures of the national, state, tribal, and local governments. (3) Discuss reserved powers and concurrent powers of state governments. (5) Explain how public policy is formed, including the setting of the public agenda and implementation of it through regulations and executive orders.

California History-Social Science Standard 12.10: Students formulate questions about and defend their analyses of tensions within our constitutional democracy and the importance of maintaining a balance between the following concepts: majority rule and individual rights; liberty and equality; state and national authority in a federal system; civil disobedience and the rule of law; freedom of the press and the right to a fair trial; the relationship of religion and government.


Automation
National U.S. History Standard 3: Understands economic, social, and cultural developments in the contemporary United States. Middle School Benchmark 1: Understands how changes in the national and global economy have influenced the workplace (e.g., sluggishness in the overall rate of economic growth, the relative stagnation of wages since 1973, the social and political impact of an increase in income disparities, the effects of increased global trade and competition on the U.S. economy, the influence of new technology on education and learning, and the relation between education and earnings in the workplace). High School Benchmark 1: Understands how changes in the national and global economy have influenced the workplace (e.g., sluggishness in the overall rate of economic growth, the relative stagnation of wages since 1973, the social and political impact of an increase in income disparities, the effects of increased global trade and competition on the U.S. economy, the influence of new technology on education and learning, and the relation between education and earnings in the workplace).

California History-Social Science Standard 11.8: Students analyze the economic boom and social transformation of post-World War II America. (7) Describe the effects on society and the economy of technological developments since 1945, including the computer revolution, changes in communication, advances in medicine, and improvements in agricultural technology.


Warsaw Ghetto Uprising
National World History Standard 4: Understands the causes and global consequences of World War II. High School Benchmark 2: Understands the Holocaust and its impact on Jewish culture and European society (e.g., the chronology of the Nazi “war on the Jews,” and the geography and scale of Jewish deaths resulting from this policy; personal reasons for resistance to or compliance with Nazi policies and orders; the brutality of Nazi genocide in the Holocaust as revealed in personal stories of the victims).

California History-Social Science Standard 10.8: Students analyze the causes and consequences of World War II. (5) Analyze the Nazi policy of pursuing racial purity, especially against the European Jews; its transformation into the Final Solution; and the Holocaust that resulted in the murder of six million Jewish civilians.


Standards reprinted with permission:
National Standards © 2000 McREL, Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning, 2550 S. Parker Road, Ste. 500, Aurora, CO 80014, (303)337.0990. California Standards copyrighted by the California Dept. of Education, P.O. Box 271, Sacramento, CA 95812.

Common Core State Standards used under public license. © Copyright 2010. National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and Council of Chief State School Officers. All rights reserved.
Landmarks: Historic U.S. Supreme Court Decisions
Linked to U.S. history and civics standards
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, outlining the decision, and explaining its 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 debriefing questions and suggestions.


Of Codes & Crowns: From the Ancient World to the Renaissance (3rd. Ed.)
Linked to world history standards
Grades 9-12

One of our most popular texts—Of Codes and Crown features lessons with:
- Short, high-interest readings.
- Discussion questions to facilitate understanding.
- Interactive activities to foster critical thinking.

Unit 1: Hammurabi’s Treasure explores the concept of lex talionis, the law of retribution, and an ancient set of laws—The Code of Hammurabi.

Unit 2: Blood Feud discusses the Greek tribunal system and the myth of Orestes.

Unit 3: Jewish Law looks at the development of Jewish law, one of the foundations of Western legal tradition.

Unit 4: Roman Law traces the more than 1,000-year evolution of this law—from its beginnings in the city-state of Rome through the republic and empire.

Unit 5: Islamic Law looks at the origins and development of Islamic law.

Unit 6: Merry Old England examines the medieval English jury system, one far different from ours today.

Unit 7: The Magna Carta analyzes how the English got King John to limit the power of monarchs.

Unit 8: The Trial of Galileo explores the conflict between the greatest scientist of the time and church officials who believed his ideas clashed with church doctrine. Of Codes & Crowns has an extensive teacher’s guide containing discussion questions and answers, and step-by-step instructions for the interactive lessons.

FREE Sample Lessons Online www.crf-usa.org/publications
ORDER ONLINE NOW: www.crf-usa.org/publications
MOCK TRIAL CASE: People v. Davidson

A Murder Trial. Featuring a pretrial argument on the Fourth Amendment

Casey Davidson faces a felony count of first degree murder for the death of Alex Thompson, a member of an extremist nationalist group. The prosecution alleges that Davidson murdered Thompson shortly after a political rally had just taken place. After Thompson was punched at the rally and walked away, Davidson allegedly followed Thompson. A short time later, Thompson's was found dead. The prosecution alleges that Davidson willfully and deliberately struck Thompson and that Davidson had done so with premeditation, even posting threatening messages on a social network.

The defense argues that Davidson did not murder Thompson and has an alibi for what happened at the time of death. According to the defense, Davidson was an activist in a nonviolent group, and had a history of mediating behavior during conflict. The defense also argues that forensic blood evidence found on Davidson's clothing was the result of Davidson's close proximity to Thompson when Thompson was punched at the rally. The messages on the social network, the defense argues, were in one case the result of someone other than Davidson, and in another case the result Davidson responding to an incident in which Thompson physically injured Davidson.

The pretrial issue focuses on whether it is a search under the Fourth Amendment for the government to obtain routinely collected GPS location data from a third-party GPS provider and against self-incrimination.

#70245CWB People v. Davidson, 80 pp. $5.95 ea.
#70118CWB People v. Davidson (Set of 10) $29.95 set
#70647CWB People v. Davidson, e-Book $4.95 ea.
Video People v. Davidson Video Available June 2018 (Download or stream online at Amazon Video starting at $3.99)

ORDER ONLINE NOW: www.crf-usa.org/publications