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Rating the Essay Question

(1) Follow your school’s procedures for training raters. This process should include:

Introduction to the task—
• Raters read the task
• Raters identify the answers to the task
• Raters discuss possible answers and summarize expectations for student responses

Introduction to the rubric and anchor papers—
• Trainer leads review of specific rubric with reference to the task
• Trainer reviews procedures for assigning holistic scores, i.e., by matching evidence from the response to the rubric
• Trainer leads review of each anchor paper and commentary

Practice scoring individually—
• Raters score a set of five papers independently without looking at the scores and commentaries provided
• Trainer records scores and leads discussion until the raters feel confident enough to move on to actual rating

(2) When actual rating begins, each rater should record his or her individual rating for a student’s essay on the rating sheet provided, not directly on the student’s essay or answer sheet. The rater should not correct the student’s work by making insertions or changes of any kind.

(3) Each essay must be rated by at least two raters; a third rater will be necessary to resolve scores that differ by more than one point.

Rating the Scaffold (open-ended) Questions

(1) Follow a similar procedure for training raters.
(2) The scaffold questions are to be scored by one rater.
(3) The scores for each scaffold question must be recorded in the student’s examination booklet and on the student’s answer sheet. The letter identifying the rater must also be recorded on the answer sheet.
(4) Record the total Part III A score if the space is provided on the student’s Part I answer sheet.

Schools are not permitted to rescore any of the open-ended questions (scaffold questions, thematic essay, DBQ essay) on this exam after each question has been rated the required number of times as specified in the rating guides, regardless of the final exam score. Schools are required to ensure that the raw scores have been added correctly and that the resulting scale score has been determined accurately. Teachers may not score their own students’ answer papers.

The scoring coordinator will be responsible for organizing the movement of papers, calculating a final score for each student’s essay, recording that score on the student’s Part I answer sheet, and determining the student’s final examination score. The conversion chart for this examination is located at http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/ and must be used for determining the final examination score.
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Document 1

…The Cherokees of Georgia, one of the most progressive tribes, attempted to consolidate their position there by setting up a state within a state. They were encouraged to do this by a series of treaties with the United States that recognized them as a nation capable of making peace and war, owning the land within its boundaries and “punishing its own citizens by its own laws.” Georgia was bound, like any other state, to observe the treaties concluded by the federal government, but was obdurate [uncompromising] where the Cherokee treaties were concerned. It [Georgia] refused to recognize the Cherokees as an independent nation, and pressed them to sell their lands. They [the Cherokees] turned a deaf ear to this demand and asked for federal protection. In two major cases [Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia (1831) and Worcester v. Georgia (1832)], the United States Supreme Court upheld the “rights” of the Cherokees against Georgia, only to have the state flout [ignore] each decision.

[President Andrew] Jackson supported Georgia. Whether or not he made the famous comment, “John Marshall has made his opinion, now let him enforce it,” the Jacksonian policy was in full accord with the spirit of the remark. His first annual message [December 1829] asked Congress to set aside a region in the Far West to which the Indians might remove. Congress did so by a strict party vote, and the forced migration began, to continue through the decade of the eighteen-thirties….


1a According to Glyndon G. Van Deusen, what was one reason the Cherokees asked for federal protection from the state of Georgia?

Score of 1:
• States a reason the Cherokees asked for federal protection from the state of Georgia according to Glyndon G. Van Deusen
  Examples: Georgia was bound to observe the Cherokee treaties with the United States and did not; Georgia was obdurate/uncompromising where the Cherokee treaties were concerned; Georgia refused to recognize the Cherokee treaties; Georgia refused to recognize the Cherokees as an independent nation; Georgia pressed the Cherokees to sell their lands; they/Cherokees wanted to protect their lands; Georgia ignored/flouted Supreme Court decisions (Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia/Worcester v. Georgia) that protected the Cherokee rights; they wanted to stay in Georgia; the Supreme Court could protect Cherokee rights under treaties; they wanted the Supreme Court to enforce their treaties with the federal government

Score of 0:
• Incorrect response
  Examples: Georgia recognized them as an independent nation; the Supreme Court ruled against them; President Jackson forced them; they turned a deaf ear; Congress set aside a region in the west
• Vague response
  Examples: a progressive tribe; they were uncompromising; they were consolidating; they could make peace and war
• No response
1b According to Glyndon G. Van Deusen, what was one action taken by President Andrew Jackson that supported Georgia?

Score of 1:
- States an action taken by President Andrew Jackson that supported Georgia according to Glyndon G. Van Deusen
  
  Examples: he ignored the Supreme Court decision; he asked Congress to set aside a region in the Far West where the Cherokees could move; he supported a forced migration of the Cherokees; he left it to Marshall to enforce the Supreme Court decision

Score of 0:
- Incorrect response
  
  Examples: he enforced the Supreme Court decision; he stopped the forced migration; he recognized them as an independent nation; he passed legislation; John Marshall made Jackson enforce it

- Vague response
  
  Examples: he voted; he gave a message; he continued through the decade; a famous comment; Congress set aside a region

- No response
Effect of Policies Toward Native American Indians, 1830–1850

Source: Irving F. Ahlquist et al., United States History, Addison-Wesley, 1984 (adapted)
2 Based on these documents, what was one effect of President Andrew Jackson’s policies toward Native American Indians?

Score of 1:
- States an effect of President Andrew Jackson’s policies toward Native American Indians based on these documents
  - Examples: tribes living east of the Mississippi River were moved west of the Mississippi River; many tribes were moved west of the Mississippi River; Native American Indians were moved to Indian territory; Native American Indians suffered hardships on the Trail of Tears; different Indian nations/different tribes were forced to live together in the same territory; Native American Indians had to pack up and carry their belongings to Indian territory west of the Mississippi River/to the West; eastern Native American Indian tribes were forced to leave their ancestral lands; Indians had a long journey to Indian territory; Indians were removed; Iowa/Sauk/Fox/Chippewa/Potawatomi/Kickapoo/Seneca/Shawnee/Ottawa/Cherokee/Chickasaw/Choctaw/Creek/Seminole moved west of the Mississippi River; Indians ceded their land to states

Score of 0:
- Incorrect response
  - Examples: Native Americans were moved east of the Mississippi River; many Native American Indians migrated to Canada; Native American Indians from Texas migrated into Indian territory
- Vague response
  - Examples: there were routes; unorganized territory
- No response
…In the Indian Territory problems quickly developed among the new arrivals and Cherokees who had already settled, especially as reprisals were taken against the contingent [group] who had signed the Treaty of New Echota [1835 treaty with the Cherokees]. As these problems were resolved, the Cherokees proceeded to adapt to their new homeland, and they reestablished their own system of government, which was modeled on that of the United States.…

This autonomy remained reasonably strong until the Civil War, when a faction of the Cherokees sided with the Confederacy. During Reconstruction they suffered a loss of self-government and, more importantly, their land base. Government annuities [payments] were reduced, and lands were sold to newly arrived tribes. Cessions of land continued during the later 19th century, and the federal government emerged as the major force for land cession under the Dawes Act of 1887, which divided up tribal lands. The establishment of the state of Oklahoma in 1907 increased pressure for land cessions. Many people of questionable Cherokee ancestry managed to get on the tribal rolls and participate in the allotment of these lands to individuals. By the early 1970s the western Cherokees had lost title to over 19 million acres of land.…

Source: Trail of Tears Association

3 According to this document, what is one impact of the federal government’s policies toward the Cherokees?

Score of 1:
• States an impact of the federal government’s policies toward the Cherokees according to this document
  Examples: problems quickly developed between the new arrivals and the Cherokees who had already settled in the Indian territory; reprisals were taken against the Cherokees who had signed the Treaty of New Echota; Cherokees adapted to their new homeland; Cherokees reestablished their own system of government; the autonomy of the Cherokees remained reasonably strong until the Civil War; some Cherokees sided with the Confederacy; after the Civil War, they suffered a loss of self-government; after the Civil War, they suffered a loss of their land base; government payments were reduced after the Civil War; Cherokee lands were sold to newly arrived tribes after the Civil War; tribal lands were divided up by the Dawes Act; establishment of state of Oklahoma increased pressure for land cessions; many people of questionable Cherokee ancestry were able to get on tribal rolls and participate in allotment of lands; by early 1970s, western Cherokees lost title to over 19 million acres of land

Score of 0:
• Incorrect response
  Examples: tribal differences disappeared; the treaty of New Echota was repealed; there were no more land cessions; most Cherokees supported the Confederacy
• Vague response
  Examples: pressure increased; it was reestablished; autonomy remained
• No response
…When, in 1919, President [Woodrow] Wilson sailed back home after his triumphant progress throughout Europe, he was the virtual author of the peace treaty. When the three government leaders — Lloyd George, Signor Orlando, Georges Clemenceau — saw him off they mimicked the joy and grief of disciples parting from an holy man.

By the way — and it’s important to the developing plot — none of them liked him. But they all knew that the success of the infant League of Nations would depend a great deal on its care and feeding by the United States. They were confident, as Wilson was, that the Treaty would pass the United States Senate.

A little detail to which Europeans didn’t pay much attention at the time, namely a firm clause in the constitution of the United States, ratified in 1787.* It laid down in article two, which is about the powers of the president — “He shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senate present concur.”…

Much worse for him and for the fate of the League of Nations, President Wilson was openly detested by the man who, in this cause, carried most weight in the Congress — the chairman of the Senate foreign relations committee — who would have and has today really the last word about whether to provide the necessary Senate consent to any foreign treaty…

Source: “A Plea to the Senate,” BBC News, October 15, 1999 (adapted)

* The United States Constitution was actually ratified in 1788.

4 According to this BBC News article, what was one problem faced by President Woodrow Wilson in his efforts to gain Senate approval of the Treaty of Versailles?

Score of 1:
- States a problem faced by President Woodrow Wilson in his efforts to gain Senate approval of the Treaty of Versailles according to this BBC News article
  Examples: he needed the advice and consent of the Senate to make a treaty; he needed two-thirds of the Senate to approve; the chairman of the Senate foreign relations committee detested him; the chairman of the Senate foreign relations committee had the last word about Senate approval; a clause in the Constitution limits the power of the president to make treaties; the chairman of the Senate foreign relations committee; he needed consent of the Senate to make a treaty

Score of 0:
- Incorrect response
  Examples: he needed the advice and consent of the House; he needed one-third of the Senate to approve the treaty
- Vague response
  Examples: there was a clause; it was a little detail; he was the virtual author; confidence
- No response
Interrupting the Ceremony

Source: Carey Orr, Chicago Daily Tribune, December 27, 1918 (adapted)

By United Press

WASHINGTON, March 20. — The Peace Treaty is now up to President Wilson.

The Senate washed its hands of the pact last night when by a vote of 49 to 35 it refused to ratify it, and by a vote of 47 to 37 voted to send it back to President Wilson with word that it could not be ratified. The question today was: “What will President Wilson do about it.”

He can send it back to the Senate. In that case Senator Lodge and other Republicans, as well as some Democrats, declared that no action would be taken on it until after the issue of the treaty or no treaty is fought out in the coming campaign.

He can go to the American people in a “solemn referendum,” as he said he would do in a letter to the Jackson Day dinner on the question of ratification of the pact as it is as an issue in the national campaign of 1920.

He can drop the treaty and begin negotiations with Germany for resuming the state of peace.

The general expectation among senators is that he will take the second course and ask the Democratic party to make the treaty the paramount issue in the campaign.

5 Based on these documents, what was one outcome of the Senate debate over the Treaty of Versailles?

Score of 1:
- States an outcome of the Senate debate over the Treaty of Versailles based on these documents
  
  Examples: the treaty was not ratified/was rejected; it was sent back to President Wilson with word that it could not be ratified; rejection of the treaty kept the United States out of the League of Nations; the Senate debate helped stop foreign entanglements; the Senate voted 49 to 35 to not ratify the treaty; the Senate washed its hands of the pact; it became a national campaign issue in 1920

Score of 0:
- Incorrect response
  
  Examples: it was ratified; the Senate did not vote; President Wilson sent the treaty back to the Senate; negotiations with Germany ended
- Vague response
  
  Examples: a paramount issue; there was a question; there was a solemn referendum; there was a Jackson Day dinner; it was a general expectation
- No response
6 According to George Scott, what was one impact of the Senate’s final vote on the Treaty of Versailles on United States foreign policy?

Score of 1:
- States an impact of the Senate’s final vote on the Treaty of Versailles on United States foreign policy according to George Scott
  
  Examples: President Harding made it clear he intended to keep the United States free of involvement in the world’s troubles; it helped lead to American isolation/America isolated itself for twenty years; the United States paid a terrible price for this decision/for its isolation

Score of 0:
- Incorrect response
  
  Examples: the United States joined the League of Nations; America became involved in world affairs; President Harding wanted to see America in the League of Nations; the Senate’s vote was reversed

- Vague response
  
  Examples: it was the last chance; President Harding made it clear; it started twenty years; a terrible price

- No response
…By now, of course, Watergate has become part of our folklore: Five men wearing business suits and surgical gloves arrested in the middle of the night with illegal bugging devices at the Democratic Party headquarters in the Watergate building in Washington, D.C. The burglars turned out to be part of a wide-ranging political espionage and sabotage operation run by President [Richard] Nixon’s top aides, one that triggered a massive White House cover-up directed by the president himself. After that cover-up unraveled, more than 70 people, including cabinet members and White House assistants, were convicted of criminal abuses of power; only a pardon by his presidential successor spared Nixon himself from becoming the first chief executive in history to be indicted for felonies committed in the Oval Office. In the words of Stanley Kutler, the scandal’s leading historian, Watergate “consumed and convulsed the nation and tested the constitutional and political system as it had not been tested since the Civil War.”…

Source: Mark Feldstein, “Watergate Revisited,” American Journalism Review, August/September 2004

7a Based on this document, identify one event that led to the Watergate investigation.

Score of 1:
• Identifies an event that led to the Watergate investigation based on this document
  
  Examples: the Watergate/Democratic Party headquarters break-in; the arrest of five men with illegal bugging devices at the Democratic Party headquarters; discovery of wide-ranging political espionage/sabotage operation run by President Nixon’s top aides; arrest of burglars involved in the political espionage/sabotage operation; attempts to cover up the White House connection to burglary; indictment of White House aides/cabinet members for their roles in Watergate cover-up

Score of 0:
• Incorrect response
  
  Examples: President Nixon’s indictment; Nixon’s pardon; the closing of the Oval Office

• Vague response
  
  Examples: test of the political system; it took place at Democratic Party headquarters; it is part of folklore; it has not been tested

• No response
Trials and Tribulations > Overview

When Congress reconvened in January 1974, following its Christmas break, the House of Representatives compounded Nixon's legal troubles. On February 6, it authorized the Judiciary Committee to investigate grounds for the impeachment of President Nixon. This added to investigations already underway by Judge [John] Sirica and the grand jury, Special Prosecutor [Leon] Jaworski and the Justice Department, and the work done by the Senate select committee on Watergate.…

The Aftermath > Overview

By May 9, 1974, the House Judiciary Committee began hearings on articles of impeachment. Judge Sirica turned over to the committee evidence gleaned against Nixon by the grand jury. Meanwhile, Jaworski appealed to the Supreme Court to force Nixon to surrender more tapes. On July 24, the Court handed down an 8-0 decision, laying bare the president's last line of defense.

In late July, the House committee drafted three articles of impeachment against Nixon:

- Obstructing the Watergate investigation
- Misuse of power and violating his oath of office
- Failure to comply with House subpoenas


7b Based on this document, identify one action the legislative branch took during the Watergate investigation.

Score of 1:
- Identifies an action the legislative branch took during the Watergate investigation based on this document

  Examples: legislative branch/House Judiciary Committee began hearings on articles of impeachment; House of Representatives authorized the Judiciary Committee to investigate grounds for impeachment of President Nixon; the Senate select committee on Watergate held hearings; the House Judiciary Committee drafted three articles of impeachment; the House Judiciary Committee charged President Nixon with (obstruction of the investigation or misuse of power or violating his oath of office or failing to comply with House subpoenas)

Score of 0:
- Incorrect response
  Examples: it refused to turn over presidential tape recordings; the House Judiciary Committee repealed articles of impeachment; House of Representatives voted to impeach President Nixon; Judge Sirica conducted investigations; the Supreme Court forced Nixon to surrender more tapes; it laid bare Nixon’s last line of defense; handed down an 8–0 decision

- Vague response
  Examples: it reconvened; added to investigations; legal troubles; three articles of impeachment

- No response
...The central issue raised by Watergate, finally, was not resolved. This was how to make American government, especially the President, more accountable to the people. A raft of legislation in 1973–74, including the War Powers Act of 1973, a law to regulate campaign financing and spending (1974), a Freedom of Information Act (1974), and a Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act (1974), tried to promote such accountability, but these laws for the most part failed to accomplish what they set out to do, largely because Presidents and other politicians figured out ways of evading them. As acts by subsequent Presidents made clear, White House high-handedness could and did happen again in the future....


8 According to James T. Patterson, what is one impact of the Watergate investigation?

Score of 1:
- States an impact of the Watergate investigation according to James T. Patterson
  
  *Examples:* the central issue of government accountability/presidential accountability to the people was not resolved; it raised the issue of government accountability/presidential accountability to the people; it promoted a raft of legislation in 1973 and 1974; legislation (War Powers Act or Freedom of Information Act or Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act) was passed to promote accountability; laws to promote accountability failed for the most part; although new laws were passed, they have not prevented presidential high-handedness; presidents/politicians figured out ways to evade the new laws

Score of 0:
- Incorrect response
  
  *Examples:* the central issue raised by Watergate was resolved; laws to promote accountability were successful; White House high-handedness has not happened again; it prevented presidential high-handedness
- Vague response
  
  *Examples:* an issue was raised; subsequent presidents made it clear; there was an accomplishment
- No response
The founders of this nation would have been stunned by the revelations of Watergate. But they would have been especially proud of the judiciary they had created. There was a trial judge who did not accept distortions of the truth. There was an appellate court that acted with decisiveness and dispatch to meet the first challenge by President Nixon opposing the release of the tapes. The same trial court and the same appellate court, without delay, decided that a crucial grand jury report should be transmitted to the House Judiciary Committee. And that trial court overruled the President's claim of executive privilege in response to a subpoena *duces tecum* [to produce evidence] in a situation involving criminal wrongdoing. The Supreme Court, in the interest of expediting [hastening] justice, bypassed the Court of Appeals and then boldly and with a minimum of delay laid to rest the troublesome problems that beset the nation…

From Watergate we learned what generations before us have known: our Constitution works. And during the Watergate years it was interpreted again so as to reaffirm that no one—absolutely no one—is above the law…

9 According to Leon Jaworski, what is *one* impact of the Watergate investigation on the United States?

**Score of 1:**
- States an impact of the Watergate investigation on the United States according to Leon Jaworski
  
  *Examples:* we learned our Constitution works; it reaffirmed that no one is above the law; the troublesome problems posed by Watergate were laid to rest by the Supreme Court; executive privilege is not allowed in a situation involving criminal wrongdoing; appellate court acted with decisiveness and dispatch, resulting in justice being done; justice was done; gave proof that the judiciary system works; the president cannot claim executive privilege in a criminal proceeding

**Score of 0:**
- Incorrect response
  
  *Examples:* the Constitution no longer works; the president is above the law; the judiciary system does not work; the founders were stunned; the founders would have been proud of the judiciary
- Vague response
  
  *Examples:* it reaffirmed it; generations learned
- No response
United States History and Government
Content Specific Rubric
Document Based Essay
January 2016

**Historical Context:** In United States history, there have been conflicts between the three branches of government. Three issues that have led to conflict include President Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision, the Senate’s rejection of the Treaty of Versailles negotiated by President Woodrow Wilson, and the investigation by Congress of President Richard Nixon’s role in the Watergate affair.

**Task:** Choose two of the issues mentioned in the historical context and for each
- Describe the historical circumstances that led to the conflict between two branches of government
- Discuss how the outcome of the conflict affected the United States and/or American society

**Scoring Notes:**

1. This document-based question has a minimum of **four** components (for each of two issues, discussing the historical circumstances that led to conflict between two branches of government **and** how the outcome of each conflict affected the United States and/or American society).
2. The discussion of the effect of the conflict’s outcome may be on the United States, on American society, or on both.
3. How the conflict’s outcome affected the United States and/or American society may be immediate or long term.
4. The same or similar information may be used for the historical circumstances that led to the conflict and as part of the discussion of how the conflict’s outcome affected the United States, e.g., pressure from the state of Georgia against the Cherokees to give up their land leading to later forced migration under the federal government.
5. How the outcome of the conflict affected the United States may be discussed from different perspectives as long as the discussion is supported with accurate historical facts and examples.
6. Only two issues should be chosen from the historical context. If three issues are addressed, only the first two issues may be scored.
7. For the purposes of meeting the criteria of using at least **four** documents in the response, documents 2a, 2b, 5a, 5b, 7a, and 7b may be considered as separate documents if the response uses specific, separate facts from each document.

All sample student essays in this rating guide are presented in the same cursive font while preserving actual student work, including errors. This will ensure that the sample essays are easier for raters to read and use as scoring aids.

Raters should continue to disregard the quality of a student’s handwriting in scoring examination papers and focus on how well the student has accomplished the task. The content-specific rubric should be applied holistically in determining the level of a student’s response.
Score of 5:

- Thoroughly develops all aspects of the task evenly and in depth for each of two issues by discussing the historical circumstances that led to conflict between two branches of government and how the outcome of each conflict affected the United States and/or American society
- Is more analytical than descriptive (analyzes, evaluates, and/or creates* information), e.g., Andrew Jackson: connects Jackson’s support for the Indian Removal Act to make more land available for white settlement, his ignoring of the ruling in Worcester v. Georgia, and his support of Georgia’s goal of gaining Cherokee land to the decision to force the relocation of the Cherokees west of the Mississippi River, the Trail of Tears, further cessions, and reservation policies that eventually undermined Native American Indian culture; Woodrow Wilson: connects Wilson’s Fourteen Points vision, his uncompromising support for a post–World War I international peace organization, and the obstructionist efforts of Senate Republicans to the failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and the rejection of collective security in favor of foreign policies that promoted disarmament and neutrality to avoid war during the 1920s and 1930s
- Incorporates relevant information from at least four documents (see Key Ideas Chart)
- Incorporates substantial relevant outside information related to conflicts between the branches of government (see Outside Information Chart)
- Richly supports the theme with many relevant facts, examples, and details, e.g., Andrew Jackson: assimilation of Cherokees; terms of Indian Removal Act; Treaty of New Echota; decision in Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia; terms of Dawes Act; establishment of state of Oklahoma; Woodrow Wilson: League of Nations; Senate Foreign Relations Committee; opposition of Henry Cabot Lodge; adoption of isolationist policy
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that are beyond a restatement of the theme

Score of 4:

- Develops all aspects of the task but may do so somewhat unevenly by discussing one issue more thoroughly than the second issue or by discussing one aspect of the task less thoroughly than the other aspects of the task
- Is both descriptive and analytical (applies, analyzes, evaluates, and/or creates* information), e.g., Andrew Jackson: discusses Jackson’s intention of making new land available for white settlement, his support for Georgia’s goal of removing Cherokees from their land in defiance of Worcester v. Georgia, and the impact of the forced migration and other federal policies on the Cherokees’ economic self-sufficiency in their new environment; Woodrow Wilson: discusses Wilson’s support for a post–World War I peace organization, the Senate’s concerns about the loss of national sovereignty, the failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, and the continuing effect of isolationist attitudes on foreign policy in the 1930s
- Incorporates relevant information from at least four documents
- Incorporates relevant outside information
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that are beyond a restatement of the theme
Score of 3:
- Develops all aspects of the task with little depth or develops at least three aspects of the task in some depth
- Is more descriptive than analytical (applies, may analyze and/or evaluate information)
- Incorporates some relevant information from some of the documents
- Incorporates limited relevant outside information
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details; may include some minor inaccuracies
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that may be a restatement of the theme

Note: If all aspects of the task have been thoroughly developed evenly and in depth for one issue and if the response meets most of the other Level 5 criteria the response may be a Level 3 paper.

Score of 2:
- Minimally develops all aspects of the task or develops at least two aspects of the task in some depth
- Is primarily descriptive; may include faulty, weak, or isolated application or analysis
- Incorporates limited relevant information from the documents or consists primarily of relevant information copied from the documents
- Presents little or no relevant outside information
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details; may include some inaccuracies
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization; may lack focus; may contain digressions; may not clearly identify which aspect of the task is being addressed; may lack an introduction and/or a conclusion

Score of 1:
- Minimally develops some aspects of the task
- Is descriptive; may lack understanding, application, or analysis
- Makes vague, unclear references to the documents or consists primarily of relevant and irrelevant information copied from the documents
- Presents no relevant outside information
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, or details; may include inaccuracies
- May demonstrate a weakness in organization; may lack focus; may contain digressions; may not clearly identify which aspect of the task is being addressed; may lack an introduction and/or a conclusion

Score of 0:
Fails to develop the task or may only refer to the theme in a general way; OR includes no relevant facts, examples, or details; OR includes only the historical context and/or task as copied from the test booklet; OR includes only entire documents copied from the test booklet; OR is illegible; OR is a blank paper

*The term create as used by Anderson/Krathwohl, et al. in their 2001 revision of Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives refers to the highest level of the cognitive domain. This usage of create is similar to Bloom’s use of the term synthesis. Creating implies an insightful reorganization of information into a new pattern or whole. While a Level 5 paper will contain analysis and/or evaluation of information, a very strong paper may also include examples of creating information as defined by Anderson and Krathwohl.
### Key Ideas from Documents 1–3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Circumstances</th>
<th>Outcome of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doc 1</strong>—Cherokees’ attempt to consolidate position by setting up a state within a state&lt;br&gt;Recognition as a nation capable of making peace and war, owning the land within its boundaries, and “punishing its own citizens by its own laws” in series of treaties with the United States&lt;br&gt;Obligation of Georgia to observe treaties concluded by federal government&lt;br&gt;Refusal by Georgia to recognize Cherokees as independent nation&lt;br&gt;Pressure from Georgia for Cherokees to sell lands&lt;br&gt;Request by Cherokees for federal protection&lt;br&gt;Rights of Cherokees upheld by Supreme Court (<em>Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia</em>, 1831, <em>Worcester v. Georgia</em>, 1832)&lt;br&gt;Flouting of Supreme Court rulings by Georgia President Jackson’s support of Georgia&lt;br&gt;Passage of Jackson’s request to Congress to set aside a region in the West for Indian removal by strict party vote&lt;br&gt;Forced migration of Cherokees to region in West</td>
<td><strong>Doc 1</strong>—Forced migration of Cherokees to region in the West&lt;br&gt;<strong>Doc 2</strong>—Establishment of Indian Territory in the West&lt;br&gt;Removal of many Native American Indian tribes to Indian Territory west of the Mississippi River between 1830 and 1850 (Iowa, Sauk, Fox, Chippewa, Potawatomi, Kickapoo, Seneca, Shawnee, Ottawa, Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, Seminole)&lt;br&gt;Trail of Tears&lt;br&gt;<strong>Doc 3</strong>—Problems in Indian Territory between new arrivals and settled Cherokees&lt;br&gt;Reprisals against group who had signed Treaty of New Echota&lt;br&gt;Adaptation of Cherokees to new homeland as problems were resolved&lt;br&gt;Reestablishment of Cherokee system of government modeled on that of United States&lt;br&gt;Support for Confederacy during Civil War by some Cherokees&lt;br&gt;Loss of self-government and land base during the late 19th century&lt;br&gt;Reduction of government annuities&lt;br&gt;Sale of lands to newly arrived tribes&lt;br&gt;Division of tribal lands under Dawes Act&lt;br&gt;Increased pressure for land cessions with establishment of state of Oklahoma&lt;br&gt;Allotment of lands to people of questionable Cherokee ancestry&lt;br&gt;Loss of over 19 million acres of land owned by western Cherokees by early 1970s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Relevant Outside Information<br>(This list is not all-inclusive.)

- Assimilation of Cherokees to white civilization (economic self-sufficiency, written constitution, alphabet, private property)
- Desire of planters, gold miners, and settlers for land in Georgia
- Justification of President Jackson for passage of Indian Removal Act (maintenance of cultural traditions, protection of Native American Indians from white intrusion)
- Details about Supreme Court cases (*Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia, Worcester v. Georgia*)
- Forced removal of other Native American Indian groups
- Details about Trail of Tears
- Limits on Native American Indian economic self-sufficiency as result of western environmental differences
- Violation of removal treaties as white settlers moved westward
- Further erosion of Native American Indian culture (disease, railroads, warfare, reservation system)
- Continuation of Native American Indian resentment toward United States government authority
**Woodrow Wilson/Senate**

**Key Ideas from Documents 4–6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Circumstances</th>
<th>Outcome of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doc 4</strong> — Woodrow Wilson, virtual author of the peace treaty in 1919. Recognition of Lloyd George, Signor Orlando, and Georges Clemenceau that success of League of Nations depended on the United States and President Wilson. Confidence of Wilson, George, Orlando, and Clemenceau that treaty would pass the United States Senate. Opposition from Senate Foreign Relations Committee chairman, who had last word about Senate consent to foreign treaty.</td>
<td><strong>Doc 5</strong> — Expectation that rejection of treaty would be major issue in 1920 national campaign. <strong>Doc 6</strong> — End of hopes for reversal of Senate rejection of Treaty of Versailles with defeat of Democratic presidential candidate, James Cox. Election of Harding, who made clear his intention to keep United States free of involvement with rest of world’s troubles. Isolation of United States for 20 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doc 5</strong> — Concern of United States Senate about foreign entanglements if Treaty of Versailles approved. Rejection of Treaty of Versailles by Senate (vote 49 to 35). Declaration from Senate leaders that no action would be taken until after election if Wilson sent treaty back to Senate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevant Outside Information**

(This list is not all-inclusive.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Circumstances</th>
<th>Outcome of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Richard Nixon/Congressional Investigation**

*Key Ideas from Documents 7–9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Circumstances</th>
<th>Outcome of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doc 7</strong>—Arrest of burglars with illegal bugging devices at Democratic Party headquarters in Washington, D.C. Discovery of wide-ranging political espionage and sabotage operation run by President Nixon’s top aides Arrest triggering massive White House cover-up directed by president Indictment of cabinet members and White House assistants for criminal abuses of power</td>
<td><strong>Doc 7</strong>—Conviction of cabinet members and White House assistants for criminal abuses of power Authorization of Judiciary Committee by House of Representatives to investigate grounds for President Nixon’s impeachment Unraveling of cover-up (Judge Sirica, grand jury, Special Prosecutor Jaworski, Justice Department, and Senate select committee on Watergate) Hearings on articles of impeachment by House Judiciary Committee Submission of grand jury evidence against Nixon to House Judiciary Committee by Judge Sirica Unanimous ruling from Supreme Court for Nixon to surrender more tapes Drafting of three articles of impeachment against Nixon by House Judiciary Committee (obstruction of Watergate investigation, misuse of power and violation of oath of office, failure to comply with House subpoenas) <strong>Doc 8</strong>—Attempts to make United States government more accountable to the American people Passage of War Powers Act of 1973, 1974 law to regulate campaign financing and spending, Freedom of Information Act of 1974, Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974 Failure of legislation to promote accountability Evasion of legislation by presidents and other politicians <strong>Doc 9</strong>—Impact of judicial proceedings (distortions of truth not accepted by trial judge; appellate court’s decisive and speedy acts in meeting Nixon’s challenge opposing release of tapes; decision of trial court and appellate court to transmit crucial grand jury report to House Judiciary Committee; overruling of president’s claim of executive privilege in response to a situation involving criminal wrongdoing; Court of Appeals bypassed by Supreme Court) Reinforcement that Constitution works Affirmation of principle that no one is above the law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relevant Outside Information
(This list is not all-inclusive.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Circumstances</th>
<th>Outcome of Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradual expansion of presidential power at the expense of other branches (executive agreements of FDR, Johnson and Gulf of Tonkin, Nixon’s impoundment of congressionally appropriated funds, secret bombing of Cambodia, invasion of Cambodia)</td>
<td>Details about United States v. Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Above the law” attitude in Nixon administration a factor leading to cover-up in Watergate</td>
<td>Concern about executive power and lack of faith in government as a result of Nixon resignation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising millions of dollars by Committee to Re-Elect the President (CREEP)</td>
<td>Temporary shift of balance of power to Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions of CREEP (“dirty tricks” and campaign of espionage against Democratic candidates in 1972; illegal use of FBI, CIA, and IRS)</td>
<td>Pardon of Nixon by his successor, Gerald Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work of President Ford and President Carter to restore faith in presidency</td>
<td>Reevaluation of use of presidential power</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the constitution of the United States was created, the Founding Fathers ensured that there would be a balance of powers between the three branches of government: the executive, judicial and legislative branches. However, this did not prevent the sectors of government from getting into serious conflicts with each other. One of the first inter-branch conflicts occurred after the election of President Andrew Jackson, who disagreed with the Supreme Court over the rights of Cherokees living on their native lands in Georgia. Another battle between President Nixon and the other two branches occurred nearly 150 years later during the Watergate Scandal. These crises had major impacts on the United States government.

Andrew Jackson’s career fighting the Indians began during his time as general of the victorious army at Horseshoe Bend and the battle of New Orleans during the War of 1812. During that war some of the Natives sided with the British and attacked American civilians and soldiers alike. Others sided with the Americans including some Cherokees. Later on, Jackson fought Indians in Florida who were being incited in some border areas by British whiskey, guns and protection and Spanish negligence. Despite the orders of Pres. Monroe and Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, to avoid any serious problems with the Spanish, Jackson invaded the Spanish colony to end this threat, and he ended up killing some Indian leaders. Later on, in 1831, when Jackson had been president for nearly 3 years, his animosity towards the Native Americans remained unchanged. When John Marshall’s Supreme Court ruled in Worcester v. Georgia and Cherokee Nation v. Georgia that the Cherokee indeed could remain on their ancestral lands, Jackson supported the state of Georgia.
wanted the federal government to help them remove the Cherokees from land that could be used for growing cotton and mining gold. Jackson did this despite the fact that the Cherokee were one of the five “civilized tribes who had done their best to assimilate to avoid the hostility of whites). During the ensuing crisis, in which Jackson ignored the Supreme Court supposedly saying “let [Marshall] enforce it” (Doc 1), the Indian Removal Act would be enforced which led to some tribes signing treaties giving up their land and some being forcibly removed from the East into Indian territory in the west (Doc 2). Some Cherokees and others were forced to march the long journey on the Trail of Tears, along which many died of exposure and hunger. Some tribes resisted, like those in Illinois and Wisconsin under Black Hawk, but were beaten by state militia forces. This removal was a result of the Indian Removal Act. This resulted in long-term hardship and land continually being removed from Indians all the way until the Dawes Severalty Act ended under the New Deal in the 1930s. Some historians would say that Native Americans never fully recovered from early removal policies or efforts by missionaries and the government to force assimilation after the Civil War. This conflict also propelled the office of the president to at times being dominant to that of other branches, as “King Andrew Jackson” imposed his imperious will over the Supreme Court under John Marshall and in his vetoes of Congressional legislation. Jackson’s use of executive power set precedents for Presidents Polk, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt. In the 1970s President Nixon like Jackson was not afraid to exercise his power. The conflict between Nixon and the Federal judiciary that unfolded during the Watergate scandal resulted in changes to
American society and the essence of the federal government. This conflict began as President Nixon was running for a second term in the 1972 election. During the campaign, Nixon had an early lead which ended up in a huge victory, but despite this, five Nixon administration employees were sent to the Democratic Party Headquarters in the Watergate Hotel to place hidden microphones to spy on the Democrats' strategies. Nixon denied that anyone in the White House was involved but a trail leading to his re-election campaign was slowly uncovered. The watergate intruders were arrested and pled guilty. Due to the persistent reporting of Carl Bernstein and the Washington Post, the watergate scandal emerged as a major crisis. Decisions about “dirty tricks” that reached to the highest levels of government were exposed in the papers. During subsequent televised hearings by congress on the scandal, it was revealed that the President secretly recorded his conversations in the White House, and the House Committee demanded the tapes. However, Nixon refused to release the tapes, claiming executive privilege. The Supreme Court unanimously ruled against him. The more the American people heard and read, the more doubts they had about his truthfulness. By 1974, over 70 White House assistants and other federal employees had been arrested in connection with the scandal, and Nixon was soon to be impeached. He resigned before an impeachment vote was taken, sending the Presidency to Gerald R. Ford, who pardoned the embattled president. The pardon was also controversial because some thought Nixon should stand trial and serve time for violating the law. This crisis, most importantly, upheld the balance of powers between the presidency and other branches. It showed that nobody was above the
law (Doc 9), as the judiciary and Supreme Court in Nixon v. United States reasserted its ability to limit the power of the President’s claims of executive privilege. Congress also reasserted its authority with the 1974 Freedom of Information Act and 1974 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act. (Doc 8) However, this conflict also caused disillusionment with Washington D.C. politics. As a result of Watergate, Ford’s only term in office as an unelected President seemed irrelevant and nonproductive, and future presidential candidates campaigned on their outsider status in Washington. Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush all had been state governors, not administration officials or congressmen in previous occupations. Outsider status continues to be an asset for presidential candidacies. Executive power and some distrust of the federal government continues to impact the 21st century. To conclude, the Indian Removal crisis and Watergate crisis resulted in conflicts that pitted the executive branch against one or both other branches of the federal government. Throughout inter-branch conflicts, however, the constitutional powers guaranteed to each branch remained, reaffirming the absolute power of the constitution over any one President, judge or congress.
Anchor Level 5-A

The response:

- Thoroughly develops all aspects of the task evenly and in depth for President Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision and the conflict between President Richard Nixon and the other branches of the federal government
- Is more analytical than descriptive (Jackson: ignored Supreme Court over rights of Cherokees in Georgia; enforced the Indian Removal Act which led to some tribes signing treaties giving up land; some historians say Native Americans never fully recovered from early removal policies; Indian Removal conflict propelled office of president to be dominant as “King Andrew Jackson” imposed his imperious will over the Supreme Court; Jackson’s use of executive power set precedents for Presidents Polk, Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt; Nixon: like Jackson not afraid to exercise power; denied that anyone in the White House involved, but a trail to his reelection campaign was uncovered; American people had doubts about his truthfulness; pardon controversial because some thought he should stand trial for violating the law; crisis showed nobody was above the law as the judiciary reasserted its ability to limit the power of the president’s claims of executive privilege; Congress reasserted its authority with 1974 Freedom of Information Act and 1974 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act; conflict caused disillusionment with Washington politics)
- Incorporates relevant information from documents 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9
- Incorporates substantial relevant outside information (Jackson: his career fighting Native Americans began during War of 1812; remove Cherokees from land that could be used for growing cotton and mining gold; Cherokees had done their best to assimilate; Indian Removal Act resulted in long-term hardship; Nixon: televised hearings by Congress revealed that the president secretly recorded his conversations; Ford’s only term in office as unelected president seemed irrelevant and nonproductive; future presidential candidates campaigned on their outsider status in Washington)
- Richly supports the theme with many relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: Battle of New Orleans; Marshall: Worcester v. Georgia; Cherokee Nation v. Georgia; Dawes Act; Nixon: intruders arrested and pled guilty; Carl Bernstein; Washington Post; House committee demanded tapes; Supreme Court ruled against him; 70 White House assistants and other federal employees arrested; soon to be impeached; resigned)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that state the Indian removal crisis and Watergate resulted in conflicts that pitted the executive branch against the other branches of government

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 5. An analytic discussion of historical circumstances provides a thorough context for the actions of both Jackson and Nixon. Critical appraisal of the outcomes of both conflicts is used to make good and effective connections about the long-term precedents involving executive power.
The system of federal government in the United States was founded on the ideas of separation of powers and checks and balances. The three branches have various roles and various ways to “check” on the power of other branches. Throughout history we have seen these ideas at work as the nation confronted conflicts in which the branches did not agree. Two such instances were President Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a supreme court decision and the Senate’s debate over the Treaty of Versailles negotiated by President Wilson. In each case, certain events triggered the conflict, the outcome of which affected American society in profound ways.

From the arrival of the very first settlers to North America, there was conflict with the indigenous people of the regions. In the South, the Powhatans created problems for Jamestown settlers and King Philip’s war was fought in New England. Many battles were fought over land and resources, and as Americans continued to expand further into Indian lands, conflict between Indians and white people only intensified. Some Americans believed that Indians and whites could live together in peace and the Indians could be civilized and made a part of American society. By Andrew Jackson’s presidency, this attitude had gradually changed. Many Native American groups were being hurt by continued westward expansion and their numbers and land were being reduced. In the South, the cotton kingdom was expanding and the Indians were in the way. Many Americans came to believe that Indians could not be assimilated. They thought of Indians as primitive and sought to remove them from the land so that white people could settle. The Cherokee was one nation that had tried to become culturally similar to whites to avoid conflict. It was considered a civilized tribe because it had a system of language, a constitution.
and was self-governing. They too grew cotton, had slaves, and were Christians. Many Cherokee lived as a sovereign nation in Georgia, an area where white Americans soon began growing more hostile because they wanted the land and resources the Cherokee had title to. The federal government of the United States viewed Indian tribes as separate nations that treaties could be made with, yet the state of Georgia refused to recognize the status of the Cherokees and extended their power over them. Georgians made efforts to gain land from the Cherokees and outright refused to comply with two supreme court decisions.—Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia and Worcester v Georgia. The court upheld the rights of the cherokees yet Georgia ignored each decision, continuing their advances against the Cherokee. The President, Andrew Jackson, as chief executive of the nation, was supposed to enforce supreme court decisions, yet Jackson was not known to be in favor of Indians living east of the Mississippi and he openly supported Georgia over the rights of Native Americans and refused to enforce the court’s rulings. He might have even stated “John Marshall (chief justice) has made his opinion, now let him enforce it” (Doc 1). His anti-Indian sentiment was demonstrated earlier when the Indian Removal Act was proposed in 1829. Jackson had asked congress to set aside a region in the far west for the relocation of the Indians. While some groups cooperated and made treaties exchanging their land east of the Mississippi for land west of the Mississippi, some Georgia Cherokees had to be forcibly removed from their homes. Thus began the brutal Trail of Tears in which the Cherokee and others trekked across land to their new homes. Continuing throughout the decades of the 1830’s and 40’s, many other indian groups were relocated to Indian territory where they
supposedly would not be bothered by encroaching white settlers. (Doc 2a). Troubles were not over for Native Americans however. Throughout American history, Indians were constantly being pushed around. The Dawes Act of 1887 aimed to assimilate Indians by splitting up reservation land and giving it to individual families for farming instead of the tribe as a whole. Many Indian children were sent to American boarding schools such as the Carlisle School, and taught to be Christian implying that their Indian culture was inferior. “By the early 1970’s, the western Cherokees had lost title to over 19 million acres of land” and many were living on poor reservations. (Doc 3). The American Indians and what happened to them was a great source of tragedy that Helen Hunt Jackson wrote about in “A Century of Dishonor.” Yet ultimately the significance of Jackson’s decision in the 1830s was it inflicted immense hardship and injustice which the Indians endured as they were moved to the West. They continue to be marginalized in American society.

The conflict over the Treaty of Versailles stemmed from the end of the 1st World War. The Big Four powers, USA, France, Great Britain, and Italy met to discuss a Treaty and how to deal with Germany. President Wilson of the United States proposed many ideas in his 14 points such as disarmament and the elimination of trade barriers but the most important idea was the formation of an international peace organization to help the world avoid another devastating war. For Wilson, the League of Nations was the most important point. Wilson needed a 2/3 majority in the senate to approve the treaty yet he faced many conflicts. (Doc 4) Henry Cabot Lodge openly detested Wilson and his liberal internationalism. As a leading figure in the senate, Lodge and his reservationist and irreconcilable supporters posed major
opposition to the Treaty. For one, they argued that Article 10 of the treaty, which called for collective security in world conflicts, would undermine the independence of the United States and lead to too much involvement in foreign affairs. A long hard debate was fought in the senate and with President Wilson who refused to compromise on the terms of the treaty. The outcome of this battle was the failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. The failure of the presidential election to elect another democrat to succeed Wilson in the white house was the final nail in the coffin. The republican winner, Warren G. Harding, “intended to keep the United States free of any such involvement with the rest of the world’s troubles” (Doc 6). This marked “a return to normalcy” and the beginning of a period of relative isolation for the United States. This was contrary to Wilson’s wishes for the United States to take more responsibility and play a more active role in the world. The nation distanced itself from the problems brewing in Europe and Asia. This isolationist impulse did nothing to discourage Hitler, Mussolini, or the imperialist Japanese. Without the United States, the League was unable to stop aggression and this eventually led to the events that resulted in the second world conflict.

Both the conflict over Native American sovereignty and land during Jackson’s presidency and the battle over the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles stemmed from important historical circumstances in the history of the United States. Those conflicts tested the Constitution. Most importantly, such conflicts and their outcomes deeply affected each time period shaping American thought and policy.
The response:

- Thoroughly develops all aspects of the task evenly and in depth for President Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision and the Senate’s debate over the Treaty of Versailles negotiated by President Woodrow Wilson
- Is more analytical than descriptive (Jackson: Georgia refused to comply with Supreme Court decisions in *Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia* and *Worcester v. Georgia*; openly supported Georgia and refused to support Court’s rulings; on brutal Trail of Tears, Cherokees and others trekked to new homes; many Native American groups were relocated to Indian territory; Jackson’s decision inflicted immense hardship and injustice which Native Americans endured as they were moved to the West; they continue to be marginalized in American society; Wilson: conflict over Treaty of Versailles stemmed from end of first world war; for Wilson, the League of Nations was the most important point; Henry Cabot Lodge and his reservationists and irreconcilable supporters posed major opposition to treaty; Wilson refused to compromise on terms of the treaty; Republican Warren Harding intended to keep United States free of involvement in rest of world’s troubles; nation distanced itself from problems brewing in Europe and Asia)
- Incorporates relevant information from documents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
- Incorporates substantial relevant outside information (Jackson: Cherokee considered a civilized tribe because it had a system of language, a constitution, and was self-governing; Cherokees grew cotton, had slaves, and were Christians; some groups cooperated and made treaties exchanging land east of Mississippi for land west of Mississippi; Dawes Act aimed to assimilate Native Americans by splitting up reservation land and giving it to individual families for farming; many Native American children sent to American boarding schools and taught to be Christian; Wilson: proposed many ideas in Fourteen Points such as disarmament and elimination of trade barriers; Senate opponents argued Article 10 of Treaty that called for collective security would undermine the independence of the United States; Harding’s presidency marked a “return to normalcy” and beginning of a period of relative isolation for United States; the League was unable to stop aggression)
- Richly supports the theme with many relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: John Marshall Chief Justice of Supreme Court; Indian Removal Act proposed in 1829; Carlisle school; Cherokees lost over 19 million acres of land; Helen Hunt Jackson, *A Century of Dishonor*; Wilson: Big Four powers: United States, France, Great Britain, and Italy; Hitler, Mussolini, imperialist Japan; second world conflict)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction that restates the theme and a conclusion that states conflicts not only tested the Constitution but affected the respective time period

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 5. A thoughtful discussion of the circumstances surrounding both conflicts is supported by substantive relevant details. Analytic statements are used to discuss each conflict’s impact.
In the history of the United States, the system of checks and balances laid down by the founding fathers has served very well for the most part in ensuring that no branch of government became dominant. Two excellent examples are the Treaty of Versailles and the Watergate scandal, during the presidencies of Woodrow Wilson and Richard Nixon respectively.

In 1919, Woodrow Wilson returned from the challenges of negotiating the League of Nation's founding treaty to find an equally big challenge trying to get the treaty approved. He needed Senate approval in order to ratify it and the partisan Senate was not inclined to do so easily. One of Wilson's political enemies held great power in the Senate chairing the Senate Foreign Relations committee so it would be nigh impossible to ratify the treaty on Wilson's terms. (Doc 4). There were many other factors as well; the Senate was split into three factions: one in favor of ratification, one firmly against, and one who would only ratify it if amendments were added. Public opinion was also split. After many years of following the advice of George Washington and avoiding entangling alliances, a commitment to the League was of great concern. Some thought Germany was treated too harshly while others were disappointed that many of the Fourteen Points were not included in the Treaty. Many were disillusioned by the loss of American lives in the war. All of this meant that there was little chance that the treaty would be ratified; indeed, it was defeated (Doc 5). As a result of this and the election of 1920, the US entered an era of isolationism and rejected global leadership. The decision to not join the League of Nations, (Doc 6) played a major role in WWII. It is impossible to say what would have
happened, if the U.S. had been a part of the global community and the League. The League might have been in a better position to respond to the rise of the Nazi party, Fascist dictators, and perhaps WWII could have been avoided. The lessons learned would result in support for joining the United Nations after fighting WWII.

Another incident, causing an even more direct clash of branches, was the Watergate Scandal. During Richard Nixon’s administration, 5 burglars were arrested attempting to bug the Democratic Headquarters (Doc 7a); eventually, their actions were traced back to the committee to reelect the president, and even the president himself. Though Nixon attempted to cover up the whole affair, shrewd and persistent journalists forced it to light, and both the legislative and judicial branches took action. The House of Representatives ordered an investigation for possible impeachment, and the Supreme Court ordered that Nixon turn over the recordings of meetings he had had in his office (Doc 7b). When Nixon claimed executive privilege and refused to turn over the tapes, the Supreme Court ruled that he had to. With the evidence from the tapes, impeachment and a conviction would have led to his removal from office. Wanting to avoid historical embarrassment, Nixon escaped impeachment by resigning and being pardoned by his successor, Gerald Ford.

The Watergate Scandal had a number of effects on American society; it sparked new laws for increased presidential accountability, such as the Freedom of Information act. After Nixon’s expansion of the Vietnam War into Cambodia with secret bombing was revealed, the War Powers Act was passed limiting presidential war powers. Laws such as these were not as effective as intended because presidents could
find ways around them. (Doc 8). However, it also reaffirmed that the system of checks and balances worked; even the president himself could not escape responsibility for his crimes and he, like other citizens, had to obey the law.

In the founding of the United States, a three-part government was established with the intent that each of these parts would hold the others in check; this, at least, has been a resounding success. Regardless of what the decision may be, the system of checks and balances is in the Constitution as a safeguard, encouraging the spirit of democracy in debate and compromise within the government.
Anchor Level 4-A

The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task for the Senate’s debate over the Treaty of Versailles and President Richard Nixon’s role in the Watergate affair
- Is both descriptive and analytical (Wilson: in 1919, he returned from challenges of negotiating a treaty to find an equally big challenge trying to get the treaty approved; partisan Senate not inclined to ratify the treaty; public opinion about treaty split; many disillusioned by the loss of American lives in the war; defeat of treaty and election of 1920 resulted in United States rejecting global leadership; the decision to not join the League of Nations played a major role in World War II; Nixon: actions of burglars traced back to committee to reelect the president and the president; though he attempted to cover up the affair, shrewd and persistent journalists forced it to light; Supreme Court ordered him to turn over recordings of meetings; wanting to avoid historical embarrassment, he escaped impeachment by resigning; Watergate sparked new laws; the president like other citizens had to obey the law)
- Incorporates relevant information from documents 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9
- Incorporates relevant outside information (Wilson: Senate split into three factions; after many years of following advice of George Washington, commitment to League was of concern; some thought Germany treated too harshly while others were disappointed that many of Fourteen Points were not included in the treaty; if the United States had been a part of the global community, it might have been in a better position to respond to rise of the Nazi party, Fascist dictators, and perhaps World War II could have been avoided; lessons learned would result in support for joining United Nations after fighting a second world war; Nixon: with evidence from tapes, impeachment and a conviction would have led to his removal from office; after Nixon’s expanding the Vietnam War into Cambodia with secret bombing was revealed, War Powers Act passed limiting presidential war powers)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (Wilson: political enemy chaired Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Nixon: five burglars; Democratic headquarters; House of Representatives; pardoned by Gerald Ford; Freedom of Information Act; checks and balances worked)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that state the system of checks and balances provides a safeguard so that no branch of government will become dominant

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. The discussion of Wilson includes relevant outside information that is used effectively to reach good conclusions. Analytic statements support document information in the discussion of Watergate; however, additional outside information would have strengthened the response.
Often in United States history, the three branches of government became entrenched in some sort of conflict. These branches are part of the system of checks and balances incorporated in the Constitution. The Constitution states the responsibilities and limits the powers of each branch and serves as the foundation of the government. Both Andrew Jackson’s disagreement with the Supreme Court and Woodrow Wilson’s troubles with the Senate are examples of the system of checks and balances at work. The conflict between branches often reflects the mood of the country, and the outcome of these conflicts can cause changes in the nation as a whole.

Andrew Jackson is well-known as the champion of the common man, except when that common man is not a white citizen of the United States. He owned slaves and thought Native Americans should give up their land and move west of the Mississippi. In his famous disagreement with the Supreme Court, Jackson asserted that the State of Georgia could ignore the decisions of the Supreme Court and not respect the sovereignty of the Cherokee government. The Cherokees, whose land was in question, were supported by the Supreme Court in the decisions Cherokee Nation vs. State of Georgia and Worcester vs. Georgia (doc 1). In Worcester v. Georgia, the Supreme Court ruled that the Cherokees should have control over their land, not Georgia. Georgia, in theory, was bound to respect the treaties that the US made with the Native American nations but was uncompromising in the face of this conflict. Georgia was angry that the Cherokees wouldn’t give up their land. Jackson had previously asked Congress to set aside some land in the West for the Native Americans and funds to remove the Native Americans from the East. The request was granted, but the United
States gave the Native American tribes land in the West for the Native Americans to share (doc 2a). This was not an equal exchange. Although many Native American groups believed they had no choice but to comply, some refused to go until they were forced. The Cherokees, along with other nations, were forced to march in the now infamous Trail of Tears to their new and unfamiliar home in the West (doc 2b). Many died of disease during the hot summers and cold winters. The government, however, was not done disrespecting the Native Americans. Warfare took a significant toll on Great Plains Native Americans and their culture. The destruction of the buffalo, railroad building, and disease also took their toll on Native Americans as the government continued to see them as standing in the way of progress. The next stop for these Native Americans was reservations. In 1887, the US government changed direction and passed the Dawes Severalty Act, which divided up the Native Americans’ tribal land and redistributed it to individuals in an attempt to assimilate these peoples and reduce tribal unity (doc 3). These ethnocentric acts against the indigenous people created an atmosphere in which it seemed okay to wrong them. Even movies in Hollywood and television programs generally stereotyped Native Americans and portrayed the Indians as savage warriors who attacked the valiant cowboy.

In another instance of a battle between branches, Woodrow Wilson attempted to get the Treaty of Versailles ratified by the Senate and failed. Unfortunately, the Republicans in the Senate were neither fond of Wilson nor his plan to push the United States onto the world stage through the creation of the League of Nations (doc 4). After the terrible
losses of World War I, Wilson wanted to set up an organization where nations could resolve their problems without going to war. He also proposed that if one nation was attacked, other member nations would come to its defense. Although this sounded okay, the Senate was critical for many reasons. Wilson, himself, was unwilling to compromise by telling his Democratic allies to pass nothing but the original treaty with all its stipulations, which would ensure a more active global role for the United States. In 1920, with a vote of 49 to 35, the Senate refused to ratify the treaty (doc 5b). To add insult to injury, in a vote of 47 to 37, the Senate also voted to send the treaty back to Wilson with word that it could not be ratified (doc 5b). The last chance to revive the treaty came in the form of the presidential election of 1920, but the Democratic candidate lost to Warren Harding, the Republican (doc 6). Harding’s slogan for his campaign was a “return to normalcy.” Certainly, that is what he and other presidents during the 1920s achieved turning away from more progressive reforms to a more laissez faire approach and following a policy of isolationism. President Wilson lost the battle with the Senate and a weak League of Nations would find itself unable to stop another war.

Often there are differences of opinion and conflicts between the branches of government. Both Jackson’s battle as well as Wilson’s battle are prime examples of the clash of strongly held opinions and the outcome of these reflect the mood of the country in turbulent eras.
The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task somewhat unevenly by discussing President Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision more thoroughly than the Senate’s debate over the Treaty of Versailles
- Is both descriptive and analytical (Jackson: in *Worcester v. Georgia*, Supreme Court ruled Cherokees should have control over their land; Georgia was bound to respect treaties the United States made with Native Americans but angry that Cherokees would not give up their land; United States gave Native American tribes land in the West to share; although many Native American groups believed they had no choice but to comply, some refused to go until forced; Dawes Severalty Act divided Native Americans tribal land and redistributed it to individuals to assimilate them and reduce tribal unity; Wilson: Republicans in Senate were neither fond of him nor his plan to push United States onto world stage through creation of League; unwilling to compromise by telling Democratic allies to pass nothing but original treaty; last chance to revive treaty came in presidential election of 1920, but Democratic candidate lost)
- Incorporates relevant information from documents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
- Incorporates relevant outside information (Jackson: well known as champion of common man except when common man was not a white citizen; many Native Americans died of disease; ethnocentric acts created atmosphere in which it seemed okay to wrong them; warfare on Great Plains took a significant toll on Native Americans and their culture; destruction of buffalo, railroad building, and disease took their toll on Native Americans as government continued to see them as standing in way of progress; movies in Hollywood stereotyped Native Americans and portrayed them as savage warriors who attacked the valiant cowboy; Wilson: wanted to set up an organization where nations could resolve their problems without war; proposed if one nation was attacked, other member nations would come to its defense; “return to normalcy”; weak League of Nations unable to stop another war)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: *Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia*; Trail of Tears; unfamiliar home in West; reservations; Wilson: *World War I*; more active global role for United States; Senate voted to send treaty back to Wilson; Warren Harding)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that state conflict between branches often reflects the mood of the country and causes change in the nation

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. Relevant facts are used to support the document-driven discussion. Good cultural and historical insights are integrated in the discussion of the outcome of Jackson’s conflict with the Supreme Court. Analytic statements could have been strengthened by including additional supporting facts and details, especially in the discussion of the conflict between Wilson and Congress.
Throughout our nation’s history, there have been many events that have tested our nation’s strength. From before the American Civil War to the Watergate Crisis and beyond, the Constitution has often been put to the test. Two major events that have strained and strengthened the checks and balance system of the US are the Watergate Crisis and the Senate’s refusal to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. In the years 1919 and after, the Treaty of Versailles became a struggle over constitutional powers. In addition in the 1970s, the Watergate Affair also became a battle between President Nixon, Congress, and the judicial system. These two incidents affected both the US and American Society.

Following one of the most devastating wars in history, Wilson created the Treaty of Versailles with the other major powers in the war. Wilson believed that the US would support the treaty even though his personal goals for a permanent peace were not achieved. Wilson also thought that the League of Nations would help avoid future wars. Although Wilson did have some support for his treaty, there were also many people who disliked Wilson and internationalism and they opposed ratification of the treaty especially because of the League of Nations. One example of this was Henry Cabot Lodge. Lodge was the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and despised Wilson, doing all that he could to prevent ratification. Lodge listened to the complaints of different groups of people and isolationists about the treaty and also publicly read every single word of the treaty to stall for time. In addition, when Wilson went to Paris to negotiate the treaty, he only brought a single Republican to the conference and it was not Henry Cabot Lodge. This only created more resentment for
Wilson among Republicans and a less likely chance that he would get a two-thirds vote. Another thing that prevented ratification was the stubborness of Wilson. After refusing ratification of the treaty, the Senate sent the treaty back to Wilson. If Wilson had made a number of changes to the treaty, some minor, the treaty might have been ratified. However, after suffering a stroke on his national tour to gain public support for the treaty, Wilson became more stubborn and only would accept the original treaty. So the treaty wasn’t ratified. This showed that the separation of powers created by the founding fathers was working. This incident helped reaffirm the strength of checks and balances. It showed that the president did not hold unlimited power to do as he pleased in foreign policy, and he could be checked by various branches of the government. However, this outcome led to a less active foreign policy. It also meant the League of Nations was much weaker and less able to stop trouble between countries. This would prove to be a huge problem when aggression started in the 1930s.

Another event that tested our nation was the Watergate Affair with President Nixon. Some of Nixon’s top aides sent 5 men to bug the Democratic campaign headquarters at Watergate. Nixon was almost certain to win the election in 1972 but wanted to discredit the Democrats for political reasons. Although Nixon claimed he had no part in the affair, the public began to doubt him. The Watergate tapes of meetings in Nixon’s office came into the spotlight during congressional hearings. After a Supreme Court ruling, Nixon was forced to hand over the tapes and more incriminating evidence was found against Nixon. The impeachment process began soon after Nixon was charged with obstructing the investigation, misuse of
power, violating his oath, and failure to comply. Eventually, before Nixon could be impeached, he resigned. After Nixon resigned, the succeeding president pardoned Nixon. Although the president has the constitutional right to grant a pardon, there were some who thought Nixon should have been tried in court for the crimes. This Watergate incident further cemented the power of the Constitution, proving that separation of powers and the working of checks and balances is important and also led to rethinking the power of the president. After this event, many people of the public lost faith in the presidency. The public began to consider the powers of the president more critically. Congress passed laws to limit those powers but they didn’t do enough to make a real difference. One big change was the War Powers Act, which was meant to limit presidents from starting wars on their own. This didn’t work really well as it actually gave presidents the power to send troops into combat. Congress has found it hard to withdraw support from troops once fighting has started, leaving the president with a lot of power as commander in chief.

Overall, the many events of our history shaped our country to what it is today, both positive and negative events. Watergate and the Treaty of Versailles both tested and helped cement the system of checks and balances our founding fathers created. These events also changed and affected American Society and the way they view the presidency.
The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task for the Senate’s debate over the Treaty of Versailles and President Richard Nixon’s role in the Watergate affair
- Is both descriptive and analytical (Wilson: created Treaty of Versailles with other major powers following one of most devastating wars in history; believed United States would support treaty even though his personal goals for a permanent peace were not achieved; although he did have some support for his treaty, many people disliked him and internationalism; became more stubborn and would only accept the original treaty; Treaty of Versailles not ratified; Nixon: although he claimed no part in affair, public began to doubt him; tapes of meetings in his office came into spotlight during Congressional hearings; before he could be impeached, he resigned; Watergate incident further cemented the power of Constitution proving separation of powers and working of checks and balances is important; after Watergate, many people lost faith in the presidency; Congress passed laws to limit the powers of president, but they did not do enough to make a real difference; War Powers Act meant to limit presidents from starting wars)
- Incorporates relevant information from documents 4, 5, 7, 8, and 9
- Incorporates relevant outside information (Wilson: Lodge listened to complaints of different groups about treaty and publicly read every word of treaty to stall for time; he only brought a single Republican to Paris conference and it was not Lodge, which caused more resentment for Wilson among Republicans; Nixon: almost certain to win election in 1972 but wanted to discredit Democrats for political reasons; after a Supreme Court ruling, more incriminating evidence was found; although the president has constitutional right to grant a pardon, some thought Nixon should have been tried in court for crimes; Congress found it hard to withdraw support from troops once fighting started)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (Wilson: Senate Foreign Relations Committee; two-thirds vote; Nixon: top aides sent five men to bug Democratic campaign headquarters; charged with obstructing investigation, misuse of power, violating his oath, and failure to comply; commander in chief)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction that states many events have tested our nation’s strength and a conclusion that states these conflicts helped cement the system of checks and balances created by our founding fathers

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. Recognizing the diverse factors influencing the Senate defeat of the Treaty of Versailles establishes a somewhat analytical context for the discussion of the ratification issue. The discussion of the conflicts involving both Wilson and Nixon could be strengthened with the integration of additional details.
When the United States formed its Constitution, it set up a 3-branch government in order to promote a system of checks and balances. While this action was intended to maintain stability in the federal government by not allowing any one branch to become too powerful, this was not always the case. Instead, the branches were sometimes drawn into political skirmishes with one another, for each wished to assert its own authority over another. Two examples in history where this battle was obvious were Andrew Jackson’s ignoring a Supreme Court order and Woodrow Wilson’s debate with the Senate over the Treaty of Versailles. In both cases, the outcome of the government conflict profoundly impacted American society in both the short and long term.

One example of a conflict between 2 branches of government involved President Jackson and the Supreme Court. During the first half of the 19th century, America was expanding its boundaries westward. As a result, many citizens wished to move west with the country, occupying lands that were previously unavailable to them. However, these lands were not barren; many Native Americans inhabited these regions. Thus, many citizens wished for the natives to be pushed elsewhere, including the Cherokees of Georgia. While this tribe had previously made agreements with the government to keep their land and govern themselves president Jackson and the state of Georgia wanted them to leave. When the Cherokees realized that they were not being recognized by Jackson or the State as independent, they appealed for federal protection (Doc A). Their case was then brought to the Supreme Court in the case of Worcester v Georgia, which declared the Indians’ right to stay on their land. Jackson disagreed.
with this and decided to ignore the Court’s decision and force the Indians to move to territory west of the Mississippi. In this manner, the Trail of Tears was created, which was the name given to the long journey the Indians followed from their old home to their new one. (Doc 2b) The effects of this decision were devastating to the Cherokees; many perished or became ill during their traveling, in addition to the grief felt in giving up land they believed they deserved and were attached to. Additionally, this incident became a predecessor to the U.S. policy toward Native Americans for many years to come. Indians were constantly stripped of their land by unfair treaties and often moved to reservations, and by the 1970’s the western Cherokees lost over 19 million acres of their land (Doc 3). Thus, the debate between Jackson and the Judiciary Branch severely impacted the US by marginalizing the Indians in American society and creating a precedent for increasing presidential power.

Another example of a conflict between 2 branches of government involved President Wilson and the Senate. After WWI, the Allied nations attempted to resolve any remaining issues by drafting the Treaty of Versailles. In this, there were clauses that called for Germany to take full responsibility for the war and to pay reparations, and also for the creation of the League of Nations. This proposed idea would have been an alliance between many of the world powers—including the U.S., Great Britain, and France—to maintain global peace. While the idealist Woodrow Wilson was eager to sign the treaty, he first needed a 2/3 vote in the Senate for approval (Doc 4). This proved to be a more difficult task than he imagined, for there were many senators who opposed ratification altogether; there were also those who opposed the
treaty as it was, but would approve it if certain adjustments were made, these were called reservationists. Still, President Wilson refused to alter the Treaty in any way. Due to this exact lack of flexibility, the Senate did not give the necessary 2/3 consent to ratify the treaty and the US did not join the controversial League of Nations. As a result, the US did not form binding relationships with other nations and in fact implemented isolationist policies for the next 20 years (Doc 6). In this manner, a dispute between the president and the legislative branch profoundly effected American society. Without the power of the United States, the League would not be able to ensure global peace. Without global peace, many countries including the United States would eventually fight another world war and more Americans would be sent to fight and die. Government conflicts often lead to profound impacts on the nation. As is evident in the cases of President Jackson’s debate with the Supreme Court and with President Wilson’s struggle with the Senate, inter-branch arguments are both fairly common and have had significant outcomes. The checks and balances system can be seen as having both beneficial and detrimental effects when it come to achieving national goals.
The response:
• Develops all aspects of the task with some depth for conflicts involving President Andrew Jackson and President Woodrow Wilson
• Is more descriptive than analytical (*Jackson*: many citizens wished natives to be pushed elsewhere; although Cherokees made agreements with government to keep their land and govern themselves, Jackson and state of Georgia wanted them to leave; when Cherokees realized they were not being recognized as independent, they appealed for federal protection; Jackson forced Indians to move west of Mississippi; incident became precedent for United States policy toward Native Americans; marginalized Native Americans in American society and created precedent for increasing presidential power; *Wilson*: getting Senate approval for the treaty proved to be difficult as many senators opposed ratification; as a result of failure of Senate to ratify treaty, United States did not form binding relationships with other nations and implemented isolationist policies)
• Incorporates some relevant information from documents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
• Incorporates relevant outside information (*Jackson*: as America expanded its boundaries westward, many citizens wished to move west, occupying lands previously unavailable to them; many Cherokees perished or became ill during traveling; *Wilson*: League of Nations would have been an alliance between many of the world powers to maintain global peace; some senators would approve the treaty if certain adjustments were made; without power of United States, League would not be able to ensure global peace; without global peace, many countries including the United States would eventually fight another world war and more Americans would be sent to fight and die)
• Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (*Jackson*: Worcester *v.* Georgia; Trail of Tears; reservations; western Cherokees lost over 19 million acres of land; *Wilson*: Great Britain and France; two-thirds vote needed for approval; reservationists; refused to alter treaty in any way)
• Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction that states branches of government were sometimes drawn into political skirmishes and a conclusion that states checks and balances system can be seen as having both beneficial and detrimental effects when it comes to achieving national goals

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. The response provides a cohesive chronological narrative for each conflict, demonstrating an understanding of the task. The discussion of the outcome of each conflict integrates some good analytic statements. The inclusion of more facts and details would have strengthened the treatment of historical circumstances, particularly for the debate over the Treaty of Versailles.
Throughout United States History, numerous conflicts between the three branches of government have arisen. Conflicts between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches will have an impact on the United States and American society. Some of the most notable conflicts include the investigation by Congress of President Richard Nixon’s role in the Watergate affair and the Senate’s debate over ratifying the Treaty of Versailles negotiated by President Woodrow Wilson.

The Watergate scandal arose in the early 1970’s when five men were arrested for stealing documents and bugging the Democratic National Headquarters in the Watergate Hotel. This act was part of a larger scheme headed by Nixon’s top aides. The Scandal arose when President Nixon became involved in a cover up and denied knowing anything about the scandal, as stated in documents 7a and 7b. This lead to both Congress and the Judiciary branch investigating the scandal. Nixon refused to release his office meeting tapes to congress for investigation for national security reasons. This led to charges of obstructing investigation and failure to comply with House subpoenas, after congress asked for the release of tapes. The Supreme Court ordered Nixon’s tapes be turned over to Congress. From the incriminating evidence on the tapes, charges were made to build a case for impeachment of Nixon. However, Nixon resigned before impeachment, and although 70 people were convicted of criminal charges, a pardon from President Ford allowed Nixon to walk free of any charges or admission of guilt.

The Watergate scandal had an enormous impact on American society as well as American legislation. The investigation of
Watergate gave the American people proof that nearly 200 years after ratification, the system of checks and balance set up by the Constitution were still very much applicable and works (document 7B). With the Watergate Scandal came an outcry from the American people for more transparency in the government. Congress met this plea with a series of new laws that granted American people more access to information within the government, along with more accountability of those who work in the government (document 9). This however did not satisfy the American people. Ever since the mid-1960’s, there had been a stigma of not trusting the government. The war in Vietnam, along with the leaking of the Pentagon papers about secret operations in Vietnam, which in itself is another issue between branches, especially the bombing of Cambodia under the Nixon administration, also caused a great deal of distrust in the government and concerns about the abuse of presidential power. The Watergate Scandal only fueled the flames. Passage of legislation for more accountability in the government could only go so far because there was always a loophole. The Watergate Scandal conflict between the three branches left the American people very unhappy with the government.

Another conflict between the three branches is the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles by the Senate. After World War I, President Wilson traveled through war-torn Europe in order to promote his Fourteen Points for the Treaty of Versailles. Wilson believed that the creation of a body, such as the League of Nations, could ensure peace in the future (doc. 4). War-torn Europe knew that the League would not be successful unless the United States were to support it and join.
The United States Senate on the other hand, felt that the participation of the US in the League of Nations meant that even more involvement in European affairs would be on the horizon. Many members of the Senate were strong isolationists. Some had been opposed to even participate in World War I despite Woodrow Wilson's decision for war. This idea of isolationism extends back to George Washington's farewell address. The United States could only participate in the League if two-thirds of the Senate ratified the Treaty of Versailles (doc. 4). The Senate opposition to the Treaty had a profound impact on the United States. As stated in document 6, it began a twenty year long period of isolationism. Although the United States was content with isolationism policies, the rise of fascism and communism in Europe caused great unrest and an even further need for US involvement. As implied in document 6, the isolation would encourage dictators and lead to the outbreak of World War II with the US sitting on the sidelines for a few years. From the standpoint of checks and balances, the conflict between the president and the senate demonstrated that the systems of checks and balances could affect foreign policy.
The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task with some depth for a conflict involving President Richard Nixon and with little depth for one involving President Woodrow Wilson
- Is more descriptive than analytical (Nixon: Watergate was part of a larger scheme headed by his top aides; scandal arose when he became involved in a cover-up and denied knowing anything about scandal; Supreme Court ordered his tapes turned over to Congress; from incriminating evidence on tapes, charges were made to build a case for impeachment; investigation gave American people proof that after nearly 200 years, the system of checks and balances was still very much applicable; American people wanted more transparency in government; series of new laws granted American people more access to information within government along with more accountability for those working in government; Wilson: believed creation of League could ensure peace in the future; war-torn Europe knew the League would not be successful unless United States supported it and joined)
- Incorporates some relevant information from documents 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9
- Incorporates relevant outside information (Nixon: refused to release his office meeting tapes to Congress for national security reasons; pardon from President Ford allowed him to walk free of any charges or admission of guilt; war in Vietnam and leaking of Pentagon Papers caused distrust in government; Wilson: many members of Senate were strong isolationists; idea of isolationism extends back to Washington’s Farewell Address; rise of fascism and communism in Europe caused great unrest and further need for United States involvement; isolation would help encourage dictators and lead to outbreak of World War II with United States sitting on the sidelines for a few years)
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (Nixon: Democratic National Headquarters; charges of obstructing investigation; failure to comply with House subpoenas; resigned before impeachment; seventy people convicted; Wilson: traveled through Europe to promote Fourteen Points; two-thirds of Senate needed to ratify treaty)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction that is a restatement of the theme and lacks a conclusion

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. The strength of the response is in the discussion of Nixon’s involvement in Watergate, which includes some well-placed analytic statements and good details. The debate over the Versailles Treaty is briefly discussed and would have been enhanced with more details.
With the three branches in the U.S. government, Executive, Legislative and Judicial, conflicts can sometimes arise. There have been a few cases in history where the Legislative Branch and Executive Branch bump heads and don’t get along. President Woodrow Wilson had trouble with the Senate regarding the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles. President Nixon was investigated by Congress for his involvement in the Watergate Affair. Both conflicts had an impact on the country.

President Woodrow Wilson traveled to France to meet with the other major leaders to discuss the Versailles treaty. In the treaty, Wilson wanted to include his 14 points. Point 14 was the establishment of the League of Nations. President Wilson wanted the League of Nations so desperately that he toured America on a train to promote it and almost died from it. The major issue confronting Wilson was that the Senate committee headed by the man that despised Wilson, Henry Cabot Lodge, didn’t want to approve the League. The Senate (Doc 4) believed that if the U.S. became a member the U.S. would be roped into every foreign conflict that ever rose up. The Senate was actually thinking of George Washington’s neutrality recommendations from his 1796 Farewell Address. When it came time to vote, the League was shot down like our U2 plane over the Soviet Union in the 1950s. (Doc 5B). The Senate did offer the Lodge Reservations, which were Fourteen revisions to Wilson’s 14 Points. Wilson would not accept them. When Warren G. Harding (Doc. 6) won the election of the Presidency in 1920 he threw away Wilson’s League of Nations entirely. For the next twenty years, the United States would isolate themselves from the world except in areas where it had a direct self-interest. President Woodrow Wilson’s
Conflict with the U.S. Senate halted the U.S. from being in the \textit{League of Nations} which probably contributed to the \textit{League} being unsuccessful.

More than 50 years after Wilson and the League of Nations, President Richard Nixon had trouble with Congress over the Watergate affair. The trouble started when the five burglars (Doc 7a.) were arrested and found with incriminating evidence. Eventually, and after many more arrests and tape recorded evidence, Nixon was found at the end of the trail. As a result, Congress was ready to bring up charges against Nixon (Doc 7B). The charges included obstruction of the investigation, and misuse of power. After much finger pointing and accusations, the judiciary committee of the House of Representatives brought impeachment charges against Nixon. The President, however, would resign before he could be impeached. The Watergate affair proved the strength of the U.S. government system (Doc 9). It proved that checks and balances are effective and that nobody is above the law. Many different types of legislation were passed to make sure Presidents in the future were more accountable. As a result of Watergate, the American people were more suspect of presidential power (Doc 8).

Conflicts arise between branches of the government, some regarding policy, others about breaking the law. Sometimes these conflicts had a big impact on America, such as Watergate & the League of Nations.
The response:
• Develops all aspects of the task with little depth but discusses the conflict involving President Woodrow Wilson in more detail than the conflict involving President Richard Nixon
• Is more descriptive than analytical (Wilson: Lodge despised him and did not want to approve League; League shot down in Senate; Harding threw away Wilson’s League entirely; United States not joining League probably contributed to it being unsuccessful; Nixon: after many arrests and tape-recorded evidence, he was found at end of trail; House of Representatives brought impeachment charges against him; many different types of legislation passed to make sure presidents in future were more accountable; American people more suspect of presidential power)
• Incorporates some relevant information from documents 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9
• Incorporates limited relevant outside information (Wilson: toured America on a train to promote League and almost died; Senate believed if United States became a member of League it could be roped into every foreign conflict; Senate thinking of Washington’s neutrality recommendations in Farewell Address; Senate offered Lodge Reservations, which were fourteen revisions to Fourteen Points which Wilson did not accept; United States isolated itself except in areas where it had a direct self-interest)
• Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (Wilson: Harding won election in 1920; Henry Cabot Lodge; Nixon: five burglars arrested; obstruction of Watergate investigation; misuse of power; resigned before he could be impeached)
• Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that are a restatement of the theme

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. Relevant outside information establishes a historical context for circumstances leading to the conflict between Wilson and the Senate while the discussion of Nixon depends only on document information. Some good generalizations are found throughout the narrative, but the lack of supporting facts and details detracts from their effectiveness.
Throughout history, conflicts have arisen within the 3 branches of U.S. government. Two examples of these conflicts include Andrew Jackson’s refusal to uphold a Supreme Court decision, and the Senate’s debate over the Treaty of Versailles. In both situations, one branch of government had a different goal than the other.

In the 19th century, many Native Americans found themselves being forced from their homes to move out west. These new policies for Native American migration were those of Andrew Jackson (doc. 2). In two major Supreme Court cases, Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia (1831) and Worcester v. Georgia (1832), the court ruled that the Cherokees had rights to not have to sell their land. (doc 1) Even though the court decided this, Andrew Jackson was against their decision. He acted unconstitutionally by not enforcing the Supreme Court’s ruling. This is an example of two government branches not being in agreement over an important issue.

Another example of that is the Senate’s debate over the Treaty of Versailles. After WWI, President Woodrow Wilson desired a permanent peace alliance to discourage war. Part of the Treaty of Versailles included membership in a new organization, the League of Nations. Yet, it was Senate’s power to ratify treaties, and this posed as a problem for Wilson. (doc 4). Being a member of the League of Nations, the United States would become entangled in foreign conflicts (doc 5). After WWI, many desired a policy of isolationism for the United States. In the end, Senate did not ratify the Treaty of Versailles, and the U.S began a 20 year period of isolationism. Both the executive branch and legislative branch had different opinions about the actions that needed to be taken.
With three branches of government that are meant to check and balance each other, it is not always that all 3 have the same goals and ideas. Yet, in the end, a power struggle may still result in success for one branch. Luckily, no conflict (between them) has yet to arise that has resulted in large-scale devastation for the United States. The Constitution still proves successful, even as time goes on and times change.

Anchor Level 2-A

The response:
• Develops some aspects of the task in some depth for President Andrew Jackson and President Woodrow Wilson
• Is primarily descriptive (Jackson: in the 19th century, many Native Americans found themselves being forced from their homes to move out west; Court ruled Cherokees had right to not have to sell their land; against Court decision and acted unconstitutionally by not enforcing the Supreme Court’s ruling; Wilson: part of Treaty of Versailles included membership in a new organization; Senate’s power to ratify treaties posed a problem for him; as a member of League of Nations, the United States would become entangled in foreign conflicts; after World War I, many desired a policy of isolationism for United States; Senate did not ratify Treaty of Versailles)
• Incorporates limited relevant information from documents 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6
• Presents little relevant outside information (Wilson: after World War I, desired a permanent peace alliance to discourage war)
• Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: Cherokee Nation v. State of Georgia; Worcester v. Georgia; Wilson: twenty-year period of isolationism)
• Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction that restates the theme and a conclusion that is somewhat beyond a restatement of the theme

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. A methodical presentation of relevant document information is the basis of a discussion that demonstrates an understanding of the task. Although the outcome of the conflict between Jackson and the Supreme Court is not addressed, a few unsupported analytic references are included in the discussion of Wilson.
When thinking of the United States, many believe that the President has the most power, however this is not the case. The President must pass through the Senate just to ratify a treaty, which at times causes a little arguing/disagreement. Presidents also usually want to stay in power as long as they can, which sometimes leads to unethical actions. The American people expect the President to always be honest and loyal to them. Being one hundred percent honest however isn’t always easy, and very often leads to conflicts. In conclusion, Americans expect the President to make executive decisions that will be best for everybody, however Americans also need to remember the President only has so much power.

In many situations with the government, a conflict occurs between two branches of government. For example, in the Watergate investigation, the President was against Congress. President Nixon was concerned on if he would win the next election, so he sent out men with illegal devices to spy on people in the Watergate building in Washington DC. From the investigation it showed Nixon wanted to sabotage his opponents (doc. 7a.) Congress took Nixon to court where they had drafted three articles of impeachment against him (doc. 7b.) The conflict with Congress and Nixon occurred just as the conflict with the President and the Senate. In this situation, President Woodrow Wilson wanted to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. One problem he faced however was that he needed the consent of the Senate (doc. 4), which was not given to him. President Wilson could have sent it back to the Senate after it was refused however it would most likely be denied again. In this situation, President Wilson had no other options than to let congress deal with the other problems. All of these historical
circumstances led to conflict between the two branches of government.

As usual, with conflict comes outcomes that actually affected Americans and American society. With the Watergate investigation, Americans felt as if they couldn’t trust the government or the decisions being made. However, once the President resigned it showed Americans that nobody was above the Law and that the constitution did work (doc. 9.) As with the Treaty of Versailles, eventually Warren Harding became President and realized it was best to stay out of the treaty and stop all conflicts. This resulted however in America isolating itself (doc. 6), and paying the consequences years later.

In conclusion, it is important to remember that the President doesn’t have all the power, even though at times it feels as if he does. The American people do have control even if they do not always feel as if they do. Many conflicts have occurred in the United States and the results may be good or bad, depending on the situation. Finally, the people, Senate, Congress, and President all play an important role in the actions taken by the United States.
Anchor Level 2-B

The response:
- Minimally develops all aspects of the task for President Richard Nixon and President Woodrow Wilson
- Is primarily descriptive (Nixon: investigation showed he wanted to sabotage his opponents; Watergate made Americans feel they could not trust the government or the decisions being made; resignation showed Americans that no one was above the law and the Constitution did work; Wilson: could have sent treaty back to the Senate, however, it would most likely be denied again; Warren Harding became president and decided to stay out of the treaty; resulted in America isolating itself; isolation led to consequences years later); includes faulty and weak application (Nixon: Congress took Nixon to court where they had drafted three articles of impeachment; Wilson: after Senate’s refusal to ratify treaty, he had no other options than to let Congress deal with other problems)
- Includes limited relevant information from documents 4, 6, 7, and 9
- Presents very little relevant outside information (Nixon: concerned if he would win the next election)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (Nixon: illegal devices; Washington, D.C.; Wilson: Treaty of Versailles; needed consent of Senate)
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that are somewhat beyond a restatement of the theme

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. Document information is paraphrased and strung together to address these conflicts, demonstrating an understanding of the task. Generalizations support details and development.
Throughout the history of the United States, testing of the government powers have ended up in conflict. These conflicts include events such as when Andrew Jackson refused to enforce a supreme court decision. This also includes the Watergate Scandal committed by president Richard Nixon. Each of these conflicts affected the United States in a different way. They also created conflict between 2 of the branches in the United States government.

The decision made by Andrew Jackson had both positive and negative impacts on the country. He asked that congress give him full support in the idea of the Cherokees moving out West. The Supreme court demanded that the State of Georgia respect the tribes rights and acknowledge them as an independent nation, but they refused to do so with the support of Andrew Jackson (Doc 1). This caused a conflict between the executive branch and the supreme court. Andrew Jackson impacted the United States by causing the forceful migration of the Cherokees called the Trail of Tears (Doc 2). Although this caused over half of the Cherokees their lives, it positively impacted the United States because the rest of the population was expanding West, thus fulfilling Manifest Destiny.

The Watergate Scandal caused by President Nixon also led to a conflict between government branches. The Watergate Scandal was caused by an abuse of executive powers later discovered by the other government branches (Doc 7a). This caused the legislative branch the desire to impeach Richard Nixon as president (Doc 7b). The Watergate Scandal positively impacted the United States because laws were created to prevent future conflicts with financing and spending as shown in Document 8. It also proved that the constitution works and
Anchor Paper – Document-Based Essay—Level 2 – C

is required to be followed by even the highest of people (Doc 9).

These two events impacted the United States today.

Anchor Level 2-C

The response:
• Minimally develops all aspects of the task for President Andrew Jackson and President Richard Nixon
• Is primarily descriptive (Jackson: asked Congress to give him full support in the idea of Cherokees moving out West; Supreme Court demanded the state of Georgia respect Cherokee rights and acknowledge them as an independent nation, but they refused to do so with support of Jackson; Nixon: Watergate scandal caused by an abuse of executive power; legislative branch to impeach Nixon; laws created to prevent future conflicts with financing and spending; Watergate proved the Constitution works and even the highest people are required to follow it)
• Includes limited relevant information from documents 1, 2, 7, 8, and 9
• Presents little relevant outside information (Jackson: over half of Cherokees lost their lives, rest of population was expanding west, thus fulfilling Manifest Destiny)
• Includes very few relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: forceful migration; Trail of Tears)
• Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction that is a restatement of the theme and a brief conclusion

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. Document interpretation and a mention of Manifest Destiny are employed to address the Jackson conflict. A general statement is used to address the historical circumstances surrounding Watergate; however, the statement about its outcome is not supported with facts and details.
In the past few years, many people have observed bickering and rifts between political candidates and the 3 branches of government. This is not a new trend, as it dates back to the conflicts stemming from the Senate’s Debate over the Treaty of Versailles, and the Watergate Scandal.

In the debate to get the peace treaty ratified, the issue stems from the large opposition Wilson faced. People such as Harding (6), and the Chairman of the foreign relations committee largely opposed Wilson’s plan for the league of Nations (4). In a senate vote, the pact failed to ratify, and America adopted a isolationist policy.

President Nixon’s conflict stems from the Watergate breakins. He was found to have been connected with the burglaries (7a) and later provided a cover up, which tarnished his reputation. This triggered a massive White House investigation, that led to the passing of several legislative measures. These measures and acts reduced political criminality, and with the resignation of Nixon, it confirmed that no one was above the law.
Anchor Level 1-A

The response:
• Minimally addresses all aspects of the task for President Woodrow Wilson and President Richard Nixon
• Is descriptive (Wilson: debate to get peace treaty ratified; Harding and chairman of foreign relations committee largely opposed his plan for League of Nations; America adopted an isolationist policy; Nixon: found to be connected with the burglaries; provided a cover-up, which tarnished his reputation; several legislative measures passed; resignation confirmed no one above the law)
• Includes minimal information from documents 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9
• Presents no relevant outside information
• Includes very few relevant facts, examples, and details (Nixon: Watergate); includes some inaccuracies (rifts between political candidates and the three branches of government; Nixon: triggered a massive White House investigation)
• Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction and lacks a conclusion

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 1. A limited understanding of the task is demonstrated in a brief but fairly accurate overview of each conflict. Although all aspects of the task are addressed, few supporting facts and details are included.
In the United States history, there have been conflicts between the 3 branches of government. Three issues leading to conflict include President Andrew Jackson's refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision, the Senate debate over the treaty of Versailles, & Congress investigating Nixon's role in the Watergate affair.

In the debate over the treaty of Versailles Woodrow Wilson was trying to get it ratified but the Senate wasn't very fond of him so they didn't ratify it. This caused Warren G Harding to be elected and we were put in 20 years of isolationism & the great depression.

In the Watergate scandal, the legislative & judiciary branch were determining whether or not that Nixon be impeached. The result of this America being stunned & Nixon resigning from office.

These were example in history of branches of government struggling to make a decision to settle an issue.

The response:
- Minimally addresses some aspects of the task for President Woodrow Wilson and President Richard Nixon
- Is descriptive (Wilson: trying to get Treaty of Versailles ratified but Senate was not fond of him so they did not ratify it; Nixon: legislative branch determining whether or not Nixon should be impeached); lacks understanding and application (Wilson: not ratifying Treaty of Versailles caused Harding to be elected and put us into the Great Depression)
- Includes minimal information from documents 4, 6, 7, and 9
- Presents little relevant outside information (Nixon: resigned from office)
- Includes very few relevant facts, examples, and details (Wilson: twenty years of isolation)
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction that restates the theme and a brief conclusion

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 1. The response lacks any mention of the historical circumstances surrounding the Watergate conflict. Simplistic statements based on document information indicate a limited understanding of Wilson’s conflict with the Senate and almost no understanding of Nixon’s conflict with Congress.
Throughout history the United States federal government has not always been unanimously united in the face of conflict, and instead were divided. Due to a difference in political opinion two such issues, Indian Removal of the mid-nineteenth century and the battle over the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, exemplified how internal government conflict is often present and leads to an impact on the nation. When it came to Indian Removal, President Jackson opposed the pro-native rulings of the Supreme Court which led to the removal of Indians. In regards to the Treaty of Versailles, the Senate feared global involvement and thus fought against Wilson's efforts to ratify it.

In the mid-19th century during the presidency of Andrew Jackson, United States-Indian relations became an important federal issue, particularly in regards to the Cherokee nation. The Cherokees had long occupied ancestral lands within the state of Georgia which was supposed to recognize Indian treaties made by the federal government. As Glyndon G. Van Deusen’s work “The Jacksonian Era: 1828–1848” states, Georgia “refused to recognize the Cherokees as an independent nation and pressed them to sell their lands,” which went against federal treaties. When the Cherokees went to court in order to gain federal protection, the Supreme Court, in the case of Worcester v. Georgia, ruled that the natives were entitled to their own land. This enraged President Jackson who was a strong supporter of Indian Removal. As a result political tension between the judicial and executive branches began. President Jackson refused to enforce the Supreme Court decision and was rumored to have asserted that “John Marshall has made his opinion, now let him enforce it,” as stated in Van Deusen’s book. Jackson, with the support of Congress had been able
to pass the **Indian Removal Act** which forced the Cherokees and other eastern tribes to leave their land and begin a new way of life in present day Oklahoma. The conflict between the judicial and executive branches over Indian Removal was significant in that, as a map of the effect of policies towards native American Indians shows, thousands of native Americans, not just the Cherokees, were forced by government mandate to leave their homes for new land that was unknown to them and inhospitable in many ways. This federal policy had horrible consequences for these tribes as not only did they lose the land which was vital to their native culture, but the forced movement itself was devastating to their populations. On the Trail of Tears, as seen in Robert Lindeux’s painting, in which thousands of Natives were forced to go West of the Mississippi River, thousands of innocent native Americans died of disease, exhaustion or starvation. This was a huge atrocity which became very controversial to the American people. While some were pro-Indian Removal because they wished to acquire new land, others were uncomfortable with the harsh treatment of the natives. In general the political conflict between Jackson and the Supreme Court led to the removal of thousands of Native peoples. Eventually they would be forced to move again or at least give up much of their new land.

Besides the Indian Removal conflict, the decision whether or not to ratify the Treaty of Versailles also impacted the United States. Following the end of World War II, the major Allied powers met to lay out a plan for the post war world which was to loosely be based on President Wilson’s Fourteen Points. Included in this treaty was the
foundation for the creation of the League of Nations which was meant to be a peace keeping organization to maintain the new world order. Woodrow Wilson, along with David Lloyd George of Britain, Georges Clemenceau of France, and Signor Orlando of Italy thought that the Senate would ratify the treaty, but as stated in BBC News’s “A Plea to the Senate,” the President didn’t account for the strong opposition of Senator Henry Lodge, the chairman of the foreign relation committee. Lodge and his supporters opposed the Treaty of Versailles for they did not wish the United States to be caught in alliances with Europe that could drag them into a future war. Their major reason for opposition was the League of Nations although they had concerns about other points as well. Lodge’s dislike for Woodrow Wilson didn’t help matters either. Lodge’s group proposed making amendment to the treaty in order to ratify it, but Wilson told Democrats to refuse. Due to this the Treaty of Versailles was never ratified.

As a result of the government’s failure to ratify the Treaty of Versailles the United States and the world was negatively impacted. As asserted in George Scott’s “The Rise and Fall of the League of Nations,” the rejection of the League of Nations “started the twenty years during which America isolated itself. twenty years for which the whole world including, eventually the Americans themselves, would pay a terrible price.” By this Scott eluded to the fact that while the United States maintained peace at home which secured the safety of the American people, their isolation indirectly led to the second world war and their involvement in that conflict. Without the U.S. involvement, the League of Nation did not have the power to deal with German aggression. The major European powers tried a policy of
Document-Based Essay—Practice Paper – A

appeasement which did not work. Due in part to U.S. isolationism Europe entered a period of tension which ultimately led to World War Two. This eventually led to the loss of American lives when the United States formally entered the war after Pearl Harbor. Throughout our history, conflict between the branches of the federal government has created controversies which have impacted the nation. Due to the battle over Indian Removal between the Supreme Court and President Jackson, thousands of Native Americans was forced to leave their homes and many of them died in the process. The stubbornness of Wilson and Lodge and their unwillingness to compromise on the Treaty of Versailles led to a rejection of the treaty which in turn led to a period of American isolationism. Overall, these conflicts have had a huge impact on the United States, its people and the world as a whole.
Throughout United States history, the three branches of government have come into conflict over actions and decisions. Notable among the conflicts are those between the president and the other branches, and notable among those are President Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision regarding the Cherokee nation and Congress’ investigation into President Nixon’s role in the Watergate Scandal. The Constitution provides a system for solving these conflicts so that no one branch has too much power.

President Andrew Jackson could be called disagreeable, given his propensity to disagree—with Congress, with the Bank of the United States, and with the Supreme Court. One of his most important disagreements was with the Supreme Court over the Cherokees in Georgia. The Cherokees had become “civilized” farmers living a lifestyle that was similar to white society. While treaties with the United States recognized the Cherokees as independent and gave them the right to self-govern, Georgia refused to recognize the treaties or the Cherokees status as an independent nation. When the Cherokees turned to the federal government for help, the Supreme Court ruled in their favor stating that Georgia’s acts were unconstitutional. President Jackson, however, ignored the Supreme Court’s decision and allowed Georgia to carry on with its actions toward the Cherokees, including pressuring them to sell their land (Doc. One). President Jackson made the decision not to protect the property rights of the Cherokees. President Jackson used federal power and millions of dollars to enforce removal policies toward Native Americans. These policies would eventually result in the Trail of Tears, a forced migration of Native Americans during which many died. Native
Americans were moved west to “Indian Territory”, losing their original lands in the process through many unfair treaties (Doc 2). Resettlement did not protect the Native Americans as Andrew Jackson said it would. Government policies passed to encourage westward expansion meant more settlers going farther west uprooting the Native Americans again. Though the Indian Removal Act would have been bad enough, with the Native Americans forced to give up millions of acres of land under terms that were often unethical, the Dawes Act began dividing up the Native American lands, distributing them to Native American families to encourage assimilation. It did not work as most never fully assimilated. The western Cherokees lost over nineteen million acres in questionable sales by the 1970s. (Doc 3). Native Americans continue to struggle socially and economically. And these struggles can be traced in part to the failed government policy begun by Andrew Jackson.

President Nixon’s presidency was less disagreeable in other ways, but he was crippled by fear of losing reelection, which led to his operation of espionage and sabotage. The operation began to be uncovered when five burglars were caught placing listening devices in the Democratic Party headquarters at Watergate (Doc. 7a). As reporters further investigated the facts, Nixon’s denial of White House involvement was called into question. The judicial branch and House Judiciary Committee both investigated the incident and Nixon’s involvement, considering grounds to impeach (Doc 7b). Though Nixon attempted to withhold information such as taped conversations under guise of executive privilege, he was forced by the Supreme Court to hand over all taped evidence (Doc. 7b). These tapes provided grounds.
for Nixon’s impeachment. Watergate forced the United States to address the president’s accountability, culminating in the passage of legislation such as the War Powers Act and Freedom of Information Act, but these were ultimately ineffective as future presidents found their way through loopholes (Doc 8). The most important result of the investigation was the proof that presidents are not above the law, and the reinforcing of the strength of the constitution and the judiciary branch (Doc. 9).

Throughout American history, presidents have come into conflict with the legislative and judiciary branches. These conflicts have lasting effects, both good and bad, on the United States and its government. The Watergate Scandal demonstrated that checks and balances can work on many different levels to stop one branch from getting too much power. In Jackson’s case it didn’t work as it should. In Nixon’s case the system worked exactly as it was supposed to.
Throughout the history of the United States, there have been times when one branch of government challenged another branch in order to gain more power for one branch. The challenger was normally the head of the executive branch, the president, as in Andrew Jackson and the Supreme Court, and Richard Nixon and Congress.

The United States government is based off of a system of checks and balances, this allows for the assurance that one branch won’t abuse its power.

- Supreme Court rulings must be upheld by the executive branch
- Jackson refused
- President doesn’t have that power to refuse
- Congress demanded the tapes from Watergate from Nixon
- Nixon refused to hand them over
- Congress began the process of impeachment
- This led to the movement of Native Americans from their land
- Jackson sold their land.
In the history of the U.S there has been conflict between the 3 branches of gov. They are not meant to always agree b/c they need to balance each other out and do what is best for the people. Two major issues that have led to conflict are the Senate’s debate over the treaty of Versailles and the Watergate Affair. These two events have had a big role in our society and have shown us the true colors of our government.

In the year 1919 Woodrow Wilson was the President. It was after world war I that the treaty of Versailles was made. This treaty would blame most of the war on Germany and get us caught up in foreign affairs. Wilson was for this treaty. Senate, on the other hand, didn’t agree. In the constitution there is a clause that says 2/3 of the Senate must agree and give their consent before he makes treaties. (DOC 4) The Senate did not ratify this treaty and in 1973, Warren Harding, a republican became President and decided to keep the U.S “free of any such involvement w/ the rest of the world’s troubles. This sent us into a period of isolation which would not exactly benefit our nation but it gave us some time to recover from the war. (DOC. 6)

Another event in U.S history that led to a conflict in gov was Nixon’s Watergate affair. 5 men were arrested for being at the Democratic party headquarters w/ illegal bugging devices. These men were Nixon’s top aides which led to a huge White House cover up. More then 70 people were convicted for abusing their power. (DOC 7a) This scandal tested our gov. Congress decided to authorize the Judiciary committee to investigate grounds for the impeachment of Nixon. Impeachment is when a President is removed from office. Nixon was forced to surrender tapes and impeached for obstructing the watergate
investigation. Misuse of power & violating oath of office and failure to comply with House subpoenas. This shows conflict between the legislative and executive branches. Many Acts and laws were passed after Watergate to try and make American gov. more accountable to the people, but the central issue wasn’t completely fixed. Conflicts within our gov. ensure us that our gov. is working properly. Checks and balances are there so not one branch has too much power and I believe that is very necessary. Events such as the denial of the Treaty of Versailles and Watergate show that the President does not have unlimited power. Things like this teach us that absolutely no one is above the law and make our gov. stronger which gives us a better society.
American government has evolved tremendously from the unicameral legislature it once consisted of under the Articles of Confederation. Since the ratification of the Constitution in the late 18th century, three bodies constituted American government: the executive branch to enforce laws, the judicial branch to interpret laws, and the legislative branch to create laws. A delicate system of checks and balances has prevented one branch of government from becoming too powerful. However, conflicts and controversies have arisen over the years between these three bodies. Two of the most famous of these conflicts are Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision, and the debate in the Senate over the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles. Both tested the boundaries of these governmental bodies and pushed leaders to their limits.

In the 1820s, there existed a major debate over the fate of Native Americans now that America was expanding substantially. One such issue was the Cherokee Indian nation residing in Georgia. The Cherokee nation had established their own government within Georgia and thought of themselves as an independent nation. (Doc. 1). They had been encouraged to think this way through a series of U.S. treaties, that allowed them to make “peace and war”, govern within their boundaries, and punish citizens based on Cherokee law. Georgia refused to recognize these treaties and wanted their land, so the Cherokees asked for federal protection. In both Supreme court cases, Worcester v. Georgia and Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, Supreme court justice John Marshall upheld the rights of the Cherokees to their land, much to Jackson’s dismay. Jackson refused to observe Marshall’s decision, and some say he boldly proclaimed that it was Marshall’s
decision, therefore he should enforce it. Jackson had already asked Congress to pass the Indian Removal Act in 1829, which would set aside “Indian Territory” west of the Mississippi. It was his support for removal that led Jackson to outright ignore the decision of the judicial branch, not respecting the way checks and balances was supposed to work. His decision created various long and short term affects. Cherokees and other tribes were forced to migrate west across thousands of miles of land and across the Mississippi River (Doc 2a). This was known as the Trail of Tears (Doc. 2b) and hundreds of Cherokee men, women, and children died. The Cherokees proceeded to develop their own nation in the new land, but problems arose in the ensuing years. As Americans fulfilled their Manifest Destiny, and more citizens occupied western lands, problems arose between settlers and Indians. the Native American land was ceded to new settlers as well as newly arrived tribes (Doc. 3). In 1887, the Dawes Severalty Act was enacted by Congress, which allowed for the break up of tribal unity and of Indian lands, some of this land went to families. The remaining land was sold to newly arrived settlers, typically for agricultural purposes. As a result, western Cherokees lost over 19 million acres of land by the 1970s, and have had a hard time recovering from the wrongdoings placed against them early in history. 

About a century later, another controversy between the Senate and president Woodrow Wilson arose. After World War I, Europe was in shambles and the issue of foreign policy and punishment of the Germans lay suspended in air. The Treaty of Versailles, negotiated by Wilson, Orlando, George, and Clemenceau (Doc. 4) in France attempted to deal with these problems. One major focus of Wilson was
the creation of a league of Nations to act as a peacekeeper of world affairs. The Senate, mainly Senator Henry Lodge, opposed the Treaty due to the League of Nations and Wilson’s wanting it. Lodge and other “reservationists” did not believe America should become involved so easily again in foreign affairs and in possible trouble spots that would require America’s military involvement. Though vehemently pushed by Wilson, the Treaty was not ratified by the Senate in a vote of 49 to 35 (Doc. 5b). As depicted in the political cartoon (Doc. 5a), the Senate stood directly in the way of Wilson and his League. Eventually Wilson’s obsession with the Treaty of Versailles led to his death after suffering a stroke while traveling cross-country to convince Americans that the League was a good idea. Harding was elected president and made it perfectly clear that he was dead set against the Treaty and the league (Doc. 6). As a result, America secluded into isolation for nearly twenty years, staying out of foreign affairs.

The judicial, executive, and legislative branches were created to ensure that not one person or group became too powerful. Naturally, in the struggle for dominance, conflicts emerged between the three bodies. Two influential debates occurred between Jackson and the Supreme Court, and the Senate and President Wilson. Jackson undermined the authority of the Supreme court, in essence changing the lives and culture of the Cherokee people and others. Senate proved in the 1920s that the president does not always have complete control over issues, especially foreign policy. This system of checks and balances represent the American ideals of equality and fair practices, and continues to play an important role in U.S. government today.
The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task with some depth for conflicts involving President Andrew Jackson and President Woodrow Wilson
- Is more descriptive than analytical (Jackson: opposed pro-native rulings of Supreme Court which led to removal of Indians; Georgia was supposed to recognize Indian treaties made by federal government; Indian Removal Act forced Cherokees to begin a new way of life in present day Oklahoma; Native American Indians lost land vital to native culture; forced movement was devastating to their populations; some Americans were pro-Indian removal because they wished to acquire new land but others were uncomfortable with the harsh treatment of natives; Native American Indians forced to move again or give up much of new land; Wilson: thought Senate would ratify treaty; did not account for strong opposition of Senator Lodge; unwillingness of Wilson and Lodge to compromise led to rejection of the treaty and led to a period of American isolationism)
- Incorporates some relevant information from documents 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6
- Incorporates relevant outside information (Jackson: Cherokees had long occupied ancestral lands in Georgia; new lands that were unknown to them and inhospitable in many ways; Wilson: major Allied powers laid out plan for post-war world loosely based on Fourteen Points; League of Nations meant to be a peacekeeping organization; Lodge and supporters did not want United States to be dragged into a war; Lodge’s group proposed amendments to treaty, but Wilson told Democrats to refuse; while United States maintained peace at home, isolation indirectly led to World War II; without United States involvement, League did not have power to deal with German aggression; major European powers tried a policy of appeasement)
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: Georgia pressed Cherokees to sell their lands; federal protection; Worcester v. Georgia; refused to enforce Supreme Court decision; Trail of Tears; thousands died of disease, exhaustion, or starvation; Wilson: Lloyd George of Britain, Georges Clemenceau of France, and Signor Orlando of Italy; Foreign Relations Committee); includes a minor inaccuracy (Wilson: Treaty of Versailles followed World War II)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that discuss how Indian Removal and the Treaty of Versailles had an impact on the nation

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. Quotations from documents and some interpretation of that information frame the discussion of these conflicts. The discussion of Wilson’s conflict with the Senate integrates outside information while the discussion of Jackson relies on the documents.
The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task for President Andrew Jackson’s refusal to enforce a Supreme Court decision and President Richard Nixon’s role in the Watergate affair
- Is both descriptive and analytical (Jackson: treaties with United States recognized Cherokees as independent and gave them the right to self-govern; Georgia refused to recognize treaties or the Cherokees’ status as independent nation; when Cherokees turned to federal government for help, the Supreme Court stated Georgia’s acts were unconstitutional; Jackson ignored Supreme Court’s decision and allowed Georgia to carry on actions toward Cherokees; Trail of Tears, a forced migration of Native Americans during which many died; resettlement did not protect Native Americans as Jackson said it would; Native Americans forced to give up millions of acres of land under terms that were unethical; Native Americans continue to struggle socially and economically; struggles can be traced to the failed government policy begun by Jackson; Nixon: as reporters investigated facts behind burglary at Watergate, his denial of White House involvement was called into question; judicial branch and House Judiciary Committee considered grounds for impeachment; tapes provided grounds for his impeachment; Watergate forced United States to address president’s accountability, culminating in passage of legislation; most important part of investigation that presidents are not above the law; Watergate demonstrated checks and balances can work on many different levels to stop one branch from getting too much power)
- Incorporates relevant information from documents 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9
- Incorporates relevant outside information (Jackson: Cherokees had become “civilized” farmers, living a lifestyle similar to white society; government policies passed to encourage westward expansion meant more settlers going further west uprooting Native Americans again; Dawes Act began dividing up the Native American lands, distributing them to Native American families to encourage assimilation; Nixon: crippled by fear of losing reelection; attempted to withhold information under guise of executive privilege)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: Indian Territory; Indian Removal Act; 19 million acres lost; Nixon: five burglars; listening devices in Democratic party headquarters; taped conversations; forced by Supreme Court to hand over taped evidence; War Powers Act; Freedom of Information Act)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that are a restatement of the theme

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. Relevant outside information is integrated with document information to produce a narrative of the conflicts, demonstrating a good understanding of the task. The discussion of the effects of outcomes for Nixon could have been strengthened by including more details.
Practice Paper C—Score Level 1

The response:
- Minimally addresses some aspects of the task for President Andrew Jackson and President Richard Nixon
- Is descriptive (Jackson: Supreme Court rulings must be upheld by executive branch; Jackson refused; Nixon: refused to hand over Watergate tapes; Congress began process of impeachment)
- Includes minimal information from documents 1, 2, and 7
- Presents little relevant outside information (United States government based on a system of checks and balances, which allows for assurance that one branch won’t abuse its power)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: Native Americans moved from their land; Nixon: Congress demanded Watergate tapes); includes an inaccuracy (Jackson: sold Native American Indian land)
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization; lacks focus; does not clearly identify which aspect of the task is being addressed; includes an introduction that is slightly beyond a restatement of the theme and lacks a conclusion

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 1. Although historical circumstances that led to Watergate are not mentioned, a list of scattered facts addresses some parts of the task. A limited understanding of the task is demonstrated.

Practice Paper D—Score Level 2

The response:
- Minimally develops all aspects of the task for President Woodrow Wilson and President Richard Nixon
- Is primarily descriptive (Wilson: Treaty of Versailles would get America caught up in foreign affairs; President Harding decided to keep the United States free of involvement with the rest of the world’s troubles; isolation did not exactly benefit our nation but gave us some time to recover from the war; Nixon: judiciary committee to investigate grounds for impeachment of Nixon; many acts and laws passed after Watergate to try and make American government more accountable to people, but central issue was not completely fixed)
- Includes limited relevant information from documents 4, 6, 7, and 8
- Presents little relevant outside information (Wilson: treaty blamed most of the war on Germany)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (Wilson: Senate did not ratify treaty; Nixon: Democratic party headquarters; illegal bugging devices; more than seventy people convicted; forced to surrender tapes); includes some inaccuracies (Wilson: two-thirds of the Senate must agree and give consent before he makes treaties; Warren Harding became president in 1973; Nixon: Watergate burglars were his top aides; impeachment is when a President is removed from office; Nixon was impeached)
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that are somewhat beyond a restatement of the theme

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. General statements related to the documents provide a brief overview; however, these statements are weakened by a lack of supporting facts and details. A misunderstanding of the impeachment process results in a somewhat confused discussion of Nixon and the Watergate crisis.
The response:

- Develops some aspects of the task with some depth for conflicts involving President Andrew Jackson and President Woodrow Wilson
- Is more descriptive than analytical (Jackson: Cherokee Nation had established own government in Georgia and thought of themselves as independent; Cherokees had been encouraged through a series of United States treaties that allowed them to govern within own boundaries and punish their citizens based on Cherokee law; Georgia refused to recognize Cherokee treaties and wanted their land; Jackson’s support for removal led him to ignore decisions of judicial branch; Cherokees forced to migrate west across Mississippi River; Dawes Act allowed for breakup of tribal unity and Indian lands; remaining land was sold to newly arrived settlers; Wilson: League of Nations to act as peacekeeper of world affairs; Senate stood directly in way of Wilson and his League; Harding made it perfectly clear he was against treaty and League; America stayed out of foreign affairs)
- Incorporates some relevant information from documents 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6
- Incorporates limited relevant outside information (Jackson: hundreds died on Trail of Tears; as Americans fulfilled Manifest Destiny, problems arose between settlers and Native Americans; Wilson: Lodge and other reservationists did not believe America should become involved again in foreign affairs and possible trouble spots that would require America’s military involvement; traveled cross-country to convince Americans the League was a good idea)
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (Jackson: Cherokees asked for federal protection; Worcester v. Georgia; Cherokee Nation v. Georgia; Indian Removal Act; Dawes Act; western Cherokees lost over 19 million acres of land; Wilson: Treaty of Versailles negotiated by Wilson, Orlando, George, and Clemenceau; treaty not ratified by Senate; Harding elected president)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction that states controversies tested the boundaries of government and a conclusion that states checks and balances continues to play an important role in the United States government today

Conclusion: Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. Although outside information is used to establish the historical circumstances for Wilson’s conflict with the Senate, explanation of document information dominates the treatment of Jackson and Indian removal. Further discussion of the outcome of both conflicts would have provided stronger support for good statements in the conclusion.
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Part I
Multiple-Choice Questions by Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Question Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1—United States and New York History</td>
<td>2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 44, 45, 46, 48, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2—World History</td>
<td>33, 37, 38, 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3—Geography</td>
<td>1, 17, 27, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4—Economics</td>
<td>3, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5—Civics, Citizenship, and Government</td>
<td>4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 31, 42, 43, 47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parts II and III by Theme and Standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>STANDARDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic Essay</td>
<td>Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4: United States and New York History; World History; Geography; Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Policy; Places and Regions; Interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document-based Essay</td>
<td>Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5: United States and New York History; World History; Geography; Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constitutional Principles; Presidential Decisions and Actions; Foreign Policy; Government; Individuals, Groups, Institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

Part I and Part II scoring information is found in Volume 1 of the Rating Guide.

Part III scoring information is found in Volume 2 of the Rating Guide.
Submitting Teacher Evaluations of the Test to the Department

Suggestions and feedback from teachers provide an important contribution to the test development process. The Department provides an online evaluation form for State assessments. It contains spaces for teachers to respond to several specific questions and to make suggestions. Instructions for completing the evaluation form are as follows:

2. Select the test title.
3. Complete the required demographic fields.
4. Complete each evaluation question and provide comments in the space provided.
5. Click the SUBMIT button at the bottom of the page to submit the completed form.