

Virginia and US History Learning in Place 2020

Week 1

✓	Task	Text	Write
	How, where, and why did the US become involved in confrontations with the Soviet Union during the Cold War?	Virginia & US History textbook Pgs. 610-616 Pgs. 663-668 Pgs. 708-721 Pgs. 748-752 Alternative source: http://DigitalLearning.whro.org Username: WHROcourses PW: Digital_Learning US History Module 9, 11	1. Create a timeline of major events that the US was involved in during the Cold War. Include at least 5 events in your timeline. Additionally, write a paragraph describing how the US' foreign policy changed over this series of events. Your paragraph should include the terms: interventionism, isolationism, containment, quarantine, "flexible response," and "Vietnamization."
		"Presidential Speeches- Cuban Missile Crisis and Vietnam War" (Packet)	2. Compare and contrast the reasons for US involvement in the Cuban Missile Crisis and the Vietnam War. Discuss the evidence presented by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson on the reasons why the US needed to become involved, and the actions that each President did, or said they would, take. Use specific quotes or evidence from the documents to support your answer. If typed, 12 point font: no less than 2 pages, no more than 4 pages. If hand-written, no less than 4 pages, no more than 6 pages.

Week 2

✓	Task	Text	Write
	How did the Cold War impact Americans?	Virginia & US History textbook Pgs. 618-622 Alternative source: http://DigitalLearning.whro.org Username: WHROcourses PW: Digital_Learning US History Module 9, 11	1. Consider the historical events surrounding the early Cold War era. Were HUAC and Senator McCarthy justified in investigating people who were suspected of being Communists? Defend your response. If typed, your response should be no less than 2 pages and no more than 3 pages. If handwritten, your response should be no less than 3 pages and no more than 4 pages.

	Describe the US-Soviet Relationship in the 1980s.	Virginia & US History textbook Pgs. 786-787 Pgs. 793-794 Alternative source: http://DigitalLearning.whro.org Username: WHROcourses PW: Digital_Learning US History Module 9, 11	2. Answer the following questions in complete sentences: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What was President Reagan’s policy with regard to the Soviet Union? How did this policy impact US involvement in international conflicts? How and why did President Reagan build up the military during this time period? How did Mikhail Gorbachev change Soviet policy? Why did the Soviet Union collapse? (Give at least 3 reasons).
		Military Build-Up, Background and Documents A-B (Packet)	3. What argument is President Reagan making about why America should invest in this military development? How is his military development plan reflected in the defense spending? If typed, 12 point font: no less than 1 page, no more than 2 pages. If hand-written, no less than 2 pages, no more than 4 pages.

Week 3

✓	Task	Text	Write
	What impact did <i>Brown v. Board</i> have on the US?	Virginia & US History textbook Pages 680-685 Alternative source: http://DigitalLearning.whro.org Username: WHROcourses PW: Digital_Learning US History Module 10	1. Answer the following textbook questions in complete sentences: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What events led to the need for the case <i>Brown v. Board</i>? Why was the ruling in <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> significant and how did Virginia respond to it? How did the circumstances surrounding <i>Brown v. Board</i> represent the larger context of the civil rights movement in the United States?
		<i>Brown v. Board</i> and <i>Davis v. County School Board</i> , Background and key players (Packet)	2. Using a Venn diagram, compare and contrast the two court cases. What was the purpose of each? Who were the complainants? What was the result? Additionally, determine who you believe to be the four most important people involved in these two landmark Civil Rights cases. Write a paragraph explaining your choices.

	<p>How did Americans work to gain Civil Rights for all?</p>	<p>Virginia & US History textbook Pgs 688-694 Pgs. 762-767</p>	<p>3. Create a timeline of major events and achievements in the expansion of civil rights. Include at least 5 events. Additionally, write a paragraph that discusses the role of American citizens and the government in effecting these changes.</p>
		<p>Alternative source: http://DigitalLearning.whro.org Username: WHROcourses PW: Digital_Learning US History Module 10</p>	<p>4. Compare and contrast the approaches to gaining Civil Rights in the 1950s/60s and 1970s. What approaches, groups, or types of events were the same, and what changed over this time period? If typed, 12 point font: no less than 1 page, no more than 2 pages. If hand-written, no less than 2 pages, no more than 4 pages.</p>

NPS

Learn in Place

Supplemental Packet:
Virginia & US History

PRESIDENTIAL SPEECHES- CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS & VIETNAM WAR

Document A: Radio and TV Report to the American People on the Soviet Arms Buildup in Cuba.

President John F. Kennedy

The White House

October 22, 1962

Good evening my fellow citizens:

This Government, as promised, has maintained the closest surveillance of the Soviet Military buildup on the island of Cuba. Within the past week, unmistakable evidence has established the fact that a series of offensive missile sites is now in preparation on that imprisoned island. The purpose of these bases can be none other than to provide a nuclear strike capability against the Western Hemisphere...

The characteristics of these new missile sites indicate two distinct types of installations. Several of them include medium range ballistic missiles capable of carrying a nuclear warhead for a distance of more than 1,000 nautical miles. Each of these missiles, in short, is capable of striking Washington, D.C., the Panama Canal, Cape Canaveral, Mexico City, or any other city in the southeastern part of the United States, in Central America, or in the Caribbean area...

This urgent transformation of Cuba into an important strategic base--by the presence of these large, long range, and clearly offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction--constitutes an explicit threat to the peace and security of all the Americas, in flagrant and deliberate defiance of the Rio Pact of 1947, the traditions of this Nation and hemisphere, the joint resolution of the 87th Congress, the Charter of the United Nations, and my own public warnings to the Soviets on September 4 and 13. This action also contradicts the repeated assurances of Soviet spokesmen, both publicly and privately delivered, that the arms buildup in Cuba would retain its original defensive character, and that the Soviet Union had no need or desire to station strategic missiles on the territory of any other nation...

Neither the United States of America nor the world community of nations can tolerate deliberate deception and offensive threats on the part of any nation, large or small. We no longer live in a world where only the actual firing of weapons represents a sufficient challenge to a nation's security to constitute maximum peril. Nuclear weapons are so destructive and ballistic missiles are so swift, that any substantially increased possibility of their use or any sudden change in their deployment may well be regarded as a definite threat to peace...

But this secret, swift, and extraordinary buildup of Communist missiles--in an area well known to have a special and historical relationship to the United States and the nations of the Western Hemisphere, in violation of Soviet assurances, and in defiance of American and hemispheric policy--this sudden, clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil--is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo which cannot be accepted by this country, if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again by either friend or foe.

The 1930's taught us a clear lesson: aggressive conduct, if allowed to go unchecked and unchallenged ultimately leads to war. This nation is opposed to war. We are also true to our word. Our unswerving objective, therefore, must be to prevent the use of these missiles against this or any other country, and to secure their withdrawal or elimination from the Western Hemisphere...

Acting, therefore, in the defense of our own security and of the entire Western Hemisphere, and under the authority entrusted to me by the Constitution as endorsed by the resolution of the Congress, I have directed that the following initial steps be taken immediately:

First: To halt this offensive buildup, a strict quarantine on all offensive military equipment under shipment to Cuba is being initiated. All ships of any kind bound for Cuba from whatever nation or port will, if found to contain cargoes of offensive weapons, be turned back. This quarantine will be extended, if needed, to other types of cargo and carriers. We are not at this time, however, denying the necessities of life as the Soviets attempted to do in their Berlin blockade of 1948...

Third: It shall be the policy of this Nation to regard any nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States, requiring a full retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union...

Sixth: Under the Charter of the United Nations, we are asking tonight that an emergency meeting of the Security Council be convoked without delay to take action against this latest Soviet threat to world peace. Our resolution will call for the prompt dismantling and withdrawal of all offensive weapons in Cuba, under the supervision of U.N. observers, before the quarantine can be lifted.

Seventh and finally: I call upon Chairman Khrushchev to halt and eliminate this clandestine, reckless and provocative threat to world peace and to stable relations between our two nations. I call upon him further to abandon this course of world domination, and to join in an historic effort to end the perilous arms race and to transform the history of man. He has an opportunity now to move the world back from the abyss of destruction--by returning to his government's own words that it had no need to station missiles outside its own territory, and withdrawing these weapons from Cuba--by refraining from any action which will widen or deepen the present crisis--and then by participating in a search for peaceful and permanent solutions.

This Nation is prepared to present its case against the Soviet threat to peace, and our own proposals for a peaceful world, at any time and in any forum--in the OAS, in the United Nations, or in any other meeting that could be useful--without limiting our freedom of action. We have in the past made strenuous efforts to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. We have proposed the elimination of all arms and military bases in a fair and effective disarmament treaty. We are prepared to discuss new proposals for the removal of tensions on both sides--including the possibility of a genuinely independent Cuba, free to determine its own destiny. We have no wish to war with the Soviet Union--for we are a peaceful people who desire to live in peace with all other peoples.

But it is difficult to settle or even discuss these problems in an atmosphere of intimidation. ... Any hostile move anywhere in the world against the safety and freedom of peoples to whom we are committed--including in particular the brave people of West Berlin--will be met by whatever action is needed...

My fellow citizens: let no one doubt that this is a difficult and dangerous effort on which we have set out. No one can see precisely what course it will take or what costs or casualties will be incurred. Many months of sacrifice and self-discipline lie ahead--months in which our patience and our will will be tested--months in which many threats and denunciations will keep us aware of our dangers. But the greatest danger of all would be to do nothing.

The path we have chosen for the present is full of hazards, as all paths are--but it is the one most consistent with our character and courage as a nation and our commitments around the world. The cost of freedom is always high--and Americans have always paid it. And one path we shall never choose, and that is the path of surrender or submission.

Our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right--not peace at the expense of freedom, but both peace and freedom, here in this hemisphere, and, we hope, around the world. God willing, that goal will be achieved.

Document B: President Johnson's Message to Congress August 5, 1964

Last night I announced to the American people that the North Vietnamese regime had conducted further deliberate attacks against U.S. naval vessels operating in international waters, and I had therefore directed air action against gunboats and supporting facilities used in these hostile operations. This air action has now been carried out with substantial damage to the boats and facilities. Two U.S. aircraft were lost in the action.

After consultation with the leaders of both parties in the Congress, I further announced a decision to ask the Congress for a resolution expressing the unity and determination of the United States in supporting freedom and in protecting peace in Southeast Asia.

These latest actions of the North Vietnamese regime has given a new and grave turn to the already serious situation in Southeast Asia. Our commitments in that area are well known to the Congress. They were first made in 1954 by President Eisenhower. They were further defined in the [Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty](#) approved by the Senate in February 1955.

[This treaty](#) with its accompanying [protocol](#) obligates the United States and other members to act in accordance with their constitutional processes to meet Communist aggression against any of the parties or protocol states.

Our policy in Southeast Asia has been consistent and unchanged since 1954. I summarized it on June 2 in four simple propositions:

America keeps her word. Here as elsewhere, we must and shall honor our commitments.

The issue is the future of Southeast Asia as a whole. A threat to any nation in that region is a threat to all, and a threat to us.

Our purpose is peace. We have no military, political, or territorial ambitions in the area.

This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity. Our military and economic assistance to South Vietnam and Laos in particular has the purpose of helping these countries to repel aggression and strengthen their independence.

The threat to the free nations of Southeast Asia has long been clear. The North Vietnamese regime has constantly sought to take over South Vietnam and Laos. This Communist regime has violated the Geneva accords for Vietnam. It has systematically conducted a campaign of subversion, which includes the direction, training, and supply of personnel and arms for the conduct of guerrilla warfare in South Vietnamese territory. In Laos, the North Vietnamese regime has maintained military forces, used Laotian territory for infiltration into South Vietnam, and most recently carried out combat operations - all in direct violation of the Geneva Agreements of 1962.

In recent months, the actions of the North Vietnamese regime have become steadily more threatening...

As President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress, on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.

As I have repeatedly made clear, the United States intends no rashness, and seeks no wider war. We must make it clear to all that the United States is united in its determination to bring about the end of Communist subversion and aggression in the area. We seek the full and effective restoration of the [international agreements signed in Geneva in 1954](#), with respect to South Vietnam, and again in Geneva in 1962, with respect to Laos...

Military Build-up

Background: President Reagan argued that through a massive defense build-up, the United States would pressure the Soviet Union to continue to keep pace, which would ultimately deplete the Soviets of their resources. During the 1980s defense spending increased from \$134 billion in 1980 before Reagan took office to \$253 billion in 1989 when he left office. This meant that American defense spending was seven percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 1989, and had dramatically increased the federal deficit. Yet the Soviets responded to this increase in spending and in the first half of the 1980s, the Soviets increased their defense spending from 22 to 27 percent of GDP, while they did not increase the production of civilian goods. Much of the increased American defense spending went towards what President Reagan proposed in Document A. In March, 1983, the president went before the American people to introduce the idea for a new defense system that he called the Strategic Defense Initiative, although opponents quickly nicknamed it "Star Wars." The aim, Reagan explained, was to research a way to repel missiles launched by the Soviet Union. Reagan hoped that this proposed technology would make nuclear war obsolete. The Soviet Union was horrified, believing that the initiative would destabilize the careful Cold War balance between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, and give the U.S. first-strike capability.

Document A: "Address to the Nation on Defense and National Security," March 23, 1983.

President Reagan Announces a new Strategic Defense Initiative

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control [reduction of weapons]. "Deterrence" means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States, or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the risks to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression. This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works. But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed... After careful consultation with my advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. ... What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies? I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. And as we proceed, we must remain constant in preserving the nuclear deterrent and maintaining a solid capability for flexible response. But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is.

Document B

Defense Spending Over Time

Fiscal Year	Administration	Total Defense Spending (in millions of dollars)	Percentage Change from Previous Year	Total Defense Spending (in millions of dollars) adjusted for inflation in 2012 dollars	Percentage Change from Previous Year adjusted for inflation in 2012 dollars
1973	Nixon	\$76,681		\$390,857	
1974	Nixon / Ford	\$79,347	3.48%	\$364,366	-6.78%
1975	Ford	\$86,509	9.03%	\$364,366.00	-0.07%
1976	Ford	\$89,816	3.82%	\$357,314	-1.87%
1977	Carter	\$97,241	8.27%	\$363,242	1.66%
1978	Carter	\$104,495	7.46%	\$362,769	-0.13%
1979	Carter	\$116,342	11.34%	\$362,240	-0.15%
1980	Carter	\$133,995	15.17%	\$367,580	1.47%
1981	Reagan	\$157,513	17.55%	\$391,746	6.57%
1982	Reagan	\$185,309	17.65%	\$433,970	10.78%
1983	Reagan	\$209,903	13.27%	\$476,324	10.45%
1984	Reagan	\$227,411	8.34%	\$494,779	3.87%
1985	Reagan	\$252,743	11.14%	\$530,785	7.28%
1986	Reagan	\$273,373	8.16%	\$563,406	6.15%
1987	Reagan	\$281,996	3.15%	\$560,982	-0.43%
1988	Reagan	\$290,360	2.97%	\$554,871	-1.09%
1989	Bush, GHW	\$303,555	4.54%	\$553,417	-0.03%
1990	Bush, GHW	\$299,321	-1.39%	\$517,834	-6.43%
1991	Bush, GHW	\$273,285	-8.70%	\$453,734	-12.38%
1992	Bush, GHW	\$298,346	9.17%	\$480,915	5.99%

Source: Office of Management and Budget, Historical Tables, Adapted from Table 3.2, Outlays by Function and Subfunction, 1962 - 2013, <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Historicals>. To calculate for inflation for more recent years, see <http://www.usinflationcalculator.com/>

Federal Deficit

- 1980 \$907 billion (33% of GDP)
- 1985 \$1.8 trillion
- 1990 \$3.2 trillion (53% of GDP)

Source: Department of Treasury, https://www.treasurydirect.gov/govt/reports/pd/histdebt/histdebt_histod.htm

BROWN ET AL. v. BOARD OF EDUCATION OF TOPEKA ET AL.

Background:

On May 17, 1954, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Earl Warren delivered the unanimous ruling in the landmark civil rights case *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas*. State-sanctioned segregation of public schools was a violation of the 14th Amendment and was therefore unconstitutional. This historic decision marked the end of the "separate but equal" precedent set by the Supreme Court nearly 60 years earlier and served as a catalyst for the expanding civil rights movement during the decade of the 1950s.

Linda Brown

Linda Brown, who was born in 1943, became a part of civil rights history as a third grader in the public schools of Topeka, KS. When Linda was denied admission into a white elementary school, Linda's father, Oliver Brown, challenged Kansas's school segregation laws in the Supreme Court. The NAACP and Thurgood Marshall took up their case, along with similar ones in South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware, as *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Oliver L. Brown

Oliver Brown, a minister in his local Topeka, KS, community, challenged Kansas's school segregation laws in the Supreme Court. Mr. Brown's 8-year-old daughter, Linda, was a black girl attending fifth grade in the public schools in Topeka when she was denied admission into a white elementary school. The NAACP and Thurgood Marshall took up Brown's case along with similar cases in South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware as *Brown v. Board of Education*. Mr. Brown died in 1961.

Robert L. Carter

Born in 1917, Robert Carter, who served as an attorney for the plaintiffs in *Briggs et al. v. Elliott et al.*, was of particular significance to the *Brown v. Board of Education* case because of his role in the *Briggs* case. Carter secured the pivotal involvement of social scientists, particularly Kenneth B. Clark, who provided evidence in the *Briggs* case on segregation's devastating effects on the psyches of black children.

Harold R. Fatzer

As Attorney General of Kansas, Harold Fatzer argued the case for the appellees (Kansas) in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*. Mr. Fatzer served as Kansas Supreme Court Justice from February, 1949, to March, 1956.

Jack Greenberg

Jack Greenberg, who was born in 1924, argued on behalf of the plaintiffs in the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* case, and worked on the briefs in *Belton v. Gebhart*. Jack Greenberg served as director-counsel of the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund from 1961 to 1984.

Thurgood Marshall

Born in 1908, Thurgood Marshall served as lead attorney for the plaintiffs in *Briggs et al. v. Elliott et al.* From 1930 to 1933, Marshall attended Howard University Law School and came under the immediate influence of the school's new dean, Charles Hamilton Houston. Marshall, who also served as lead counsel in the *Brown v. Board of Education* case, went on to become the first African American Supreme Court Justice in U.S. history. Justice Marshall died in 1993.

Frank Daniel Reeves

Frank D. Reeves, who was born in 1916, served as an attorney for the plaintiffs in the *Brown v. Board* decisions of 1954, and 1955 (*Brown II*). Mr. Reeves was the first African American appointed to the District of Columbia Board of Commissioners, although he declined the position. Frank Reeves died in 1973.

Charles Scott

Topeka, KS based lawyer who initially began the Brown case on behalf of Oliver Brown and the other litigants.

John Scott

Topeka, KS based lawyer who initially began the Brown case on behalf of Oliver Brown and the other litigants.

Earl Warren

Chief Justice Earl Warren, who was born in 1891, secured a unanimous decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*, outlawing segregation in public schools and striking down the "separate but equal" doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson*. Warren also delivered the opinion in the District of Columbia case, *Bolling v. Sharpe*. Justice Warren died in 1974.

DAVIS ET AL. v. COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF PRINCE EDWARD COUNTY, VIRGINIA ET AL.

Background:

In April 1951, Barbara Rose Johns, a high school student in Farmville, Virginia, organized a student strike to protest poor school conditions. Four hundred fifty African American students from Moton High School participated in the two-week protest. The student strike committee requested assistance from the NAACP branch office in Richmond, Virginia. The students believed that the deplorable conditions at the school deprived them of equal educational opportunities. Moton had no gymnasium, cafeteria, infirmary or teachers restrooms, and the overflow of students was housed in an old school bus and three buildings covered in tar paper. Local parents had repeatedly sought improvements from the local school board without success.

In May 1951, Spottswood Robinson and Oliver Hill from the local NAACP filed suit on behalf of one hundred seventeen students. The plaintiffs asked that the state law requiring segregated schools in Virginia be struck down. A three-judge panel at the U.S. District Court unanimously rejected the students' request stating, "We have found no hurt or harm to either race." The school board was ordered to proceed with plans to equalize the African American students' school. When the U.S. Supreme Court overturned the ruling and ordered desegregation, white Virginians launched a campaign of massive resistance. The Board of Supervisors for Prince Edward County refused to appropriate any funds for the County School Board for the period 1959-1964, effectively closing the public schools rather than integrate them. Prince Edward County schools remained closed for five years.

Robert L. Carter

Born in 1917, Robert Carter, who served as an attorney for the plaintiffs in *Briggs et al. v. Elliott et al.*, was of particular significance to the *Brown v. Board of Education* case because of his role in the *Briggs* case. Carter secured the pivotal involvement of social scientists, particularly Kenneth B. Clark, who provided evidence in the *Briggs* case on segregation's devastating effects on the psyches of black children.

Dorothy E. Davis

On May 23, 1951, a NAACP lawyer filed suit in the federal district court in Richmond, VA, on behalf of 117 Moton High School, Prince Edward County, VA, students and their parents. The first plaintiff listed was Dorothy Davis, a 14-year old ninth grader; the case was titled *Dorothy E. Davis, et al. v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et. al.* It asked that the state law requiring segregated schools in Virginia be struck down.

John Davis

John Davis, who was born in 1912, filed suit against the County School Board of Prince Edward County, VA, on behalf of his daughters Dorothy, Bertha, and Inez Davis, who were denied access to their local “whites only” school, in the case *Davis et al. v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al.*

Oliver White Hill

Born in 1907, Oliver Hill served as one of the lead attorneys for the plaintiffs on the case *Davis et al. v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, et al.* Hill’s most famous case, *Davis v. Prince Edward County, Virginia*, became part of the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision.

Barbara Rose Johns

On May 23, 1951, a NAACP lawyer, on behalf of 117 Moton High School, Prince Edward County, VA, students and their parents, filed suit in the Federal District court in Richmond, VA. The suit began, however, as a result of a student strike organized and led by 16 year-old Barbara Rose Johns, in an attempt to force the county to provide facilities equal to those provided to white high school students as required by law. Their case eventually became one of five included in the landmark 1954 case, *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Spottswood William Robinson, III

Spottswood W. Robinson, III, who was born in 1916, taught law at Howard University, in Washington, DC, and eventually became dean of the school. He made his mark on the history of *Brown v. Board of Education* along with his legal partner, Oliver W. Hill, by trying and winning the case *Davis et al. v. Prince Edward County School Board, Virginia, et al.* Spottswood Robinson III died in 1998.