Question 1 (Document-Based Question)
Suggested reading period: 15 minutes
Suggested writing period: 45 minutes

Directions: Question 1 is based on the accompanying documents. The documents have been edited for the purpose of this exercise. You are advised to spend 15 minutes reading and planning and 45 minutes writing your answer.

Write your responses on the lined pages that follow the question.

In your response you should do the following.

- State a relevant thesis that directly addresses all parts of the question.
- Support the thesis or a relevant argument with evidence from all, or all but one, of the documents.
- Incorporate analysis of all, or all but one, of the documents into your argument.
- Focus your analysis of each document on at least one of the following: intended audience, purpose, historical context, and/or point of view.
- Support your argument with analysis of historical examples outside the documents.
- Connect historical phenomena relevant to your argument to broader events or processes.
- Synthesize the elements above into a persuasive essay that extends your argument, connects it to a different historical context, or accounts for contradictory evidence on the topic.

1. Compare and contrast views of United States overseas expansion in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Evaluate how understandings of national identity, at the time, shaped these views.
Document 1


March 19: [The war with Spain will result in a] quickened sense of our duty toward one another, and a loftier conception of the obligations of government to its humblest citizen. . . . April 30: [Black participation in the war will bring about] an era of good feeling the country over and cement the races into a more compact brotherhood through perfect unity of purpose and patriotic affinity [where White people will] . . . unloose themselves from the bondage of racial prejudice.

Document 2


The Americans have been committed from the outset to the doctrine that all men are equal. We have elevated it into an absolute doctrine as a part of the theory of our social and political fabric. . . . It is an astonishing event that we have lived to see American arms carry this domestic dogma out where it must be tested in its application to uncivilized and half-civilized peoples. At the first touch of the test we throw the doctrine away and adopt the Spanish doctrine. We are told by all the imperialists that these people are not fit for liberty and self-government; that it is rebellion for them to resist our beneficence; that we must send fleets and armies to kill them if they do it; that we must devise a government for them and administer it ourselves; that we may buy them or sell them as we please, and dispose of their “trade” for our own advantage. What is that but the policy of Spain to her dependencies? What can we expect as a consequence of it? Nothing but that it will bring us where Spain is now.
Document 3

Source: Statement attributed to President William McKinley, describing to a church delegation the decision to acquire the Philippines, 1899.

When next I realized that the Philippines had dropped into our laps, I confess I did not know what to do with them. I sought counsel from all sides—Democrats as well as Republicans—but got little help. . . . I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way—I don’t know how it was, but it came:

(1) That we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable;

(2) That we could not turn them over to France or Germany, our commercial rivals in the Orient—that would be bad business and discreditable;

(3) That we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government, and they would soon have anarchy and misrule worse than Spain’s was; and

(4) That there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them and by God’s grace do the very best we could by them . . .

And then I went to bed and went to sleep, and slept soundly, and the next morning I sent for the chief engineer of the War Department (our map-maker), and I told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States [pointing to a large map on the wall of his office], and there they are and there they will stay while I am president!

Document 4

Source: Jane Addams, social reformer, “Democracy or Militarism,” speech given in Chicago, 1899.

Some of us were beginning to hope that . . . we were ready to accept the peace ideal . . . to recognize that . . . the man who irrigates a plain [is] greater than he who lays it waste. Then came the Spanish war, with its gilt and lace and tinsel, and again the moral issues are confused with exhibitions of brutality. For ten years I have lived in a neighborhood which is by no means criminal, and yet during last October and November we were startled by seven murders within a radius of ten blocks. A little investigation of details and motives . . . made it not in the least difficult to trace the murders back to the influence of the war. . . . The newspapers, the theatrical posters, the street conversations for weeks had to do with war and bloodshed. The little children on the street played at war, . . . killing Spaniards. The humane instinct . . . gives way, and the barbaric instinct asserts itself.
Document 5


The Philippines offer a [grave] problem. . . . Many of their people are utterly unfit for self-government, and show no signs of becoming fit. Others may in time become fit but at present can only take part in self-government under a wise supervision, at once firm and beneficent. We have driven Spanish tyranny from the islands. If we now let it be replaced by savage anarchy, our work has been for harm and not for good. I have scant patience with those who fear to undertake the task of governing the Philippines, and who openly avow that they do fear to undertake it, or that they shrink from it because of the expense and trouble; but I have even scantier patience with those who make a pretense of humanitarianism to hide and cover their timidity, and who cant about “liberty” and the “consent of the governed,” in order to excuse themselves for their unwillingness to play the part of men. . . . Their doctrines condemn your forefathers and mine for ever having settled in these United States.

Document 6

Source: William Jennings Bryan speech, campaign for the presidency, 1900.

Imperialism is the policy of an empire. And an empire is a nation composed of different races, living under varying forms of government. A republic cannot be an empire, for a republic rests upon the theory that the government derive their powers from the consent of the governed and colonialism violates this theory. We do not want the Filipinos for citizens. They cannot, without danger to us, share in the government of our nation and moreover, we cannot afford to add another race question to the race questions which we already have. Neither can we hold the Filipinos as subjects even if we could benefit them by so doing. . . . Our experiment in colonialism has been unfortunate. Instead of profit, it has brought loss. Instead of strength, it has brought weakness. Instead of glory, it has brought humiliation.
Source: *Puck*, a satirical magazine, June 29, 1904.

His 128th Birthday.
“Gee, but this is an awful stretch!”

END OF DOCUMENTS FOR QUESTION 1
Information for Document-Based Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>The student should spend approximately 55 minutes on this question.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objective</td>
<td>WOR-6 Analyze the major aspects of domestic debates over U.S. expansionism in the 19th century and the early 20th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WOR-7 Analyze the goals of U.S. policymakers in major international conflicts, such as the Spanish-American War, World Wars I and II, and the Cold War, and explain how U.S. involvement in these conflicts has altered the U.S. role in world affairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Thinking Skill</td>
<td>Historical Argumentation, Appropriate Use of Relevant Historical Evidence, Comparison, Contextualization, Synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Concepts in the Curriculum Framework</td>
<td>7.3 I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scoring Guidelines for Document-Based Question 1

Compare and contrast views of United States overseas expansion in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Evaluate how understandings of national identity at the time shaped these views.

Maximum Possible Points: 7

A. Thesis: 0–1 point
Skills assessed: Argumentation + targeted skill

States a thesis that directly addresses all parts of the question. The thesis must do more than restate the question.

1 point
B. Analysis of historical evidence and support of argument: 0–4 points
Skills assessed: Use of Evidence, Argumentation, + targeted skill (e.g., Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis of documents (0–3 points)</th>
<th>Analysis of outside examples to support the thesis/argument (0–1 point)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offers plausible analysis of the content of a majority of the documents, explicitly using this analysis to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument</td>
<td>Offers plausible analysis of historical examples beyond/outside the documents to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers plausible analysis of BOTH the content of a majority of the documents, explicitly using this analysis to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument; AND at least one of the following for the majority of the documents: • intended audience, • purpose, • historical context, and/or • the author's point of view</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>2 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers plausible analysis of BOTH the content of all or all but one of the documents, explicitly using this analysis to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument; AND at least one of the following for all or all but one of the documents: • intended audience, • purpose, • historical context, and/or • the author's point of view</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND/OR

C. Contextualization: 0–1 point
Skill assessed: Contextualization

Accurately and explicitly connects historical phenomena relevant to the argument to broader historical events and/or processes.

1 point
D. Synthesis: 0–1 point

Skill assessed: Synthesis

Response synthesizes the argument, evidence, an analysis of the documents, and context into a coherent and persuasive essay by accomplishing one or more of the following as relevant to the question:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriately extends or modifies the stated thesis or argument</th>
<th>Recognizes and effectively accounts for disparate, sometimes contradictory evidence from primary sources and/or secondary works in crafting a coherent argument</th>
<th>Appropriately connects the topic of the question to other historical periods, geographical areas, contexts, or circumstances</th>
<th>(World and European History) Draws on appropriate ideas and methods from different fields of inquiry or disciplines in support of the argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCORING NOTES

Thesis

Possible thesis statements could include the following.

- Arguments about overseas expansionism tended to be framed in terms of who Americans were and what the United States stood for, whether or not one supported or opposed expansionism and imperialists and anti-imperialists.
- Contrasting views about United States expansion were linked to different notions of the United States mission.
- Positive views of expansion were linked to national ideals.
- Debates over expansionism hinged on the role of the United States as a world power.
- Negative views of expansion framed national identity in terms of the long-standing isolationist and anticolonial traditions of the United States.
- The prevalent racist notions of national identity shaped the views of both proponents and opponents of expansionism.
- The tendency of expansionism to become the dominant policy reflected a long-standing tendency in United States culture to link American identity with a mission to proselytize for the values of the United States, but expansionism also conflicted with the national history of anticolonialism and revolution.
Analysis of Documents

As explained in the scoring notes, to earn full credit for analyzing documents, responses must include at least one of the following for all or all but one of the documents: intended audience, purpose, historical context, author's point of view. Although examples of these elements are listed below, these examples of analysis must explicitly be used in support of a stated thesis or a relevant argument.

Document 1


March 19: [The war with Spain will result in a] quickened sense of our duty toward one another, and a loftier conception of the obligations of government to its humblest citizen. . . . April 30: [Black participation in the war will bring about] an era of good feeling the country over and cement the races into a more compact brotherhood through perfect unity of purpose and patriotic affinity [where White people will] . . . unloose themselves from the bondage of racial prejudice.

Components of document analysis may include the following.

- Intended audience: African American newspaper readers
- Purpose: to support African American military service
- Historical context: written during the same year as the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, prior to the United States acquisition of the Philippines, and two years after the Plessy v. Ferguson decision
- The author's point of view: written by an educated African American male with a sense of leadership of people, who presents African American participation in the Spanish-American War as a positive good for race relations and portrays patriotism and the United States as being a multiracial brotherhood
Document 2


The Americans have been committed from the outset to the doctrine that all men are equal. We have elevated it into an absolute doctrine as a part of the theory of our social and political fabric . . . It is an astonishing event that we have lived to see American arms carry this domestic dogma out where it must be tested in its application to uncivilized and half-civilized peoples. At the first touch of the test we throw the doctrine away and adopt the Spanish doctrine. We are told by all the imperialists that these people are not fit for liberty and self-government; that it is rebellion for them to resist our beneficence; that we must send fleets and armies to kill them if they do it; that we must devise a government for them and administer it ourselves; that we may buy them or sell them as we please, and dispose of their “trade” for our own advantage. What is that but the policy of Spain to her dependencies? What can we expect as a consequence of it? Nothing but that it will bring us where Spain is now.

Components of document analysis may include the following.

- Intended audience: a speech to a university audience and population who were presumably educated, mostly White, and mostly affluent
- Purpose: to criticize imperialism
- Historical context: stated after the outbreak of the Spanish-American War and prior to the United States acquisition of the Philippines
- The author's point of view: written by a White American intellectual, who was an opponent of imperialism and a proponent of Social Darwinism, skeptical about imperialism and the concept of exporting United States values via military force, and concerned that doing so would make the United States similar to Spain
Document 3

Source: Statement attributed to President William McKinley, describing to a church delegation the decision to acquire the Philippines, 1899.

When next I realized that the Philippines had dropped into our laps, I confess I did not know what to do with them. I sought counsel from all sides—Democrats as well as Republicans—but got little help. . . . I walked the floor of the White House night after night until midnight; and I am not ashamed to tell you, gentlemen, that I went down on my knees and prayed to Almighty God for light and guidance more than one night. And one night late it came to me this way—I don’t know how it was, but it came:

(1) That we could not give them back to Spain—that would be cowardly and dishonorable;

(2) That we could not turn them over to France or Germany, our commercial rivals in the Orient—that would be bad business and discreditable;

(3) That we could not leave them to themselves—they were unfit for self-government, and they would soon have anarchy and misrule worse than Spain’s was; and

(4) That there was nothing left for us to do but to take them all, and to educate the Filipinos, and uplift and civilize and Christianize them and by God’s grace do the very best we could by them. . . .

And then I went to bed and went to sleep, and slept soundly, and the next morning I sent for the chief engineer of the War Department (our map-maker), and I told him to put the Philippines on the map of the United States [pointing to a large map on the wall of his office], and there they are and there they will stay while I am president!

Components of document analysis may include the following:

- Intended audience: the American church delegation, magazine readers, and the general United States public
- Purpose: to justify the United States acquisition of the Philippines
- Historical context: stated soon after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War and the debates about the United States acquisition of the Philippines (but some questions exist as to whether McKinley really made the statement)
- The author’s point of view: stated by a United States president who was a White male, holding leadership of people, who perhaps held a sense of religious mission, and who was explaining his thought process leading to the decision to annex the Philippines for the United States by considering the options available, suggesting that Filipinos were unfit for self-government and needed United States intervention, and ultimately suggesting that the United States had a Christian mission to uplift the Philippine people
Document 4

Source: Jane Addams, social reformer, “Democracy or Militarism,” speech given in Chicago, 1899.

Some of us were beginning to hope that . . . we were ready to accept the peace ideal . . . to recognize that the man . . . who irrigates a plain [is] greater than he who lays it waste. Then came the Spanish war, with its gilt and lace and tinsel, and again the moral issues are confused with exhibitions of brutality. For ten years I have lived in a neighborhood which is by no means criminal, and yet during last October and November we were startled by seven murders within a radius of ten blocks. A little investigation of details and motives . . . made it not in the least difficult to trace the murders back to the influence of the war. . . . The newspapers, the theatrical posters, the street conversations for weeks had to do with war and bloodshed. The little children on the street played at war, . . . killing Spaniards. The humane instinct . . . gives way, and the barbaric instinct asserts itself.

Components of document analysis may include the following:

- Intended audience: excerpt from a speech to an audience that is uncertain but were likely similar-minded supporters of social reform, isolationism, and peace
- Purpose: to criticize the Spanish-American War and the militarism it encouraged in the United States
- Social context: stated soon after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War and immediately after the United States acquisition of the Philippines and reflects urban perspective
- The author's point of view: stated by a White American female, who was a social activist and a progressive reformer based in Chicago and a pacifist who asserts that United States participation in the Spanish-American War had undermined support for ideals of peace and had possibly encouraged more violence among Americans on the streets of Chicago
Document 5


The Philippines offer a [grave] problem . . . . Many of their people are utterly unfit for self-government, and show no signs of becoming fit. Others may in time become fit but at present can only take part in self-government under a wise supervision, at once firm and beneficent. We have driven Spanish tyranny from the islands. If we now let it be replaced by savage anarchy, our work has been for harm and not for good. I have scant patience with those who fear to undertake the task of governing the Philippines, and who openly avow that they do fear to undertake it, or that they shrink from it because of the expense and trouble; but I have even scant patience with those who make a pretense of humanitarianism to hide and cover their timidity, and who cant about “liberty” and the “consent of the governed,” in order to excuse themselves for their unwillingness to play the part of men . . . . Their doctrines condemn your forefathers and mine for ever having settled in these United States.

Components of document analysis may include the following:

- Intended audience: excerpt from a speech to business owners and local leaders in Chicago, presumably White males who embraced a mainstream understanding of national politics
- Purpose: to justify the United States acquisition of the Philippines
- Historical context: stated soon after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War and immediately after the United States acquisition of the Philippines
- The author’s point of view: stated by a White American male political leader (the governor of New York at the time), an advocate of assertive late-nineteenth-century masculinity, imperialism, and militarism, who expresses that the United States had an obligation to provide government for the Philippines and criticizes opponents of the acquisition of the Philippines as being fearful and “unwilling . . . to play the part of men.”
Document 6

Source: William Jennings Bryan speech, campaign for the presidency, 1900.

Imperialism is the policy of an empire. And an empire is a nation composed of different races, living under varying forms of government. A republic cannot be an empire, for a republic rests upon the theory that the government derive their powers from the consent of the government and colonialism violates this theory. We do not want the Filipinos for citizens. They cannot, without danger to us, share in the government of our nation and moreover, we cannot afford to add another race question to the race questions which we already have. Neither can we hold the Filipinos as subjects even if we could benefit them by so doing. . . Our experiment in colonialism has been unfortunate. Instead of profit, it has brought loss. Instead of strength, it has brought weakness. Instead of glory, it has brought humiliation.

Components of document analysis may include the following.

- Audience: an excerpt from a speech given while Bryan was campaigning for president to an audience that is unclear but presumably made up of his political supporters
- Purpose: to condemn the United States acquisition of the Philippines, to make a case for ending colonialism, and to make a case for his own campaign for the presidency
- Historical context: stated soon after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War and soon after the United States acquisition of the Philippines
- The author's point of view: stated by a White American male political leader (a United States representative from Nebraska at the time), an opponent of imperialism who was supportive of Populist ideas, critical of United States imperialism and condemnatory of United States colonialism but at the same time, critical of the notion of incorporating Filipinos as citizens
Document 7

Source: *Puck*, a satirical magazine, June 29, 1904.

Components of document analysis may include the following.

- **Audience**: A cartoon published on the cover of *Puck*, a satirical magazine whose audience is unclear but presumably the American reading public.
- **Purpose**: To humorously critique the irony of an American symbol of liberty encompassing non–United States territories and to suggest that American interests may be overextended.
- **Historical context**: Published soon after the conclusion of the Spanish-American War and the United States acquisition of the Philippines and Panama and in the same year as the Roosevelt Corollary.
- **Author's point of view**: Unclear but seems to be critical of United States expansionism and presents the United States as a quasi-imperial power in the Western Hemisphere and as protective but with talons.
Analysis of outside examples to support thesis/argument

Possible examples of information not found in the documents that could be used to support the stated thesis or a relevant argument could include the following.

- The Monroe Doctrine, 1823
- The doctrine of Manifest Destiny
- The formulation of the Roosevelt Corollary, 1904
- The American victory in the Spanish-American War leading to the following outcomes.
  - The United States acquisition of island territories
  - Expanded United States economic and military presence in the Caribbean and Latin America
  - The United States engagement in a protracted insurrection in the Philippines
  - Increased United States involvement in Asia
  - Widespread public support for expansionism in the late nineteenth century
- The active role of the press in mobilizing support for expansionism (e.g., yellow journalism and William Randolph Hearst)
- The opposition of some African American leaders to the war in the Philippines (e.g., W. E. B. Du Bois)
- Knowledge of the details of expansionism in the Pacific and the Caribbean (e.g., how United States sovereignty was extended to Hawaii and Samoa)
- Later events or topics related to United States overseas expansion
  - Dollar diplomacy
  - Moral diplomacy
  - The United States intervention in Mexico
Contextualization
Students can earn a point for contextualization by accurately and explicitly connecting historical phenomena relevant to the argument to broader historical events and/or processes. These historical phenomena may include, but are not limited to, the following.

- Debates and policies about race, immigration, nativism, and United States society in the late 19th century
  - Popular social-scientific theories including Social Darwinism and scientific racism
  - Codification of Jim Crow laws (segregation) de facto and de jure in the late nineteenth century; race riots and lynching
  - Rise of the Niagara Movement and the NAACP
  - Growth of the Social Gospel in the late nineteenth century
  - The Progressive reform movement
  - The perception in the 1890s that the western frontier was closed

- Contemporary debates over late-19th-century and early-20th-century imperialism
  - Yellow journalism and prevalent public support for expansionism
  - The desire to have outposts and coaling stations in the Pacific to facilitate commerce in Asia
  - The severe depression of the 1890s (the Panic of 1893) and the need to open up foreign commercial markets
  - Prior public support for the Cuban nationalists and revolutionaries
  - Distinctions in popular attitudes between support for the Spanish-American War and greater opposition to the subsequent war in the Philippines
  - The long history of the United States territorial expansion and conquest and debates over the United States role as a global power
  - Isolationism, the Monroe Doctrine, and the Roosevelt Corollary
  - Division of Africa on the part of European powers and imperial competition
  - The naval buildup in Europe, the rise of imperial Japan, and the subsequent American response to increase naval power
  - Arguments that Americans were destined to expand their culture and norms to others, especially the non-White nations of the globe
  - The notion of Christian evangelism contributing to a duty to expand United States influence in the world
Synthesis

- Essays can earn the point for synthesis by crafting a persuasive and coherent essay. This can be accomplished providing a conclusion that extends or modifies the analysis in the essay, by using disparate and sometimes contradictory evidence from primary and/or secondary sources to craft a coherent argument, or by connecting to another historical period or context. Examples could include, but are not limited to, the following.
  - Linking the argument to earlier debates about United States involvement in European affairs, from George Washington's Farewell Address through the Monroe Doctrine
  - Linking the argument to debates about territorial expansion prior to the Civil War, including issues surrounding the Louisiana Purchase and the Mexican Cession
  - Linking the argument to later twentieth-century debates about expansionism and isolationism
  - Linking the argument to the rise of the United States as a world power following the Second World War