

# FOR TEACHERS ONLY

The University of the State of New York  
REGENTS HIGH SCHOOL EXAMINATION

## UNITED STATES HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT

VOLUME  
**1** OF **2**  
THEMATIC ESSAY

Wednesday, January 22, 2020 — 9:15 a.m. to 12:15 p.m., only

### RATING GUIDE FOR PART II (THEMATIC ESSAY)

Updated information regarding the rating of this examination may be posted on the New York State Education Department's web site during the rating period. Visit the site at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/> and select the link "Scoring Information" for any recently posted information regarding this examination. This site should be checked before the rating process for this examination begins and several times throughout the Regents Examination period.

#### Contents of the Rating Guide

For **Part II** (thematic) essay:

- A content-specific rubric
- Prescored answer papers. Score levels 5 and 1 have two papers each, and score levels 4, 3, and 2 have three papers each. They are ordered by score level from high to low.
- Commentary explaining the specific score awarded to each paper
- Five prescored practice papers

General:

- Test Specifications
- Web addresses for the test-specific conversion chart and teacher evaluation forms

## Mechanics of Rating

The following procedures are to be used in rating essay papers for this examination. More detailed directions for the organization of the rating process and procedures for rating the examination are included in the *Information Booklet for Scoring the Regents Examination in United States History and Government*.

### 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.

**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.**

**United States History and Government**  
**Content-Specific Rubric**  
**Thematic Essay**  
**January 2020**

**Theme:**        **Foreign Policy**

Throughout United States history, the government has taken foreign policy actions that have resulted in differences of opinion among the American people. These actions have had impacts on the United States and on other countries and regions.

**Task:**        Choose *two* foreign policy actions that have caused disagreement among the American people and for *each*

- Explain the point of view of those who *supported* the foreign policy action
- Explain the point of view of those who *opposed* the foreign policy action
- Discuss the impact of the action on the United States *and/or* on another country or region

You may use any foreign policy action that caused disagreement among the American people. Some suggestions you might wish to consider include purchasing Louisiana (1803), declaring war against Mexico (1846), purchasing Alaska (1867), annexing the Philippines (1899), maintaining neutrality in World War I (1914–1917), providing Lend-Lease aid to Great Britain (1941), sending troops to Vietnam (1964–1973), ratifying the North American Free Trade Agreement (1993), and implementing Operation Iraqi Freedom (2003).

**You are *not* limited to these suggestions.**

**Scoring Notes:**

1. This thematic essay has a minimum of *six* components (for *each* of *two* foreign policy actions that have caused disagreement among the American people, discussing the point of view of those who *supported* the foreign policy action, the point of view of those who *opposed* the foreign policy action, **and** the impact of the action on the United States and/or on another country or region).
2. The historical circumstances surrounding the foreign policy action may be included as part of the explanation of support or opposition but are not part of the required task.
3. Specific groups and/or individuals who supported or opposed the foreign policy action do not have to be identified by name, but specific reasons for the positions must be included in the discussion.
4. The point of view may or may not be identified as support or opposition to a foreign policy action as long as the position is clear in the discussion.
5. Arguments for or against a foreign policy action may be from a broad or a narrow perspective, e.g., a response about sending troops to Vietnam may discuss containment and the domino theory or it may discuss the alleged attack on United States naval vessels in the Gulf of Tonkin.
6. The discussion of the arguments for or against a foreign policy action as well as the impact of the action may be immediate or long term.
7. Actions with similar arguments may be selected as long as separate and distinct information is included for each, e.g., supporters of purchasing Louisiana and declaring war against Mexico favored westward expansion but support for the Louisiana Purchase focused on securing control of the Mississippi River while support for going to war with Mexico centered on achieving Manifest Destiny.
8. Actions with similar impacts may be selected as long as separate and distinct information is included for each, e.g., purchasing Louisiana and declaring war with Mexico both resulted in compromises over the expansion of slavery, but the Louisiana Purchase led to the Missouri Compromise while the Mexican-American War led to the Compromise of 1850.
9. The response may discuss the impact of the foreign policy action from any perspective as long as the position taken is supported by accurate facts and examples.
10. If more than two foreign policy actions that have caused disagreement among the American people are discussed, only the first two may be scored.

### Score of 5:

- Thoroughly develops **all** aspects of the task evenly and in depth by discussing **each** of **two** foreign policy actions that have caused disagreement among the American people, the point of view of those who *supported* the foreign policy action, the point of view of those who *opposed* the foreign policy action, and the impact of the action on the United States and/or on another country or region
- Is more analytical than descriptive (analyzes, evaluates, and/or creates\* information), e.g., *purchasing Louisiana*: connects the argument of supporters that western farmers needed unrestricted use of the port of New Orleans to ship their crops and that the purchase would open millions of acres of farmland to American settlers, and the argument of opponents that President Jefferson violated his belief in strict construction of the Constitution and that the territory was too large for the young republic to govern effectively, to how the purchase of Louisiana set a precedent for future continental expansion, doubled the size of the United States, and sparked deadly conflicts between white settlers and Plains Indians; *annexing the Philippines*: connects the argument of supporters that the United States had the “White Man’s Burden” to civilize the Filipinos and needed naval bases in the Pacific, and the argument of opponents that annexation violated the American ideal of self-determination and that the United States should not acquire colonies that would never become states, to how annexing the Philippines led to a bloody guerrilla war to suppress Filipino nationalists, the construction of new infrastructure by the United States, and later, to a democratic ally in the Pacific
- Richly supports the theme with many relevant facts, examples, and details, e.g., *purchasing Louisiana*: Kentucky and Tennessee farmers; right of deposit; full use of Mississippi River; trade with East Coast and Europe; Jefferson’s agrarian vision; Federalists in New England; lack of military to defend; treaty-making power of the president; Lewis and Clark expedition; creation of new states; breadbasket of America; destruction of the buffalo; Sioux and Cheyenne; *annexing the Philippines*: imperialists; Spanish-American War; Theodore Roosevelt; spread of Christianity; ethnocentrism; Admiral Alfred Mahan; two-ocean navy; raw materials and markets; industrialization; Anti-Imperialist League; Mark Twain; Declaration of Independence; cost of empire; Emilio Aguinaldo; insurgency crushed; Open Door policy with China; post-World War II independence
- 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 aspect of the task less thoroughly than the other aspects of the task *or* by discussing one foreign policy action more thoroughly than the other foreign policy action
- Is both descriptive and analytical (applies, analyzes, evaluates, and/or creates\* information), e.g., *purchasing Louisiana*: connects the argument of supporters that western farmers needed access to the port of New Orleans for shipping their crops and that the United States would gain valuable farmland, and the argument of opponents that Jefferson did not have the constitutional power to make the purchase and the nation would be too large to defend, to how the Louisiana Purchase doubled the size of the United States and led to conflicts with Plains Indians; *annexing the Philippines*: connects the argument of supporters that the United States should uplift Filipinos and strengthen United States naval power, and the argument of opponents that annexation violated American ideals and that an overseas empire would be expensive to defend, to how the annexation of the Philippines led to a bloody war to maintain control of the islands but allowed the United States to establish Pacific trade routes
- 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 four** aspects of the task in some depth
- Is more descriptive than analytical (applies, may analyze and/or evaluate 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** foreign policy action and if the response meets most of the other Level 5 criteria, the overall response may be a Level 3 paper.

**Score of 2:**

- Minimally develops **all** aspects of the task *or* develops **at least three** aspects of the task in some depth
- Is primarily descriptive; may include faulty, weak, or isolated application or analysis
- 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
- 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 theme, task, or suggestions as 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.

**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.**

Throughout American history, the controversy of foreign involvement versus neutrality has been a topic of hot debate. Since George Washington's Farewell Address, the United States has tried to stay isolated from political alliances and foreign conflicts. When war and trouble raged overseas in Europe and Asia, the United States had to consider whether to take a more involved approach and whether it would be met with complete support or total backlash by the American people. The U.S. war with Spain and involvement in Vietnam had two very different viewpoints in the eyes of historians and the people of the era.

The Spanish-American War marked the beginning of interventionism. Americans, under the influence of yellow journalism, were hungry for war against Spain due to the mistreatment of Cubans. New York Publishers Hearst and Pulitzer battled for circulation by exaggerating accounts of "Butcher" Weyler and treatment of innocent Cubans. The war was provoked under false pretenses and stories, but regardless the cry for war rose especially after incendiary photos of the battleship Maine exploding in the Havana Harbor were circulated. Spain was immediately blamed despite the complete lack of evidence. Proponents of war argued that Cuba was so close to the United States that we had a duty to stop Spain's abuses of the Cuban people. Many others argued against the war as one of an expansionist agenda. Anti-imperialists claimed that the United States was less interested in Cuba than in achieving national power. They pointed out the hypocrisy of freeing Cuba while seeking overseas colonies of our own. After the war was over, Spain was forced to give up control of Cuba along with other islands/territories.

The U.S. acquisition of these new territories caused controversy. The new colonies would not be allowed the opportunity for self-determination which outraged anti-imperialists. In fact, the Supreme Court later ruled that overseas colonists were not guaranteed full rights of citizenship. The war over imperialism was longer than the actual Spanish-American War and put both Teddy Roosevelt and the United States on the world stage. It was a momentous turning point marking the country as a global power with a growing two ocean navy and naval bases all over the world. The Philippines were subjected to a strong United States military presence and restricted sovereignty until their liberation after World War II when they finally gained independence.

Cuba and the Philippines would not be the last countries to deal with U.S. efforts of interventionism. In post WWII Asia, communism was spreading at an alarming rate in the eyes of Americans. John F. Kennedy was worried about the Domino Effect, as one country turned "red," so others would also fall under Communist rule. Later Presidents such as Lyndon B. Johnson would take initiative in the fight with communism in Vietnam. The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution gave the president authority to do what was necessary in order to end North Vietnamese aggression in Indochina. This was widely accepted in the beginning as Americans viewed the containment efforts as vital to the upkeep of capitalism and the ideals of freedom. The United States had already contained communism on the Korean peninsula and now wanted to hold the line at the 17<sup>th</sup> parallel in Vietnam. Others saw the Resolution as an act of unofficial war, never officially declared by Congress. The opponents of United

States involvement in Vietnam argued that it was a civil war of self-determination which should be decided by the Vietnamese. Ho Chi Minh was first and foremost a nationalist who was fighting to remove Western control from his nation. The war shook America as citizens saw the gruesome, horrific events on TV. Broadcasts showed a war of attrition with daily body counts. Especially troubling was news about the massacres of innocent civilians like the attack on My Lai.

Opposition to the war grew as the size of the war escalated and American casualties increased sharply. American support was never the same. Civilians clamored for an end of the Vietnam War. There was a resurgence of isolationism as many tried to leave the war and all of its legacy behind in favor of democratic ideals and less intervention. American military might had failed to defeat an army of determined nationalists. The United States recognized it could no longer police the world. Foreign policy shifted from all out containment to détente, with much less willingness to intervene in foreign conflicts.

The significance of actions such as foreign policies are never limited to a single period of time, rather it progresses and changes, and has an impact on future events. The “splendid victory” over Spain marked the beginning of the United States as a world power while a humiliating loss in Vietnam caused a reassessment of our global responsibilities.



## Anchor Level 5-A

### **The response:**

- Thoroughly develops all aspects of the task evenly and in depth for declaring war against Spain and for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is more analytical than descriptive (*Spain*: Americans under the influence of yellow journalism were hungry for war against Spain due to the mistreatment of Cubans; the cry for war rose especially after incendiary photos of the battleship USS *Maine* exploding in the Havana Harbor were circulated; proponents of war argued that Cuba was so close to the United States that we had a duty to stop Spain's abuses of the Cuban people; anti-imperialists claimed the United States was less interested in protecting Cuba than in achieving national power; new colonies would not be allowed the opportunity for self-determination which outraged anti-imperialists; momentous turning point marking the country as a global power with a growing two-ocean navy and naval bases all over the world; Philippines were subjected to a strong United States military presence and restricted sovereignty until their liberation after World War II when they finally gained independence; *Vietnam*: John F. Kennedy was worried about the domino effect, as one country turned "red" so others would fall under communist rule; United States had already contained communism on the Korean peninsula and now wanted to hold the line at the 17th parallel in Vietnam; opponents of United States involvement in Vietnam argued it was a civil war of self-determination which should be decided by the Vietnamese; Ho Chi Minh was first and foremost a nationalist who was fighting to remove Western influence from his nation; the war shook America as citizens saw the gruesome, horrific events on television; opposition to the war grew as the size of the war escalated and American casualties increased sharply; American military might had failed to defeat an army of determined nationalists; foreign policy shifted from all-out containment to détente with less willingness to intervene in foreign conflicts)
- Richly supports the theme with many relevant facts, examples, and details (*Spain*: New York publishers Hearst and Pulitzer; "Butcher" Weyler; re-concentration of innocent Cubans; not guaranteed full rights of citizenship; Teddy Roosevelt; *Vietnam*: Lyndon B. Johnson; Gulf of Tonkin Resolution; North Vietnamese aggression; Indochina; never officially declared; war of attrition; daily body counts; My Lai; no longer police the world)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction that mentions Washington's Farewell Address and ends with an analytical conclusion that war with Spain was the beginning of the United States as a world power while a humiliating loss in Vietnam caused a reassessment of our global responsibilities

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 5. The response connects both wars to conflicting opinions regarding United States national interests and self-determination by weaving good analytic statements and historical details into a cohesive discussion.

Throughout U.S. History, the government has taken various actions in foreign policy that have had major implications on the U.S. homefront and abroad. While some actions have caused widespread unity and nationalism, others have divided the union into war-hawk and pacifist factions. The decision of the United States to enter World War II and the Vietnam War have had both supporters and critics, and both decisions have affected history on a global scale.

In the years leading up to World War II, the United States was faced with the decision to either stay out of the developing war in Europe or get involved. In the early stages of the war, FDR sided with isolationists. The nation was in a state of unprecedented depression and the previous World War had failed to keep the world “safe for democracy,” as Woodrow Wilson said. Isolationists like Charles Lindbergh and the America First Committee argued that fascism in Europe posed no direct threat to the United States. However, once Hitler and the axis powers grew in their influence, democratic nations such as France were overtaken and Great Britain was verging on the brink of collapse. Thus, FDR changed his policy from isolationism to cash-and-carry, to lend-lease, to eventually full-scale involvement. Clearly, Hitler’s fascist government was gaining too much power, and the collapse of Great Britain would mean complete domination of Europe by the fascists. At this point, FDR decided to make the U.S. an “arsenal for democracy.” The surprise attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 ended the arguments of the isolationists and Americans unified in support of war against the Axis threat. This decision, although it cost many American lives, accomplished two major goals. It jumpstarted the economy, essentially freeing America from its Great Depression

by reopening factories to fuel the insatiable need for war materials. Most importantly, the United States decision to enter World War II, although it cost many American lives, ended the reign of Hitler and the Japanese militarists. The war left the United States and the Soviet Union as the undisputed Superpowers of the world. President Truman's decision to use the atomic bomb on Japan during the war led the Soviet Union to quickly match American firepower after the war, ushering in a terrifying nuclear arms race between the two former allies.

In the post war period, the rivalry between the Superpowers spread from Europe to Asia. President Johnson's decision to escalate the conflict in Vietnam stemmed mainly from Cold War fears at the time. Faced with communist aggression from Ho Chi Minh's troops in the North, Johnson decided to side with the war hawks of the time. With widespread beliefs such as the Domino theory, many believed that, if one Southeast Asia country fell to communism, it would bring others with it. The cycle would continue on until communism dominated the globe. However, due to fear of communism and the U.S. policy of containment, President Johnson decided to escalate the conflict to try and root out communism in the area. After North Vietnam attacked two U.S. ships in the Gulf of Tonkin, Congress overwhelmingly supported Johnson's escalation of the war. However, support for the war eroded as the number of young men killed steadily increased. Media reporting facts contrary to the official story turned the public against the war and helped create a "credibility gap" for the Johnson Administration. Further opposition resulted as young men were drafted to serve their country in a war they did not have

any say in.

Unfortunately Johnson's efforts to win the war were in vain. His successor, President Nixon eventually negotiated a peace treaty which removed troops from the war zone. The damage had been done. Not only did communism spread throughout Vietnam, but the fact that thousands of lives were lost over an unsuccessful cause led to widespread distrust of the federal government. Disillusionment and dismay over Vietnam made Americans wary of sending troops overseas and the government retreated from foreign intervention and containment. Congress attempted to reassert its war-making authority by passage of the War Powers Act over Nixon's veto.

The United States' involvement in both WWII and the Vietnam conflict had major implications both domestically and worldwide. Such implications have shaped foreign policy up through the late 1900s and their effects are still felt today.

## Anchor Level 5-B

### **The response:**

- Thoroughly develops all aspects of the task evenly and in depth for entering World War II and for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is more analytical than descriptive (*World War II*: nation was in a state of unprecedented depression and the previous world war had failed to keep the world safe for democracy as Woodrow Wilson said; isolationists like Charles Lindbergh and the America First Committee argued that fascism in Europe posed no direct threat to the United States; Hitler's fascist government was gaining too much power and the collapse of Great Britain would mean complete domination of Europe by the fascists; surprise attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 ended the arguments of the isolationists and Americans unified in support of war against the Axis threat; it jump-started the economy, essentially freeing America from its Great Depression by reopening factories to fuel the insatiable need for war materials; the war left the United States and the Soviet Union as the undisputed superpowers of the world; *Vietnam*: faced with communist aggression from Ho Chi Minh's troops in the North, Johnson decided to side with the war hawks of the time; after North Vietnam attacked two United States ships in the Gulf of Tonkin Congress overwhelmingly supported Johnson's escalation of the war; media reporting facts contrary to the official story turned the public against the war; further opposition resulted as young men were drafted to serve their country in a war they did not have any say in; not only did communism spread throughout Vietnam but the fact that thousands of lives were lost over an unsuccessful cause led to widespread distrust of the federal government; disillusionment and dismay over Vietnam made Americans wary of sending troops overseas and the government retreated from foreign intervention and containment)
- Richly supports the theme with many relevant facts, examples, and details (*World War II*: Franklin D. Roosevelt; France; Great Britain; "cash and carry"; Lend-Lease; arsenal for democracy; Japanese militarists; President Truman; atomic bomb; nuclear arms race; *Vietnam*: spread from Europe to Asia; Cold War fears; domino theory; Southeast Asia; credibility gap; peace treaty; removed troops; War Powers Act; Nixon's veto)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that are little more than a restatement of the theme

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 5. The response uses strong analysis and ample detail to discuss the reasons for shifting views about United States involvement in World War II and the Vietnam War, and the impacts of each.

It is commonly believed that if a nation wants to reach the highest level of wealth, security, and success it desires, the nation must interact with its surrounding nations and the world. An example of a nation that has followed this belief would be the U.S., which has taken many different foreign policy actions. It cannot be denied that many of the United States foreign policies and actions have been extremely controversial. Usually, these controversial foreign policy actions have involved war such as the Mexican War from 1846 to 1848 and the Vietnam War from 1964 to 1973. Both of these wars were shrouded in controversy when they took place, and have had lasting effects into the modern U.S.

The Mexican War was started in 1846, when claims were made that Mexican forces attacked and killed U.S. soldiers on U.S. soil over a border dispute. Proponents of the war reacted aggressively, believing that in order to defend their nation they would need to retaliate and fight the Mexican people. President Polk's infamous quote claiming that there was 'American blood spilled on American soil' was what really riled up those who supported the war, supporting the idea that the Mexicans had purposely damaged our honor with such a low blow. However, this reasoning for the war is what sparked controversy. Opponents of the war questioned whether the Mexican forces came onto American land, or if General Taylor's troops deliberately provoked the Mexican forces. Abraham Lincoln even called out to the president at the time and stated that if he wasn't shown the spot where these American soldiers died, he would not support the war. Opponents also claimed that the primary motive for the war was greed for land to fulfill Manifest Destiny and expand slavery. They

believed that this motive was immoral so the whole war was immoral. The effects of the war were great, in that Mexico lost some territory to the U.S., thousands on both sides died, and tensions grew between Mexico and the U.S. and within the U.S.

The Vietnam War was officially started in 1964 and ended in 1973 for the U.S. when it pulled its forces out of the divided nation. Almost all Americans initially supported the war because they believed it was a true and honorable fight against Communism. They believed that if all of Vietnam became Communist, the rest of Southeast Asia would also fall to Communism according to Eisenhower's Domino Theory. War Hawks believed that if we ignored Communism in Vietnam the "red menace" would end up in the United States. However, as the war progressed and it was covered on national television news, more and more Americans became opposed to the war especially because of the draft. They saw an increasing credibility gap in the war, in that while President Johnson was reporting that the U.S. was winning a good war, the news reported that the U.S. was losing to Ho Chi Minh's forces and committing atrocious acts of violence, all in support of an extremely oppressive leader. Congress tried to limit Nixon's ability to wage war and send troops by enacting the War Powers Act. The effects of this controversy were so great, that from the Vietnam War to now the trust between the people and the government has remained damaged. The U.S. didn't win the war, and Vietnam became a unified Communist State. Future foreign involvement would be judged based on the outcomes of the Vietnam war.

Many of the U.S.'s foreign policy actions have resulted in

controversy, such as the Mexican War and the Vietnam War. Both of these wars had those who supported it in order to keep U.S. interests safe while others opposed the war for seeing that the war wasn't as honorable as those who started it claimed it was.

#### Anchor Level 4-A

##### **The response:**

- Develops all aspects of the task but does so somewhat unevenly by discussing the impact of war with Mexico less thoroughly than the remainder of the task
- Is both descriptive and analytical (*Mexico*: claims were made that Mexican forces attacked and killed United States soldiers on United States soil over a border dispute; proponents of the war reacted aggressively believing that in order to defend their nation they would need to retaliate and fight the Mexican people; opponents of the war questioned whether the Mexican forces came onto American land or if General Taylor's troops deliberately provoked the Mexican forces; opponents also claimed that the primary motive for the war was greed for land to fulfill Manifest Destiny and expand slavery; Mexico lost some territory to the United States, thousands on both sides died, and tension grew between Mexico and the United States and within the United States; *Vietnam*: almost all Americans initially supported the war because they believed it was a true and honorable fight against communism; war hawks believed that if we ignored communism in Vietnam the "red menace" would end up in the United States; as the war progressed and it was covered on national television news more and more Americans became opposed to the war especially because of the draft; while President Johnson was reporting that the United States was winning a good war the news reported that the United States was losing to Ho Chi Minh's forces and committing atrocious acts of violence all in support of an extremely oppressive leader; from the Vietnam War to now the trust between the people and the government has remained damaged; future foreign involvement would be judged based on outcomes of Vietnam War)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (*Mexico*: President Polk; American blood spilled on American soil; damaged our honor; Abraham Lincoln; the spot; war was immoral; *Vietnam*: divided nation; Southeast Asia; Eisenhower's domino theory; credibility gap; War Powers Act; unified communist state)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction and conclusion that observe foreign policy actions have often resulted in controversy

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. The response uses strong analytic statements woven with good supporting details to discuss the role of presidential actions in two controversial wars and the point of view of supporters and opponents of these wars. However, the impact of the Mexican-American War is stated in general terms and would have benefited from further development.



The American government has implemented several foreign policies that have not been fully supported by the American citizens. Among these policies the decision to enter World War I in Europe and the sending of troops to Vietnam led to American citizens who either supported or opposed the government's policies.

During the first world war, America had first decided to remain neutral. The war had started in Austria-Hungary and when their leader was killed, war was declared and due to alliances several nations got involved. Most people supported the idea of remaining neutral because they liked America's traditional isolation from European conflicts. These people were mostly those that supported George Washington's wisdom in his Farewell Address when he advised the nation to avoid foreign entanglements. Yet others eventually opposed neutrality because they felt as if they were targeted by several events. The Louisiana was sunk by German u-boats killing over 100 American citizens angering people at home. Yet, what really made people oppose neutrality was the Zimmermann note where Germany was trying to convince Mexico to start a war with the U.S. to take back the southwest. When this telegram was published to inform citizens, American citizens were outraged. President Wilson had attempted to keep America out of war, but now moved toward war. He pledged to "make the world safe for democracy." Anti-German propaganda, including songs and posters, made citizens hate the Germans and want to go to war against them. American involvement meant large numbers of troops and resources being sent to crush Germany and end the war. The Treaty of Versailles was signed and Germany was forced to take all the blame, pay for all

damages, and to decrease it's military causing resentment and later the growth of Nazism. America became recognized as a true world power.

During the mid-late 1900's America had changed it's foreign policy. It used to be an isolated nation that didn't want to get involved in foreign affairs yet after World War II it started to shift it's foreign policy to the idea/concept of containment. Containment was the idea of preventing communism from spreading. Many Americans supported proxy wars fought for this ideology instead of another World War. Amongst them was the Vietnam War. The nation was filled with xenophobia and fear of the spreading of Reds. So some people supported war in Vietnam to prevent the domino effect in Southeast Asia. Yet, on the other hand many citizens were tired of war and foreign entanglements. They had fought the Korean War, experienced fears from the Cuban Missile Crisis, and were involved with aiding nations through policies such as the Truman Doctrine (helped Greece and Turkey) and the Marshall Plan. On top of this the drafting of men in the nation left many people outraged, as they lost fathers, sons, and friends. Vietnam War was also highly reported in the media with photographs etc. The brutality made people disgusted and a common protest phrase was "Hey, hey LBJ how many kids did you kill today?" The American people just responded negatively and so finally in Nixon's presidency major pushes were made to end the war. Yet as soldiers returned if it was known they fought in Vietnam they were looked down upon instead of respected for their services. The loss in Vietnam led to a real reluctance to take on any new foreign conflicts. Many returning soldiers suffered from PTSD and disorders

from Agent Orange. The impact is still felt today, homeless Vietnam veterans can be seen begging on the streets of large cities.

All in all, there is a clear shift in America's foreign policy. The nation at first went along with staying neutral and isolated and later shifted its opinion to being a nation that became more involved in global affairs and providing aid to others. Yet, the government's decisions didn't at times have the complete support of the American population leading to disagreements. Vietnam and World War I are examples that show how American citizens reacted to the foreign policy decisions of the nation.

## Anchor Level 4-B

### The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task but does so somewhat unevenly by discussing the impacts of the United States foreign policy actions for World War I and the Vietnam War less thoroughly than the supporting and opposing points of view for each action
- Is both descriptive and analytical (*World War I*: most people supported the idea of remaining neutral because they liked America's traditional isolation from European conflicts; these people supported George Washington's wisdom in his Farewell Address when he advised the nation to avoid foreign entanglements; what really made people oppose neutrality was the Zimmermann Note in which Germany was trying to convince Mexico to start a war with the United States to take back the southwest; President Wilson had attempted to keep America out of war but now moved toward war; anti-German propaganda made American citizens hate the Germans and want to go to war against them; American involvement meant large numbers of troops and resources being sent to crush Germany and end the war; Treaty of Versailles was signed and Germany was forced to take all the blame, pay for all damages, and decrease its military causing resentment and later the growth of Nazism; *Vietnam*: many Americans supported proxy wars that were fought for this ideology instead of another world war; some people supported war in Vietnam to prevent the domino effect in Southeast Asia; the drafting of men in the nation left many people outraged as they lost fathers, sons, and friends; brutality made people disgusted and a common protest phrase was "hey, hey, LBJ, how many kids did you kill today?"; looked down upon instead of respected for their service; loss in Vietnam led to real reluctance to take on any new foreign conflicts; today, homeless Vietnam veterans can be seen begging on the streets of large cities)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (*World War I*: Austria-Hungary; alliances; Lusitania; German U-boats; true world power; *Vietnam*: after World War II; containment; xenophobia; Reds; Korean War; Truman Doctrine; highly reported in the media; Nixon's presidency; post-traumatic stress disorder; Agent Orange)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction that generally restates the theme and concludes that the two wars show how citizens react to foreign policy decisions

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. The response shows an understanding of the opposing views expressed during two 20th-century wars. The discussion of the impact of both conflicts, while accurate, is brief and would have been strengthened by further development.

Most foreign policy issues in US History have created a divide in society, no matter how large or small. People will agree or disagree with any policy the government creates as is shown by our past. Some of the conflicts created large divides, like the government's decision to send troops to Vietnam in 1964-'73, and declaring war against Mexico in 1846.

In 1846, the president was Polk and he was determined to achieve Manifest Destiny by expanding American land from what is now Maine to California. A lot of Americans also wanted expansion but the remaining land that Polk wanted belonged to Mexico. When American soldiers were killed on ground that was disputed, Polk got people fired up by claiming "American blood has been shed on American soil." Many agreed with him and wanted to go to war against Mexico. Others, like Abraham Lincoln disagreed with how Polk was provoking the conflict. With his famous Spot resolution, he called Polk a liar essentially and said Polk could not show him the spot that definitely belonged to America where Americans were killed. Opponents also claimed that war with Mexico was a way for slaveholders to further expand slavery.

Later, one of the biggest ever disputes in American history arose: The Vietnam War. During the Cold War era, many Americans supported a very strict containment policy. There were many foreign policies that were created for the sake of containment, such as the Truman Doctrine. Furthermore because of the Domino Theory, Americans feared if one southeast Asian country fell to communism, all the rest would soon follow. When a communist leader rose, the United States backed an anti-communist leader who was severely

oppressive. Americans sent troops to Vietnam to help anti-communist forces. Critics began to loudly protest the use of American troops in a civil war to support an unpopular leader. Young men were dying in a far away jungle when there was no direct threat to the United States. However, it also launched a whole American counter-culture.

“Hippies”, music, drug and sex experimentation, all of it was intended to go against the pro-war mentality and oppose the Vietnam war. After protestors were killed at Kent State, college campuses around the country erupted in protest.

Both the Mexican-American war and the Vietnam war had serious implications for America as a whole. In the Mexican-American war, Polk gained his dream of having America stretch from “sea to shining sea”. This also created mounting tension for when California applied for statehood. Henry Clay’s 36°30’ line would no longer be able to determine if California was a free or slave state. Clay made a new sectional compromise that added California as a free state but toughened the Fugitive slave law, thereby delaying but not preventing the Civil War. On the other hand the Vietnam war had serious implications for America as well. This war created distrust in the government. The failure to win in Vietnam and the domestic turmoil it unleashed led to less support for intervention abroad for years to come.

With any foreign policy, there will be supporters and dissenters. Sometimes the split is more even than others but the rift these policies create in society help Americans to grow and develop. The Mexican-American War and the Vietnam War pushed American society further for better or for worse.

## Anchor Level 4-C

### The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task for declaring war against Mexico and for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is both descriptive and analytical (*Mexico*: Polk was determined to achieve Manifest Destiny by expanding American land from what is now Maine to California; when American soldiers were killed on ground that was disputed Polk got people fired up by claiming American blood has been shed on American soil; others like Abraham Lincoln disagreed with how Polk was provoking the conflict; opponents also claimed that war with Mexico was a way for slaveholders to further expand of slavery; Polk gained his dream of having America stretch from “sea to shining sea”; Clay made a new sectional compromise that added California as a free state but toughened the Fugitive Slave Law thereby delaying but not preventing the Civil War; *Vietnam*: many Americans supported a very strict containment policy; because of the domino theory Americans feared if one Southeast Asian country fell to communism all the rest would soon follow; critics began to loudly protest the use of American troops in a civil war to support an unpopular leader; young men were dying in a faraway jungle when there was no direct threat to the United States; after protestors were killed at Kent State college campuses erupted around the country; failure to win in Vietnam and the domestic turmoil it unleashed led to less support for intervention abroad for years to come)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (*Mexico*: Spot Resolution; 36°30’ line; *Vietnam*: Truman Doctrine; backed an anti-communist leader; American counterculture; distrust in the government)
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization with some of the impacts at the end; includes an introduction and conclusion that generally restate the theme

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. The response includes good information about conflict between supporters and opponents of both the Mexican-American War and the Vietnam War. The impact of each foreign policy action could have been strengthened, especially in the case of the Vietnam War.

United States citizens took an active role in expressing opinions about expansion within the continent, and later outside the continent. For instance, the purchase of Louisiana in 1803 and the annexation of the Philippines in 1899 managed to stir previously held notions regarding staunch American beliefs about the constitution and self-determination. Although these two instances created some opposition, many came to accept the changes these foreign policies would bring.

The purchase of Louisiana in 1803 was immediately accepted by the two American ministers sent to France. Due to Napoleon's wars with Great Britain, he was compelled to sell the vast territory at a cheap price to raise revenue for funding. The land essentially doubled the United States by twice its original size, and this was widely accepted by most Americans. Even Jefferson was content with the purchase, except he had a dilemma - the Constitution never mentioned anything specific about acquiring new lands. Strict interpreters of the constitution, including Jefferson himself, opposed taking action such as purchasing land when it wasn't explicitly permitted. Not only that, but some northerners were concerned about the spread of slavery into new lands. However, there was too much at stake. Jefferson couldn't possibly back out from such an enticing deal, considering it had future positive implications toward a stronger economy. He ultimately chose to accept the purchase, stating that the president was allowed to accept Louisiana in terms of a treaty agreement. While most Americans supported the president's decision, several Federalists were infuriated by his sudden display of hypocrisy. However, the United States finally owned the whole Mississippi River. This had a huge impact because this land would become the source of our food



supply. However, it also meant decades of conflict with Native Americans who actually controlled the land.

In a similar manner, the annexation of the Philippines in 1899 divided the American population. After winning the Spanish-American war, the U.S. took power over Cuba, and control of Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines. Both sides of the division presented passionate arguments. Those in favor of annexing the Philippines were strong supporters of imperialism, who firmly believed that the Philippines would serve to expand Asian trade, thereby bolstering the economy. They were willing to believe that Manifest Destiny wasn't supposed to stop at California, but was actually meant to spread to a whole new continent. Those opposing the annexation, however, claimed that it would go against the American democratic ideal entirely. For example, the Philippines was very far away from the continental U.S., so it would be impractical to govern such a distant place (similar to how Americans didn't want to be governed by a nation far away - Great Britain). Not only that, but opposers felt that they had fought the Spanish to prevent imperialism from taking a stronger root in Cuba, so they should not practice imperialism in the Philippines. The U.S. ruled the islands as a colony until after WWII when democratic ideals ultimately compelled the U.S. government to give up claims to the Philippines, thereby guaranteeing their independence.

In summation, these two foreign policies truly shaped the formation of a complex American identity.

### Anchor Level 3-A

#### **The response:**

- Develops all aspects of the task with little depth for purchasing Louisiana and for annexing the Philippines
- Is more descriptive than analytical (*Louisiana*: essentially doubled the United States by twice its original size; strict interpreters of the Constitution including Jefferson himself opposed taking action such as the purchasing of any land when it was not explicitly permitted; Jefferson could not possibly back out from such an enticing deal considering it had future positive implications toward a stronger economy; the president was allowed to accept Louisiana in terms of a treaty agreement; several federalists were infuriated by his sudden display of hypocrisy; United States finally owned the whole Mississippi River; huge impact because this land would become the source of our food supply; *Philippines*: would serve to expand Asian trade thereby bolstering the economy; they were willing to believe that Manifest Destiny was not supposed to stop at California; Philippines was very far away from the continental United States so it would be impractical to govern such a distant place; opposes felt the United States had fought the Spanish to prevent imperialism from taking a stronger root in Cuba so they should not practice imperialism in the Philippines; United States ruled the islands as a colony until after World War II when democratic ideals ultimately compelled the United States government to give up claims to the Philippines thereby guaranteeing their independence)
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (*Louisiana*: two American ministers; Napoleon's wars with Great Britain; cheap price; spread of slavery; conflict with Native Americans; *Philippines*: winning the Spanish-American War; took power over Cuba; Guam; Puerto Rico)
- Demonstrates a logical plan of organization; includes an introduction that connects the two foreign policy actions to expansion and a brief conclusion

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. The response shows an understanding of the government's role in expansion in both the Louisiana Territory and the Philippines but fails to fully explore either. Further development of the opposing points of view concerning purchasing Louisiana and the impact of annexing the Philippines would have strengthened the response.

Throughout U.S. History the government has taken foreign policy actions that have resulted in differences of opinion among the American people. For example the annexing of the Philippines and the U.S. sending troops to Vietnam, both foreign policy actions that not only caused disagreements among the American people, but also made an impact on the United States and other areas.

The annexing of the Philippines was a foreign policy action made by the U.S. in 1899, that became very controversial and disagreed upon by the American people. On one side you had those for the annexation. These were people who saw the annexation of the Philippines as the gateway into the thriving and extensive Asian market. This was a very coveted goal of American business leaders and the general public as the frontier had closed, the U.S. had become completely developed, making it obvious to look outside its borders for opportunity and expansion, primarily for economic reasons. Secondly the U.S. economy was growing rapidly with the boom (and bust) of industrialization and technological improvements, this also made it necessary and beneficial to begin looking for a new market for American products. On the other side, of those in the American public who were against the annexation, they banded around more ideological reasons to not expand. For example many thought this was opposite to what the U.S.'s role should be in the world, the U.S. shouldn't become a colonial power and global power that took over regions outside its borders. Firstly the ideals of the U.S., freedom, liberty and independence, are in direct opposition to expanding and controlling other countries. Secondly the U.S. was built on the idea and image that it wouldn't be a colonial power, the U.S. had been

distancing itself from the British and other European colonial powers since its creation, the American public felt this way about becoming a colonial power because this was the first time a scenario like this arose. The impact on the Philippines was that the U.S. would continue to have influence and military presence for a long time, and the impact for the U.S. is that the American businesses and economy could continue to rapidly grow.

The second foreign policy action that sparked disagreement was the sending of U.S. troops to Vietnam. Those in support felt it was a necessary action in order to contain communism, something which the government had for years, through propaganda and other strategies, (McCarthyism) made the American public fear and hate. This fear, also spread through numerous security checks and the possibility of losing your job if you had any connection to communism, culminated in the U.S. public being very passionate and supportive of any action that would prevent communism from spreading into the U.S. and all over the world. Those who opposed it were enraged by the seemingly pointlessness of it as American deaths rose rapidly. Many Americans thought it should be the South Vietnam's job to do the fighting, not young American soldiers. This is evidenced by numerous protests that occurred after images were released and statistics were reported that showed the horror of the Vietnam war. The impact of the Vietnam war on Vietnam was, after U.S. troops withdrew due to huge opposition by the American public and failure to take any significant ground, it fell to the North.

### Anchor Level 3-B

#### **The response:**

- Develops most aspects of the task in some depth for annexing the Philippines and in little depth for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is more descriptive than analytical (*Philippines*: there were people who saw the annexation of the Philippines as the gateway into the thriving and extensive Asian market; as the frontier had closed the United States had become completely developed making it obvious to look outside its borders for opportunities and expansion primarily for economic reasons; United States should not become a colonial power and global power that took over regions outside its borders; ideals of the United States, liberty and independence, are in direct opposition to expanding and controlling other countries; impact on the Philippines was that the United States would continue to have an influence and military presence for a long time; impact for the United States is that the American businesses and economy could continue to rapidly grow; *Vietnam*: culminated in the United States public being very passionate and supportive of any action that would prevent communism from spreading into the United States and all over the world; those who opposed it were enraged by the seeming pointlessness of it as American deaths rose rapidly; many Americans thought it should be South Vietnam's job to do the fighting not young American soldiers; after United States troops withdrew due to the huge opposition by the American public and failure to take any significant ground it fell to the North)
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (*Philippines*: industrialization; ideological reasons; Revolutionary War; *Vietnam*: contain communism; propaganda; McCarthyism)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction that restates the theme and lacks a conclusion

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. The response provides general statements regarding support for and opposition to annexing the Philippines and the Vietnam War, as well as the impact these foreign policies had on the United States and others, demonstrating an understanding of the task. Additional details and development especially concerning opposition to the war in Vietnam and its impact would have strengthened the response.

United States History has been shaped by the decisions made by a variety of government administrators. Although almost every decision made by a leader will spark controversy, few issues have been as divisive (whether publically or internally) as the decision to purchase the Louisiana territories from France in 1803 by Pres. Thomas Jefferson, and the declaration of war against Mexico by James Polk in 1846. These two events split the public into supporters and opponents with strong ideologies.

The Louisiana purchase was not as simple of a decision for Thomas Jefferson as some may think. Thomas Jefferson believed in a very strict interpretation of the U.S. Constitution, as a result Jefferson considered himself as someone who lacks the Constitutional authority to purchase lands with federal funds. However, those in the public that were less concerned about the letter of the law, and even Jefferson himself, realized the significance of such a purchase because the United States would get control of the Mississippi River. The acquisition of the Louisiana territory would double the size of the U.S., Jefferson decided to take this controversial step, knowing that it opened a vast territory for farmers.

The Mexican-American War, and the act of its declaration in 1846 by Polk was far more controversial. The argument for the declaration of war bore its roots in the infectious ideology of Manifest Destiny, the belief that America had a divine right to expand across the entire North-American Continent. In addition to this belief in expansion, a skirmish broke out on the frontlines between the Mexican and American army, leading Polk to gain support with the words "American Blood has been spilled on American soil." This appeal to

Manifest Destiny and the emotions of American people allowed Polk's decision to gain support. However many were against this decision. Polk lost a lot of respect from his critics for mongering hatred and causing bloodshed. A young Abraham Lincoln publically condemned Polk for provoking war, and for the absolute lack of necessity of acquiring Mexican lands.

Overall, many other controversial decisions have been made between the 1800's and present day in the United States. However very little had such impact on the U.S and countries such as France and Mexico. As a result of the controversial Louisiana Purchase, the busy port of New Orleans is part of the U.S, while the Mexican-American war impacted Mexico's history by greatly reducing it's geographic size, while leaving the U.S with new regions such as the Southwest and California on the Pacific coast. Sometimes leaders must make decisions even if they spark controversy, and as a result these decisions often pay off throughout the course of history.

### Anchor Level 3-C

#### **The response:**

- Develops all aspects of the task with little depth for purchasing Louisiana and for declaring war against Mexico
- Is more descriptive than analytical (*Louisiana*: Jefferson considered himself as someone who lacks the constitutional authority to purchase lands with federal funds; those in the public that were less concerned with the letter of the law, and even Jefferson himself, realized the significance of such a purchase because the United States would get control of the Mississippi River; acquisition of the Louisiana Territory would double the size of the United States; opened a vast territory for farmers; *Mexico*: argument for the declaration of war bore its roots in the infectious ideology of Manifest Destiny, the belief that America had a divine right to expand across the entire North American continent; a skirmish broke out on the front lines between the Mexican and American armies leading Polk to gain support with the words “American blood has been spilled on American soil”; a young Abraham Lincoln publicly condemned Polk for provoking war and for the absolute lack of necessity of acquiring Mexican lands; impacted Mexico’s history by greatly reducing its geographic size)
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (*Louisiana*: strict interpretation; busy port of New Orleans; *Mexico*: new regions; southwest; California)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and a conclusion that focuses on the impacts of the foreign policy actions

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. The response demonstrates an understanding of the task by discussing the supporting and opposing points of view of the Mexican-American War and its impact as well as the supporting point of view and the impact of the Louisiana Purchase. Additional details and development, especially for the opposing view on the Louisiana Purchase, would have strengthened the response. The essay relies heavily on generalizations and overgeneralizations.



Throughout United States history the government has taken different foreign policy actions. The American people have had different opinions on these actions. Two examples of this is annexing the Philippines in 1899 and sending troops to Vietnam. Both of these had impacts domestically and abroad.

Annexation of the Philippines caused debates between people who supported and opposed this. The two groups were known as the Imperialist League and the Anti-Imperialist League. The Imperialist League supported the annexation of the Philippines. They believed that it would help the U.S. economically and politically. The Philippines would provide access to new natural resources and allow the U.S. to set up new markets. The United States would also help set up a government in the Philippines. They would establish a democracy. However, people who opposed the annexation of the Philippines were part of the Anti-Imperialist League. The anti-Imperialist League viewed the annexation as taken away self-determination from the Philippines. The U.S. didn't like when this happened to them so they shouldn't be doing it to other people. The U.S. annexing the Philippines created great controversy between the people of the U.S.

Sending troops to Vietnam created great opposition between the American people. The U.S. was enforcing their policy of containment, keeping communism from spreading by sending troops over. There were people who supported sending troops over because they believed in the policy of containment. However, there were also groups who opposed sending troops to Vietnam. Many were upset because the government claimed it would be a quick war but it lasted many years. People began protesting the war in Vietnam. Those that opposed the war

---

**Anchor Paper – Thematic Essay—Level 2 – A**

---

supported the policy of Vietnamization. The impact on the US of sending troops was there were many protests. The impact abroad was it reinforced the idea to nations around the world that the US would stand by the policy of containment.

The United States foreign policy has continually created debates amongst the American people. There are some people in favor and some people who oppose it. The US foreign policy always has impacts domestically and on the rest of the world.

**Anchor Level 2-A****The response:**

- Develops some aspects of the task in some depth for annexing the Philippines and for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is primarily descriptive (*Philippines*: would provide access to new natural resources and allow the United States to set up new markets; United States would also help set up a government in the Philippines; Anti-Imperialist League viewed the annexation as taking away self-determination from the Philippines; United States did not like when this happened to them so they should not be doing it to other people; *Vietnam*: United States was enforcing their policy of containment, keeping communism from spreading by sending troops over; many were upset because the government claimed it would be a quick war but it lasted many years; impact on the United States of sending troops was there were many protests); includes weak analysis (*Philippines*: they would establish a democracy; *Vietnam*: it reinforced the idea to nations around the world that the United States would stand by a policy of containment)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (*Philippines*: believed it would help the United States economically and politically; *Vietnam*: Vietnamization)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and conclusion that restate the theme

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. A basic understanding of the task is demonstrated in the discussion of supporting and opposing points of view for annexation of the Philippines and for sending troops to Vietnam. The impact of these foreign policies is mentioned but not developed. Repetition also weakens this response.

Foreign policy has always been a fundamental part of how the world works. In American history, there has been a lot of debate over foreign policy. For example, many opposed and agreed with Thomas Jefferson's Louisiana Purchase in 1803, and many also opposed and agreed with President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Lend Lease aid to Britain in 1941.

In 1803, Thomas Jefferson bought the Louisiana territory from France. This land ultimately doubled American territory. Many people opposed this however, because they thought that Jefferson's decision to purchase the territory surpassed his power as president. Many people thought Congress should have had the power to purchase the land. Even though many opposed Jefferson's decision, it still expanded the US greatly and eventually promoted the idea of Manifest Destiny. The people who believed in Manifest Destiny, the belief that America needed to expand westward "from sea to shining sea," supported Jefferson's decision to double American territory. The impact of Jefferson's decision was mainly on the Natives who lived in that territory. There were many Indian conflicts with the Americans.

The Lend-Lease act provided by the US to Great Britain occurred during WWII in 1941. Many people opposed this because they wanted to remain neutral, but giving aid to Europe wasn't being neutral. Roosevelt countered this by saying it was lending military supplies to Britain and not giving it to them. However, this was military aid, and it was probably destroyed. The people who supported Roosevelt recognized that if America didn't help Britain, Germany was going to take over more land and possibly the entirety of Europe. The other people who agreed with him saw the Lend-Lease aid as lending, when America was probably going to get back broken and battered ships.

---

**Anchor Paper – Thematic Essay—Level 2 – B**

---

This decision greatly affected Britain, as they had more support to fight against the Axis powers. Even though America eventually actually joined the war, this was as close as “being neutral” got for Roosevelt before going to war.

In conclusion, foreign policy has been a widely controversial topic. Everyone has their own opinion and consequently, every foreign policy decision has both positive and negative reactions. From the beginning of US history to now, there has always been disputes over US Foreign policy, including over Jefferson’s decision to purchase the Louisiana territory in 1803 to Roosevelt’s decision to lend aid to Britain in 1941.

**Anchor Level 2-B****The response:**

- Minimally develops most aspects of the task for purchasing Louisiana and for providing Lend-Lease aid to Great Britain
- Is primarily descriptive (*Louisiana*: many people opposed this because they thought Jefferson’s decision to purchase the territory surpassed his power as president; expanded the United States greatly and eventually promoted the idea of Manifest Destiny; impact of Jefferson’s decision was mainly on the natives who lived in that territory; there were many Native American Indian conflicts with the Americans; *Lend-Lease*: many people opposed this because they wanted to remain neutral; people who supported Roosevelt recognized that if America didn’t help Britain Germany was going to take over more land and possibly the entirety of Europe; decision greatly affected Britain as they had more support to fight against the Axis powers; America eventually actually joined the war); includes weak and faulty analysis (*Louisiana*: people who believed in Manifest Destiny, the belief that America needed to expand westward “from sea to shining sea”, supported Jefferson’s decision)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (*Louisiana*: from France; doubled American territory; Congress; *Lend-Lease*: during World War II)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and conclusion that restate the theme

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. The discussion demonstrates a basic understanding of the foreign policy actions and the controversies that arose regarding their implementation. Repetition of limited details, lack of development, and faulty analysis weaken the effort.

Throughout United States history, the government has taken foreign policy actions because it wants to help other nations. There were always two sides to these decisions. There were people who were for it and people who were against it. These actions have had impacts on the United States and other countries and regions so it could either help them or put them down.

The Louisiana purchase of 1803 was a big decision. The people that supported the decision said that it would expand the country. The people who opposed it said that president Jefferson was stretching out his power. The people who opposed believed that he was cutting down states power. The opinion of the people was split in two.

The lend-lease act of 1941 was also a big foreign decision. It provided aid to Great Britain. There was a big argument about whether this should happen or not. The people that supported the decision believed that we were helping end a world war and going against our enemies. The people who opposed the decision believed that we were going to get dragged into the war. The act was passed and we sent aid to Britain.

There were many impacts to these foreign policies on both the United States and the other country. The Louisiana Purchase increased the size of the United States. It also gave us full access to the Mississippi river and the new Orleans port. The lend-lease act ended up pulling the United States into world war II. We ended up fighting in the war and ending it. Both of these policies has positive effects and negative effects.

In conclusion, foreign policies are a major issue in the United States. These policies have people who support them and people who oppose them. They effect both the United States and the country that the policy is towards.

## Anchor Level 2-C

### **The response:**

- Minimally addresses all aspects of the task for purchasing Louisiana and for providing Lend-Lease aid to Great Britain
- Is primarily descriptive (*Louisiana*: people that supported the decision said that it would expand the country; people who opposed it said that Jefferson was stretching out his power; gave us full access to the Mississippi River; *Lend-Lease*: people that supported the decision believed we were helping end a world war and going against our enemies; people who opposed the decision believed that we were going to get dragged into the war; ended up pulling the United States into World War II)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (*Louisiana*: port of New Orleans; *Lend-Lease*: provided aid to Great Britain)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and conclusion that are little more than a restatement of the theme

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. The response demonstrates a basic understanding of the task by mentioning supporting and opposing points of view and the impact of the Louisiana Purchase and the Lend-Lease program. A lack of development and details weakens the response.

Throughout history, there have been different U.S. policies that created a difference in opinion among many Americans and impacted America in addition to other countries. Declaring war against Mexico in 1846 is an example of a foreign policy that has caused mixed opinions. The same goes for the U.S. foreign policy of sending troops to Vietnam from 1964 to 1973; some people supported it while others opposed it. Moreover, declaring war against Mexico favored the people who advocated new territory and repelled the people who believed that Mexico didn't shed blood on American soil. In another instance, the people who supported troops being sent to Vietnam wanted to stop communism from spreading and the ones who opposed the foreign policy reasoned that there would be too many casualties.

Declaring war against Mexico was controversial in that some people believed it wasn't necessary because Mexico shed blood on unnamed territory, not American territory. For example, Mexican soldiers invaded the land on the border of Rio Grande, which wasn't claimed by Americans yet. Polk, however, twisted the situation into one that looked like Americans were hurt on American soil. Therefore, some people opposed a war against Mexico. Others, however, supported it because it would benefit America by claiming more territory. At the end, America won the war and as a result, the foreign policy impacted the country by expanding its borders.

Another controversial U.S. foreign policy was the decision of sending troops to Vietnam (1964-1973). Some people opposed it because it would result in many casualties for both Vietnam and America, preventing further progress.

## Anchor Level 1-A

### **The response:**

- Minimally develops some aspects of the task for declaring war against Mexico and for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is descriptive (*Mexico*: favored the people who advocated new territory; repelled the people who believed that Mexico did not shed blood on American soil; Polk twisted the situation into one that looked like Americans were hurt on American soil; impacted the country by expanding its borders; *Vietnam*: people who supported troops being sent to Vietnam wanted to stop communism from spreading; people opposed it because it would result in many casualties for both Vietnam and America); includes faulty analysis (*Mexico*: Mexican soldiers invaded the land on the border of the Rio Grande which was not claimed by Americans)
- Includes no relevant facts, examples, or details
- Demonstrate a weakness in organization; includes an introduction with arguments for and against the foreign policy actions and lacks a conclusion

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 1. The response includes a few general ideas about the Mexican-American War and two basic statements about the Vietnam War, demonstrating a limited understanding of the task. Repetition and a lack of development detract from the discussion.



---

**Anchor Paper – Thematic Essay—Level 1 – B**

---

United States foreign policy often creates a divide in the American people. This is because foreign policies can both benefit or hinder the development of a country. Such controversial decisions include the Louisiana purchase and neutrality in world war 1.

The Louisiana Purchase involved President Thomas Jefferson buying a large are of land which doubled the size of the U.S. at the time. Some people supported it because the land was cheap and resources were needed. Others opposed because the U.S. had little production and money at the time so there was no way of developing the land.

Neutrality in world war one was controversial as well. The American government passed Neutrality Acts in order to avoid involvement with the war in Europe. Some supported it because they wanted to maintain stable European trades. Others were opposed because they wanted to help countries which previously helped them.

**Anchor Level 1-B**

**The response:**

- Minimally develops some aspects of the task for purchasing Louisiana and for maintaining neutrality in World War I
- Is descriptive (*Louisiana*: doubled the size of the United States; some people supported it because the land was cheap and resources were needed; others opposed it because the United States had little production and money at the time; *World War I*: wanted to maintain stable European trades; others were opposed because they wanted to help countries which previously helped them);
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, or details (*Louisiana*: President Thomas Jefferson); includes an inaccuracy (*World War I*: American government passed Neutrality Acts in order to avoid involvement with the war in Europe)
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction that notes foreign policies can both benefit or hinder the development of a country and lacks a conclusion

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 1. The discussion of the Louisiana Purchase shows limited understanding of the task. The discussion of pre-World War I neutrality uses an example from the 1930s which is anachronistic.

Throughout the United States history, the government has taken foreign policy actions that have resulted in differences of opinion among the American people. These actions have had impacts on the United States and other countries and regions. The foreign policies of purchasing Louisiana and providing lend lease aid to Great Britain, have resulted in differences of opinion among the American people. Lastly, these actions had positive and negative impacts on America.

First, the purchasing of Louisiana in 1803, was purchased from France at a cheap price because they needed the money. Those who supported this purchase did so because they wanted more land to farm and they wanted to go sea to sea expanding across the country this was called manifest destiny. On the other hand, there was those who opposed and they did so because it went beyond the President's power to purchase land. It was never stated in the constitution that a president could do that so, it was very controversial. In the end, we did purchase Louisiana and it had positive effects on the United States. One impact made by this purchase was that the United States gained more land for farming and resources. In conclusion, Purchasing Louisiana was controversial, but the president did do what he thought was the best choice at the time.

Second foreign policy is, providing lend lease to Great Britain. Supporters wanted to help during the war and the allies needed help, especially Great Britain, because they were being bombed. Also, without the aid of the United States the allies would of lost. Although this is true, those who opposed did so because of the following provisions. First, they wanted to remain neutral because of the devaistating aftermath and deaths of WWI. Also, lending aid will

---

**Thematic Essay—Practice Paper – A**

---

show us choosing sides making the axis powers our enemies. The United States did provide aid to Great Britain and impacted the war, the allied powers, and the United States. Negatively, choosing sides ultimately made Japan attack Pearl Harbor leaving us no choice to get fully involved.

To summarize, the American people were torn in WW2 whether to get involved, until Pearl Harbor, but deciding to get involved had impacted the United States, other countries, and regions.

In conclusion, opinions on foreign policy are controversial and usually require a lot of thinking over of the impact before a decision can be made. The American people play a big role when deciding foreign policy because our satisfaction will keep our government stable.

Throughout the History of the United States, the government has made decisions that the entire public does not always agree with. Sometimes people quietly protest while others take aggressive action. These choices lead to a divide in the United States people that affect the nation as a whole. The problems could manifest as economic panics or social outrages. The Mexican-American War and the Vietnam War were two of the most divisive debates among the American public.

The Mexican-American War started after the United States annexed Texas, who, at the time, was an independent republic. Americans thought that they owned up to the Rio Grande River; Mexicans thought they owned north of the Rio Grande River. When President Polk sent troops to the disputed border, there was a confrontation. American soldiers died. War Hawks in Congress proclaimed that the Mexicans murdered our men in cold blood, tried to take our land, and needed to be reprimanded. Around this time, the concept of manifest destiny was put into words and printed around the country. Ordinary citizens wanted to continue western expansion but Mexico, which contained the present day west coast and southwest, was in the way. Many Americans also had a superiority complex and believe that they were better than the Mexicans. On the other hand, many people opposed the war because they believed it was unjust. Thoreau, a transcendentalist was jailed because he refused to pay taxes that funded the Mexican-American war because it was "unjust." Taking land that belonged to a weak neighbor didn't settle well for some Americans. The question of slavery in newly acquired territories was another major objection. The Wilmont Proviso to ban slavery in land from Mexico wreaked havoc in Congress when it was presented.

The slavery debate got even worse after the Mexican cession.

The end of the Mexican American war led to the expansion of the United States. The country physically grew in size. Mexicans who were living in the Southwest had a crisis: who were they? The United States promised them fair treatment but it never happened. Most notably, the addition of California to the Union caused the 1849 Gold Rush and a huge population increase. Those who didn't find gold made the fertile land into farms. Eventually, California became one of the richest states in the Union.

The Vietnam War was fought as a "hot war" during the Cold War. Desperate to keep communism from spreading, the United States helped South Vietnam fight against the USSR-backed North Vietnam.

Though the Vietnam War is not officially a declared war by Congress, Congress issued President Johnson a blank check after the Gulf of Tonkin incident. People in support of the war saw the Gulf of Tonkin attack as another Pearl Harbor, and those responsible must be punished. The war also backed up the Truman Doctrine, which preached a policy of containment of communism. People who opposed the war believed that a war in Vietnam was not a war Americans should fight. It was on the other side of the world and we should let the Vietnamese fight their own civil war. We learned that our government was lying about what was happening in Vietnam: the number of losses were much higher and the war was being expanded into Cambodia. After people saw the Tet Offensive televised, that was it. The nation was completely divided.

The Vietnam War sparked outrage and protests across the nation. Young people developed the counterculture and shootings at colleges, like Kent State, caused disbelief and panic.

Over the course of the United States' history, major shifts in foreign policy have occurred. These changes in foreign policy often included actions much different than what was advised by President Washington in his farewell address to the nation & were very controversial. When these shifts in America's foreign policy occur, the consequences take effect around the world.

One example of a significant change in foreign policy would be the Lend-Lease Act to Britain prior to the US officially entering the Second World War. While the US had been aiding Britain through the Cash and Carry policy, and had lent Great Britain surplus military equipment such as the instance where Britain was lent fifty U.S. destroyers for use by the British Navy. Many Americans supported giving more direct aid to Britain under the Lend Lease Act, as Britain was alone in fighting against Nazi Germany. The United States stood against the political ideology of the Nazis & supported Britain fighting off what most considered Germany as a hostile power. However, some Americans protested the passing of the Lend-Lease Act in 1941. The main foreign policy of the United States at the time was isolationism & the Lend-Lease involved the US risking becoming part of a foreign war. After all the lives lost in World War I, not much had been accomplished. Due to the passing of the Lend-Lease Act, Great Britain & later the Soviet Union could get supplies from the US and survive until the US was attacked by the Japanese Empire on December 7th, 1941 & entered the Second World war as a member of the Allies alongside Britain.

A additional controversial foreign policy action in US history is US involvement in the Vietnam War. Reasoning for the US military

taking part in the Vietnam War was due to the US policy of containing the spread of Communism during the Cold War. Some Americans supported the war as the spread of communism around the world threatened the US & her allies. How the fall of South Vietnam that was supported by the US would threaten the US overall is due to the Domino Theory, where if one nation were to fall under a communist government the bordering nations were likely to fall. Many Americans however opposed the war as it progressed since many Americans didn't think the US was winning the war & it was only costing lives & money. The result of the US taking part in such an unpopular war was a lot of tension between the American people & the US government. Many college students protested war. Eventually the US militarily withdrew from Vietnam & the Domino Theory took effect after Southern Vietnam was conquered by Northern Vietnam & surrounding nations fell to communist forces soon after as well. After the defeat, the United States was less willing to commit military forces to trouble spots for years to come.

The US has made multiple changes in foreign policy through American history. The shifts have been either widely supported or been protested within the United States such as the Lend-Lease Act or the US involvement in the Vietnam War, respectively. Regardless if these actions were popular or not, US foreign policy actions often have global repercussions.

Throughout United States history the government has taken foreign policy actions that have resulted in differences of opinion among American people. These polarizing actions have had impacts not just on the United States, but on other nations and regions as well. From the Spanish-American War to the escalation in Vietnam, the United States truly has a major effect on the history of other regions, and the history of the world.

The Spanish-American War, and subsequent annexations and acquisitions had a large polarizing effect on the American citizens. Those who supported the war and its effects called for a new kind of America; an American Empire. Supporters wanted America to take her role on the world stage. One senator boldly said [in reference to new American territories] “where the flag of America goes up, it must never come down.”

However not everyone felt that way. Many believed that America should live up to its isolationist potential, as Washington, Madison, and the other founding fathers had said. Furthermore as the country was born out of rebellion against a colonizing power,



The United States's engagement in global affairs has caused disagreements amongst Americans since the time that George Washington warned against forming permanent alliances when engaging in foreign affairs. However, America often wavered on the stance of neutrality, often taking action in the form of war. Two such actions that caused disagreement between the American people were declaring war against Mexico in 1846 and deploying troops to Vietnam between 1964 and 1973.

The Mexican-American War resulted from a border dispute along the Río Grande, after America had annexed the land that is now Texas the year before. Supporters of the war, led by the newly elected Polk, were fueled by manifest destiny, the belief in the right, desire and obligation to expand. Polk was absolutely determined to acquire California and the Southwest and when the Slidell mission to buy the territory failed, Polk sent American troops to the disputed land between the Río Grande and the Nueces River. After Americans were killed by Mexican troops, Polk gained support for the war by claiming that "American blood has been shed on American soil." However, those who opposed the war did not want to be entangled with Mexico and accused Polk of deliberately provoking the war. In Congress, Abraham Lincoln's "Spot Resolution" demanded that Polk prove that the spot where Americans had been killed was definitely on American soil. However, with the border of Texas not defined there was no proof. Additionally, the Wilmot Proviso was formulated by Northern Congressmen who opposed the war, wanting to eliminate slavery in the new areas acquired. Behind the issue of war with Mexico was the more critical issue of the expansion of slavery. The Proviso failed, but

the war with Mexico was an American success because it achieved manifest destiny. The acquisition of California with its Pacific seaports, fertile farmland and vast mineral resources was a huge victory. However, by winning the war, the most divisive and controversial issue at the time - slavery - could no longer be ignored. When California applied to become a free state, the South demanded a stronger Fugitive Slave Law in return for upsetting the balance in the Senate. The Compromise of 1850 was a long and complicated agreement that failed to reduce sectional tension.

Times of war often create controversy. Like the Mexican-American War, sending troops to Vietnam was also controversial. While the Mexican-American War created a social divide between those who supported and those who were against slavery, the Vietnam War created a social divide between the classes. Those who supported the Vietnam War, called War Hawks, focused on containment. They used Eisenhower's domino theory to argue that if we didn't fight communism in Vietnam we would have to fight it at home. Furthermore, everyone knew "better dead than Red." It was obvious to supporters that communists would not stop until they controlled the entire world. Those opposed to the war were often focused on the economic discrimination and repercussions of the war. While the wealthy could defer the draft by financing their path to higher education, poor and minorities could not. Consequently, the masses were drafted off to a far off, dangerous place and giving their lives at the order of a few, rich people in power whose sons were in college and exempt from fighting and dying in the war. Therefore, draft protests ensued as young men burned their draft cards in defiance of the war.

Martin Luther King criticized the government for spending precious dollars on a far off war instead of on social programs for the poor. King saw that one impact of sending troops was the decimation of Great Society initiatives. Those who opposed the war distrusted the government, especially because most who faced death in Vietnam had no say about who was sending them to war. Americans began to say if you're old enough to fight you're old enough to vote. One of the most direct effects of the Vietnam war was ratification of the 26th amendment granting suffrage to 18 year-olds.

America's involvement in foreign affairs has caused controversy amongst Americans, especially during times of war.

Practice Paper A—Score Level 2

**The response:**

- Develops all aspects of the task in some depth for purchasing Louisiana and develops some aspects of the task in minimal depth for providing Lend-Lease aid to Great Britain
- Is primarily descriptive (*Louisiana*: those who supported this purchase did so because they wanted more land to farm; they wanted to go sea to sea expanding across the country; there were those who opposed it because it went beyond the president's power to purchase land; gained more land for farming and resources; *Lend-Lease*: supporters wanted to help during the war and the Allies needed help, especially Great Britain, because they were being bombed; wanted to remain neutral because of the devastating aftermath and deaths of World War I; choosing sides ultimately made Japan attack Pearl Harbor)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, and details (*Louisiana*: from France; cheap price; Manifest Destiny; *Lend-Lease*: Axis powers; World War II)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction and conclusion that restate the theme

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 2. The response demonstrates a basic understanding of the issues involved in purchasing Louisiana and providing Lend-Lease aid to Great Britain, but provides only a general overview of the arguments of supporters and opponents of the action. The impact of Lend-Lease is mentioned but is not developed. Faulty analysis weakens the effort.

## Practice Paper B—Score Level 4

### The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task but does so unevenly by discussing the Mexican-American War more thoroughly than the Vietnam War
- Is both descriptive and analytical (*Mexico*: war hawks in Congress proclaimed that the Mexicans murdered our men in cold blood, tried to take our land, and needed to be reprimanded; ordinary citizens wanted to continue western expansion but Mexico which contained the present-day west coast and southwest was in the way; taking land that belonged to a weak neighbor did not settle well for some Americans; the question of slavery in newly acquired territories was another major objection; *Vietnam*: desperate to keep communism from spreading the United States helped South Vietnam fight against the USSR-backed North Vietnam; the war also backed up the Truman Doctrine which preached a policy of containment of communism; it was on the other side of the world and we should let the Vietnamese fight their own civil war; the number of losses were much higher and the war was being expanded into Cambodia; young people developed the counterculture and shootings at colleges like Kent State caused disbelief and panic)
- Supports the theme with relevant facts, examples, and details (*Mexico*: annexed Texas; Rio Grande; President Polk; disputed border; Manifest Destiny; Thoreau refused to pay taxes; Wilmot Proviso; Mexican Cession; 1849 Gold Rush; fertile land; *Vietnam*: “hot war”; Cold War; not officially a declared war; President Johnson; blank check; Gulf of Tonkin incident; Tet Offensive)
- Demonstrates a logical plan of organization; includes an introduction that states the two wars led to the most divisive debates in United States history and lacks a conclusion

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 4. Well-placed analytic statements are supported by historical details and examples demonstrating a good understanding of the task. The treatment of the Vietnam War policies would have been enhanced with further development.

### Practice Paper C—Score Level 3

#### The response:

- Develops all aspects of the task with little depth for providing Lend-Lease aid to Great Britain and for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is more descriptive than analytic (*Lend-Lease*: many Americans supported giving more direct aid to Britain under the Lend-Lease Act as Britain was alone in fighting against Nazi Germany; main foreign policy of the United States at the time was isolationism and Lend-Lease involved the United States risking becoming part of a foreign war; due to the passing of the Lend-Lease Act, Great Britain and later the Soviet Union could get supplies from the United States and survive until the United States was attacked by the Japanese Empire; *Vietnam*: due to the United States policy of containing communism during the Cold War; if one nation were to fall under a communist government the bordering nations were likely to fall; most Americans opposed the war as it progressed since many Americans did not think the United States was winning and it was only costing lives and money; result of the United States taking part in such an unpopular war was a lot of tension between the American people and the United States government; after the defeat the United States was less willing to commit military forces for years to come)
- Includes some relevant facts, examples, and details (*Lend-Lease*: “cash and carry;” fifty United States destroyers; lives lost in World War I; December 7, 1941; second world war; *Vietnam*: domino theory; college students protested; United States militarily withdrew; southern Vietnam was conquered)
- Demonstrates a satisfactory plan of organization; includes an introduction that mentions George Washington’s Farewell Address and a conclusion that restates the theme

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 3. The response shows a basic knowledge of the two foreign policy actions and the point of view of those who supported and opposed the actions, but includes limited analysis and lacks elaboration.

### Practice Paper D—Score Level 1

#### The response:

- Minimally develops some aspects of the task for fighting the Spanish-American War
- Is descriptive (*Spanish-American War*: those who supported the war and its effects called for a new kind of America: an American Empire; supporters wanted America to take her role on the world stage; America should live up to its isolationist potential; the country was born out of rebellion against a colonizing power)
- Includes few relevant facts, examples, or details (*Spanish-American War*: Washington)
- Demonstrates a general plan of organization; includes an introduction that restates the theme and lacks a conclusion

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 1. The response addresses the support for and opposition to the Spanish-American War, demonstrating a limited understanding of the task.

## Practice Paper E—Score Level 5

### The response:

- Thoroughly develops all aspects of the task evenly and in depth for declaring war against Mexico and for sending troops to Vietnam
- Is more analytical than descriptive (*Mexico*: supporters of the war led by the newly elected Polk were fueled by Manifest Destiny, the belief in the right, desire, and obligation to expand; after Americans were killed by Mexican troops Polk gained support for the war by claiming that “American blood has been shed on American soil”; those who opposed the war did not want to be entangled with Mexico and accused Polk of deliberately provoking the war; behind the issue of war with Mexico was the more critical issue of the expansion of slavery; the Wilmot Proviso failed but the war was an American success because it achieved Manifest Destiny; the acquisition of California with its Pacific seaports, fertile farmland, and vast mineral resources was a huge victory; the Compromise of 1850 was a long and complicated agreement that failed to reduce sectional tension; *Vietnam*: they used Eisenhower’s domino theory to argue that if we did not fight communism in Vietnam we would have to fight it at home; obvious to supporters that communists would not stop until they controlled the entire world; while the wealthy could defer the draft by financing their path to higher education, poor and minorities could not; Martin Luther King Jr. criticized the government for spending precious dollars on a far-off war instead of social programs for the poor; King saw that one impact of sending troops was the decimation of Great Society initiatives; most who faced death in Vietnam had no say about who was sending them to war; one of the most direct effects of the Vietnam War was ratification of the 26th amendment granting suffrage to 18-year-olds)
- Richly supports the theme with many relevant facts, examples, and details (*Mexico*: Rio Grande; Texas; Nueces River; Slidell mission; Abraham Lincoln’s Spot Resolution; Northern Congressmen; free state; stronger Fugitive Slave Law; upsetting the balance in the Senate; *Vietnam*: war hawks; containment; “better dead than Red”; economic discrimination; draft protests; burned their draft cards)
- Demonstrates a logical and clear plan of organization; includes an introduction that notes Americans have often wavered from the advice in Washington’s Farewell Address and a brief conclusion

**Conclusion:** Overall, the response fits the criteria for Level 5. The response integrates strong analysis and rich detail into a discussion about the effects of war on social issues such as slavery in the mid-19th century and economic discrimination during the Vietnam War.

# United States History and Government Specifications January 2020

## Part I Multiple-Choice Questions by Standard

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

## Parts II and III by Theme and Standard

	Theme	STANDARDS
Thematic Essay	Foreign Policy; Presidential Decisions and Actions; Civic Values	Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5: United States and New York History; World History; Geography; Economics; Civics, Citizenship, and Government
Document-based Essay	Civic Values; Reform Movements; Individuals, Groups, Institutions; Citizenship	Standards 1, 2, 4, and 5: United States and New York History; World History; Economics; Civics, Citizenship, and Government

### *Notes:*

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.

**The *Chart for Determining the Final Examination Score for the January 2020 Regents Examination in United States History and Government* will be posted on the Department's web site at: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/assessment/> on the day of the examination. Conversion charts provided for the previous administrations of the United States History and Government examination must NOT be used to determine students' final scores for this administration.**

### **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:

1. Go to <http://www.forms2.nysed.gov/emsc/osa/exameval/reexameval.cfm>.
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.